



Autumn 2011
Number 81

The ARCHAEOLOGIST

Understanding Significance



This issue:

IfA ANNUAL CONFERENCE

**The Southport
group session –
a delegate's view**

p7

**Ascribing
significance in
the 'Big Society'**

p18

**Evaluating
significance in
the commercial
sector**

p21

**IfA Conference –
the next
generation**

p31



Institute for Archaeologists
SHES, University of Reading, Whiteknights
PO Box 227, Reading RG6 6AB
tel: 0118 378 6446
fax: 0118 378 6448
email: admin@archaeologists.net
www.archaeologists.net

**IfA CONFERENCE
READING 2011**



C O N T E N T S



1	Contents
2	Editorial
3	From the finds tray
4	Advocacy <i>Peter Hinton</i>
6	IfA Conference 2011: assessing significance <i>Kathryn Whittington</i>
7	The Southport Group Session – a delegate’s view <i>Joe Abrams</i>
8	Realising the benefits of planning-led investigation in the historic environment: a framework for delivery <i>The Southport Group</i>
10	Characterisation: where next? <i>Emma Hancox</i>
12	CPD logs, PDPs and training plans: a session review <i>Gail Mackintosh</i>
14	Assessing the significance of iron objects and production remains <i>Paul Belford and Evelyn Godfrey</i>
16	Understanding and protection: the application of significance in the historic environment and England’s National Heritage Protection Plan <i>Edmund Lee</i>
17	Measuring the significance of historic designed landscapes in Lancashire: Local Lists and community involvement <i>Nigel R J Neil</i>
18	Ascribing significance in the ‘Big Society’ <i>Stella Jackson</i>
20	Assessing significance underwater: just piles of old rocks, geophysical anomalies and shifting sands? <i>Mark Littlewood</i>
21	Evaluating significance in the commercial sector <i>Paul Sharman</i>
22	Lovely – but what is it? The Rising Tide Project and research on the submerged landscape of Orkney <i>Caroline Wickham-Jones</i>
24	Aren’t we all in this together? The importance of partnership working <i>Jeff Sanders and Susan Casey</i>
25	The experience of partnership working: English Heritage’s current ‘Miner-Farmer Landscapes of the North Pennines AONB’ project <i>Al Oswald</i>
26	Self-employment and business start-ups <i>David Cawdeary</i>
28	Assessing significance for planning applications: preparing PPS5 – compliant reports for local authorities <i>Duncan Coe</i>
29	Essential writing skills for archaeologists <i>Kasia Gdaniec, Jenny Glazebrook and Alison Taylor</i>
30	In recognition of professional development <i>Anthony Sinclair and Kate Geary</i>
31	IfA Conference – the next generation <i>Nathalie Ward, Edward James and Holly Beavitt-Pike</i>
34	Widening the audience for community archaeology: the significance of PPS5 <i>Mike Nevell</i>
36	Reflectance Transformation: an approach for imaging archaeological finds <i>Graeme Earl, Gareth Beale, Hembo Pagi and Nicole Smith</i>
38	Forensic Archaeology Special Interest Group AGM <i>John Hunter</i>
40	Conference excursions <i>Kirsten Collins and Karen Bewick</i>
42	Recognising your achievements <i>Kathryn Whittington</i>
44	New members

As guest editor of the autumn Conference edition of *The Archaeologist* it has been no insignificant task to condense three days of lively workshops and debates, vibrant social events, stimulating sessions and resulting papers into a mere 44 pages. Yet the articles, session reviews and papers contained within aim to provide you with a brief glimpse of what proved to be one of the most successful and well attended IfA Conferences in recent years.

The success of the Conference was in no small part due to the efforts of a host of inspirational speakers each offering different views and experiences relating to the central theme of ‘understanding significance as the key to assessing, managing and explaining the historic environment’. While some sessions focused on macro issues such as ascribing value, significance and importance across the whole spectrum of heritage assets, others drilled down to the level of particular asset types and how they might be studied and recorded. Meanwhile other sessions, such as that on assessment of underwater significance, highlighted the opportunities arising from new policy and legislation for what is a growing area of the profession.

Perhaps surprisingly, this undercurrent of optimism was evident in other areas of the Conference, particularly in discussions of the report by the Southport Group whose work was instigated by Taryn Nixon’s heartfelt call-to-action at the IfA Conference in 2010. The report, which will have launched by the time this issue goes to press, sets out a long-term strategy for change in full recognition that economic conditions are likely to remain tough for some time. Nevertheless, there are numerous opportunities that can be seized now to improve the benefits stemming from planning-led investigation of the historic

environment. By the time you read this I hope that those organisations committed to implementing report recommendations will already be taking positive steps. Doubtless IfA will be in the vanguard!

You may have noticed that this edition does not contain the IfA annual report, which as a result of member feedback is now published online. This does not imply a lack of news on IfA’s part. On the contrary, this year has seen the emergence of a sleeker, more efficient IfA working ever harder to grow our network, raise standards in the profession, develop new guidance, and campaign for better pay and conditions for sector professionals. Efforts to promote the interests of the historic environment to national and local government are also ceaseless, particularly with such uncertainty relating to policy and legislation.

The growth in IfA activity was evident at Conference where five Special Interest Groups held AGM’s, including an inaugural meeting of the Forensic Archaeology Group; one of three new SIGs launched this year. IfA will hold its own AGM on 3 October 2011. Preparations are also underway for the 2012 Conference which will be held in Oxford from 18–20 April. The theme for next year’s conference will be Partnership Working – creating effective networks throughout the historic, natural and built environments to maximise resources, increase public benefit and build a stronger sector. Meanwhile, in the spirit of 2012 the winter issue will provide a sneak preview of the exciting things to come when the spring sunshine returns to mark the start of IfA Conference 2012.

Karen Bewick
Editor

Notes to contributors

Themes and deadlines

Winter: ‘Inspiring excellence in public engagement’
deadline: 1 October 2011

Contributions and letter/emails are always welcome. *TA* is made digitally available through our website and if this raises copyright issues with any authors, artists or photographers, please notify the editor. Accessed digitally, web links are especially useful in articles, so do include these where relevant. Short articles (max. 1000 words) are preferred. They should be sent as an email attachment, which must include captions and credits for illustrations. The editor will edit and shorten if necessary. Illustrations are very important. These can be supplied as originals, on CD or as emails, at a minimum resolution of 500 kb. Copyright of content and illustrations remains with the author, that of the final design with IfA (who will make it available on its website). Authors are responsible for obtaining reproduction rights and for providing the editor with appropriate captions and credits. More detailed *Notes for contributors* for each issue are available from the editor. Opinions expressed in *The Archaeologist* are those of the authors, and are not necessarily those of IfA.

EDITED by Karen Bewick and Kathryn Whittington, IfA, SHES, University of Reading, Whiteknights, PO Box 227 READING RG6 6AB
DESIGNED and TYPESET by Sue Cawood
PRINTED by Duffield Printers Ltd (Leeds)

FROM THE FINDS TRAY

IfA 2012 Conference

Our 2012 conference will be held in Oxford from 18–20 April.

The theme for the 2012 conference will be Partnership Working – creating effective networks throughout the historic, natural and built environments to maximise resources, increase public benefit and build a stronger sector. We would welcome proposals for sessions, CPD workshops and excursions based around this theme. Please submit a short abstract identifying 2–3 potential speakers to alex.llewellyn@archaeologists.net by 31 August 2011.

IfA AGM

The Institute’s AGM will take place on 3 October 2011 at The Society of Antiquaries, Burlington House, London. For more information please see the AGM event page (www.archaeologists.net/node/352). We have contacted members with a notice and nomination form by email or post (depending on your contact settings). If you haven’t heard from us by July, please get in touch.

BAG EGM

IfA Executive committee, on behalf of IfA council has called an Extraordinary General Meeting to elect a new committee for the Buildings Archaeology Group. All committee places will be up for election.

The event will take place at 4pm, on Friday 26 August 2011 at the Guildhall, London. To be followed by a social event. More details including nomination forms (if you have not received yours) can be downloaded from the BAG webpage (www.archaeologists.net/groups/buildings).

Free admission to the Historic Buildings Parks and Gardens Event, 15 November 2011

IfA members now gain free admission to the Historic Building Park and Gardens Event held in November at The Queen Elizabeth II Conference Centre in Westminster.

Held annually for over 25 years, this major heritage conservation day has evolved from, and is held in parallel with, the Annual General Meeting of The Historic Houses Association who allow, subject to seating availability, visitors and delegates to listen to their President’s Address, to their Guest Speaker, John Penrose MP, Minister for Heritage and Tourism and to attend the HHA/Smiths Gore Lecture, this year given by The Marquess of Douro. Visitors to the event will also have free access to the comprehensive all day exhibition, where over 70 exhibitors will display a broad selection of products and services used in the care, repair, conservation and restoration of historic buildings, their contents and surrounding landscapes.

Free admission is available to all those who are either owners of historic buildings or who are involved in the upkeep, restoration or conservation of historic buildings, their contents or associated landscapes. Members can register for the event by visiting <http://www.hall-mccartney.co.uk/HBPGform.htm>.

University of Cambridge launch new MSt in Building History

The University of Cambridge have a part-time Master’s degree, an interdisciplinary research-based MSt at Apsley House. It has been designed by the Faculty of Architecture and History of Art in close association with English Heritage, and with the Institute of Continuing Education at Madingley Hall.

The MSt is aimed at students from a variety of backgrounds who wish to become architectural historians trained in both academic and practical skills of building analysis and assigning value and significance. It will also enable students to situate buildings in their historic area and landscape contexts. For more information please see their website (www.ice.cam.ac.uk/mst-buildinghistory)

Our members and Registered Organisation bulletin has been running since January, and is well received. If you’ve not been receiving yours please contact the office.

The Institute undertakes a great deal of advocacy work for the sector. Here is a roundup of recent activities.

England and Wales: Localism Bill

The Bill contains provision for both England and Wales and if enacted would have particular consequences for England with the introduction of neighbourhood planning.

At the Bill's second reading in the Lords, working with its Advisory Group, we provided a briefing to the All-Party Parliamentary Archaeology Group on the key issues affecting the historic environment and especially archaeology.

The Bill is currently (7 July) at committee stage in the Lords. Tim Howard and Archaeology Forum colleagues (TAF) helped draft several amendments that APPAG Lords will table during debates. Most are 'probing amendments', not expected to alter the Bill but to force a policy response from government about concerns; but one by Lord Renfrew of Kaimsthorn is a serious attempt alter the draft legislation to make it a statutory requirement of local authorities to maintain or have access to a Historic Environment Record. This was a provision of the Heritage Protection Reform Bill, which had cross-party support. Mike Heyworth, CBA Director and amanuensis to APPAG, has been particularly active in marshalling support for the amendment from peers: he and Peter Hinton have also met with government to explore how they might view the amendment, if accepted, when the Bill returns to the Commons.

England: National Planning Policy Framework

Government intends to produce a single framework document to encompass all high-level planning policy. It will replace all existing PPSs including PPS5, with all its hard-won improvements on PPGs 15 and 16. The policies of PPS5 will be highly condensed, with guidance on implementation allegedly eschewed by government, and it is important to ensure that the most critical provisions are carried forward in the NPPF. Lobbying, particularly by The Heritage Alliance (THA), has secured several undertakings from government not to weaken protection.

IfA individually, as well as via The Archaeology Forum, has continued to lobby for changes to the government's draft to correct shortcomings in the text produced by the Practitioners' Advisory Group a few weeks back. This draft would have left planning-led, developer-funded archaeology on a very shaky footing in England, so we have had private meetings with government and its officials to argue strongly for improvements. The government consultation draft, released on 25 June, includes many improvements. We will be scrutinising it in detail and using members' input.

England: NPPF Practice Guide

There is no doubt that government does not intend the NPPF to contain guidance on implementation of its policies. Government has advised us that it is not the responsibility for government or its agencies to provide that guidance, but that professional bodies should take on the role. Elsewhere those sentiments have been expressed in terms of 'sector bodies', which casts the net wider. Gerry Wait and Peter Hinton have attended meetings of a working party of the Historic Environment Forum to draft replacement guidance: CBA, ALGAO, English Heritage, THA, IHBC, Historic Towns Forum, Country Land and Business Association, Black Environment Network, British Property Federation and Civic Voice are also represented.

England: Bunnygate

IfA responded quickly to Cllr Melton's interesting views on the desirability of removing historic environment provisions from the planning process in Fenland District. The affair shows the direction the localism agenda may take unless (a) adequate safeguards are in place and (b) those with responsibilities are aware of them.

