

# Re-imagining Scottish Archaeology: structure, funding, and delivery

## Proposed recommendations

Jen Parker Wooding  
Senior Professional Standards & Practice Coordinator  
Chartered Institute for Archaeologists

### Executive summary

The Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CifA) received a grant from Historic Environment Scotland (HES) to organise three workshops on behalf of the Scottish Strategic Archaeology Committee (SSAC). The workshops focused on the structure, funding, and delivery of archaeology in Scotland to support Aim 1 of the Archaeology Strategy and involved facilitated group discussion. Questions were posed that focused on the current status quo but also encouraged ‘blue sky thinking’ and the exploration of different approaches. The resulting discussions were broad, and the feedback mixed with a few topics achieving some measure of consensus and others provoking more varied debate. Overall, the workshops were productive bringing together over 70 delegates from across Scotland representing 33 organisations (comprising contractors, local and national government, multi-disciplinary consultancies, sole traders, academics, students, and volunteers). Based on the feedback CifA has outlined several recommendations for consideration by the SSAC and Aim 1 leader HES. This report outlines those recommendations, identifies actions and provides a cross reference to Scotland’s Archaeology Strategy Delivery Plan. The report recommends that additional targeted discussions take place in the future as another opportunity to bring people together but also to ensure that all the topics raised in response to the consultation on the draft strategy have been thoroughly explored.

### 1. Introduction

Three workshops were held in Inverness, Edinburgh and Glasgow in November and December 2019. The purpose of the workshops was to generate new ideas about the structure, funding and delivery of archaeology in Scotland to support the delivery of Aim One of Scotland’s Archaeology Strategy: - *Delivering Archaeology - ‘To broaden and deepen the impact and public benefit of archaeology within and beyond Scotland’*. CifA has contributed to related initiatives in England, Wales and Northern Ireland and offered to facilitate the workshops in partnership with ALGAO and FAME, to bring a ‘national conversation’ to the discussions on behalf of HES. Prior to the workshops, three think pieces were published and two Twitter chats held to stimulate early discussion which helped to frame the agendas and discussion topics for the workshops (see Appendix 1, 2 & 3 for a summary of the workshop organisation, content and Twitter extracts). The topics of discussion focused on the following three themes

- **Structure: How the sector is organised, managed, and legislated**

**Topics of discussion:** self-regulation, Standard and guidance, licensing, quality management

- **Funding: Procurement and funding models**

**Topics of discussion:** different funding models, competitive tendering, design competition, models for assessing tenders on quality as well as cost

- **Delivery: Putting public benefit at the heart of what we do**

**Topics of discussion:** Embedding public/social benefit into WSI’s/PERDS, ensuring we have the right skills

## **1. Discussion summary**

Workshops participants were split into groups and allocated a series of questions to discuss. A facilitator was placed with each group to take notes. The questions provided stimulus for wide-ranging discussions, looking in detail at the structure, funding, and delivery of archaeology within Scotland and beyond to include wider perspectives from other countries (see Appendix 4 for a summary of the questions and workshop commentary). However, only a finite amount of time could be devoted to these discussions and some topics could not be explored to their full potential. As a result, there are some areas and questions that would benefit from further, thoughtful consideration potentially through the organisation of future workshops. The recommendations outlined by ClfA in this report are based on the discussion and comments noted at the workshops and have been reviewed by the SSAC. They are presented in order of consensus using green to denote general support for the recommendation, amber to highlight a mixed response with the potential for further discussion and red to show no support at the current time (see Tables 1-3). Following further consideration by the SSAC and Aim 1 lead, HES, recommendations could be taken forward via an updated Strategy Delivery Plan.

### **1.1. Structure: recommendations, feedback, and actions (recommendations 1-8)**

When discussing the structure of archaeology in Scotland, the questions posed were primarily focused on the management and delivery of quality across all archaeological endeavours, both inside and outside the planning system, with discussions centred on whether the current systems in place were fit for purpose and effective. Alan Leslie's think piece entitled *Delivering Archaeology – "Structure"* provided the backdrop for this with a focus on collaborative working and discussion topics also included professional competence and the efficacy of the professional standards, guidance, and advice available to practitioners. Workshop feedback highlighted that the quality of work across Scotland (especially commercial work) was generally considered to be high and approaches highlighted for managing quality elsewhere, including licencing, were not deemed necessary. See Table 1 and Appendix 4 for summarised comments from the discussion groups.

