

The Archaeologist

Issue 102

Autumn 2017



In this issue:

Delivering successful
outreach on the Westgate
Oxford project
p3

Archeology under
pressure: the museum
perspective
p14

Advocacy news:
the future of the
environment
p18

Guidelines for cultural
heritage impact
assessment – project
launched
p20

Part-time courses in Archaeology at Oxford

DEPARTMENT FOR
CONTINUING
EDUCATION



- Undergraduate Certificate in Archaeology
- Undergraduate Diploma in British Archaeology
- Advanced Diploma in British Archaeology
- MSc in Applied Landscape Archaeology
- DPhil in Archaeology

Short and online courses also run throughout the year

www.conted.ox.ac.uk/ba2017



Oxford Radiocarbon Accelerator Unit

<http://c14.arch.ox.ac.uk>



ORAU is dedicated to providing high quality radiocarbon dating services for UK archaeologists:

- Advice on sampling strategy
- Sample-specific chemical pre-treatment
- Isotope and elemental analysis ($\delta^{13}\text{C}$, $\delta^{15}\text{N}$, CN)
- Precision AMS measurement
- Prompt reporting
- Comprehensive quality assurance
- Interpretation, calibration and modelling

Also visit our website for the OxCal calibration software and our online searchable database of published radiocarbon dates.

Contact details:

Director	Prof Christopher Ramsey
Deputy Director	Prof Thomas Higham
Administrator	Emma Henderson

Oxford Radiocarbon Accelerator Unit Research Laboratory for Archaeology Dyson Perrins Building South Parks Road Oxford OX1 3QY UK

Tel	01865 285229
Fax	01865 285220
Email	orau@rlaha.ox.ac.uk
Website	http://c14.arch.ox.ac.uk



FS-53284

Please see our website for more information including current prices and turnaround times

Contents

Notes for contributors

Themes and deadlines

TA103 will be looking at the professional pathways that are opening up in archaeology, how these can help to address the issues of capacity and skills for the sector and what we can do to make them the norm.

Deadline for abstracts and images: 1 December 2017

TA104: Collaboration is now often a key consideration in all aspects of archaeology. It can take place between archaeologists who may work in different countries, have different roles, be in education or commercial practice, and may be paid or unpaid: there are also valuable collaborations between archaeologists, professionals in other sectors and communities.

Deadline of abstracts and images: 1 April 2018.

Contributions to *The Archaeologist* are encouraged.

Please get in touch if you would like to discuss ideas for articles, opinion pieces or interviews.

We now invite submission of 100–150 word abstracts for articles on the theme of forthcoming issues. Abstracts must be accompanied by at least three hi-resolution images (at least 300dpi) in jpeg or tiff format, along with the appropriate photo captions and credits for each image listed within the text document. The editorial team will get in touch regarding selection and final submissions.

We request that all authors pay close attention to ClfA house style guidance, which can be found on the website: www.archaeologists.net/publications/notesforauthors

TA is made digitally available through the ClfA website and if this raises copyright issues for any authors, artists or photographers, please notify the editor. Copyright of content and illustrations remain with the author, and that of final design with ClfA. Authors are responsible for obtaining reproduction rights and for providing the editor with appropriate image captions and credits. Opinions expressed in *The Archaeologist* are those of the authors and not necessarily those of ClfA.

Commissioning editor Alex Llewellyn

alex.llewellyn@archaeologists.net

Copy editor Tess Millar

Members' news: please send to Lianne Birney, lianne.birney@archaeologists.net

Registered Organisations: please send to Kerry Wiggins, kerry.wiggins@archaeologists.net

ClfA, Miller Building, University of Reading
Reading, RG6 6AB Telephone 0118 378 6446

Design and layout by Sue Cawood

Printed by Fuller Davies

ISSN: 1368-9169

- 2 Editorial
- 3 Delivering successful outreach on the Westgate Oxford project *Ben Ford*
- 6 Archaeology under pressure: excavating Partick Castle *Warren Bailie*
- 8 Going underground: the challenges of fieldwork and interpretation in cave archaeology *Steven Birch*
- 11 Murder, mayhem and misdemeanour: the application of archaeology to the recently deceased *Jennifer Miller*
- 14 Archaeology under pressure: the museum perspective *Lucy Creighton*
- 16 Archaeology under fire? Heritage conservation on the MOD estate *Martin Brown*
- 18 Advocacy news: the future of the environment
- 20 Guidelines for cultural heritage impact assessment – project launched
- 21 RO News
- 22 Spotlight on... the ClfA Standard and guidance for commissioning work or providing consultancy advice on archaeology and the historic environment
- 24 Your chance to vote on a proposal for Chartered Archaeologist status
- 26 RTPI and ClfA heritage seminar: Layers of London
- 27 Member news
- 28 'My job means it's too difficult to join ClfA' – or does it? *Helen Parslow*
- 29 ClfA enrolment party for Dutch archaeologists *Marloes van der Sommen*
- 30 New members
- 32 Noticeboard

Cover photo: *Site of the new museum for London in West Smithfield. Credit: Museum of London*



EDITORIAL

Guest Editors: **Beverley Ballin Smith** MClfA (294) and **Gerry Wait** MClfA (771)

TA 102 started, as do so many good ideas, while a few of us talked in general about the magazine. Our shared observation was that archaeology has successfully permeated so much of the development control and land management systems in Britain that it has moved from an ‘amateur’ past-time into mainstream commerce, adapting to working in situations that our professional ancestors of a generation or two ago would not recognise.

This edition presents some case studies about doing **archaeology under pressure**, which nowadays comes in many forms. In no particular order (of project, author, or pressure!), Ben Ford shows that even in the midst of a massive commercially driven redevelopment with considerable health and safety issues, innovative public presentation is not only possible but can be hugely successful.

Warren Bailie’s work at Partick Castle encountered severely contaminated land, and the ability to conduct first-class excavations under quite extreme safety conditions, with full recovery and recording, is a landmark.

Likewise, Steven Birch’s work in the High Pasture Cave system encountered very hazardous working conditions (both guest editors would be simply unable to work in these underground environments!) and yet still produced ground-breaking results, enabling far-reaching synthesis and re-interpretation of the prehistory in Scotland’s Islands and Highlands.

Lucy Creighton introduces a very different form of pressure – the ever-increasing volume of artefacts and archives in museum stores. Once thought to be the place where archaeologists could consult and research the results of past fieldwork, museum archives may now more closely resemble warehouses, and in practice the ability of archaeologists to make use of the collections is threatened.

Jennifer Miller takes us to the world of forensic archaeology, once the realm of fiction and TV but now conducted under a peculiar set of constraints imposed by the requirements of meeting the needs of law courts. This is in addition to adapting methodologies to match the requirements of

other specialists, who must achieve the objectives of their disciplines, and then the whole goes to court.