We worked closely with TAF colleagues and a 'clarification' now been produced. (www.archaeologists.net/news/110704-taf-response-cllr-melton-clarification).

Scotland: Planning Advice Note on archaeology

IfA has been pushing Scottish Government through its planning division and Historic Scotland to make revisions to PAN42 ever since Scottish Planning Policy was released and NPPG 18 withdrawn. Progress has been made, and Peter Hinton has represented IfA on a Scottish Government drafting group, and he reports that the most recent draft is looking sound. Publication is imminent.


Northern Ireland: PPS6

Before and immediately after the Assembly elections (and the passage of a planning reform bill in the closing stages of the last session) IfA provided a briefing to the Northern Ireland Archaeology Forum on potential improvements to PPS6, in line with Southport agenda.

IfA has provided text for a letter from NIAF to the Culture, Arts and Leisure committee at Stormont, requesting a meeting to brief MLAs on the issues and to get their support in getting the reforms taken forward.

Much depends on secondary legislation to underpin the changes to planning law, and on the as-yet unclear timescale for the Reform of Public Administration: this involves changing the boundaries and make-up of local authorities, and devolving planning responsibilities to clusters of them from the Department of the Environment.

Peter Hinton MfA
IfA Chief Executive





This summer saw the official launch of the Southport report at an event in London attended by Heritage Minister for England John Penrose. Feedback from both the IfA conference workshop and ensuing public consultation helped to shape the ultimate version. The publication of Planning Policy Statement 5 by the

Department of Communities and Local Government (2010), alongside a strong and insightful Government vision statement on the historic environment (DCMS 2010), offered an extraordinary and rare opportunity – of the sort that comes along only once or twice in a professional lifetime.

The Southport report has been prepared as a response to that opportunity by a small working party of historic environment professionals – the Southport Group – that was formed following a debate at the Institute for Archaeologists' conference in Southport in April 2010. It sets out the key findings from a series of workshops, an economic

Peter Hinton, IfA © Martin Newman



analysis commissioned from the London School of Economics, and from consultation on a draft report: each written submission on the draft report has influenced and changed the final report. The visions and general thrust of the recommendations have received widespread and very enthusiastic support, although unsurprisingly there are some disagreements about the detail of the recommendations. The overwhelming conclusion is that the sector is ready for change.

The scope of the report is the planning-led investigation of the historic environment. It does not cover conservation, design or conservation and design services, except insofar as good conservation decisions are made on the basis of sound information that frequently arises from planning-led investigation. The report does not seek to cover investigation of the historic environment that takes place outside the planning process, though it does make recommendations on closer working between university, museum, curatorial and commercial archaeologists.

With the principles of PPS5 as their catalyst, many of the recommendations can at present only be applied explicitly to the English planning regime. When PPS5 is absorbed into the National Planning Policy Framework, it has been made clear in public Government statements that those principles are set to endure. Reform of PAN42 in Scotland is underway, so some of those recommendations may have application there. Reform of PPS6 in Northern Ireland and the historic environment elements of PG Wales have been mooted, providing further opportunities for UK-wide application. But many of the findings are not restricted to a particular planning policy framework, and so many of the recommendations are of immediate relevance across the UK – and beyond.

The starting point of the Southport Group's work was the recognition that there have been huge achievements under the previous planning regime. Developer-funded archaeology arising from PPG 16 has transformed our understanding of the past, and has produced excellent examples of good practice. It is this good practice that the recommendations in this Report seek to make more widespread. To be clear, the description in the economic analysis of market failure is terminology that is specific to economics, and should in no way be read as any criticism of curatorial, contracting or consulting

services, or of individuals. Rather, the economic analysis recognises a quality assurance framework that has depended on self-regulation but has operated in a price-driven market that required the providers or specifiers of services to submit to self-regulation. There have been strong commercial drivers that work against the consistent delivery of the high quality services that commercial archaeologists in particular can and wish to provide. We now have the opportunity to change that.

The report sets out a vision for public involvement and participation, research and the use of archived and published results, for how historic environment sector professionals should operate and for what the property and development sector should gain. It outlines a vision for the sector where management of the historic environment is a partnership between local authorities and community groups and where decisions proactively, confidently and genuinely take account of public values and concerns.

Development-led research into the historic environment should be a collaborative venture involving commercially-funded, local authority, higher education and voluntary sectors. Recognising the fundamental value of a solid record and evidence base, development-led investigation should be focused on interpretation, understanding and significance, not on record alone. In all cases decisions should be founded on sound knowledge derived from HERs mediated by expert professionals, and from proportionate and appropriate professional research commissioned by the applicant into the interests of a place and its significance. It should be conducted in a way that increases opportunities for public participation alongside properly resourced commercial practitioners. Voluntary public participation is an adjunct to, not a replacement or alternative to, professional leadership. Commercial and voluntary practitioners should be encouraged to acquire new skills, and where appropriate to have them accredited.

The report advises how to create a sector that consistently adds value to development by contributing to the sustainable development agenda, to design, brand, place-shaping, securing consents, risk management, PR, CSR, marketing and sales/rental values. It sees a market for services investigating the historic environment that places greater emphasis on quality than heretofore.

Planning-led investigation and explanation of the historic environment should be commissioned to comply with clear professional standards for person, process and product.

Based on these achievable aspirations, the report makes a series of recommendations which, the Southport Group believes, will provide the sector with the tools it needs to implement the principles of PPS5. Many sector bodies have already endorsed the recommendations, and there have already been practical offers of support and funding to take them forward. A good number of the recommendations could be addressed through a stronger specification for standardised Written Schemes of Investigation documents. The Southport Group has completed its work with the publication of this report and will cease to exist. It is now up to established organisations and the many skilled and committed practitioners in the sector to consider adopting the recommendations and products into their working methods.

Voting © Martin Newman

(below) Taryn Nixon © Martin Newman

The Southport Group





Looking down on the encroachment enclosure on Castlemorton common, Worcestershire © Worcestershire County Council

The value of Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC) and Extensive Urban Survey (EUS) has been demonstrated and documented, but we are only beginning to realise their potential when used together, or with other strategic projects and datasets. This session explored characterisation's potential, and in particular how it is evolving to meet a wider range of planning and community-based applications, examined a broad range of issues, and considered how all forms of characterisation can be used to manage, protect and promote the historic environment.

George Lambrick opened the session with a critical look at Sustainability Appraisals and Strategic Environment Assessments. He argued that not enough consideration has been given to the legal tools available to ensure that characterisation influences strategic development planning. He outlined how well-established characterisation practice principles could be used to greater effect, while also suggesting the need to develop methods to address the big strategic planning issues.

Kae Neustadt's paper also considered the desire to create a tool for historic landscape management, specifically informing strategic and spatial planning decisions. She presented an approach where characterisation projects can be used as the basis for identifying distinctiveness, significance and value within the historic landscape. By attaching significance to heritage assets, this model moves characterisation from being a descriptive informational base for archaeological research, to a usable method for evaluating proposed change and active, positive management.

Green infrastructure initiatives have become increasingly embedded in core planning strategies as the principle policy framework for delivering multi-functional environmental benefits in the context of medium to large-scale development. **Adam Mindykowski's** paper considered the role of integrated Historic Environment Assessment (HEA) in the context of green infrastructure planning. This remains a strategic concept with biodiversity 'green networks' and 'honey-pot' public amenity sites often driving the agenda. He argued that integrated assessment can provide context for Historic Environment Record (HER) features; identify group value, diversity, sensitivity and potential at a landscape scale. This then provides a baseline with


which to identify multi-functional conservation and enhancement opportunities. Historic environment professionals have long recognised the value of local place and landscape, but have not always capitalised on how effectively characterisation can influence green infrastructure initiatives.

Andrew Young's paper moved away from the purely planning aspect and looked at predictive modelling techniques using HLC. He demonstrated how HLC has shed light on the below-ground prehistoric landscape of Cornwall, by allowing an understanding of potential archaeological and historical attributes of each HLC type. In Cornwall the correlation between HLC types and archaeological sites listed in the HER has been used as a form of generic prediction. This has allowed targeted evaluation and mitigation work in areas where there are no sites in the HER. The resulting discussion highlighted the fact that, while this works in Cornwall, it does not work for all landscapes and/or site types. More research is needed in this area for the full potential to be realised.

Adam Partington focussed on the characterisation's potential to engage the public with their heritage. He used the example of the Heritage Connect website www.heritageconnectlincoln.com, which is providing a new method to connect communities with place. The website provides information about the character of places, how it developed, and also allows individuals to add their own views. The website was created as part of the Lincoln Townscape Assessment (LTA). The LTA has developed a new methodology for urban characterisation, providing wide ranging description, and incorporating the public's views of character.

Characterisation is a well established spatial planning tool in Wales as **Judith Alfrey** and **Andrew Marvel** discussed in their paper. It has developed and tested methodologies that allow local distinctiveness to be recognised.

A screenshot of the Heritage Connect website



They considered the success of characterisation as a tool for positive planning and regeneration while simultaneously inviting broader participation in the process. It highlighted the need for methodologies that are transparent and capable of consistent application, backed up by guidance, training and mentoring, and supported by better access to data sets. They argued that support high level government, and a strategic approach are key to successful integration of the historic environment into both the planning process and community engagement.

The session addressed, and also raised several key questions. Acknowledging that characterisation can be an effective tool for capturing the historic attributes that contribute towards local distinctiveness was central. Characterisation is increasingly being used to inform planning and regeneration strategies and decisions, however, there are still opportunities to capitalise on this more effectively. There are fantastic examples characterisation projects that have contributed successfully towards planning, community and prospection initiatives, which clearly set a positive trend that should lead further developments. There are nonetheless opportunities to promote characterisation to a wider audience, foster a clearer understanding of opportunities, and develop a more inclusive approach towards conservation of heritage assets and regeneration.

Emma Hancox Alfa
Worcestershire Historic Environment & Archaeology Service

CPD logs, PDPs and training plans: a session review

Gail Mackintosh

As a student member of IfA I attended my first Conference this year in need of career guidance, focus and direction. Thanks to the CPD workshop and the people that I met I successfully received a little bit of each.

I booked my place at the Conference while still unemployed; I graduated from my Masters in January and had been job-hunting ever since. Fortunately the week before the event I was accepted for the position of seasonal Learning Assistant with the National Trust for Scotland at Culloden Battlefield visitor centre. It is an interesting job and has provided a much needed breathing space in the pursuit of full-time work. I was still, however, in need of long-term career advice and hoped that the IfA Conference would prove to be an ideal place to start. I was particularly keen to attend the workshop on Continuing Professional Development (CPD) logs, Personal Development Plans (PDPs) and training plans in the hope that it would set me on the right track.

The PDP and CPD section of the workshop was run by **Kate Geary** of the IfA, while training plans were covered by **Kenneth Aitchison** of Landward Research Ltd. The PDP session abstract promised a seminar that would shed light on clarifying personal and career aims and identifying specific learning goals and opportunities to achieve them. The session began with a description of three kinds of PDP objectives; personal, professional and work. It was emphasised that these objectives should be SMART: Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Timetabled.

As the session was a workshop, however, not a lecture, we moved straight into the practical activity of personally defining a goal for each objective through discussions with a partner. We then read out our chosen goals. The members attending ranged from the recently graduated such as myself, to Bursary placement holders, commercial workers and a new business owner. It was interesting and surprisingly reassuring to hear what others had listed as it gave me confidence in the validity of my own goals. However, this was only the beginning as the next activity required us to define some practical

steps that we could take to reach these goals. Again we shared these with the group and by the end of the first half of the workshop I hope that I was not alone in feeling more confident that I would one day achieve them.

Although Kenneth Aitchison's following session was aimed more at employers and companies, this did not mean that it wasn't also useful to employees like myself. It was particularly helpful in outlining the process and reasoning for the performance review of an employee, such as that which I had recently experienced at work. Mr Aitchison explained that employers should use a review to benefit both company and employee by finding ways to help their employees to improve – eg training opportunities. I was delighted to find out that my current employer understands this and is keen to assist employees by providing opportunities to advance their career.

The workshop was offered twice during the three days – I took it on the first day and it prepared me for the rest of the Conference. After the session I thought more about who to meet and what to attend. I was focussed on not only attending interesting sessions but furthering my personal and professional aims for the future.

Therefore I came away from the conference having taken some active steps towards the professional and work PDP aims that the seminar had helped me to identify. Firstly, the seminar had helped me in finding out how to upgrade my IfA membership; secondly, I began to get up to speed on archaeological policy by attending the opening address and the National Heritage Protection Plan session. Finally, I took certain steps towards working in community archaeology by making contact with helpful people such as Suzie Thomas at the CBA.