### **1.2. Funding: recommendations, feedback, and actions (recommendations 9-11)**

The discussions focused on the funding of archaeology in Scotland focused primarily on work undertaken within the planning system highlighting for discussion the tendering and commissions processes outlined in Kirsty Dingwall's think piece *Does competitive tendering work?* The current delivery model was reviewed, in addition to elements of several other approaches (French, Brussels and Swedish models etc). The aim was to assess current practice but also to encourage discussion that would consider how (and if) other approaches could work in Scotland. The consensus from the workshops emphasised that the current model is producing some high-quality work and is delivering value to the public, however, the system in general is also under resourced with regional archaeologists and advisors in need of additional support. There was no support for exploring other aspects of funding/delivery models employed in different countries. See Table 2 and Appendix 4 for summarised comments from the discussion groups.

### **1.3. Delivery: recommendations, feedback, and actions (recommendations 12-20)**

The discussions surrounding the delivery of archaeology in Scotland focused primarily on public benefit, delivering value, engaging communities in developer-led projects and funding community projects. These drew on the themes running through Kenny Brophy's think piece *Putting public benefit at the heart of what we do*. Case study presentations highlighted some examples of the high-quality public benefit and social value being delivered across Scotland. However, the discussions also noted that improvements could be made, including promoting more clearly the range of benefits archaeology provides. The use of community hubs as highlighted in Alan Leslie's think piece was highlighted in addition to looking more closely at the wording included in WSI's and of communication approaches in general. See Table 3 and Appendix 4 for summarised comments from the discussion groups.

## **2. Conclusion**

The recommendations presented by ClfA reflect the wide-ranging discussions held over the course of the three workshops and were based upon the facilitator notes provided (see Appendix 4). These have been reviewed by members of the SSAC committee and presented to reflect the level of support received at the workshops as a potential way forward in terms of identifiable actions. Additional recommendations may need adding but they provide the foundation for further discussion and consideration by the SSAC and Aim 1 lead, HES.

Due to time constraints and the volume of discussion, it was noted that several questions were not explored to their full potential. The workshops highlighted the benefit of bringing together stakeholders from across Scotland and beyond to discuss these issues, to share ideas and to have the opportunity to learn from others. Therefore, to encourage the continuation of these conversations, to foster working relationships and provide the opportunity to develop future partnerships, it is recommended that similar workshops are held in the future.

## **Acknowledgments**

Thank you to the workshop Chairs, presenters, think piece authors and facilitators for helping to manage the discussions and for collecting the feedback. Euan Leitch (BEFS), Robin Turner, Lisa Brown, Allan Rutherford, Kirsty Owen, Kevin Grant (HES), Cara Jones, Rob Lennox, Kate Geary, Peter Hinton (ClfA), Alan Leslie, Thomas Rees (Rathmell Archaeology Limited), Matt Ritchie (Forestry and Land Scotland), Ronan Toolis (Guard Archaeology), Stephen Driscoll (University of Glasgow), Kenny Brophy (University of Glasgow), Kirsty Dingwall (Headland Archaeology), Hugh McBrien (West of Scotland Archaeology Service), Gavin MacGregor (Northlight Heritage), and Dan Lee (UHI Archaeology Institute).

| <b>Table 1</b>   |  |   |                                  |
|--|--|---|----------------------------------|
| <b>Structure: recommendations, feedback, and actions (1-8)</b> |  |   |                                  |
| <b>No.</b>   | <b>Recommendation</b>  | <b>Action</b>                                   | <b>Link to SAS Delivery Plan</b> |
| 1  | For ClfA to facilitate the sector to develop a shared understanding of 'quality', what it is and what it means for different project types   | In plan for 2020/21                             | 1.3.2                            |
| 2  | ClfA and sector partners to provide good practice examples focused on quality for dissemination and hosting on organisation websites (ClfA/HES/SSAC)   | ClfA to contact organisations for examples      | 1.4.1                            |
| 3  | ClfA, in consultation with the sector, to improve its suite of Standards and guidance and encourage their use  | In plan for 2020.21                             | 1.4.1, 1.5.1                     |
| 4  | ClfA to ensure that its suite of Standards and guidance initially focusing on commercial archaeology (but intended for all projects) are promoted more widely and applied across <u>all archaeological endeavours</u> to achieve maximum public benefit            | In plan for 2020/21                             | 1.4.1, 1.5.1                     |
| 5  | Specifically, in relation to academic projects, ClfA to address compliance with Standards as a condition of grant with Research Councils and other funding bodies, for example, NHLF to ensure consistent delivery of quality and public benefit across the sector | As part of ongoing ClfA advocacy                | 1.5.1                            |
| 6  | ClfA to review, update and promote the use of its client guide to explain better the importance of quality assurance   | In plan for 2020/21                             | 1.3.2, 1.4.1, 1.5.1              |
| 7  | HES to review the current requirements regarding compliance with ClfA Standards and guidance as part of granting Scheduled Monument Consent  | For HES (including the Policy Forum) to discuss | 1.5.1                            |
| 8  | A working group (new or existing) to explore further the ideas of licensing to address quality management issues   | No further work currently required              |                                  |