Martin Brown outlines the role of archaeology and the military. Not so much ‘archaeology under fire’ as he says in his title (or at least we understand there are no bullets flying past) but archaeology and conservation in a wide range of military contexts, where the pressure can, and perhaps does, involve the national defence or military operations in foreign theatres of operations.

We think this small collection demonstrates the maturity of our discipline and our ability to adapt and extend the use and effectiveness of our skills in areas and contexts that even 20 years ago would have been difficult. As a celebration of the breadth, depth (pun intended) and diversity of archaeology, this will be hard to rival.

Gerry Wait

Gerry has over 35 years of experience as an archaeologist and heritage consultant and has worked all over the world, especially in the UK and West Africa. His principal expertise lies in conservation planning, environmental and social impact assessment and finding ways to make the past relevant to people and communities in building their future. Gerry is a member of the ClfA Board of Directors and is active in the Committee on Professional Associations in Archaeology of the European Association of Archaeologists (EAA).



Beverley Ballin Smith

Beverley has been a member of ClfA for nearly all her professional life; she has served on ClfA committees, Council and as a ClfA Board director, and is currently President of Archaeology Scotland. Her experience as an archaeologist has taken her far afield, and she is now based in Scotland as Publications Manager at GUARD Archaeology Ltd and editor of ARO (Archaeology Reports Online).



p6



p8




p11



p20

Delivering successful outreach on the Westgate Oxford project

Ben Ford, MCIFA (5424)



View over Oxford looking NE shows the site and Greyfriars (in red) in the foreground, with the historic medieval city in sepia-tone and landmark buildings labelled. Credit: Oxford Archaeology

At the British Archaeological Awards in June 2016 OA South won the Best Archaeological Project Award for the *Westgate Oxford project*, a large excavation in advance of a major shopping centre redevelopment within the heart of Oxford.

The judges especially liked the hugely successful programme of public outreach that saw over 13,000 visitors to a variety of 'events'. We worked with two local schools and students from Oxford Brookes University, members of local heritage societies, volunteers from a variety of local heritage groups, and the Museum of Oxford. This success can be attributed to a number of factors, and was the result of an inclusive and coordinated team effort.

From the outset, the significance of the site's archaeology (known from previous excavations) played an important role, and was maximised by a public-benefit-oriented application of planning guidance and tools, enhanced by the dedication of an archaeological advisory panel.

During the late 1960s and early 1970s, extensive and highly publicised archaeological works, which included a visit from the Queen, were undertaken at the site in advance of the construction of the first Westgate Shopping Centre. These revealed, amongst other things, the remains of the Church of the Oxford Greyfriars, a highly significant institution in the early evolution of the modern university city. Archaeological evaluation in the 2000s proved that the site still contained significant and well-preserved, yet mainly undesignated, archaeological

remains of the Greyfriars claustral ranges and wider precinct, as well as a large area of Thames floodplain channels and deposit sequences. This 'heritage asset' was rightly considered by David Radford, the Planning Archaeologist for Oxford City Council, to be of a significance equal to designated status, and therefore a commensurate Planning Condition regarding the archaeology was set by the LPA within which were two clear clauses relating to public engagement:

- a strategy to communicate the progress of the archaeological investigations to the general public
- a programme of public outreach for the duration of fieldwork



Information sheet/poster designed for pop-up museum, open days etc. Credit: Oxford Archaeology



Site open day during Heritage Open Days/Oxford Open Doors in September 2015. Credit: Oxford Archaeology

Once outreach work was scoped, it included time for a dedicated outreach officer to assist the project manager, and we factored in voluntary help

These were summarised in the Mitigation Strategy/ Archaeological Scope by the client's Archaeological Consultant, Myk Flitcroft of CgMS. Radford then convened the 'Westgate Archaeological Advisory Panel' for the project. Importantly, this included a representative from the developer, their consultant CgMS, the archaeological contractor OA, Tom Hassall (director of the previous excavations at the site), George Lambrick (director of excavations at the neighbouring site of the Oxford Blackfriars), a representative from the Oxford Preservation Trust (OPT – an influential local heritage charity), Jane Harrison, leader of the East Oxford Community Archaeology Project (a public archaeology group), and academic Deirdre O'Sullivan (expert in English medieval friaries). Through discussions within this group, the planning conditions and their scope evolved into a set of clear objectives within the final approved project design or Written Scheme of Investigation:

- press, radio and TV coverage
- a public viewing platform with information
- an educational programme involving two local schools
- two public site open days and a web page
- site tours for interested local groups
- a series of public talks
- a temporary exhibition (four-month duration)
- input into permanent public display boards

Once outreach work was scoped, it included time for a dedicated outreach officer to assist the project manager, and we factored in voluntary help. OA wrote many of the press releases, which were vetted by the client and the principal contractor (Laing O'Rourke). At first this was a drawn-out process, but once they acknowledged that we worked to the rules, we were left to deal independently with media enquiries. Good news stories were stored up and released in advance of 'events' such as open days or a new venue for the pop-up museum.

Our Outreach Officer Becky Peacock managed the pop-up museum with artefacts from the previous excavations, and display cases loaned by Oxfordshire Museum

Charles Rousseau demonstrates artefact drawing at a 'show-and-tell' day in the pop-up museum. Credit: Oxford Archaeology



Services. The client provided a spruced-up former shop unit as the first venue. This gave the project a physical presence within the town, outside of the site, its hoardings and its health and safety restrictions, and enabled us to take the dig to the people. For a day every week we held a 'show-and-tell', where one of the site archaeologists would demonstrate some aspect of our work. On the remaining days the museum was staffed by volunteers from the East Oxford Archaeological Community Project. We attracted people who did not usually visit museums and were going about their everyday business. New contacts and opportunities arose from this 'hub' and allowed us to move to the local lending library, and then to the Museum of Oxford, who loaned us their large gallery and recorded over 1000 visits a week. The length of the project and the changing venues meant we were able to update and change the displays as the excavation progressed.


The key points for success for any site open day are visitor numbers and the quality of the visitor experience. From a very early stage the dates were marked on the principal contractor's programme, so they could arrange their works, viewing walkways, display areas and security. Advanced planning meant we could coincide our open days with the national Festival of Archaeology and Heritage Open Days (Oxford Open Doors – run by OPT) and get our events into their literature and onto their web sites – helping to boost numbers, which ran to 4000 over two weekends. We displayed our discoveries and processes, and site tours were conducted every 20 minutes by the excavation staff.

Information posters were designed from the start to follow a consistent format. They were first used in the pop-up museum with copies displayed on the viewing platform, at the open days, printed as a booklet, and downloadable as pdfs from our web site. As the site evolved we simply added new posters.

The talk series, involving experts in all things associated with the history and archaeology of the site, was mainly



Lisa Kennard on site, taken for a press release to show positive images of women in archaeology. Credit: Oxford Archaeology



Interpretive overlay on a photorectified plan using 250+ drone photos of the buildings within the Greyfriars Precinct (3D Sketchfab Version on OA's Westgate web page). Credit: Oxford Archaeology

organised by David Radford and hosted by Castle Unlocked, with the assistance of OPT. OA filmed the speakers, and for those who couldn't attend they were published on our web page.