Overall, the workshop on CPD logs, PDPs and training plans gave me career guidance, focus and direction, yet the people I met at the conference reminded me why I had sought that career in the first place. I met various IfA employees and fellow members, commercial archaeologists and even the Head of Education at the CBA. Collectively they re-confirmed my passion for discovering what the past can tell us and using this knowledge to engage and inspire others.

Gail Mackintosh MA Hons MSc
Student member



I was focused on not only attending interesting sessions but furthering my personal and professional aims for the future.



Gail undertaking research for her MSc. Photo: Gail Mackintosh





This workshop showcased a number of current approaches and new developments in understanding archaeological iron objects and production remains. The session examined theoretical and social perspectives, as well as practical and technological issues. The Historical Metallurgy Society was emphasised as a forum for debate and communication.

Jessie Slater and **Derek Pitman**, University of Sheffield, opened the session, drawing attention to the social and cultural contexts within which prehistoric ironworking took place. They argued that portable analytical techniques enabled much closer dialogue between field practitioners and their lab-based colleagues. Their case study emphasised how such dialogue enabled hypotheses to be posited and tested during fieldwork, thus allowing continual revision of both high-level interpretation and day-to-day fieldwork strategy.

An overview of field evidence for early ironworking was provided by **Sarah Paynter**, English Heritage. She noted how quantities of slag recovered in the field may not always reflect realities of operational practice; traces of furnaces, hearths, workshops and charcoal platforms may also survive and are not

always obvious. Research and experimentation was continually challenging previous assumptions about ancient ironworking. Sarah strongly emphasised the need to consult closely with archeometallurgical specialists at all stages, not just post-excavation, and drew particular attention to the EH Guidelines for *Archeometallurgy* (<http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/publications/archaeometallurgy/>).

This theme was continued by **Tim Young**, GeoArch, who showed how the application of trace element geochemistry and microanalysis alongside careful use of standard morphological and petrographical investigations, can enable an increasingly sophisticated interpretation of archeometallurgical residues. Answers to archaeologically interesting questions may require the piecing together of multiple items of data, both from within an assemblage and from related assemblages.

Paul Belford, Nexus Heritage, outlined the role of the Historical Metallurgy Society (HMS), which has been the leading forum for archeometallurgical research for nearly 50 years. Bringing together archaeologists, metallurgists and historians with a wide range of expertise and interests, HMS provides important member services. These include several conferences and meetings per year, a peer-reviewed journal (*Historical Metallurgy*), and advice, support and CPD opportunities for professionals. The Society had recently produced *Metals and Metalworking* (a national research framework), and was in the process of updating and enlarging its highly-regarded series of datasheets (<http://hist-met.org/datasheets.html>).

Eleanor Blakelock, Historical Metallurgy Society, outlined how metallographic analysis is the best technique for understanding ancient iron. Analysis can not only determine materials and methods of construction, but may also enable broader conclusions to be drawn about social and cultural aspects. Eleanor suggested that early medieval standardisation of knife-making may have been linked to increasing urbanisation.

Despite English Heritage encouragement of x-radiography for all excavated ironwork, many projects only do this selectively or not at all. **Sonia O'Connor** (University of Bradford) explained that high quality radiography of complete iron assemblages enabled much more information to be recovered, and permitted more targeted approaches to conservation. The wider adoption of this practice

has been inhibited by poor quality archaeological radiography, and inadequately-prepared briefs and specifications. Sonia also emphasised close dialogue between laboratory analysis and ongoing fieldwork.

Metallography is the best way to characterise iron, but its drawback is that it requires destructive sampling. Thus it is done infrequently, and when it is, samples are as few and small as possible, meaning results are not always necessarily representative.

Evelyn Godfrey, Open University, outlined one non-destructive alternative: neutron diffraction. This allows identification of different materials and processes, with particular application for artefacts that would never be considered for destructive sampling.

Dana Goodburn-Brown, AMTeC Co-op Ltd, concluded by looking at mineralised organic materials that can be found in association with iron artefacts, including insects and plant material. Scanning Electron Microscope analysis can provide

species identification. This was illustrated with examples from a recent community project to conserve finds from an Anglo-Saxon cemetery in Kent. CSI:Sittingbourne was an innovative initiative in which investigative conservation of iron artefacts from 228 graves was undertaken by professional conservators and local volunteers, in a shopping mall 'conservation lab' open to public visitors.

This very comprehensive workshop touched on a wide range of techniques and approaches. Two essential aspects emerged in all of the papers: close integration of field- and lab-based specialists, and the need for all archaeological projects to consider metallurgical issues at the earliest stage of project specification and design.

Paul Belford MfA
Nexus Heritage

Evelyn Godfrey PlfA
Open University

Members of the Historical Metallurgy Society from the UK, Ireland, Germany, US, Canada, Mexico and Argentina enjoy a field trip to medieval and later ironworking sites at Rievaulx (Yorkshire) led by Gerry McDonnell as part of their recent 2011 Spring Meeting and AGM. Photo: Paul Belford



Early Medieval single-edged sword set up for non-destructive analysis on the ENGIN-X diffractometer at the ISIS Neutron Facility, Harwell. Photo: Evelyn Godfrey



UNDERSTANDING AND PROTECTION: *the application of Significance in the Historic Environment and England's National Heritage Protection Plan*

Edmund Lee

A well-attended session on the morning of day two examined techniques and philosophies for assessing the significance of England's heritage at all levels, and applying that understanding to statutory and non-statutory protection regimes. Barney Sloane, English Heritage Head of National Heritage Protection Commissions chaired the session and placed it in the context of the National Heritage Protection Plan (NHPP), now available on the English Heritage website www.english-heritage.org.uk/nhpp. The Plan directs research effort to identifying strategic threats to the historic environment or to particular classes of site; to ensuring that we have adequate understanding of the significance of the threatened environment or asset; and to determining appropriate responses. To define significance he noted the formula, from 'Conservation Principles' (English Heritage 2006), that significance is the sum of cultural and natural values, noting that the cultural values (aesthetic, communal, historical and evidential) are refined further for planning casework by the 'interests' set out in PPS5 (archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic).

George Lambrick, freelance consultant, examined the assessment of setting as an aspect of significance. Different approaches are needed, for example between large scale Environmental Impact Assessment, such as that in progress on the High Speed 2 rail project, and local assessment of specific assets or buildings. The type of impact, nature of change over time, and the impact of changes in setting of values all need careful consideration. Conclusions were that current guidance is stronger on visual impact, and absent or weak on economic viability of land or property arising from changes in setting.

Deborah Williams, English Heritage, reviewed work undertaken to produce new guidance to accompany the reform of the heritage protection system. This covers the criteria for selection in a wide range of different ages, types and scales of heritage asset, and aims to provide consistency and transparency in the process of designation.

Cathy Tyers, English Heritage Dendrochronologist zoomed into to the scale of individual sites, even specific timbers, with her review of the role of dendro dating in casework. Cathy presented past and current cases where new dendro dating has radically altered our understanding of a particular building's significance, including in one case the accurate dating of the sole surviving timber (a window sill-beam) in what was otherwise a poorly dated roofless ruin.



READING 2011

A tension exists between national, community and individual interests. Who are the local community?

Nigel Neil, Lancashire Gardens Trust, then described a project which sees Lancashire County Council, Lancashire Gardens Trust, and Manchester Metropolitan University working in partnership to enhance the knowledge of historic designed landscapes throughout Lancashire. An accompanying article reports this in detail.

Finally **Stella Jackson** reviewed the nominations for national designation received via the English Heritage website <http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/caring/listing/> (see separate article).

Discussion during the session highlighted the complexity of community involvement. A tension exists between national, community and individual interests. Who are the local community? The need for national oversight both for consistency and also as arbitrator between different 'communities' was apparent. Desk Based Assessment procedures will need updating to give greater emphasis to understanding the values and interests from all these perspectives.

Different approaches to assessing significance are also needed. Large area, cross-disciplinary studies such as Environmental Impact Assessments which aim to gain a national overview for the NHPP will need techniques for scoping significance of large numbers of sites efficiently. Managing change to particular assets or sites at the point when planning decisions are made will need critical analysis at site specific level, with sufficient flexibility in approach to allow for the bewildering variety of England's heritage assets.

Edmund Lee MIfA
Standards and Guidelines Manager
English Heritage

Measuring the significance of Historic Designed Landscapes in Lancashire: Local Lists and community involvement

In 2008, Lancashire County Council (LCC) agreed to fund Lancashire Gardens Trust (LGT) to undertake a 5-year Historic Designed Landscapes (HDL) in Lancashire project. The project incorporated academic input from Ed Bennis, taking his and Dyke's 1998 report, part of English Heritage's country-wide desk-based 'Register Review', as its starting point. Having suffered severe financial strictures in 2009–10, LCC agreed in January 2011 to grant LGT £20,000 to complete the project within three years – a quarter of the original budget.

LCC were concerned that the English Heritage (EH) criteria for adding sites to the Register of parks and gardens of special historic interest were neither sufficiently transparent, nor suited to the development of robust local lists of parks of regional and local importance for the 14 district and unitary authorities that exist in the county. Although ten sites had been added to the 25 already on the EH Register in 1998, data on 290 sites graded by Bennis and Dyke into categories 'A to D', and a further 211 'Appendix' sites, remained unused. An estimated 200 omissions had not been addressed, and the data was unreliable for development control purposes.

LGT recruited and trained a team of (currently 15) volunteers, that contributed nearly 4000 hours visiting all the Bennis and Dyke category A to D sites, completing pro-forma records for each, together with photographs, archive maps, illustrations, and written and oral history sources.

To measure significance we first categorise sites by one of the four broad EH types – Urban, Rural, Landscape of Memory and Industrial, and then sub-group if necessary by principal date range. The aim is to compare like-with-like, as in the EH Monuments

Protection Programme. Specific datasets can be extracted. The merits of a multi-period category are under consideration.

The next step is to assign a score of 1–3 in response to 13 questions, then total the scores. The questions have been selected from around 30 used by EH, Historic Scotland, CADW, and the Northern Ireland Environment Agency for their Registers and equivalents

- completeness
- archaeological interest and importance
- architectural interest of buildings and structures
- representativeness of a particular style; work of a known designer
- association with significant persons or historical events
- rarity
- group or setting value
- contribution to local landscape character
- nature conservation / scientific / geological interest
- horticultural / arboricultural / silvicultural interest and importance
- amenity value
- documentation

LGT are considering whether to use 'extent to which site is at risk', as a multiplier, scores to some or all questions thus being increased for vulnerable sites

Use of the system is still in its early stages. LGT are pleased that the project and methodology have been greeted with enthusiasm from many quarters, and we welcome comments about how to refine it.

Nigel R J Neil MA MSc MIfA LRPS
Lancashire Gardens Trust and Neil Archaeological Services

The principal aims have been to

- enhance the database of HDLs
- validate by site visits
- make information widely accessible, through the Parks and Gardens UK website, Lancashire HER and Lancashire Environmental Records Network
- devise and implement methodologies for characterisation and measurement of significance of HDLs
- compile Local Lists and test these through public consultation
- prepare guidance for the conservation and enhancement of HDLs
- select themes and raise additional funding for longer-term research and to enhance public engagement.

Nigel R J Neil

READING 2011



ASCRIBING SIGNIFICANCE IN THE 'BIG SOCIETY'

Stella Jackson

As many would now agree, significance is ascribed to heritage, and is not intrinsic to the asset in question. Heritage, therefore, is not a haphazard survival of historic buildings and monuments, it is the outcome of a conscious and intentional choice to create, maintain and preserve selected places, often for a specific purpose. As such, there is a multi-vocality of heritage significance which leads to a somewhat inherent tension between local significance and the national designation system.

This is the subject of my PhD, which I was asked to present at the IfA Conference in Reading. My research focuses on the tension resulting from a 'national' framework of heritage designation policies, which seek to be participatory and inclusive, but which cannot effectively recognise the increasing importance of 'local' heritage due to the restrictions of current legislation and guidance. It asks, therefore, whether 'national' heritage legislation and policy is still an effective way of 'protecting' valued heritage sites, or whether we should be looking to more local policies given the localism agenda of the 2010 coalition Government.

DESIGNATION APPLICATIONS

Although the addition of a specific building to the national list is often the focus of heated debate, for example the Plymouth Civic Centre, in general the designation of those aspects of the historic environment which are deemed to be of national significance is largely unquestioned. Other ways of protecting assets are often not considered, leading to the general assumption that the only way to protect what we value, is to have it designated.

