Workshop 2

Standards and Guidance

What are they for and who sets them?

17th May 2017

Draft recommendations/actions, summary of issues discussed, and notes from the workshop
JW V2, incorporating comments from workshop leads and facilitators
14/08/17

Draft recommendations and actions

	Topic	Proposed actions
1	Principles covering work undertaken across the whole of the historic environment	• Consider the creation of a high level statement of principles
2	Definition of roles, and of terms	• Define who does what ie who should publish/own/enforce/persuade • Articulate clearly the meaning, purposes and status of standards and guidance, and advisory/ technical documents
3	Clarification of what standards and guidance, good practice advice, and technical guidance exist and are required	• Map existing standards and guidance etc • Identify how they influence or are enforced • Identify gaps/overlaps, and seek consensus on results • Commission new material /remove overlaps
4	Professional standards and guidance	• Review how CIfA Standards and Guidance are used and perceived by others (incorporating results of any recent studies eg standards in artefact reports) – are they effective in a) maintaining minimum standards and b) promoting good practice? • Review enforceability of standards and guidance and reconfigure as appropriate • Consider splitting standards away from guidance/technical specifications • Review and update existing CIfA Standards and Guidance
5	Lack of common understanding of standards and guidance across the sector	• Develop and promote a better understanding of standards and guidance and how to meet them through training and professional workshops/seminars • Engage with all parts of the sector, including the academic community and community groups, to develop a common understanding, • Consider cross sector regional hubs/groups to bring sector 'silos' together
6	Compliance/enforcement	• Promote the use of accredited professionals by those specifying and commissioning as a route to compliance with standards • Set out enforcement/compliance mechanisms (eg through

		planning system, accreditation, professional institute's professional conduct process) to enable better understanding of how to take forward a complaint or a case of poor performance • Encourage Registered Organisations to embed compliance with Standards and Guidance in their training and CPD programmes
7	Poor professional practice	• Invest in education and training in standards • Utilise provisions of Registered Organisations scheme • Consider how to support individuals confronting ethical dilemmas concerning bad practice/poor standards • Investigate the causes of poor practice: a consequence of resourcing, or ignorance, or just 'cutting corners'? • Disseminate appropriate information on professional conduct cases
8	Lack of innovation in professional practice	• Promote change and innovation within the profession through discussion, conference, workshops, journal • Link with revision of regional research frameworks • Identify innovative case studies from all areas of professional practice for publication and/or discussion at conference. • Consider how barriers to collaboration and sharing innovation in a commercial environment can be addressed
9	Implications of outcomes of synthesis projects for professional practice	• Review the methodological recommendations of the Roman Rural Settlement Research Project • Consider what and how to incorporate into Standards and Guidance or technical/methodological advice • Convene further discussion within the profession as needed.
10	Local government services: reduction in capacity and impact on standards	• Take issue forward into Workshop 4 discussions • Consider further the implications for professional practice and self-regulation

Summary of main issues discussed

1. The Southport vision
The vision set out in the Southport report was supported although the change in context was also recognised. We still need to articulate better the public value of the work we undertake, and to make further progress on many of the aspirations set out in the report.

2. Definition of terms
There is often a lack of understanding of what is meant by a 'standard' and by 'guidance'. The following definitions were agreed:

> **Standard:** something you can measure against
> **CIfA Standard:** a measurable outcome
> **Guidance:** advice on 'how to…'
> **CIfA Guidance:** how you might/should achieve the outcome… and avoid sub-standard work
> **Quality:** fitness for purpos**e**

3. Volume of documentation from differing organisations
In total there is a great deal of material comprising standards, guidance, advice and technical specifications etc produced by different organisations, often overlapping in content but with differing terminologies. There is a lack of clarity in how these documents inter-relate, and how they influence or are enforced. Existing standards and guidance need to be mapped; gaps and overlaps can then be defined and filled/removed.

4. Who should produce which documents?
Whose responsibility is it to produce which documents? The roles of Historic England, professional institutes and other expert organisations need to be better defined. It was agreed that policy and advice on, for example, planning, is produced by government and public bodies; professional organisations provide standards and guidance (both ethical and methodological/technical). Who produces the latter should be the organisation in which the expertise resides: professional body, Historic England, CIfA Group etc; responsibility may be shared in appropriate circumstances.