For further information on Westgate Oxford please go to: <https://oxfordarchaeology.com/our-projects/westgate-oxford> and click the drop-down menu in the sidebar.



Aerial shot of the site and western part of historic Oxford. Credit: a friendly helicopter pilot



Pupils from Cheney School, Oxford, during a site visit. Credit: Oxford Archaeology



Ben M Ford
Ben is a Senior Project Manager at Oxford Archaeology and directed the Westgate Oxford Project.



Archaeology under pressure: excavating Partick Castle

Warren Bailie MCifA (7419)

In 2016, GUARD Archaeology Limited was commissioned by Scottish Water and a private developer to address potential archaeological requirements on the reputed site of Partick Castle, situated at the confluence of the rivers Kelvin and Clyde.

The lands of Partick were given to Glasgow Cathedral in 1136 by David I of Scotland. It was believed to have subsequently become the country seat of the Bishops of Glasgow, with a fortified stone structure of some kind likely erected on the site; building documents relating to the construction by George Hutcheson of a tower house in 1611 specify the demolition of a pre-existing structure. The ruin of this 17th-century building stood on the west bank of the River Kelvin, near the position of the railway bridge, until it was removed around 1837. The riverside site was subsequently used for industrial works during the 19th century and as a result harboured industrial waste and contaminants. The site team and contractors needed to approach the site with ingenuity and adaptability to ensure that the development was delivered to the programme of works and that the archaeology could be excavated and recorded safely and in accordance with ClfA *Standards and guidance*.

Excavation of Partick Castle walls and ditch. Credit: GUARD Archaeology Ltd

A ground investigation report, produced prior to the works commencing, highlighted potential issues for the contractor in the form of contaminants such as petrochemicals and asbestos, which were of particular concern given the proximity of the two major rivers. But unlike the main contractor, the archaeologists would need to be on their hands and knees, up close and personal with any apparent contaminants. The initial evaluation had shown that the site had enormous archaeological potential, so reducing the level of recording to limit exposure of personnel to the contaminants was not an option. Measures were required to ensure the safety of those who would also be digging within a deep area, adding to the potential dangers of the site works.

Working closely with the contractor, we agreed on appropriate PPE, which included

full Tyvek suits and breathing apparatus, as well as strict procedures for the safe disposal of contaminated PPE at agreed intervals. Regular briefings, training and toolbox talks were given to the crew to ensure that awareness of any potential risks remained high. The procedures were monitored for their effectiveness and were updated as necessary in close consultation with the GUARD Archaeology personnel, our Compliance Manager Bob Will, and the main contractor's Health & Safety personnel. These procedures enabled the team to expose any apparent uncontaminated deposits for environmental sampling while excavating nationally significant archaeological deposits, all within an area approximately 3m deep. Bespoke access apparatus was prepared and installed in consultation with the client to enable safe access, as well as observation of the archaeological works.



View of Partick Castle from the east side of the Kelvin, from A MacGeorge's Old Glasgow: the place and the people; from the Roman occupation to the eighteenth century, 1880, 121

STV news crew filming the GUARD Archaeology team's excavation of Partick Castle. Credit: GUARD Archaeology Ltd



Excavation of Partick Castle walls and ditch. Credit: GUARD Archaeology Ltd

As well as the strict procedures for dealing with contaminated ground, the excavation team were required to work in parts of the site that extended to 9m below current ground level. Safe access and working in confined spaces on an active construction site had to be carefully managed. Access in and out of the area was monitored, with a safe distance maintained from trench edges, and shoring and scaffolding used where appropriate. All scaffolding crossing the excavation areas had high-level barriers to prevent any personnel, tools or equipment falling into the excavation area.

These procedures were absolutely necessary, but instead of preventing our team from doing their job, they enabled our archaeologists to discover a series of archaeological features including ditches, a well and several stone walls belonging to the lost remains of Partick Castle and the tower house that replaced it. Among the material recovered were significant amounts of pottery, metalwork, leather, glass and animal bones that suggested a date range of 12th/13th century to the 17th century, and which correlated with the historical evidence.

Health and safety was not our only concern. The significance of the archaeology we were discovering generated a great deal of local and wider interest from the public and academics. Although access was strictly controlled, GUARD Archaeology was able to facilitate limited press access to ensure that information about the archaeology could be disseminated widely through local press and television channels.

The potential issues with contaminants did not end on completion of the main site works. The numerous (1000+) artefacts had to be processed safely, keeping in mind the conditions in which they were recovered. This also extended to any samples recovered, despite every effort to limit sampling to those deposits least contaminated. The post-excavation works are still ongoing and will ultimately lead to publication.

The GUARD Archaeology team came up against barriers on this excavation in more ways than one, but overcame them. The excavations at Partick Castle will improve our understanding of what was, until now, thought to have been lost to the heavy industry of 19th-century Glasgow. This case study shows that issues such as contaminated ground or confined spaces need not impact on the quality of output, research and reporting on archaeological sites, and that when an experienced team of archaeologists works closely with the site contractor, there is no obstacle that cannot be overcome.



Selection of medieval pottery from the excavation. Credit: GUARD Archaeology Ltd

Warren Bailie

Warren is Operations Manager at GUARD Archaeology Ltd and has worked in archaeology in Scotland and Northern Ireland over the last 13 years.



Going underground: the challenges of fieldwork and interpretation in cave archaeology


Steven Birch PCIfA (2221)

Caves intrigue us – the mysterious underground spaces are captivating; their entrances draw us in, whether we find their dank dark interiors fascinating or frightening. Entry into a cave involves dramatic changes in light, sound and smell, a loss of freedom of movement and dangers such as streams and rivers, flooded passages, vertical drops and complete darkness.

Despite these inherent dangers, caves are data-rich – a diverse range of activity and the repeated use of caves through time, along with the specific taphonomic processes, make the interpretation of the archaeological record a challenge. They require specialised investigation and interpretation techniques.

The archaeological significance of a cave is often recognised when deposits are disturbed by natural erosion or human activity. In particular, speleologists play a crucial role in the discovery of caves and the archaeological deposits they contain while exploring caves to find new passages. The important discoveries made at High Pasture Cave between 2004 and 2010 would not have materialised without the activities of visiting cavers!

Schematic image showing the main components of the site with figures for scale. Credit: AOC Archaeology Group




The natural amphitheatre surrounding the entrance to the High Pasture Cave system is located in the shadow of the Cuillin Mountains on the island of Skye, Scotland. The subterranean focus of the site is a short section of dry

passage (Bone Passage), located above the streamway of a cave system extending for over 320 metres through the Durness Limestone. About 50 metres downstream of the caver's entrance, a short section of low wet passage can fill to the roof during periods of heavy rain, protecting the far reaches of the system.