Two hundred and fifty applications for new designations have been analysed as part of my research. Almost half of these applications (44%) refer to the local significance of the site. Of these, the most common types of buildings that are applied for, other than domestic properties, are commercial buildings (shops, pubs, etc) and culture and entertainment buildings (including libraries), with industrial buildings also popular. This is because such buildings are often focal points or landmarks in the local area, which are well-known and used regularly

by members of the community. However, when assessed under the national criteria, many of these applications are turned down because the site is not considered to have national significance, with 74% of those that refer to the local value of the site being rejected.

TENSION

There is now an increasingly engaged and enthusiastic public who care about their local heritage, and wish to see it protected. With the ease of applying for listing, and the apparent lack of other methods of protection, they therefore apply for national designation of their cherished local sites. However, as noted previously, the majority of applications do not result in a listing outcome. These sites, however, are not less significant, as is often suggested, but are simply significant in a different way. Discounting this as less important is one of the major sources of tension – so what can be done?

THE BIG SOCIETY & LOCALISM

Current government policy is strongly focused on localism. Should significance thus be re-defined in the national criteria to include a wider range of sites? Or, can we use the 'Big Society' programme to ensure that what communities' value is taken more seriously through local lists? The draft Localism Bill which is currently going through parliament does include a policy that will require planning authorities to maintain a list of 'assets of community value', with sites being nominated by the local community. However, just over 50% of planning authorities already have a 'local list', yet their current non-statutory nature means that the public often apply for national designation instead, or in addition. In contrast, although Conservation Areas do carry some statutory control only 39% of the 250 designation applications analysed were for buildings already within one.

Additionally, the localism bill has an essentialised view of 'local', focusing mainly on 'traditional' village life. The concept of 'community' that is used follows the normative ideal of something which is 'good', 'safe' and 'comfortable' (Smith & Waterton, 2009, p13), but it should not be assumed that everyone within a community will necessarily agree with each other. In addition, communities are not always 'local', something which does not seem to have been considered.



Bradford Odeon, which has had numerous designation requests over the last few years, all of which were turned down. Photo: © All rights reserved by freebird ubx (downloaded from Flickr via Creative Commons License)

CONCLUSION

Local community groups no longer simply support conservation but now seek to have their own sense of heritage acknowledged and legitimised. However, the national designation criteria exclude large numbers of locally significant buildings. In the past these have been seen as less significant, resulting in a somewhat inherent tension between local value and national designation. The national lists cannot easily deal with the need to recognise the local significance of these sites but the localism bill does suggest a way of taking local heritage seriously and giving people a voice.

Stella Jackson Student member
English Heritage

Suggested reading

- Ashworth, G J, 2002 'The experience of heritage conservation: outcomes and futures' in: Ashworth, G J & Larkham, P J (eds) *Building a new heritage: tourism, culture, identity in the new Europe*. London: Routledge
- Ashworth, G J, 2008 'Heritage: definitions, delusions and dissonances' in: Amoeda, R, Lira, S, Pinheiro, C, Pinheiro, F & Pinheiro, J (eds) *World heritage and sustainable development, Vol 1*. Barcelos, Portugal: Green Lines Institute for Sustainable Development
- Ashworth, G J & Phelps, A, 2002 'The cultural construction of heritage conservation' in: Phelps, A, Ashworth, G J & Johansson, B O H (eds) *The construction of built heritage: a North European perspective on policies, practices and outcomes*. Hampshire: Ashgate
- Carman, J, 2002 *Archaeology and heritage: an introduction*. London: Continuum



The Conservative Party Big Society conference, 31st March 2010. Photo by Andrew Parsons (downloaded from Flickr via Creative Commons License)



ASSESSING SIGNIFICANCE UNDERWATER: *just piles of old rocks, geophysical anomalies and shifting sands?*

Mark Littlewood

This year's maritime session had a distinctly northern British slant, in contrast to previous years, with project examples from Northern Ireland and Scotland playing a prominent part. It was also different in that it was not organised by the IfA's Maritime Affairs Group, which is normally the case. The session focused on issues and best practice examples relating to the assessment of significance of underwater assets.

The first paper from **Ed Pollard**, ORCA Marine and Archaeology Department and **Niall Brady**, Discovery Programme, Dublin, considered past work in Ireland in both high and low energy zones, highlighting Drogheda and the Boyne estuary as a case study of archaeology and development in an Irish maritime context.

Caroline Wickham-Jones of the University of Aberdeen, outlined how most underwater archaeology work has tended to focus on low energy sites as these are easier to access and there is an expectation that more maritime archaeology will survive. In contrast, Orkney waters have a lot of high energy, rocky sites which require investigation. This is becoming especially important considering the development of the marine energy renewables in these areas.

Paul Sharman of ORCA and the Department of Archaeology, UHI, continued with an examination of the situation in Scotland where new marine planning, licensing and Marine Protected Area (MPA) powers are now in force. One of the major challenges is increasing awareness of the requirement to consider the significance of the marine historic environment.


Philip Robertson of Historic Scotland, outlined their role within the planning process in Scotland. Historic Scotland is responsible for the seabed out to the 200 nautical miles limit but cannot designate beyond

the territorial limit of 12 nautical miles. However, Scottish ministers do have such devolved powers.

Tony Firth of Wessex Archaeology finished the session with a detailed discussion of the criteria used to define 'significance' by the Coastal and Marine section at Wessex Archaeology. He concluded that there is no direct comparison between international, national and local significance and that we should instead think of them as different dimensions.

The world of underwater archaeology is exciting and is a world where new contributions are still possible. However, it is the archaeologist's responsibility to ensure good management of the archaeological resource as the exploitation and development of the seabed increases in intensity. The fact that this is still an area where the principals of good practice are being tried and tested only increases the value of sessions such as this, which offer practitioners the opportunity to get together and exchange experience.

Mark Littlewood IfA
IfA MAG Committee



Wreck inspection
© University of Aberdeen

Evaluating Significance in the Commercial Sector: Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) off the Coast of Scotland

Paul Sharman

In Scottish waters, the number of proposed marine developments, from gas pipelines to wind farms, from tidal devices to fish farms, is increasing rapidly - especially in the renewable energy sector. Such developments are being brought within a planning-style control system by way of provisions in legislation such as *The Marine Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2007* and the *Marine (Scotland) Act 2010*.

Marine spatial plans, at national and regional/local levels, are currently under development. They are meant to identify opportunities and constraints and lay out integrated and sustainable management of the marine and coastal areas. The effect is to identify areas more likely to be appropriate for use, focusing developers' attention and the speed of development, before all environmental data is gathered and fully integrated plans are finalised. There is still a fundamental lack of knowledge of what and where historic environment assets survive in Scottish waters, yet the Crown Estate has already licensed many areas for renewable energy developments.

As a result, it often falls to the EIA process to identify and evaluate the significance of elements in the marine historic environment that may be affected. However, despite legislation and guidance, members of some authorities, developers and even environmental consultancy companies remain unaware of the requirement to consider the historic environment.

However, the situation is constantly improving with a growing body of developer guidance taking effect, especially material produced for COWRIE and the Crown Estate concerning the range of work necessary to identify the baseline. However, this is still only guidance and not part of the licensing regime.

The purpose of an EIA is to ensure that the authority giving the primary consent for a particular project makes its decision in the knowledge of any likely significant effects on the environment. Mitigation and management must be predicated on both the significance of impact and that which is impacted. Guidance criteria from ALSF and EH funded projects

on the importance of shipwrecks and prehistoric land surfaces and deposits have helped to standardise approaches, although in Scotland the development of criteria of significance and relative importance is only in a pre-consultation draft phase.

Unfortunately, there is no statutory definition of 'significance' (often used as a synonym for 'importance') or what is 'significant', yet legislation and guidance constantly refers to significant effects and impacts on sites of significance, as in *The Marine Works (EIA) Regulations* (Schedule 1, Clause 2 (c) (ix)). The Government's 2011 *UK Marine Policy Statement* section 2.6.6 on the Historic Environment uses the word 'significance' ten times in just over a page, but provides a rather vague definition.

All of this has consequences for how, during the comparatively short period allotted to the production of an EIA, we can satisfactorily identify what exists and where, and gather enough evidence to evaluate how to proceed, with the certainty a developer may require for risk reduction and elimination.

According to the Marine Works (EIA) Regulations and the Marine (Scotland) Act, this has to be within a framework of what is a reasonable level of effort and expenditure for the developer to make.

One outcome may be that extra significance is allotted to anomalies, submerged landscapes and deposits simply because they are underwater. There is a tendency to avoid anything that could require further time and expense in more targeted evaluation work, even though the targets may prove to be of negligible significance. This is a rapidly changing field in terms of methodologies and statutory requirements and although not necessarily desirable for the developer, the over-protection of the marine historic environment may be preferable in the meantime.

Paul Sharman
Senior Project Officer
Orkney Research Centre for Archaeology



ORCA monitoring cable
landfall at Skail Bay,
Orkney © ORCA

There is still a fundamental lack of knowledge of what historic environment assets survive and where in Scottish waters.



READING 2011

Lovely – but what is it? *The Rising Tide Project* and research on the submerged landscape of Orkney

Caroline Wickham-Jones



The Bay of Firth © University of Aberdeen

The Rising Tide Project is an interdisciplinary, multi-institutional project, set up in 2005 to investigate Holocene relative sea-level change and the potential of the submerged landscape around Orkney. At the end of the last glacial period and into the start of the Holocene relative sea-level may have been some 40 metres lower than today, and dates from sediment cores indicate that present height was only reached around 2000 BC. Given the shallow waters around the islands, a substantial submerged landscape is indicated, with the possibility of both a Mesolithic and a Neolithic signature.


In addition to work to build a sea-level curve, the recent focus of the project has been on the Bay of Firth at the heart of the archipelago. Attention was drawn to the bay because of its strong ethno-archaeological record, including stories relating to possible submerged archaeological remains, furthermore the bay offers classic sheltered conditions conducive to the survival of sites after inundation. Fieldwork combines a variety of techniques including

high frequency sonar surveys, diving, coring, field walking of the inter-tidal zone, aerial photography, and archive work.

As a result, it has been possible to construct a picture of the influx of water into the bay in the period between 5000–1000 BC. A variety of anomalies have been recorded by remote sensing and diving examinations have taken place on the principal sites. Nevertheless, it is still difficult to interpret the various anomalies, and characterisation is currently restricted to descriptive terms: mounds; isolated stones and stone settings; linear features; and modern. Work in the inter-tidal zone is helping us to understand the processes of site formation and decay as structures make the transition from land to sea.

In this respect the assessment of significance for an archaeological site underwater has to include information on context and landscape as much as for any site on land, the difference being that precise information relating to the past sea-level history of most of Scotland has yet to be drawn up.

Caroline Wickham-Jones MfA
University of Aberdeen
c.wickham-jones@abdn.ac.uk



©Crown Copyright/database right 2009. A Hydrographic Survey/EDINA supplied service

Bay of Firth_bathycorrected to OD2010. Crown copyright

READING 2011



AREN'T WE ALL IN THIS TOGETHER? The importance of partnership working

Following the announcement that the next IfA conference would take partnership working as its core theme, this session was in the vanguard. Hopefully some of the ideas and examples discussed at this session will be drawn through into 2012. The session itself was created by **Susan Casey**, RCAHMS and **Jeff Sanders**, Society of Antiquaries of Scotland to provide a forum for discussing experiences of working in partnership and to share inspirational case studies, as well as lessons learned. With an emphasis on thought-provoking and punchy papers, Martin Carver (editor, *Antiquity*) set the tone as chair, asking how we can improve the research dividend of what is done in the name of archaeology. Taking up that challenge were a number of speakers who managed to deliver stimulating, challenging and at times provocative papers.

Joe Flatman, UCL/Surrey County Council, opened proceedings with a consideration of opportunities archaeology could take, particularly in respect to how academia and local government could work better in partnership. He highlighted some of the problems that archaeology in Britain faces in terms of cross-sectoral working, as well as some of the likely long-term impacts on the practice of archaeology, including the issue of how archaeology might be

undertaken domestically and internationally in a future low carbon economy. **Al Oswald**, English Heritage, then provided a specific case study from the North Pennines of a project with well-established partnerships. **Peter McKeague**, RCAHMS, highlighted the efficiency of data being created once and then shared, exploring this through the INSPIRE directive. **Dave Thomas** RCAHMS then explored the SWISH (Shared Web Information Services for Heritage) partnership between Scotland and Wales – outlining the challenges, and the benefits of overcoming them.