| <b>Table 2</b>  |   |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|
| <b>Funding: recommendations, feedback, and actions (9-11)</b> |   |  |  |
| <b>No.</b>  | <b>Recommendation</b>   | <b>Action</b>  | <b>Link to SAS<br/><a href="#">Delivery Plan</a></b> |
|   | <b>Table 2</b><br><b>Funding: recommendations, feedback, and actions (9-11)</b>   |  |  |
| <b>9</b>  | Review the current structure of HES and consider options for dispersal across Scotland to provide wider coverage and support  | For HES (including the Policy Forum) to discuss  |  |
| <b>10</b>   | The current system depends on a mixture of public and private sector funding. It would be beneficial to explore in further detail where the division should be between public and private funding and which parts of the sector would be better for targeted public funding. A working group (new or existing) could explore further the use of levies ( <i>cf. Aggregates Levy Sustainability Fund</i> ) as an alternative funding stream for public benefit | No further work currently required   | 3.1.1, 3.1.2   |
| <b>11</b>   | To review the setup of the Welsh Trusts/Orkney and Shetland as examples of how regional archaeologists could be better supported  | No further work currently required but does link to structure discussions (see Appendix 4) | 3.1.2  |

| <b>Table 3</b>  |  |   |                                  |
|---|--|---|----------------------------------|
| <b>Delivery: recommendations, feedback, and actions (12-20)</b> |  |   |                                  |
| <b>No.</b>  | <b>Recommendation</b>  | <b>Action</b>   | <b>Link to SAS Delivery Plan</b> |
| 12  | CifA to better articulate why an ethical approach is necessary to achieve public benefit and to explain how its Code of conduct and Standards and guidance help to deliver that ethical approach   | CifA is addressing this as part of its current professionalism campaign   |                                  |
| 13  | CifA to add reference to emphasise public benefit in its Standards and guidance, where relevant, especially relating to its advice on WSIs   | Guidance on WSIs incorporated in 2014, CifA exploring further support for implementation  |                                  |
| 14  | CifA to review and update its client guide with further examples of public benefit from archaeology  | In plan for 2020 as part of CifA work on the CIRIA project  |                                  |
| 15  | To develop a project(s) focused on public benefit that will draw comparisons with other professions and bring together case studies to showcase good practice examples for promotion   | Action lead: Archaeology Scotland<br>ALGAO and CifA are involved in the project <i>Measuring, maximising, and transforming public benefit from UK Government infrastructure investment in archaeology</i> which forms part of a four-year UKRI Future Leaders Fellowship led by Dr Sadie Watson, MOLA.<br>See no.18 | 3.1.2, 3.3.2,<br>4.1.1           |
| 16  | To re-evaluate how accessible information and data is to the public wanting to learn more and engage   | For the Museums Working Group to consider   | 2.3.1, 2.5.1<br>3.5.1, 3.5.2     |
| 17  | For organisations to link public benefit to their wellbeing agendas to highlight the wider benefits of engagement and getting involved   | To be explored further by Aim 3 leads   | 3.3.1, 3.3.2                     |
| 18  | To explore the possibility of establishing community hubs, possibly utilising local museums to maximise the promotion of public benefit and engagement across Scotland (to link with the Community Heritage Scotland project)                        | Explore link to the UKRI Fellowship project (Dr Sadie Watson, MOLA) (see no. 15)  | 4.3.1                            |
| 19  | To conduct a review of planning conditions and compare them with models and examples/case studies recently developed in Northern Ireland and England to increase public benefit and to prevent either early discharge or undue burdens on applicants | SSAC to discuss   | 3.3.1, 3.3.2                     |
| 20  | A working group (new or existing) to explore how changes to legislation, policy or practice might better support the delivery of public benefit.   |   | 3.3.1<br>4.1.3                   |