Work at the site was initiated as a rescue excavation, with the aims of recording and recovering archaeological material disturbed by the activities of the cavers in Bone Passage. This evolved into a research-driven project with a team of volunteers drawn from local communities, along with students from the UK and international universities. Health and safety was of paramount importance so only experienced cavers were allowed to work in some areas of the site.

A large volume of artefacts and ecofacts were recovered from the cave, along with contemporary structures identified at the surface. The natural amphitheatre surrounding the cave entrance was a focus for activities from circa 820–755 cal BC to the site's closure between cal AD 75–145. Structures included a series of walkways, hearths and stairwells and enclosure walls to define and control access to the cave. The site also boasted 4.5-metre-deep stratified deposits of ash and associated residues.

Due to the problems of working in the cave and the complicated task of excavating the deep deposits outside, both excavation and analysis strategies had to evolve quickly. Excavation strategies and methods developed to include the installation of lights and CCTV cameras controlled from the surface. Excavation of the damp organic cave sediments, containing rich assemblages of artefacts and ecofacts, required us to use plastic or



Plan of the precinct area and stairwell access to Bone Passage. Credit: Mary Peteranna, AOC Archaeology Group

wooden spatulas rather than more destructive steel trowels. We moved to a 100 per cent on-site wet-sieving programme for all cave deposits and for a large percentage of the deep sequence of sediments outside the cave, leading to the recovery of a remarkably rich and diverse palaeobotanical assemblage.


Deposits excavated from Bone Passage were transported through 35 metres of the narrow and wet stream passage to the cavers' entrance using rubber kibbles, where a manual hoist lifted them to the surface. After the stairwell access to Bone Passage was cleared in 2006, material could be hoisted directly to a working platform mounted above. By the end of excavations in the cave in 2009 at least 14 tonnes of sediments had been removed from Bone Passage.

The material recovered was generally of Iron Age date and domestic in nature, similar to that seen on surface settlement sites elsewhere in Scotland. However, the small-finds assemblage is large compared to most other excavated Scottish Iron Age sites and includes some spectacular discoveries, such as the charred wooden bridge from a musical instrument – the earliest physical evidence recovered for a stringed instrument in western Europe. Interpretation of the faunal remains suggested some unusual butchery practices and species characteristics. There is clear evidence for the structured deposition of human and animal remains, objects of material culture, and large quantities of burnt grain. Excavation was designed to explore notions of curation – were these individuals contemporary with the items of material culture and other materials deposited with them?



Main stream passage at High Pasture Cave. Credit: High Pasture Cave Project

A diverse range of activity and the repeated use of caves through time, along with the specific taphonomic processes, make the interpretation of the archaeological record a challenge



Laser scan of Bone Passage. Credit: AOC Archaeology Group



Martin Wildgoose bringing kibble of sediment and stone through main stream passage
Credit: High Pasture Cave Project



Stairwell access to Bone Passage Credit: High Pasture Cave Project



Burials deposited in the top of the backfilled stairwell as closing deposits (adult woman, human perinate and neonate, perinatal pig and dog)
 Credit: High Pasture Cave Project

There was evidence for a wide range of crafts and activities: bronze and iron working, textile manufacture, hide processing, bone and antler working, personal ornaments, weaponry, and music. This may challenge interpretations and appears to be incompatible with a normal domestic settlement context, a factor that has been highlighted at some other European cave sites.

Overall, the work carried out at the High Pasture Cave complex represents the most thorough investigation of a cave site and its

immediate environs in Scotland. Excavation outside the cave entrance proved that the cave formed just one (important) element of a much larger prehistoric complex. The challenges will also include publication – it is imperative that we portray the complex and 3D nature of the site through time to explain the overall layout of the major areas and features. The depth and quality of the archaeological evidence makes High Pasture Cave central to an understanding of Iron Age ritual practices, and provides a unique opportunity to investigate the role of caves in the cosmology of later prehistoric communities in Scotland and within a wider European context.

Birch, S A, Cruickshanks, G & Mackenzie, J, (Forthcoming) *High Pasture Cave: Ritual, Place and Memory in the Iron Age of Skye*. Oxford: Oxbow Books



Steven Birch

The High Pasture Cave & Environs Project was co-directed by Steven Birch and Martin Wildgoose, with funding from Historic Environment Scotland, the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland and Highland Council. The project has also benefited from the assistance of a large team of post-excavation specialists, some of whom provided their services for free.



Selection of bone and antler pins, needles and fasteners.
 Credit: National Museum of Scotland



Cache of steatite spindle whorls from Bone Passage. Credit: National Museum of Scotland



Iron socketed adze with alder handle from Bone Passage.
 Credit: National Museum of Scotland

MURDER, MAYHEM AND MISDEMEANOUR: the application of archaeology to the recently deceased

Jennifer Miller MClfA (5117)

Forensic archaeology is the application of archaeological practices to legal matters. The overriding principle is the recovery of evidence and interpretation of the scene to identify who did what, when and how. Although initially deeply distrustful of archaeologists at crime scenes, police now recognise the value a suitably experienced forensic archaeologist can bring to the investigation.

Media footage of archaeologists excavating clandestine graves within patios, basements or woodland glades is now relatively commonplace. However, forensic archaeology is much more than digging holes. Archaeologists also assist in various

scales of search and interpret events and timings at the scene, under severe constraints of time and logistical considerations. The body needs to be found and recovered quickly without losing evidence in the process.

Like all professional archaeologists, forensic practitioners abide by ClfA's *Code of conduct* within their professional careers. As with all forensic practitioners, archaeologists owe a duty of responsibility to the courts to be impartial, professional, knowledgeable and rigorous. The rules for forensic practitioners have been adapted as appropriate, allowing flexibility (and speed) in recording or recovery. However, it also means having the depth of knowledge to work quickly but effectively without compromising evidence.

Although forensic archaeologists work within their professional guidelines, they must also

operate within the legal framework and as part of a forensic team, within which every specialist's actions has the potential to destroy the evidence that others might recover. Understanding the roles of other forensic specialists at a crime scene and being able to work with them is essential. Every discipline is important, but which specialist leads the investigation is determined entirely by the case itself. An archaeologist would lead the recovery of a skeleton found in deep undergrowth (taking environmental advice), but the biologist would assume responsibility where there is potential for recovery of DNA, such as with a very recently dead person lying in open ground. In practice, no case is clear-cut.