Melissa Strauss, Heritage Lottery Fund, gave the perspective from a funder's viewpoint, outlining how the HLF views the principles and practicalities of collaboration. **Neil Rushton**, Churches Conservation Trust, then described a series of case studies showing how redundant Anglican churches could be regenerated as community assets through partnerships – including a short video on All Souls Church, Bolton (<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=K5gltaYUkjs>).

Victoria Hunns, Natural England, explored partnerships with Natural England and DEFRA, highlighting the importance of agri-environment schemes and the need for archaeology to adapt to working cultures in this area to reap rewards. **Don Henson**, CBA, brought the talks to a fitting conclusion with lessons learned from the Yorkshire Dales – developing links between people, and remembering that archaeology can be fun.

Lively discussion ensued, ranging from funding regimes to harnessing social media, from education to environmental change, and from stewardship of the land to the social benefits of heritage. There were lots of ideas about how to improve the research dividend of what is done in the name of archaeology, and examples of many already being done. Judging by the discussion, the next IfA Conference should be a dynamic one.

Dr Jeff Sanders
Society of Antiquaries of Scotland

Susan Casey AlfA
RCAHMS

SWISH © Martin Newman



The experience of partnership working: English Heritage's current 'Miner-Farmer landscapes of the North Pennines AONB' project

In 2005, English Heritage signed a 'Joint Accord' which pledged the organisation to work closely with AONB authorities, as well as other partners, to help further shared aims of understanding, caring for, valuing and enjoying the historic environment. This agreement, which cemented a more than a decade of partnership working with Protected Landscapes, has given rise to a number of major research and conservation projects, of which the current 'Miner-Farmer Landscapes of the North Pennines AONB' project, due to continue until 2012, is one of the most ambitious and successful to date.

Beneath the over-arching partnership between English Heritage and the AONB authority sit other partnerships: with Birmingham University's Vista Spatial and Technology Unit, who tendered successfully to explore the potential of the remotely-sensed datasets specially acquired for the project (including Lidar, digital RGB, colour infra-red and multi-spectral vertical aerial photography); with the local community through the vehicles of the Alston Moor Historical Society and the North Pennines Heritage Trust, and with the commercial sector in the form of North Pennines Archaeology Ltd. Based within the project area, North Pennines Archaeology Ltd has undertaken a portion of the rapid analytical field survey of this intensively exploited yet little understood landscape. They bring with them their own local expertise and all the benefits of established close links with the local mining fraternity. This component of the project, constructed around a formal programme of mentoring and on-going quality assurance, was designed to build the commercial sector's capacity to carry out a form of archaeological investigation rarely practiced to a high standard due to falling outside the scope of planning interventions.

The Miner-Farmer Landscapes project has also been a touchstone for the AONB Authority's development of a second major project, funded largely by the Heritage Lottery Fund, called 'Altogether Archaeology'. The aim of this project is more explicitly to encourage participation in archaeology and conservation among the widely scattered inhabitants of this 2000 square kilometre massif, and

indeed to use the historic environment to help build a sense of community throughout the area.

In addition to these partnerships English Heritage has forged very productive links with two other government agencies: the Environment Agency and Natural England. With a responsibility to understand and address factors affecting water quality (the Nent being England's most contaminated river, largely due to the region's mining history), the Environment Agency is keen to benefit from the detailed understanding of water sources and distorted flow patterns that the study of the area's extensive and prolonged industrial and agricultural exploitation is revealing. As part of its contribution to the project, the Environment Agency is sharing its detailed data on contamination and water flow, which has an important bearing on understanding how water has been harnessed and how erosion of archaeological sites can be addressed. For once, archaeological monuments – often the threatened resource – are themselves the threats, and need to be managed sensitively, especially with regard to fluvial erosion.

Natural England are keen to develop their understanding of the designated plant communities that inhabit the uplands, including some which have developed specifically in response to the metalliferous conditions. Similarly, the vast raised peat bogs are well understood to be an internationally important natural resource (notably with reference to their carbon storage capacity). The damaging effects of 'peat gripping' to improve drainage for agricultural improvement over recent decades have been investigated through the AONB Authority's ongoing 'Peatscapes' project and potential solutions implemented. However, the impacts of the prolonged extraction to provide industrial (as well as domestic) fuel in the past are very poorly understood. Natural England's contribution to the Miner-Farmer Landscapes project recognises the potential value of archaeological research to the sensitive management of ecology. In turn, through that organisation's Higher Level Stewardship scheme, key archaeological sites like the extraordinarily well-preserved Roman fort known as Whitley Castle are benefiting from enhanced access, interpretation and protection.

Alastair Oswald,
Senior Archaeological Investigator, English Heritage



... the current 'Miner-Farmer Landscapes of the North Pennines AONB' project, due to continue until 2012, is one of the most ambitious and successful to date.

SELF-EMPLOYMENT AND BUSINESS START-UPS

Towergate Insurance were once again delighted to be involved with the IfA conference, and for the first time delivered a business seminar to add real value for delegates. This year, the theme of our seminar was 'Business Start-ups'.

Considering the economic challenges that archaeologists currently face, the session looked at 'how to set up in business', 'how to run a business' and 'how to manage your risks'. What follows is a brief overview of the topics that were covered in our session.

TYPES OF LEGAL STRUCTURE

Perhaps the first thing to consider once you've decided to set up in business is that your legal structure should match the scale of your operation. We discussed the merits of the following structures

- sole trader
- partnership
- Limited Liability Partnership (LLP)
- limited company
- charitable incorporated organisations

MARKET RESEARCH

Market research may not be so valid to the typical archaeologist, but when it comes to buying and selling services, it never hurts to know more about your potential customers and their buying behaviours. In this segment we discussed

- market factors
- market positioning
- customer's needs and buying behaviour
- market trends and competitors
- consider joint ventures with other companies to offer a wider range of services



BUSINESS PLANNING

A business plan should be a live document and as such, should be updated regularly. The plan shouldn't be longer than it needs to be, but should consider the following points

- goals and aims
- the market opportunity
- strategy to achieve goals and aims
- marketing plan
- Operations, Productivity, ICT & Systems
- people & Skills
- Financial & Legal (including health and safety)
- financial forecasts

FINANCE

Once the plan is in place, it should become clear to what degree finance is required. Once this has been ascertained, the following could be considered to gain adequate financing

- can family or friends help with financing the business?
- develop a good relationship with your business bank manager
- shop around if necessary
- manage your finances and ensure cash flow is maintained
- report your accounts regularly

MARKETING

Now you're in operation, but how do you get your business known?

- Marketing for a small business is about being visible to your customers.
- Marketing starts with understanding your customers. This helps you know how, when and why they buy. It helps you find ways to communicate and stay in contact with them.
- Marketing can be as simple as identifying the customer you need to speak to and buying them a beer!
- Tendering for business is also important in your industry. Consider hiring a freelance bid writer if necessary.
- What makes you different from and better than your competition?

David Cawdeary

TRAINING & SKILLS

We then considered how running your own business requires you to gain a different set of skills and knowledge than what you're probably used to. These can include

- financial management
- marketing/sales skills
- ICT
- health and safety

Search online for training providers local to you. If you are being made redundant, you may be able to access funding for re-training through your redundancy package or local Jobcentre Plus.

HEALTH & SAFETY / RISK MANAGEMENT

This section considered Duty of Care – to yourself, those you work with and anybody else that may be affected by your business' activities (e.g. the general public walking past a dig site). When you run your own business, you are responsible for this.

You are also responsible for office / laboratory health and safety, e.g. computer workstation ergonomics and eyestrain, slip, trip and fall hazards, PAT testing, fire safety, COSHH and first aid.

LIABILITY

Sole traders and partners are personally liable for the debts of their business, but partners may also be liable for other partners' debts! The organisation's liability is generally limited unless personal guarantees have been given; however, directors' liability is unlimited.



Health and safety can also help to retain staff, reduce absence and sick leave, maintains your reputation, and keeps insurance and legal costs down. Prevention, therefore, is far better than cure!

The key message delivered was to understand the risks your business faces and learn to manage them. If you are financially dependent on one key customer, for example, but also your operational risks such as health and safety.

If you would like to find out more on the above, we can provide a copy of the handout from our presentation by post or e-mail. In addition, if you require any guidance on insuring your business, please give the team a call on **0844 892 1638** or e-mail archaeology@towergate.co.uk

David Cawdeary
Towergate Risk Solutions



Assessing significance for planning applications: preparing PPS5 – compliant reports for local authorities

Duncan Coe



READING 2011

It seemed fitting that at a conference where the emphasis was so much on 'significance' that a session should focus on the thorny issue of preparing PPS5 compliant reports. It was decided early on that as it is still early days for PPS5 and that we are still feeling our way through many of its requirements that the workshop should do what it says on the tin; seek to engage participants in a proper dialogue about the issues.

Duncan McCallum, Government Advice Director, English Heritage, gave a short account of the drafting of PPS5, setting out the principles that underpin the approach and explaining some of the outcomes expected. He also gave his view on the current discussions about the expected new National Planning Framework and on an upbeat note said that he thought that the key principles of PPS5 would be retained.

Duncan Coe, Archaeological Officer, West Berkshire Council, summarised what he thought the role of significance would play in the planning process and why the concept of significance would lead to more robust decision making.

Participants were split into groups of 7-8 and the workshop was divided into two sessions. The first session focused on the use of the English Heritage Conservation Principles as a tool for defining and understanding significance. Each group was given a heritage asset and asked to consider

- what the different components of the heritage asset might be
- to list the different significances
- to consider whether the Conservation Principles can be used to define significance
- to suggest how the heritage significance can best be articulated

There were mixed views on the applicability of the approach set out in Conservation Principles and the differences in terminology between it and the PPS were seen as problematic. On the whole it was recognised that there remains no common standard for articulating significance and this will be an issue for the sector to address if a consistent approach to PPS5 is going to be adopted. What was clearly appreciated was just how complex individual heritage assets can be, both in terms of their physical fabric and setting, but also in the way they are viewed and valued by different and diverse groups and communities.

The second part of the workshop looked at what PPS5 seeks from applicants as a 'description of the significance of the heritage assets' and the 'assessment of the impact' on the significances identified.

- The groups were given a series of real planning cases and asked to consider
- what heritage assets were present

- whether the significance of the assets could be determined
- what tools could be used to determine significance
- what further works might be required to clarify the significance of heritage assets present
- what level of report would be appropriate

The cases were chosen to illustrate a wide range of issues, non-listed but locally important buildings, development within a scheduled monument, development on a registered battlefield and development within a conservation area.

A lively discussion followed which illustrated that while there is good understanding of the approach set out in PPS5, there is also a wide range of opinions about the level of work required on a specific site. One of the key challenges ahead will be to ensure that the level of assessment undertaken is appropriate and is properly informed by the level of significance of the heritage asset. It is also clear that dialogue with the local curatorial authority is fundamental to ensuring that any assessment undertaken meets the needs of the local planning authority.

The positive atmosphere and the willingness of all participants to join in with the debate were especially pleasing. While no firm conclusions on the issues can be drawn from the workshop it is clear that the profession is thinking about this matter in a constructive way.

Duncan Coe MfA
Archaeological Officer
West Berkshire Council



Essential writing skills for archaeologists

Kasia Gdaniec, Jenny Glazebrook and Alison Taylor

Publication and dissemination of data are tough issues for archaeologists today. What should we be printing and how? What and how should we publish by other means? Can we make grey literature into a more useful product? How can we fulfil our duty to make a permanent record of excavation results whilst getting essential information across to a wide audience in a digestible way?

Alison Taylor looked at how the last 20 years have provided archaeologists with a massive data bank, new technology to publish, disseminate and search it, cheap print and online facilities, cheap colour illustration, good distribution networks and an eager audience – yet overall outcomes for academic knowledge are disappointing. The need for both physical and intellectual accessibility was emphasised, with searchability through standard search engines seen as the ideal way ahead.

Kasia Gdaniec concentrated on the post-excavation assessment phase – how we should assess raw data, make decisions on how to treat them and what more work they deserve, what we should print or disseminate in other ways in order to make grey literature a more useful product. Is further advice needed to make the processes of assessment and publication easier and less resource-intensive for both contractors and curators and produce more useful results?

Jenny Glazebrook, looking at the process from an editor's viewpoint, emphasised the value of readers knowing immediately whether a report was relevant to their own researches, and being able to find data easily. Basics such as clear structure supported by a good abstract, proper signposting, strong correlation between text and illustrations, internal consistency, plain but stimulating prose, expert interpretation and original thought are still essential whatever the medium.