5. Principles for work across the whole of the historic environment?
Should we aspire to a common high level set of overarching principles applicable for work across the whole of the historic environment eg a 'Conservation Principles' type of document? It might have political benefits ie one voice for the sector. It could realign the sector with the NPPF, and reflect the multi-disciplinary nature of many professional practices. It should link into broader public policy *cf* the well-being and resource-for-all approaches in Wales and Scotland.

6. Revising and updating CIfA Standards and Guidance
Most Standards and Guidance need some updating; certain topics require more radical revision. A review should include consideration of splitting standards away from guidance/technical specifications, and consider clarity of terminology and enforceability.

7. Enforcement/compliance, and self-regulation
Standards should be enforceable by professional bodies, but all professionals have a responsibility to adhere to standards through self-regulation, a concept that is not always fully recognised.
A review of Standards and Guidance needs to consider how they are used in professional conduct cases; in their current form are they at the right level and sufficiently robust?

8. Innovation

There is limited innovation within the profession. Many people are locked into PPG16 processes despite the policy changes (PPS5 and NPPF) and the beneficial outcomes of research-focused and reflexive projects. There can be barriers to discussing and sharing innovation in a commercial environment. Challenges include resourcing, lack of time to innovate, lack of trust, reduced curatorial input and a need better to articulate public benefit

9. Creating a better understanding of standards and guidance though education and training.

We are not investing enough in discussion of professional practice, and the sub-divisions within the profession often militate against this. We need to consider how to bring people together eg through cross-sector regional hubs/groups, and to include all of those engaged in archaeological work including contractors, curators, community groups and academics. At present we don't have the right forums to bring people together. We should consider the planned and properly resourced use of online forums to provide cost-effective professional discussion.

10. Bad practice

Evidence of non-compliance is often difficult to establish beyond the anecdotal; widespread non-compliance is discussed but numbers of formal complaints are few. Lack of resources is not a valid reason for non-compliance with standards. There are barriers to individuals/organisations speaking out. There is a lack of understanding and/or confidence in how to make a complaints or seek enforcement eg CIFA procedures or through the planning system.

11. Support for professional accreditation

Professional accreditation is a way of promoting and enforcing professional standards and may become increasingly important if curatorial input diminishes. Many currently working in archaeology are not accredited, and national agencies and local government do not always support the use of accredited professionals; there is uncertainty about the implications of requiring the use of accredited professionals

12. Results of recent synthesis projects

Research projects utilising the results of the 25+ years of PPG16 and post-PPG16 developer funded archaeological work, especially the Rural Roman Settlement Research project, have produced important information on the quality of data collected, and standards in fieldwork, analysis and publication. The results of this and similar projects need to be reviewed and fed into the revisions of standards and guidance, and the production of technical specifications.

13. Local government curatorial services

The diminishing resources in local government and the impact of this on curatorial time to discuss, agree and monitor programmes of archaeological work was of concern. This affects compliance and the enforceability of standards through the planning system. It may militate against innovation since curatorial time to engage in innovative proposals at the design stage and on site is so limited. There needs to be a consequent increase in peer review and self-regulation; the latter is, anyway, a professional responsibility (*cf* 7 above).

14. Wales and Scotland

Changes in policy and guidance in Wales, and the development of different agendas in the devolved administrations that will influence professional practice were discussed.

Workshop notes

Opening presentations

Gwilym Hughes (CADW) spoke about the recent Welsh legislative and policy changes, and the place of guidance in the new structure.

Gill Hey (Oxford Archaeology) reflected on relatively unchanging post-PPG16 archaeological practice, despite the policy changes (PPS5 and NPPF) and the beneficial outcomes of research-focused and reflexive projects such as Terminal 5. Challenges include resourcing, lack of time to innovate, lack of trust, reduced curatorial input and a need better to articulate public benefit.

Stewart Bryant (consultant) spoke about the results of the Roman Rural Settlement research project and some of the implications of the analysis of 25 + years of developer-funded archaeological project reports for current and future professional practice.