*Landfill search from above.
Credit: Jennifer Miller*



*Grid ensures rigorous search underwater.
Credit: Jennifer Miller*



Landfill search: search strategy in progress. Credit: Jennifer Miller



Landfill. Extent of gridded search area (sanitised). Credit: Jennifer Miller



Recovery of scattered decomp. Each flag is a bone find. Spatial patterning helps interpret events. Credit: Jennifer Miller

Understanding the roles of other forensic specialists at a crime scene and being able to work with them is essential



Skull duration is indicated by vegetation growth. Credit: Jennifer Miller



Teamwork is vital and forensic archaeologists must think on their feet and adapt standard methods to suit the circumstances

Shallow grave is excavated within the cut. Credit: Jennifer Miller

Teamwork is vital and forensic archaeologists must think on their feet and adapt standard methods to suit the circumstances. They must also be prepared to work for as long as the job requires, often 14+ hours a day in all weathers for days or weeks at a time.

The recovery of human remains within a shallow grave in a hillside park was achieved by a small team of specialists working together to maximise evidence recovery. Conditions were pressured, including the usual constraints of time and logistical issues; bodies are seldom found in convenient places. However, in this particular case, extreme heat was also a concern. A passing cyclist reported the remains late one hot afternoon in early summer. The site was protected and photographed, with specialists meeting the following morning to agree a

forensic recovery strategy and logistics. In this case, practicalities included a gazebo to provide shade. Everyone knew their role and worked within it, helping others as appropriate and under direction. Nothing happened without confirmation that it would not compromise other evidence. During the recording and recovery process, the archaeologist was in charge. Following the recovery of the body, the biologists took control, leaving the grave to the archaeologist to record further detail. The area was gridded and the grave fill recovered stratigraphically, with soil retained for search under laboratory conditions. Maggots were recovered by the biologist as they were encountered during the excavation, but search of the grave cut for further entomological evidence only happened once the grave section drawings

had been completed. The entire excavation and recording process took two (long) days.

In accordance with standard practice, the area of interest was gridded to enable spatial patterning of evidence recovered. All specialists utilised the grid nomenclature for consistency. Photographs were taken of all stages of the process and a time-lapse record of the recovery process was made using a camera and tripod with images at ten-minute intervals. The images were stitched together subsequently to produce a short presentation for court. This helped the jury visualise events at the scene and to appreciate the efforts to which the perpetrator had gone. It was the first incidence of a time-lapse recording being shown in court, although we have used the technique on numerous prior and



Skeleton buried within sand is excavated using standard methods. Credit: Jennifer Miller



The main difference between mainstream and forensic archaeology is the overarching responsibility to the legal process and criminal justice

Specialists sampling a body stain. Credit: Jennifer Miller

subsequent occasions. The presentation highlights how forensic archaeological recording can be maximised under severe pressures of time. The visual impact is significant, especially for court purposes where juries have to absorb a great deal of technical information from multiple sources.

The ability to adapt standard techniques to suit the case is crucial. A grid set in 10m² sectors was used in the search of a decommissioned landfill site for a body buried just before the site was covered with topsoil and grassed over. This enabled a search to start at the place the witness had identified but gave the potential to extend in any direction. The team included two archaeologists, one driving a ten-tonne excavator and the other directing. The search was so precise that despite the size of

machinery the body was located intact. Subsequent excavation was manual, with a pathologist in attendance. The process took 13 days, working daylight hours in all weathers. Over 5000m³ of sediment and debris was moved, with the body ultimately found almost 30m from the location indicated initially.

Standard techniques were also adapted when human bones were found within freshwater lake shallows. Outboard motor use had caused extensive fragmentation and scattering. The grid was constructed using police tape held underwater by stones, photographed by the police helicopter. Recognisable bone fragments were collected manually, with gravel from each grid square collected and dried in the lab for recovery of bone chips and other artefacts. This

facilitated spatial patterning analysis and partial reconstruction.

The main difference between mainstream and forensic archaeology is the overarching responsibility to the legal process and criminal justice. Where the deceased has a recognisable name and an identifiable killer, the pressure upon a forensic archaeologist to work quickly but accurately, justify their actions and not compromise those of others is tangible. However, ClfA's *Code of conduct* provides a governing legislation that enables archaeologists to defend their actions in court, confident that they have operated appropriately and within peer-reviewed professional procedures.



Jennifer Miller

Jennifer is a senior lecturer in forensic science and an active forensic practitioner in the fields of problematic body recovery and stomach contents analysis to assist in interpretation of events perimortem. She has nearly 25 years of forensic casework experience, almost entirely related to murder and unexplained death. She has acted as an expert witness and been cross-examined under Scottish and UK High Court jurisprudence on countless occasions. Jennifer is recognised by the National Crime Agency (NCA) as a specialist in search and recovery of human remains, interpretation of events, duration and non-standard evidence capture and analysis. She is also considered to be the principal UK expert in stomach contents analysis for criminal investigation. In addition to casework, Jennifer is a member of the Home Office Search Technologies Academic Research Team (START). This is a new initiative bringing together the expertise of leading experts in fields related to search to promote research in that field and to compile a best-practice manual of guidance for law enforcement to help find missing individuals.

Archaeology under pressure: the museum perspective

Lucy Creighton, Affiliate (7878)

The Society for Museum Archaeology (SMA) is working in partnership with Historic England to produce guidance for museums on how to approach the rationalisation of archaeological collections.

Museums are widely acknowledged as both guardians of archaeological objects and engagers with the public, but nevertheless museum collections and professionals are at risk. Last year Historic England commissioned SMA to complete the first of three annual surveys to gather data on the current state of archaeological collecting and expertise in museums. The results are worrying, with almost a quarter of the 200 museums who responded no longer collecting archives and almost two thirds estimating they will run out of space in five years or less. The full report can be downloaded from the SMA's website (<http://socmusarch.org.uk/projects/>) and the second survey is currently underway.

Against this backdrop of uncertainty SMA and Historic England are continuing to support museum archaeologists by working to provide sector-wide guidance that will arm staff with methods to enable them to be more proactive in dealing with storage problems. Work being carried out to create and implement new deposition standards will ease pressure placed on storage space by current and future collecting activity; there are, however, many thousands of archives that predate planning policy frameworks and deposition standards that bring curators out in a cold sweat. Do these older archives hold a privileged position within museum collections, or should they be subjected to the same rigorous standards of selection and retention that we employ today?

Collections rationalisation is one method of releasing space in store and has other advantages too, since auditing and assessing collection significance increases in-house knowledge and improves access. With this in mind, a project funded by Historic England has enabled five museums to carry out scoping studies to investigate the potential of rationalising their archaeology collections, as well as assessing the resources required to achieve it. The resulting case studies will form the basis of guidance produced by SMA.

These five organisations are the Museum of London, Tullie House Museum, Museums Worcestershire, Suffolk County Council and Stroud District Museum Service. This selection provided a good geographical spread with a wide range of collections, staffing levels and expertise. Participating museums were asked to audit their entire archaeology holdings, establish criteria for selection and estimate the resources needed to undertake rationalisation. They were also asked to calculate the amount of storage space that would be created if rationalisation took place and to critically reflect on the whole process.