Discussion was important in this session. Despite the wish for strong narrative in reports, there were supporters and detractors for a generally synthetic approach. There was agreement however that the aim for sites with significant results should be to have full supporting evidence accessible online and be

properly signposted within a shorter analytical hard-copy publication. Grey literature is most valuable online, although there will often be requirements for hard copy. We were reminded of the CBA Publication User Needs Survey (PUNS) published in 2001, which recommended that detailed evidence be available online, allowing archaeologists to concentrate on producing more accessible reports with strong storylines, and we recommended that this approach be revived and re-visited. Other specific recommendations that gained general support were

- Abstracts and Conclusions, the most crucial parts of each report (and often all that is read) needed more care and guidance over their preparation
- standard terminologies should be agreed and universally adopted
- all grey literature must be rapidly available through OASIS, perhaps using a simpler system with less emphasis on validation and more on searchability
- IfA should purchase institutional subscription to online academic journals, providing free access as a benefit of membership

Alison Taylor
(then) Editor, IfA
Alison.taylor47@ntlworld.com

Jenny Glazebrook
Editor, East Anglian Archaeology
jenny.glazebrook@norfolk.gov.uk

Kasia Gdaniec
Cambridgeshire County Council
Kasia.Gdaniec@cambridgeshire.gov.uk

How can we fulfil our duty to make a permanent record of excavation results whilst getting essential information across to a wide audience in a digestible way?



READING 2011



In recognition of Professional Development

Anthony Sinclair and Kate Geary

The first Archaeology Training Forum (ATF) Training Award was made to the Nautical Archaeology Society (NAS) at this year's IfA Conference. **Mary Harvey**, Training Manager at the NAS picked up the award from **Dr Mike Heyworth**, Chair of the ATF.

The ATF Training Award is an annual prize. It is open to entries from archaeological organisations, individuals, partnerships and projects; both voluntary and professional from within the United Kingdom. Entries are judged by a panel of representatives from English Heritage, Historic Scotland, the Institute for Archaeologists, the Higher Education Academy and the Council for British Archaeology. Award entries must demonstrate their commitment to CPD, and to recognised professional standards and ethics. They must also demonstrate clear benefits extending beyond the individual organisation and show an innovative approach or the development of best practice.

In presenting this year's award, Mike Heyworth stated, 'The Nautical Archaeology Society was a worthy winner of the inaugural ATF Training Award. The NAS stood out for its strategic approach and long term commitment to training, delivered through an established and internationally recognised programme which is coherent, well-structured and tested, aimed at both professional and amateur sectors'.

NAS is a charitable organisation aiming to promote the study and preservation of maritime heritage both in the UK and overseas. It has been actively involved in training within the archaeology sector since 1991 and today runs a range of courses focused on the skills of underwater and foreshore archaeology as well as the fundamental principles and theoretical parameters of maritime archaeology. Its training curriculum includes three Certificates and a Diploma. Certificate course-work is aligned with National Occupational Standards in Archaeological Practice, and is suitable for those undertaking the National Vocational Qualifications at level 3 or 4. The Training Programme is internationally recognised and operates in several countries.

In judging this year's award, the ATF panel also commended entries from Archaeology South East

working in the commercial sector, and from the website Arch Points. Archaeology South East runs training excavations for students in the UK and in Palestine. It operates a funded CPD programme for staff, and has created five in-house training programs on topics such as Roman Pottery and Archaeobotany in response to skills shortages identified in IfA labour market intelligence reports. Arch Points operates through Facebook and is the largest archaeology resource on the site. Each day one of the three person team makes a posting to the site with a tip, fact, item of legislation, safety warning or other useful bit of information to aid archaeologists in their work. Over 2900 friends across the world follow and respond to these postings.

Such examples illustrate the diversity and originality of approaches to professional development that the ATF seeks to recognise through the award.

The ATF works to promote the value of training throughout the archaeology sector in both professional and voluntary contexts. Through its partners, it has conducted surveys of training provision, worked with the Sector Skills Councils to create the National Occupational Standards and the National Vocational Qualifications in Archaeological Practice and supported the development of placement schemes such as the EPPIC placements administered by the IfA. The ATF also administers a bursary scheme funded by English Heritage to support individuals attending ATF recognised training courses.

A call for applications to the ATF Training Award for 2012 will appear in September. The closing date will be 31 January 2012, and the winner will be presented with their award at the IfA Annual Conference in April 2012. The ATF is keen to see entries from the professional and voluntary sectors, as well as the nomination of individuals who have made a significant contribution to the training of others. Detailed guidelines, and an application form will be available from the ATF website (www.britarch.ac.uk/training/atf.html).

Anthony Sinclair
Chair, Archaeology Training Forum

Kate Geary MIfA
Standards Development Manager, IfA

IfA CONFERENCE – the next generation

Nathalie Ward, Edward James and Holly Beavitt-Pike

The conference has a reputation for attracting mostly senior established figures in the profession. This isn't the case however, as three of this year's attendees found when they came to Conference for the first time.

Nathalie Ward MIfA
IfA Bursary Holder, Heritage at Risk Officer,
Northumberland National Park

In a time when there appear to be fewer opportunities and increasing pressures on available funding, new graduates can struggle to make a start in the profession. The IfA Conference presents a unique opportunity to gain knowledge and understanding of the sector, acquire new skills, meet other people in the same situation and those in the profession who can offer advice and guidance based on their years of experience.

The series of workshops that occurred across the three days of the conference proved extremely useful, and could prove likewise to other professionals. This year's selection included introductions to the Planning System, MoRPHE project management, the implications of PPS5, writing skills for archaeologists and self-employment and business start-ups. As a young practitioner, and as an IfA bursary holder, I recognise the importance of the conference for all archaeologists, but particularly the younger generation, who I encourage to attend to develop their skills, improve their CVs and connect with and learn from other members of the profession. After all, we are the future of the profession and as one of the sessions asked 'aren't we all in this together?'

Edward James Student member

I was excited to attend my first IfA Conference in Reading this year and was lucky enough that a bursary from IfA made it possible. I had several motivations for attending. I wanted to meet people who work within the sector, especially those who are pro-active enough to attend the conference, and do some networking with a view to future employment. I felt the central theme 'Understanding Significance' was likely to engender engaging debate, and I was

very interested in the discussion topics, particularly the future of planning and the historic environment. The CPD sessions also attracted me, as I've had little experience of this to-date. Finally, there was of course the social aspect of the conference and I was looking forward to meeting and chatting to some like-minded people, both of my own age and older, in a less formal atmosphere. I wasn't disappointed, and thoroughly enjoyed my three days in Reading.

Understanding Significance

The key theme emerged early and questions at the opening address revolved around the uncertainty of the current economic climate, what the roles of the IfA, CBA, FAME and other organisations should be, and how the understanding of significance should play a crucial role within the sector. I was particularly pleased to hear questions about the level of graduate unemployment and pay and conditions. Duncan Brown, Head of Archives at English Heritage, asked the panel what they thought 'archaeology' was and it was interesting to hear the different answers each panel member gave.

I attended the 'Southport Group: towards a revitalisation of the planning process' session. I am interested in this area, and wanted to enhance my understanding of how the system is changing in the light of PPS5, and what the heritage sector's response might be. There was an interesting presentation by Kath Scanlan from the LSE emphasising the necessity for commercial archaeology to be economically viable and create a niche for itself within the development market. The Southport Group's report was then presented in sections, and the audience could vote on each section using red and green postcards. Despite some hesitations I took a positive message from the session, which seemed to convey a coherent idea of the way forward. I look forward to reading the final report, and hopefully seeing some of its recommendations in action.

On Thursday morning I attended a CPD workshop by IfA's Kate Geary, and Kenneth Aitchison of Landward Research Ltd. This was very useful as I have only just graduated, and it helped me clarify the direction I want to take and the steps needed to achieve professional standards. This is an important part of starting any career, and I am pleased that IfA makes CPD mandatory. The session also highlighted the potential gap between ideal level of training



I felt the central theme 'Understanding Significance' was likely to engender engaging debate, and I was very interested in the discussion topics, particularly the future of planning and the historic environment.

provided, and training actually undertaken. As an inexperienced member of the sector, I think it is vital that people in my position push for more training in order to reach their potential, and also benefit their employers. I was disappointed that so few people attended the session, and I hope that this reflects that CPD and PDPs are well understood and practiced within the sector, rather than a lack of interest.

I then attended the second half of *'Understanding and protection: the application of significance in the historic environment and the National Heritage Protection Plan'*. The debate was an interesting one. The disparity between 'local significance' and 'national importance' was discussed alongside other issues, with consideration given to how application of significance fits in with 'localism' and 'Big Society' concepts. It is reassuring that accounting for the perspective of local communities is a central tenet of PPS5 and I hope it remains so.

Thursday afternoon's session was on the importance of Partnership Working. There were interesting papers on the relationship between Local Government and academia, the INSPIRE directive, the SWISH partnership and some other case studies of successful partnership working within archaeology. The partnership session prompted interesting and sometimes heated discussion, illustrating clearly the diversity of opinion within the archaeological community. I enjoyed it because I was able to get involved and ask some questions. The perceived

difference between academic and commercial archaeology was raised, leading to discussion on how this gap can be bridged more effectively from both sides in the future. By the end of the afternoon I had seen some interesting and encouraging presentations and felt that I had learned a good deal about how partnership working can benefit the archaeological sector.

Friday's session options included training, community archaeology, an overview of the 'Best of British Archaeology', and developing digital visualisation. I decided to attend the community archaeology session because I am keen to get involved in this area and feel that increasing public awareness of archaeology is of fundamental importance. As Peter Hinton suggested, ideally there should only be 'archaeology' and what is now called 'community archaeology' should be automatically included. There were some engaging presentations in this session, with smaller but good examples from Surrey and Telford, and then an example of large scale community involvement at the East Kent Access Road excavations. There were important questions asked about the practicalities of 'getting people involved' and how to attract a more diverse ethnic audience, with the associated equality and diversity issues which can be encountered within archaeology. This was my favourite session, and it has inspired me to investigate how I can contribute to my local community's voluntary heritage sector, and get more involved with organisations such as YAC and my local archaeology group.

The conference covered a diverse range of subjects, and raised a number of important questions: how can we better quantify significance, and relate it to managing the historic environment from a planning and legislative perspective? What can be done to raise awareness and get more people involved at a community level within commercial archaeology? What will the role of the 'Big Society' be, and will an increase in the number of volunteers have a positive effect on archaeology? How can the sector continue to operate in the face of budget cuts, and how can we work together as an industry more effectively to combat their effects? What can be done about the level of graduate unemployment in the sector, and a possible lack of training opportunities? Such questions pose challenges to the sector, which I look forward to working with others to meet.

Concluding thoughts

The conference was a fantastic opportunity to network and make contacts which have already proven to be great sources of information, advice, support and friendship. I found the formal sessions engaging and thought provoking, and the social events vibrant and extremely good fun. I was especially delighted at the welcome and support that I and other younger attendees were given by older Institute members. If you are a young archaeologist and you are looking to network and get involved then I highly recommend attending the conference in the future.

Holly Beavitt-Pike PlfA
IfA Bursary Holder, Heritage at Risk Officer,
RCAHMS

I attended the IfA conference for the first time this year and found it to be useful and thought-provoking, particularly the session on *'Training: promoting best practice'*. As a result, I felt compelled to voice my concerns and opinions about the problems faced by archaeology in the UK from my perspective as a recent graduate and heritage sector employee.

There appears to be a potential crisis deriving from a large number of senior professionals approaching retirement, and a lack of opportunities and appropriate training for graduates hoping to start out in archaeology. The result is an ever-widening skills gap. It is imperative that knowledge and skills are passed down from the experienced to the inexperienced, and a profession with a shortfall at the more experienced end of the career scale would be one risking a significant decline in standards.

The emergence of a skills gap coincides with a shake-up of the university tuition fee system, which is

likely to reduce the number of graduates willing to pay up to £27,000 in fees to enter what has consistently been the lowest paid graduate career. A profession with a shortfall at both ends of the experience scale is at risk of disappearing entirely.

Fortunately, these problems have been acknowledged and attempts are being made to create opportunities and alternative training methods for a new generation of professionals. These aim to bridge the emerging skills gap by introducing new formats of early career training, recognising that the profession should offer greater support for those wanting to follow a more direct route into practical archaeology. This was discussed in the training session, which outlined the importance of continuing the workplace learning programme, was originally set up in 2006 and funded by the Heritage Lottery Fund.