Kate Geary (CIfA) considered the issues of professionalism and professional self-regulation against the results of recent workshops on WSIs which had exposed a lack of understanding of these concepts and a need for further cross-sector discussion and training.

Morning session

Question 1 A new vision for 2017 and beyond?

Notwithstanding the changes in planning policy, is the Southport vision is still relevant? Can we construct a new vision for 2017 and beyond?

Table 2

Notes of group discussion

Consensus/collaboration, commonality of purpose
Consistency/clarity, for:
- Professional standards and guidance
- Recognising boundaries

Principles:
- Training/CPD/education
- Communication
- Proportionality

Plenary summary

We concentrated on the Southport vision.
Collaboration is key in the production of S + G. Technical guidance is the province of those with technical knowledge.
We need consistency of terminology.

Professional institutes should deal with their own areas of competence but they should also collaborate.
Training is key but rather piecemeal.
Collaboration is also needed with universities.
Proportionality.

Table 3

Notes of group discussion

The principles are still valid but the context is very different.
Differences between different parts of the UK: eg the development of the well-being agenda in Wales; the Archaeology Strategy in Scotland 'archaeology is for everyone'; London is different – has a sense of identity, and with high profile projects.
There is a lack of monitoring because of lack of resources in central and local government.
The pressures on local government and public spending generally are a weak link, and the perception is that the 'gap' is filled by consultants – is that a bad thing? But they are working on behalf of clients and therefore potential conflicts of interest. Do consultants ask for work that breaches S + G?
With limited resources projects revert to the basics: how many postholes -> how much does it cost? Why do we put up with minimum compliance?
Greater reliance on professional accreditation.
Articulating public benefit.
Need research into client attitudes to archaeology (PR, CSR etc). Evidence v experience (look at wider cultural heritage/environment).
Mechanisms for discussing (and changing?) professional practice? (Evidence base through Oasis and Regional Research Frameworks).
The discussion shouldn't just be about developer-funded archaeology – other types of projects – research – should also comply with standards.

Plenary summary

The Southport principles are still valid but the context is very different. Wales and Scotland are different and closer to the vision because of the well-being agenda in Wales and public engagement with the strategy in Scotland.
Public spending is a weak link because of the lack of curatorial input and more reliance on consultants who may have a conflict of interest.
Why do we put up with minimum compliance?
We need to articulate better the public benefit – we don't know much about what clients think of this i.e. public benefit and cost.
We don't have the right forums to bring people together eg usefulness of WSI workshops in bring people together from different roles within the sector.
We need to look closely at how this applies to community and research projects.

In discussion:

Some local groups see Standards and Guidance as disproportionate. Some of the terminology may be difficult. The CBA ISGAP project was intended to assist with this – those who use it report finding it helpful.

Table 4

Notes of group discussion

Self-regulation in the current climate (2017) is the only path we can follow – with declining curatorial input.
Standards (eg CIfA evaluation standard) need revisiting to capture the RRSP research outcomes.
A desire for more detailed and methodological (process) standards – data sets and data capture in particular are missing (not everyone agrees).
Taking good practice and guidance and making them standards.
Innovation and reflexive approaches <u>can</u> work within correct/useful/workable standards.
Standards that focus on outcomes – detail and prescription are there to achieve outcomes.
Enforcement: a quick fix…mandatory (accreditation?) adherence to standards – lawful?

Plenary summary

There will be an increasing emphasis on self-regulation in the future.
We mainly have the Standards and Guidance that we need although there are some gaps in the detail eg a gap in the toolkit that would allow inter-site comparison.
Evaluation reports have a research value too, and the evaluation S + G should articulate that.
Having more standards should not prevent innovation or a reflexive approach.
There should be more focus on peer review, less on monitoring by local authority curators who have less resource.
A recognition that, if self-regulation is the future, what do we do about the 50% of archaeologists that are not CIfA accredited?

Table 5

Notes of group discussion

Agree with Southport that the objective must be maximum value to society. Also agree that quality must be driver, not price.