Museum of London archaeological archive. Credit: Museum of London

Of those undertaking scoping studies, my employer, the Museum of London, has the highest number of specialist staff and the largest collection. The project looked at our archaeological archive, the largest of its kind in the world, housing over 100,000 boxes of objects and documents relating to archaeological investigations carried out in Greater London. Despite the collection's size and reputation, the issues we face mirror those of smaller museums; we have little remaining storage space and a backlog of 'legacy' archives that fail to meet current standards and are difficult to access and use. The size of the collection perpetuates the problem – each year we assign about 400 new site codes for archaeological projects whose archives will eventually come here. Something has to give; we simply don't have the capacity to collect at our current rate.

... we have little remaining storage space and a backlog of 'legacy' archives that fail to meet current standards and are difficult to access and use

We worked with various specialists to assess a representative sample of the archives in the collection, focusing on the categories of material that take up most space (pottery and animal bone) and are the most difficult to store (ironwork). The findings from this exercise were discussed at a seminar with various sector stakeholders and the results will be used to estimate the effectiveness of the approach if rolled out on a larger scale.

This project sits within a wider reappraisal of the Museum of London and its collections as part of our ongoing major capital project – building a brand new museum for London in West Smithfield and working on developing the London Collection. It has also been informed by the recent successful rationalisation of our social and working history collections funded by the Esmée Fairbairn Foundation.

The SMA project team will publish its guidance in 2018. It will be written in plain language to enable non-specialists to engage with it and the team hopes it will demonstrate the potential benefits of collections rationalisation, as well as the difficulties and real costs involved. It will be aimed at helping museums to decide whether or not rationalisation is appropriate to their situation rather than promoting a quick win. There's still work to be done but one thing that's already clear is that a thorough collections audit is beneficial in its own right and a good first step towards realising the potential of stored collections.

Clearly the significance of archaeological collections is unique and varied, but perhaps with a structured approach to assessing this significance we can make our collections more manageable and accessible for all, now and in the future.



Lucy Creighton

Lucy is the Archaeology Collections Manager (Volunteers) at the Museum of London's Archaeological Archive, where she works on the Museum's Arts Council England-funded

collections volunteer programme. Before this she was Archaeology Curatorial Assistant at Museums Sheffield. Lucy has been a member of the Society for Museum Archaeology since she was a student and became Treasurer of the group in 2015. She is part of the SMA working party for this project and will be co-authoring the guidance.



Site of the new museum for London in West Smithfield. Credit: Museum of London



Archaeology under fire? Heritage conservation on the MOD estate

Martin Brown MCIfA (932)

The Ministry of Defence has a landholding of around 1 per cent of the UK landmass; it also leases land for training in Britain and overseas. Those holdings include significant historic landscapes, such as Salisbury Plain, parts of Dartmoor, the Pembrokeshire coast and the Otterburn Ranges in Northumberland, as well as built heritage, including historic airfields, Victorian fortifications and Nelson-era dockyards. The MOD estate has escaped some

Many heritage assets are found in open landscapes used by troops training in digging, firing, driving armoured vehicles, or engaging in tactical training – all of which are potentially harmful to archaeology

of the modern pressures on landscape, including intensive agriculture and development, meaning that there is extensive archaeological survival. Preservation can be exceptional; for example, there are upstanding earthworks of Romano-British settlements surviving within the Salisbury Plain artillery ranges (McOmish, Field & Brown 2002: 99, 101).

Most MOD land is administered by Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO), an agency of the MOD, who have their own archaeology team within a wider environmental advisory service, delivering heritage policy (JSP 362: 12) as well as an audit and assurance of external contractors. They work alongside the armed forces, contracted service providers and external suppliers to deliver a sustainable estate that supports the service personnel and their families by providing training facilities, accommodation and other infrastructure. The DIO historic buildings team assists with the plethora of listings on the MOD Estate.

Where DIO is engaged in development, normal planning legislation and policies apply; whilst still in place for Scheduled Monuments (although MOD follows a parallel process), Crown exemption from planning controls ceased in 2006. MOD developments proceed like any other, with the usual assessments, evaluation and mitigation employed. However, the situation is more complex and unusual in the care of the historic environment across the training estate. DIO works with the Department of Culture Media and Sport (DCMS) *Protocol for the Care of the Government Historic Estate*. There are almost 1000 Scheduled Monuments, parts of ten World Heritage Sites, six Registered Battlefields and many undesignated

heritage assets on the MOD estate. Scheduled Monuments are subject to a five-yearly inspection that informs DIO on the condition of the estate (MOD 2016: 41–43). Importantly, the survey results help target resources to support monument management, including scrub clearance and installation or renewal of protection, identifying threats, whether natural or military, and helping maintain monument condition. The Conservation Stewardship Fund (CSF) within DIO also enables the in-house archaeologists to fund works that will improve monuments, including reducing holdings of 'Heritage At Risk' (HAR) – a key target of the team. The results of this work are highlighted in a Biennial Heritage Report (MOD 2013).

Many heritage assets are found in open landscapes used by troops training in digging, firing, driving armoured vehicles, or engaging in tactical training – all of which are potentially harmful to archaeology. DIO works closely with their industry partner Landmarc Support Services to secure the protection of Scheduled Monuments across the training estate; many monuments are now enclosed by palisades and marked by signage alerting users to their presence. Prohibitory and advisory signage, based on road signs, is readily understandable to all, including visiting foreign troops, and is clear enough to be seen and understood during training activities (Brown 2010: 66–68). Where physical controls are not appropriate, monuments are mapped and can be declared out of bounds, either permanently or for specific exercises by an 'impassable' designation within the battlefield, such as marshland or minefield (Brown 2010: 62). The importance of archaeology within military operations has expanded following experiences in Iraq, with the government recently announcing the ratification of The Hague Convention (1954) on the protection of cultural property in war (Parliament 2017), meaning that remains can play an important function that supports both training and their own preservation. Finally, education is critical – no one can expect every Private to carry a trowel in his knapsack. DIO has produced resources promoting good behaviour, including briefings, posters displayed in prominent locations, and playing cards for ranges in Britain and Kenya; whilst time is passed playing cards the images and messages about heritage protection and conservation flash up repeatedly before the players' eyes (Brown 2010: 69). Finally, there are sanctions imposed when things do occasionally go wrong.

Martin Brown

Martin is Principal Archaeologist with WYG, who are currently conducting quinquennial Scheduled Monument condition assessments for Landmarc Support Services and acting as consultants on a number of DIO development projects. From 2003 to 2012 Martin worked as Archaeological Adviser with DIO with responsibility for southern Britain, Gibraltar and Kenya.



Archaeology may be under fire in parts of the MOD estate, but that does not mean it is at risk. The absence of intensive farming and development, coupled with user education and physical protection, have secured the archaeological resource whilst working in partnership with the end users.