Workplace learning bursaries prepare individuals to become skilled professionals by providing structured work placements. The programme has enabled placement holders to gain skills and expertise in areas where skills gaps have been identified, as well as looking at ways to address the future challenges that the historic environment sector might face. The introduction of the NVQ in Archaeological Practice has enabled appropriately recorded and accredited on-the-job training. I feel strongly that we need additional opportunities offering structured training and financial support or the deficit of heritage professionals will continue and worsen.

As a recent graduate I can confirm that many new graduates believe that an archaeological degree equals automatic entry into an archaeology career. Graduate unemployment statistics suggest that this is not the case. While I enjoyed the university experience and developed transferable skills necessary for a future career, it concerns me that a large part of my degree was not relevant to acquiring or holding onto a skilled, paid job within the archaeological profession. Instead, the series of work placements that I personally arranged have enabled me to do this.

While the academic route should still be available, I suggest that there is a need for people considering a career in archaeology to develop 'employability skills' if the profession is to continue. I passionately believe that there should be a wider range of opportunities to inspire young people who have an interest in archaeology to begin, remain within and succeed professionally. Archaeology should open its doors to a wider intake of interested young people and embrace new forms of training to bridge the skills gap.

Andrea Bradley
(front, centre) with
IfA bursary holders
at the conference.
Photo: Alison Taylor



Widening the Audience for Community Archaeology: the Significance of PPS5

Michael Nevell

This conference session looked at the role of the planning process and in particular PPS5 in developing and enabling community archaeology projects. Organised by **Austin Ainsworth**, formerly of Gloucester City Council, and chaired by **Michael Nevell**, the aim of the session was to explore the theoretical background to archaeological engagement, especially with groups at risk of social exclusion, to assess the current level of engagement with such groups and to highlight best practice case-studies and methodologies in exploring equality and diversity issues in community archaeology.

Suzie Thomas, CBA, started the session by looking at ways of increasing the diversity of those participating in archaeology. She looked at several schemes including the Museums Association's *Diversify* scheme that offered post-graduate bursaries to Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) candidates. It was apparent, however, that the notion of diversity here was connected almost exclusively with ethnicity, with much less attention being given to other, perhaps less visible types of diversity, such as socio-economic or disability backgrounds. The archaeological sector has sometimes been slower in diversifying its audiences despite the existence of positive models such as Gloucester City Council's Heritage Services collaboration with GEAR to engage homeless people. The CBA's most recent experience of diversification of the workforce is tied in with targets set by the Heritage Lottery Fund for the Community Archaeological Bursaries Project. Suzie examined how this project challenged the traditional image of the archaeology profession by retaining diversity targets yet remaining fair to all potential candidates.

Michael Nevell then looked at some of the theoretical issues and practices behind community archaeology projects. After assessing the increasing scale of the voluntary sector (doubling to c 215,000 individuals involved annually between 1985/86 and 2009) and the role of academic archaeology in professionalising, and often excluding, voluntary involvement through elitist language and concepts, he sought to outline how the significance and impact of such projects could be recorded and assessed. Impact could be measured by collecting evidence-based research to look at snapshots of volunteers' experiences and responses to small-scale projects, as well as 'longitudinal' information – that is information across the life of a project which shows the longer-term impact of people's experiences. Methodologies for this could be used and adapted from national voluntary groups and the Museum and Libraries Association. He concluded that community archaeology projects should look at measuring their impact on people's quality of life.

Abby Guinness, Surrey County Council, gave the first of three case-studies highlighting recent outstanding practice in delivering diverse community heritage through the planning process. She studied two projects currently being undertaken by Heritage Enterprise and the Surrey County

Archaeological Unit (the Preston Howe Excavation Archive project and the Merstham Interpretation Board project both in East Surrey), as a way of bringing together local communities to increase audiences and participation in local archaeology. Both sites contained medieval moats now surrounded by 20th century social housing estates, and were little known or understood by their local communities. The areas scored very highly on the Index of Multiple Deprivation. Through a variety of non-invasive archaeological activities (historic landscape analysis, study of previous excavation archives, historical records, and archaeological finds analysis), groups from a variety of socio-economic backgrounds, including excluded school pupils, were brought together on the projects and interacted in social settings they were unlikely to encounter in their daily life.

Building on this theme, **David Crawford-White** of Oxford Wessex Archaeology and **Simon Mason** of Kent County Council discussed the community engagement side of one of the largest archaeological projects of recent years; the East Kent Access Road. The community archaeology programme was written into the contract and project designed from the



Volunteers sorting medieval tiles © Surrey County Council

beginning with the funders Kent County Council working with the road builders, VolkerFitzpatrick Hochtief. The outreach programme, which employed a dedicated community archaeologist, included volunteer opportunities, a community excavation, open days, road shows, school visits, exhibitions and displays, talks, guided tours, publicity material including a website and media liaison. It showed how archaeology could be integrated into a complex development programme providing benefits both to the developer (high positive profile and local community engagement) and the local community through increased access to their heritage, training and a legacy of continued support.

Paul Belford's presentation returned to issues of identity and community by looking at two small-scale projects at Telford New Town undertaken by NEXUS Heritage. These projects looked at the excavation of a small group of workers' housing and an iron furnace. Paul noted how a top-down project begun through the planning process brought a dispersed community from the workers' housing, demolished in 1970, back together to interact with the post-1970 locals of Telford New Town. The skills transferred to this group allowed the New Telford residents to establish their own heritage group to investigate a local blast furnace, and so to reclaim a parkland area in the centre of Telford as historically significant to the local community. Both sites helped to challenge the popular image of Telford New Town as having no historic roots.



Volunteers sorting through the boxes of finds from the 1952 archive © Surrey County Council

The concluding discussion noted that community archaeology undertaken through the planning process, and particularly under PPS5, was naturally biased towards top-down, formal programmes of engagement, and without good examples to follow like those outlined, did not easily lend itself to wider engagement and the participation of marginalised groups.

Michael Nevell MIFA
Head of Archaeology, University of Salford



Telford New Town community dig. Photo: Paul Belford, Nexus Heritage





A series of screenshots from an RTI file showing a Roman brick stamp from the AHRC Portus Project.
© University of Southampton

Reflectance transformation: an approach for imaging archaeological finds

Graeme Earl, Gareth Beale, Hembo Pagi and Nicole Smith

Reflectance Transformation Imaging (RTI) is a technology that uses conventional digital photographs to derive detailed surface shape information. It is a digital, interactive version of the raking light photography commonly used in finds photography and (with the sun) on site to represent subtle changes in surface morphology. The University of Southampton is currently leading a project in collaboration with Oxford University funded by the AHRC further to develop and promote the RTI technology. The IfA conference on 11 April 2011 provided an opportunity to demonstrate the available tools.

The project team has been working for the past year with a range of institutions on capturing RTI data.

This has included extensive work recording rock art, stone, graffiti, wall paintings and a host of artefact types including cuneiform, lead and wood tablets, textiles, paper, inscriptions, amphora stamps, statues, wood, bone, metal, lithics, ceramics and glass. There are even applications for imaging excavated contexts. We have worked with the Portable Antiquities Scheme, English Heritage, British Museum, British Library, Ashmolean Museum, Fitzwilliam Museum, the Louvre, Hampshire and Wight Trust for Maritime Archaeology, Carlsberg Glyptotek amongst others and on projects in Pompeii, Herculaneum, Çatalhöyük, Portus, Medieval Southampton and Winchester. Tom Goskar at Wessex Archaeology has also been a prominent user and developer of the technology in the UK.

The RTI tools are accessible to a wide range of users and, due to their comparative low cost, we also hope that there can be widespread adoption of them by the archaeological community. The software is free to use for non-commercial purposes. Some of the success

stories include identification of subtle surface cracking on Islamic ceramics, comparing submerged wood pre- and post-conservation, recording Anglo Saxon metalwork prior to conservation, capturing medieval graffiti during building renovation, and identifying heavily eroded brick stamps and inscriptions.

There are two ways to capture reflectance transformation images: via a lighting dome or arc, or via highlights on reflective spheres. In the first method we commonly use a lighting dome with 76 LEDs to capture a series of images under known varying light positions. Every image is taken with a different light switched on while object and camera positions remain the same. As the lights' locations are known, data processing requires limited human input, and so is appropriate for large collections. In the highlight based RTI method, a handheld light source (usually a flashgun or torch) and a reflective sphere (snooker ball for example) are used. As with the dome setup, the camera and artifact remain in a fixed position. The reflective sphere is used by the Highlight RTI software to identify the light location, which is then used for post processing. Highlight based RTI is more laborious but it is inexpensive, more portable, and can capture a range of object sizes. The only constraints on the digital camera used are that it must be able to fire a remote flash (via a cable or wirelessly) and have the focus locked.

We see a few areas of benefit to the archaeological community

- 1 increased recording of surface details of objects, with only limited increase in time and expense
- 2 image processing tools to identify otherwise invisible surface properties
- 3 enhanced visual dissemination of objects to scholars and the general public
- 4 mechanism for annotation of surface details, and for sharing these annotations


Examples of our work are presented in a *Journal of Archaeological Science* paper available from <http://eprints.soton.ac.uk/156253/>

If you are interested in learning how this technology might be employed please email graeme.earl@soton.ac.uk at the University of Southampton.



Further details are also available on capture technique and many other aspects of RTI from the website of our colleagues at Cultural Heritage Imaging <http://www.c-h-i.org/>.

Graeme Earl, Gareth Beale, Hembo Pagi and Nicole Smith
Archaeological Computing Research Group,
University of Southampton



One of the lighting domes produced by the project. © University of Southampton



Highlight based RTI: the setup for highlight based capture of small finds.
© University of Southampton



Forensic Archaeology Special Interest Group AGM

John Hunter

This session saw the formal establishment of the new Forensic Archaeology Special Interest Group (SIG). Its formation stems from a long-standing development in which archaeology has gradually been recognised as having a role to play in aspects of criminal investigation, typically in searching for and recovering buried victims of murder.

This SIG is different from others in that it also embodies an 'Expert Panel', the members of which are deemed sufficiently experienced and competent in forensic archaeology to operate within the police structure. This development was partly driven by the office of the Forensic Regulator (based in the Home Office) as part of a broader remit to ensure appropriate standards in all areas of forensic science. The Forensic Regulator was involved in the build-up to the SIG and the Expert Panel and is very supportive of IfA acting as the vehicle for validation of forensic archaeologists.



Photo © Wessex Archaeology

Forensic evidence can be very different to that normally found on archaeological sites, often in the form of fibres, paint, human materials, clothing, and even cigarette butts.

The Expert Panel is relatively small but will incorporate a training programme to allow trainees to assist at scenes of crime and gain the necessary experience to become validated.

The opening session of the SIG included two presentations by **John Hunter**, MFL Forensics, and **Steve Litherland**, Cellmark Forensic Services, which gave an overview of the development of the discipline and outlined the various applications of archaeological techniques within criminal investigation in the UK and elsewhere.

Some emphasis was placed on the ways that 'conventional' and forensic archaeology differed, and the constraints which apply at a scene of crime. Key differences lie in the manner of interrogating buried remains, for example in the individualisation of the victim, the manner the grave was dug, the value of contact materials and factors of taphonomics. Forensic evidence can be very different to that normally found on archaeological sites, often in the form of fibres, paint, human materials, clothing, and even cigarette butts.

One major difference is that unlike conventional archaeological remains, buried murder victims have a human decay dynamic which can have significant implications for surface vegetation effects, geophysical survey and thermal imaging. There appear to be specific time windows when the graves might be best detected.

Forensic archaeology can also embrace the remains of victims from socio-historical contexts, and perhaps the best known involves the excavation of mass graves from recent conflicts around the world. This can range from the humanitarian-focused recovery and identification of victims to the gathering of evidence for war crimes and criminal investigations - or a combination of the two.

Some idea of the scale and complexity of this work can be seen by looking at the former Yugoslavia. Here, in the four year war between 1992 and 1996 110,000+ people were killed and 2 million displaced from an original population of 4 million. Over 17,000 bodies have been recovered from 300+ mass graves in Bosnia alone, and still the fate of an estimated 16,000+ people remains unknown. Methodologies advanced significantly during this time, bringing together analysis of aerial photographs and satellite imagery with geomatics and other ecological disciplines to find and link primary and secondary grave sites.