Difficulties are:
- Availability of resources - need to find alternative sources
- Ability to articulate research questions and prioritise outcomes
- Ability to communicate to client and others the <u>value</u> of research and other outcomes
- Lack of focus on bridging the divide between the profession and academia
- Poor data standardisation and consistency
- Piecemeal nature of training

Standards need to be rationalised – hierarchy made clear - and produced by appropriately placed and technically competent bodies/authors.

Tiers of control:
- Overarching standard? Something for the whole sector, setting the bar for public benefit, well-being agenda, resource for all etc. – VALUE (sector based)

- Ethical Standards – through professional accreditation – BENEFITS (profession based or could be sector based)
- Professional Standards - OUTCOMES (profession based)
- Technical Standards (or specifications, or guidance) – OUTPUTS (technical expert produced)

Better quality (through application of Standards) not possible without investment in:
- Organisation (rationalisation of standards above)
- Leadership
- Training
- Opportunities for self-directed learning
- Better communication and debate about innovation and quality.

Plenary summary

We agree with the Southport vision, but there are barriers to achieving it:
- Difficulties in articulating the research value of work to a wider audience
- A divide between academics and the rest
- Training needs of the next generation
Quality: we agree with the vision. Accreditation and Standards + Guidance are right but there are difficulties with the various levels ie, standards, guidance, advice, guidelines.
A need for improved leadership and training.
CIfA standards are now referenced more.
There are issues around publication and the post-excavation process – less guidance is available on this.

Summary at the end of the morning session:

We are all signed up to the vision
We seek to deliver public benefit but we don't always articulate it well
We aspire to quality but are also constrained by reliance on established methodologies and a lack of time/space to innovate
So many of the issue we've discussed are actually under our control – we can solve them.
There are issues around training and support – people are not always confident.
Universities have a role to play.

It was agreed that the circulated questions were the ones to be discussed in the afternoon session.

Afternoon Session
Definitions:

Standard: something you can measure against

CIfA Standard: a measurable outcome

Guidance: advice on 'how to…'

CIfA Guidance: how you might/should achieve the outcome… and avoid sub-standard work

Quality: fitness for purpos**e**

Table 2

Roles and responsibilities – who sets standards?

Notes of group discussion

- Guide
- Guidance
- Standardisation
- Technical/professional

Which level?
Research frameworks.
Aspire to a common standard for historic environment work, separate at the guidance level.
The principles of defining significance are the same for both archaeology and historic buildings.
There is some bad practice across both professions.
Need to explain better the various levels of advice, guidance etc
Need for greater clarity/brevity

Plenary summary

A consensus that:
- Policy is the responsibility of government, local government and national bodies
- Professional practice standards and guidance are the responsibility of professional institutes
- But there needs to be more collaboration in writing them

The higher level standards should be drafted by the professional institutes in collaboration:
- short standards applicable across the whole of the historic environment, decoupled from
- guidance which would be specific to different areas.
- and CIfA should publish its all its standards separately – at present they are only available with the guidance

The standards must be achievable.
Guidance can be at two levels:
- how to achieve the standard,
- more detailed and methodological

There is no place for local authorities' own guidance that is simply a variation on professional institute guidance.

Table 3

How are standards implemented and enforced?

Notes of group discussion

Mechanisms for measuring compliance and enforcement:
- Refer to CIfA standards when there's a problem
- LPA advisers/planners
- National agency advisors
- Other agencies: MoD, forestry, utilities, who specify work to standards and can ensure that there is compliance
- Responsible postholders (duty to work within CIfA standards and guidance)
- Consultants
    - Specifying work to standards
    - Working to standards
    - Measuring compliance (resource implications)

Defining competence?

Enforcement:
- LPA adviser
- NT/NTS, Forestry Commission,
- QA/peer review processes
- CIfA to advise on RO whistle-blowing policy?

More transparency around the RO scheme.

Enforcement though contract – requires an informed client.

Formal enforcement through the planning process rarely happens.