A Second World War target railway within the Castlemartin Ranges, Pembrokeshire. Older military infrastructure now forms part of the heritage resource within the Defence estate. Credit: M Brown



A hut circle within Wilsworthy Range, Dartmoor. On this range signage is not allowed, to prevent cluttering in the landscape so mapping and education are vital protection. Credit: M Brown



Bowl barrow on Salisbury Plain with palisade and signage identified for refurbishment during condition assessment. Credit: M Brown



Palisading and signage afford protection to a Salisbury Plain long barrow. Credit: M Brown



A tank hulk formerly used as a target within an extensive Scheduled Monument. Credit: M Brown



No Digging signs are easy to spot and readily understandable in any language. Credit: M Brown

References

Brown M (2010) Good Training and Good Practice: Protection of the Cultural Heritage on the UK Defence Training Estate, in L Rush (ed) *Archaeology, Cultural Property and the Military*, Woodbridge: Boydell, 60–72

JSP 362 (2010) Leaflet 12, Historic Environment, https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/33623/jsp362_leaflet12.pdf Accessed 26 July 2017

McOmish, D, Field D & Brown G (2002) *The Field Archaeology of the Salisbury Plain Training Area*, Swindon: English Heritage

MOD (2013) *MOD Heritage Report 2011–2013* <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/mod-heritage-report-2011-to-2013> Accessed 28 July 2017

MOD (2016) *Sustainable MOD, Annual Report 2015/16* https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/575553/Sustainable_MOD_2015-16_Edited_DEC16.pdf Accessed 27 July 2017

Parliament (2017) <https://hansard.parliament.uk/lords/2017-02-23/debates/59B52EC3-48C5-4B82-A2A1-EDBBD429C8B9/RoyalAssent> Accessed 26 July 2017

Advocacy news The future of the environment

In July, Michael Gove made his first speech as Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. He used it to describe the green vision that he would seek to implement across his department's portfolio. He covered climate change, criticising President Trump's decision to withdraw from the Paris climate accords, diesel emissions, and the importance of scientific research, but it was during his description of farm subsidy reform that the ears of ClfA advocacy really pricked up.

Mr Gove set out how his department would seek to replace the current system of agricultural funding under the EU's Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) post-Brexit. The proposals promised to shift the system of farm subsidies from one predominantly based on the model of a 'basic payment' – calculated by gross area of land and assessed free from any qualifying requirement (which currently accounts for the majority of the £3 billion in annual subsidies) – to one which instead tied 100 per cent of subsidies to creating 'public goods' in the form of environmental protection measures.

This was a characteristically Conservative policy on farm subsidies, which 'must be earned', but it gave a firm and encouraging message that the post-Brexit future might be that bit greener, and that better care for our environment was a public benefit which the government bought into.

There is a stake in this process of reform for the historic environment. Since 2000, the

system of agri-environment schemes has created opportunities to advance understanding among landowners and managers of the needs of rural historic assets, and has brought in systems by which they can be more effectively managed, grant-funded for conservation, and even better interpreted. However, it is also important because this system has set a new context for treating archaeological sites as part of the environment, enabling integrated management practices and shared understandings of landscape to grow.

Of course, this relationship was not fully developed, and is still not fully understood by many of those who work in environmental conservation, just as there is still a lack of understanding of the natural environment amongst many archaeologists. Only a tiny fraction of the overall attention of agri-environment schemes is currently paid to historic assets. Nonetheless, the principles are ones to which we, at ClfA, are fully committed. Mr Gove's speech did not include

The Lake District's designation as a World Heritage site shows how the heritage and present use of cultural landscapes is indivisible. Credit: By Diliff - Own work, CC BY-SA 3.0, <https://commons.wikimedia.org/w/index.php?curid=8165679>

direct reference to the historic environment, so the challenge is to ensure that archaeology is not forgotten in any new system. There were, however, some hooks for us to advance our advocacy.

In his speech, Mr Gove expressed, in essence, an excellent understanding of the importance of the interconnectedness of the cultural and natural landscape in talking about the designation of the Lake District as a World Heritage Site – designated for its cultural landscape value – and the (continuing) relationship of people and the land. It should be a simple, logical leap to instil the idea that cultural heritage, including the importance of archaeological assets, from historic farm buildings and centuries-old dry-stone walls to Neolithic axe factories, should be treated in the same breath.

This is not an insignificant win, incidentally, when in the same week as Gove's speech, George Monbiot was writing in *The Guardian* to decry the 'cowardice, the grovelling, the

blandishments, [and] the falsehoods' of those who would seek to try to understand the natural and cultural, past and present landscapes as the same (www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2017/jul/11/lake-district-world-heritage-site-sheep).

CAP reform is, therefore, one of our top Brexit priorities and we recently prepared a briefing setting out our policy priorities in this area. ClfA has also been collaborating with key advisors internally, and working to assist in the wider sector's work to influence across government. Recent meetings with Historic England and the Heritage Alliance have sought to raise the issue of agri-environment schemes and archaeology. As a result, the Heritage Alliance represented ClfA's views to DEFRA in a meeting with Mr Gove in August, following on from a recent letter in which he acknowledged that his department would 'give importance to the issue [of the historic environment]'.
We are also working closely with colleagues

at the Council for British Archaeology, who are representing archaeology in natural environment policy fora like the Wildlife and Countryside Link.

However, this positivity is not naiveté. We do not see Mr Gove's speech as indicating a full commitment to environmentalism over, say, austerity. We also know that there is a significant need for pressure to be applied to ensure that the potential of Mr Gove's vision does not slide into something less reflective of our (and the natural environment) sector's aims, and that positive noises of recognition for the historic environment are not lost in the din of competing niche voices seeking to influence new policies. Nonetheless, advocacy is easier when you can praise government for presenting the right vision – and so we do not hold back from optimism at this stage. So, cautiously, we will proceed with building relationships and seeking to influence new policies in this area over the coming months and years.



Guidelines for cultural heritage impact assessment – project launched

Current practice in cultural heritage impact assessment is of variable quality, reflecting the absence of widely adopted guidelines; feedback from ClfA members has identified that guidance on impact assessment would be a welcome addition to the good practice guidance the Institute has developed and published.

The identification of cultural heritage guidelines by the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) as a primary objective for their Impact Assessment Network for 2017/18 and the recently signed Memorandum of Understanding between ClfA and the Institute for Historic Building Conservation (IHBC) has led to the formation of a partnership between the three professional institutes to author new *Guidelines for Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (GCHIA)*. The project was launched to coincide with ClfA's annual conference in Newcastle.

Cultural heritage is a broad topic and the guidelines will seek to address the cultural heritage resource in its widest sense. The scope will be UK wide and the guidelines will therefore seek to demonstrate relevance both to the heritage and regulatory contexts in England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland.