In recent years the archaeologically-led recovery of combatant and non-combatant victims of major

historic twentieth century conflicts has taken place in most major European countries. The most recent UK example being the recovery and on-going identification of Allied soldiers killed in the battle of Fromelles (1916) carried out under the auspices of the Commonwealth War Graves Commission, UKMOD, and the Australian Defence Force. This marks a likely watershed in terms of public expectations regarding the recovery of soldier's remains in the UK.

The Expert Panel is to be chaired by Rob Janaway (Bradford University) with Barrie Simpson (MFL Forensics) as Secretary. The Special Interest Group will be chaired in the first instance by John Hunter (MFL Forensics), with Barrie Simpson as Secretary and Caroline Sturdy Colls (Staffordshire University) as Treasurer.

John Hunter, MifA
University of Birmingham



John Hunter giving a paper about forensic archaeology © Martin Newman



Members of the new group at the AGM © Martin Newman

Conference excursions

Kirsten Collins and Karen Bewick

On the Thursday afternoon of Conference, delegates were offered the chance to join one of two excursions to local sites of historic interest:

READING MUSEUM AND ABBEY RUINS

Christelle Beaupoux, Reading Borough Council, and **Gill Greenaway**, curator at Reading Museum, took two small groups on a tour around the Abbey ruins and associated buildings, and artifacts in the museum.

The ruins are currently closed to the public while investigations into the state of the remains and the scope of necessary conservation works continue. The groups heard about the conservation project, part of the proposed £8million Abbey Quarter regeneration programme, that involves the repair and reopening of the ruins which will sit at the heart of a new cultural area.

Reading Abbey was founded by King Henry I in 1121, because of its location close to the Thames and the Kennet. When Henry I died in Lyons-la-Forêt, Normandy in 1135 his body was returned to Reading, and was buried in the front of the altar of the then incomplete abbey.



Reading Abbey. Photo: Kirsten Collins

CALLEVA ATREBATUM

Professor **Mike Fulford**, University of Reading, led an interesting excursion to the Roman Town of Calleva Atrebatum, once the centre of the territory of the Atrebates; one of Southern Britain's major late Iron Age tribes.

Professor Fulford directs the Silchester Roman Town Insula IX 'Town Life' Project, an ongoing excavation of one block of the Roman town now in its fourteenth year.

After a short coach journey to St Mary the Virgin Church, an interesting building in its own right, Professor Fulford gave a presentation on the importance of the work carried out at the Roman site, and its impact on commercial archaeology. This was followed by a welcome cup of tea over which delegates were able to discuss the project or just take in St Marys mid -13th century wall paintings.

A guided walk around the amphitheatre and town walls ensued, proving to be something of a sentimental journey for a number of delegates who, as it transpired, had worked on various excavations of the site, some dating back to the 1970s.



(above) Mike Fulford at Calleva Atrebatum and (below) with delegates at the amphitheatre. Photos: Alison Taylor



RECOGNISING YOUR ACHIEVEMENTS

Kathryn Whittington

Joining the Institute is an important process. For those who join at a corporate grade, it demonstrates a commitment to professionalism, and is a way for employers, clients and colleagues to understand your level of competence. It also offers a means of feeding into the development of the profession. Yet joining is just the first stage of a journey that should span your entire career.

The Institute has five membership grades, two are 'non-corporate' – which means that technical competence is **not** assessed, and as a result these members don't have post-nominal letters and cannot sit on Council or vote. Student membership is granted to individuals enrolled on eligible courses, while Affiliate membership is aimed at individuals who have an active interest in the historic environment, or are working in the sector but do not yet qualify for a corporate grade. There are also three 'corporate' grades: Practitioner (PlfA), Associate (AlfA) and Member (MlfA), which require assessment of both ethical **and** technical competence by committee. Applicants have to demonstrate their levels of competence through a Statement, through referees and by providing examples of work. Corporate grade members are allowed to use post-nominal letters, can sit on Council and vote at meetings. These are the grades that employers look for in job applications, as they are a means of accrediting your abilities and achievements.

While some members enter the Institute at MlfA level, many do not. Progression through the membership grades should mirror your career, so it is important to upgrade your membership when you are able to do so. Around 50% of adverts posted in the JIS which require or recommend IfA membership state a preferred membership grade, so to be able to move up the career ladder you should always ensure your grade is the highest you can achieve. Holding the relevant membership grade is also important for your perception outside of the profession, and for the perception of the industry as a whole by others. The Institute works hard to promote archaeology and IfA membership to other industries, so that they understand how to assess whether an archaeologist is competent. If you are not a member at the level that corresponds to your role and responsibilities, you may not be viewed as you might wish.

When you apply to upgrade, it is important to consider how the grade you are applying for is different to your current grade, and use this to guide your application. If you are a Student or Affiliate member, it is a big step to reach PlfA grade. You need to demonstrate that you have the knowledge, autonomy and ability to cope with complexity and perception of competence expected of PlfA members, and you need to select referees who can confirm this. It may take you a little while to develop these competencies and contacts, but it is an important part of becoming a professional archaeologist. Ask yourself what have you done to give you a good working knowledge of key areas of historic environment practice? How can you demonstrate that you recognise the importance of each step you undertake when you are working? Where have you used your own judgement when undertaking tasks? Answer those questions within your Statement of Competence and you will be demonstrating why you should be a member at PlfA grade.

Similarly the difference between PlfA and AlfA is considerable, as is the difference between AlfA and MlfA. The competence matrix in the *Applicants' Handbook* sets out what you need to demonstrate for all the corporate grades. This is the key document whenever you prepare an IfA membership or upgrade application, so make sure you read it first. The committee can always tell if it is assessing an application from somebody who has not!

You will probably find your Personal Development Plan and CPD log useful for this. Think about the learning opportunities you have had, or hope to have in the future, and how they might feed into your competences in these four areas. What opportunities have you taken at work since you last applied? You may have had experiences outside of your job that you can discuss in your application too.

Sometimes upgrade applications are unsuccessful. This is not always a reflection of your professional ability, though sometimes it may be that you have not reached the level required. If this is the case, the committee will offer feedback and explain where you did not meet the criteria. In other cases it is down to the quality of the application. It can be hard to validate eligibility for a higher grade if there is insufficient detail. Therefore, taking care over your application will increase your chances of success. Make sure that your Statement of Competence is not just a list of roles and responsibilities but details how you meet the competency criteria for the grade you are applying for. Examples of your work should represent your most complex efforts, while your nominated referees should be relevant and prepared to provide a reference.

Upgrading is currently free as Council have waived the fees as part of the membership support plan. Our present fees structure also means that changing your grade won't necessarily change your subscription category, as fees are based on your income (apart from Student and Affiliate grades, which have a flat rate). It's a little extra work, but you will be recognising your achievements and it will make it easier for your peers and those outside the sector to recognise your achievements too. If you have any questions, or would like some feedback on your application before you apply, please get in touch with Kathryn Whittington at kathryn.whittington@archaeologists.net.

Kathryn Whittington AlfA
IfA membership and Services Coordinator



Members will be sharing their experiences of upgrading and its benefits in the next issue.

New members

ELECTED

Member (MfA)

Timothy Bradley
Jonathan Butler
Andrew Davidson
Judith Doyle
Benjamin Morton
Amanda Feather
Paul Gilman
Gary Trimble

Associate (AfA)

Timothy
Braybrooke
John Ette
Marie Leverett
Nuala Marshall
James Snee

Practitioner (PifA)

Joanne Barnes
Sharon Cook
Rachel English
Jim Gunter
Daniel Jackson
Hannah Smith
Sophie
Thoroughgood

Affiliate

Jennie Avery
Matthew Brooks
Stella De-Villiers
Jonathan Goldberg
Janice Gooch
David Hunt
Helen Mallalieu
David Millum
Stephen O'Brien
Armin Yavari
Sheryl Watt

Student

Lou Albessard
Reg Amin
Jon Baczkowski
Sarahjayne
Clements
(Drake)
Aaron Colgrove
Claire Dennis
Annamaria Diana
Sam Ferguson
Stephen Foster
Giovanna Fregni
John Goree
Jack Hanson
Andrew McGuire
Anne McIntyre
Matthew Neu
Somayyeh
Mottaghi-
Toramosari
Erin Robinson
Claire Taylor
Emma Turner
Jamie Walker
Gareth Verney
Meike Weber
Jennifer White
Helen White
Lee Woodall

TRANSFERS

Member (MfA)

Paul Masser
Paul Mason
James Newbould
Andrew Passmore
Emma Rouse

Associate (AfA)

Thomas Bradley-
Lovekin
Vasileios Tsamis

Practitioner (PifA)

Owain Mason

Obituary

Philip Rahtz (11 March 1921 – 2 June 2011)

Young people starting out in archaeology in the second half of the twentieth century would be lucky to find a more inspiring excavation director than Philip Rahtz. Most likely they would first encounter him down on the ground digging next to them, clad in a decrepit pair of khaki shorts and wielding a shovel – occasionally stopping to hold instant on-site seminars on what was happening. If excavation is theatre, this was not so much directed theatre as devised theatre. Everyone was expected to work, contribute and express an opinion. There was a buzz of expectation from morning to night, a sense of mission, of resolving the past's great riddles, discovering people and revealing events. Things

were not there just to be found and recorded, but to be unleashed back into life.

Now that inclusivity and multivocality are being urged on an overheated profession, it is easy to forget that such things were once considered routine, agreeable and essential by all successful practitioners. Philip Arthur Rahtz was one of the great archaeological excavators of the twentieth century. He was born in Bristol on 11 March 1921. After



Philip Rahtz

Bristol Grammar School he was called up and served in the RAF until 1946. He then worked briefly as a teacher and photographer before being taken on with Ernest Greenfield by the Ministry of Public Buildings and Works to record archaeology ahead of the construction of Chew Valley reservoir.

Then, aged thirty-two, he went on to excavate in Spain, Greece and Ghana, as well completing fifty-three excavations in England, thirteen of them in Somerset. His excavations opened windows on Bronze Age burials, Roman villas and temples, Anglo-Saxon palaces and cemeteries, medieval houses, abbeys, churches and a hunting lodge. The post-Roman cemetery at Cannington with its young female "saint", the "Arthurian" fort at Congresbury, King Alfred's palace at Cheddar and the great Cistercian landscape of Bordesley Abbey are household names in the profession, sites where history was revealed with exceptional clarity, proficiency and common sense.

Rahtz had a near perfect record of reporting and deserves to be as renowned for finishing and publishing his excavations as others are for failing to do so. He achieved it by toiling at home, day after day, turning field records into clear simple narratives supported by strong graphics. During these marathon indoor campaigns, which took up most of his life when he was not digging or teaching, a network of wires blasted waves of classical music into every room. His was a house where a visit to the lavatory was met by the Ride of the Valkyries.

The harvest of all this work was twofold: first, he was instrumental in forging the application of archaeology to the Middle Ages. While others theorised the role of medieval material culture, he went out and dug it up, creating a legacy on which modern medieval archaeologists will long continue to draw. Second, when in 1963 he became a lecturer at the University of Birmingham, he imported the mud and dust of archaeological exploration deep into the academy. Creating the department of archaeology at York, where he became professor in 1978, he extended his principle of on-site empowerment to students. They were not there just to listen to lectures, but also to

speak, lecture and intervene. They had to cover all periods, in all places, linked by a chain of themes – settlement and economy, urbanism, death and burial.

His gift to teaching was not so much this innovative degree, with its rather controvertible syllabus, as the development of education as interaction: York courses were interactive before there was an internet. Out of term each student had to undertake twelve weeks of residential fieldwork, because that is where the love of archaeology took hold. In term, they were loaded into a minibus and when it stopped each had to deliver a ten-minute introductory talk about a place they may never have seen before. Seminar contributions were expected of students from Day One. By the time they graduated each had been recorded chairing a seminar, and videoed giving a public lecture – unusual forms of examination but great preparations for real work.

As an academic Rahtz performed two counter-intuitive conjuring tricks: he made medieval archaeology matter, and he made archaeological theory fun. He leaves a large and affectionate following. In a profession well known for its earthy character – in every sense – he relished his reputation as a Lothario, and attributed it somewhat eccentrically in his autobiography, *Living Archaeology* (2001), to evolutionary forces. His close friends included some of the most intelligent and influential women working in archaeology.

Philip Rahtz died on 2 June 2011, aged ninety, and was buried at the Anglo-Scandinavian church at Kirkdale, North Yorkshire, the subject of his last field project. His first wife, Wendy, died in 1977. They had three sons and two daughters. He and his second wife, Lorna Rosemary Jane Watts, had a son.

From the obituary of Philip Rahtz by that first appeared in *SALON*, by **Martin Carver**