Plenary summary

The different methods of enforcement were discussed, using Kate's diagram. Not all guidance is published or prepared by the right organisations. Better understanding of the mechanisms for ensuring that work is carried out in accordance with professional standards and other good practice guidance, and for monitoring or enforcing compliance, will lead to stronger more appropriate standards.
Monitoring is problematical because of resource issues in local authorities. There is also a cost to CIfA of professional conduct cases.
Position of an individual in an organisation being pressed to undertake work that is not to standards, or of a company being asked to do likewise, and feeling that they can't refuse because of loss of employment or contact.
Formal enforcement through the planning process is rare.
ALGAO members need training on how to record and report bad practice.
Do managers in large organisations know what is happening on individual projects/sites? Issues of internal organisational QA and compliance.

Table 4

New thinking on methodology and standards - how do we capitalise on the lessons of synthesis projects, and translate them into professional practice?

Notes of group discussion

There is more money. Spend wisely!
Development volume is increasing.
The unit cost of archaeology per home will fall – we must change our approach.
More public benefit: knowledge gain is central.
Can a focus on methodology led to better value for money?
Can a focus on selective application of methods give better value for money? And reflexion?
Community values may not match 'dig less better'.
Who specifies?
Client education: case studies.
How to reward clients who achieve more than just good practice?
Design completion within price envelope?
RRSP won't have found all the issues. Flush them out from this and other projects – continuous improvement.
HE prepared to support more examination of methods. Feed back to Research Councils.
Will LPAs permit/require offsetting?
How can LPAs encourage synthetic working?
Compatible site narratives.
If we change the standards will they be met by all?
We are comfortable specifying the use of Roman pottery fabric series – because we've proved the problem and the potential.
Creating consensus: debate -> good practice -> self-imposed standards.
Funding division between the private sector (site) and public sector (synthesis) – not a hard line.
How should we change the procurement standards and guidance?
HE could offer comments on synthesis standards. RCs intelligent clients? CIfA standards?
WSIs – more statements on:
  • Sampling strategies
  • Volumetric
  • Metal detecting
  • Fabric
  • Etc
  • As well as research aims and flexible strategies

Plenary summary

There is money, development is increasing but we need to deliver value for money and public benefit
Will better methodology lead to better value for money? Dig less, dig better? But this may not satisfy local communities
There is a need for more CIfA guidance but everything is challenged by competitive tendering. There are design competitions but these may in fact be price led.
Split funding responsibility: developer pays for project, public pay for synthesis.
RRSP produced many methodological issues but there will be others.
We need compatible site narratives eg all should use the Roman pottery type series.

Debate -> good practice -> make a standards.
Synthesis projects themselves may need standards.
WSIs need to be more specific eg which pottery type series will be used.

Table 5

How much should we be prescribing methods as opposed to seeking outcomes?

Notes of group discussion

How to measure outputs: research frameworks, descriptive specifications, data formats, checklists
How to measure outcomes (benefits, value, quality): standards

We need:
- Better definitions
- Map of current documentation
- Portal to access re-organised suite of standards/methods
- Gap analysis – what do we need that doesn't already exist? : standard/specification/guideline/technical guidance/descriptive specification

Innovation:
- How not to be confined by methods. Too much is process not outcome driven.
- Conference as mechanism for debate and change (to feed back into Standards/specifications)
- Build regional hubs/networks, including both contractors and curators to share knowledge and experience
- How to capture innovation from synthesis and other projects – HEPP, other journals?

Plenary summary

We need to look at how to prescribe methods, outputs and outcomes – need for clarity in terminology eg:
- Outcomes = value, public benefit
- Outputs = research outputs should be measurable
- Map of what there is essential
- Make the full suite of S + G and advice more accessible
- To feed new ideas and innovation into the profession use CIfA conference, regional hubs/networks, and the Journal
- Methods -> outcomes -> methods = virtuous circle
- Money: do more standards cost more? More compliance should lead to more cost effective projects

In discussion:
Definition of terms: see agreed definitions above.

It was noted that Government guidance on planning would express things as <u>might</u> or <u>could,</u> and therefore guidance that uses <u>should</u> or <u>must</u> has to be referred to as 'guidance to support professional standards'. In response it was suggested that, if government won't say <u>should,</u> other organisations should write guidance instead.