The primary purpose of the new guidelines will be *'to show how the broad principles and key assessment requirements of the impact assessment process apply to cultural heritage issues throughout the project lifecycle.'*


To achieve this goal, the guidelines will need to explicitly address a number of key challenges that face the sector when undertaking impact assessment to significantly enhance assessment and achieve new good practice, including:

- all developments must be assessed by a suitably qualified and accredited heritage professional or team of professionals
- there must be an appropriate level of engagement in all stages of the planning and design process
- assessments must be proportionate to the nature of the development and the heritage resource affected
- findings are always presented in a form that uses well-defined terminology.

The primary audience for the guidelines will be heritage professionals undertaking assessments, individuals responsible for commissioning assessments and professionals from related disciplines who need to understand the nature of cultural heritage assessment. It is the intention that the guidelines should be available electronically and free of charge.

It is recognised that the success of the guidelines will be dependent on effective consultation across the sector. A programme for consultation is being developed for key milestones in the development of the guidelines and further announcements will follow to the memberships of all three professional institutes.

The guidelines will provide a framework for assessing impacts from plans, policies and projects affecting all types of cultural heritage assets in the terrestrial and marine environments. This photograph was taken as part of survey work prior to the filling in of the former floating roadway cut in Liverpool. Credit: Adam Stanford/ AerialCam



The three professional institutes have formed an advisory panel to support the delivery of the guidelines. The panel will manage the process on behalf of the institutes, develop the scope and content of the GCHIA, oversee the production of the guidelines document and the consultation process. Panel members are drawn from across the historic environment and impact assessment sectors:

- James Caird (IHBC)
- Stephen Carter (Headland Archaeology)
- Victoria Cooper (Royal Haskoning DHV)
- Josh Fothergill (IEMA)
- Kirsten Holland (ClfA)
- Ian Houlston (LDA Design)
- Peter Jones (IEMA)
- Andy Ricketts (WSP | Parsons Brinkerhoff)
- Rob Sutton (Cotswold Archaeology)

Corporate sponsorship opportunities are available to those seeking to support the development of the guidelines. Sponsors are organisations that want to be a core part of enabling the shared vision of ClfA, IHBC and IEMA in delivering quality guidance that drives more proportionate and effective cultural heritage assessments across UK practice, generating benefits to clients, communities and the environment. A sponsor will demonstrate their leadership in improving the quality and effectiveness of the assessment of cultural heritage. Further details on sponsorship opportunities are available from Andrew Ricketts, Chair of the Advisory Panel (Andrew.Ricketts@wspgroup.com).

Registered Organisation news



WYAS Archaeological Services

Archaeological Services WYAS marched to Eboracum in June

As the armies of Rome marched to York for the second Eboracum festival in June 2017, archaeologists from Archaeological Services WYAS joined them to run the popular Archaeology Tent.

The festival, organised by York Museums Trust, highlights the depth and breadth of life in Roman York and as part of that, the ASWYAS Archaeology Tent was where visitors could take part in a range of archaeological activities, guided by our professional archaeologists.

We had dual goals: to provide a fun, interactive experience to add to the range of events available during the festival and to demonstrate aspects of archaeological practice as a possible career to future generations.

In addition to the 'tent' itself, we also had an area of York Museum Gardens that we were able to use to demonstrate some of our latest geophysics equipment and to provide a 'hands-on' experience for the visitors.

Our new Bartington 601-2D, the workhorse of archaeological geophysics, was the star of the show and was constantly in action throughout the weekend, tried out by young and old alike. We also gave visitors the opportunity to try out our Sensys cart-based gradiometer, which helped us show off the technological advances that are happening in archaeology at the moment. In addition, we also displayed our RM15 resistance meter to give an idea of the different scientific techniques that archaeologists employ to discover the past.

Each of these hands-on demonstrations gave visitors the opportunity to really understand the type of work that is undertaken by geophysicists and how

important it is, as well as exciting some people with the technology itself.

Back in the tent, we had displays of objects and artefacts that have been discovered following the use of geophysics, allowing us to link technology to history in a very real sense for everyone. These included a beehive quern and part of the largest pot ever found in Yorkshire. Sticking with the theme of the festival, we also displayed some

of the different types of pottery that the Romans used during their occupation of northern England.

Over the course of the two days, we spoke to hundreds of people of all ages about working in the field of archaeology and had queues of people keen to try their hand at geophysical surveying. We had a great weekend and hope that we have helped to inspire the next generation of archaeologists.



Holly, aged 2½, getting to grips with the Bartington 601-2D. Credit: ASYWAS



Chris Sykes from ASWYAS teaches the next generation about archaeological geophysics. Credit: ASYWAS

Spotlight on... the ClfA Standard and guidance for commissioning work or providing consultancy advice on archaeology and the historic environment

www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/ClfAS&GCommissioning_1.pdf

The overarching *ClfA Standard and guidance for the Stewardship of the historic environment* describes the stewardship responsibilities that **all** members of the Institute owe to the historic environment under the *Code of conduct*. The *Standard and guidance for commissioning work or providing consultancy advice on archaeology and the historic environment* expands that responsibility, providing more detailed guidance to advisors working in a consultancy environment and to archaeologists who commission work from others.



Site tour of excavations at Pocock's Field, Eastbourne for Bovis Homes. Credit: Archaeology South-East

It is complemented by the ClfA *Standard and guidance for archaeological advice by historic environment services*, which fulfils a similar role for advisors acting on behalf of regulatory bodies. The two documents have been closely aligned very deliberately in order to acknowledge that all parties are working together to manage change and to achieve the best outcomes for the historic environment.

The *Standard* replaced the *Code of approved practice for the regulation of contractual arrangement in field archaeology* in 2014. It provides guidance on

- the expertise and competence of advisors, including the duty to maintain high professional standards of conduct and integrity
- procedures for providing consultancy advice and procuring work, including dealing with real and perceived conflicts of interest
- the importance of adequate resourcing
- communication
- monitoring and managing quality

It also places specific requirements on advisors to ensure that the work they commission – or advise should be commissioned – has clearly defined research objectives, considers opportunities for engaging with local communities either directly or through the dissemination of results, and is focused on delivering public benefit.

Membership of ClfA places a professional obligation on individuals or Registered Organisations to comply with the *Code of conduct* and *Standards and guidance*, in addition to any other requirements placed upon them by legislation or policy or its interpretation by local planning authority, or other advisors or by their clients. Where the requirements of clients and/or advisors appear to involve a less rigorous approach, members and Registered Organisations are, nevertheless, expected to adhere to the *Standard*.

So what does the Standard say?

To comply with the *Standard*, specialist advice to commissioners of archaeological work **must**

- ensure that the commissioner sufficiently understands and complies with ethical, legal and policy requirements, and is aware of the likely resource requirements
- be clear, compliant, impartial, informed and robust, and should be proportionate to a thoroughly researched and clearly reasoned assessment of the known or potential significance of the heritage assets concerned
- be provided by an advisor who is suitably qualified, skilled and competent

ClfA Standards and guidance

- Define good practice, expanding and explaining general definitions in the *Code of conduct*
- Define a required *outcome*: the **standard**
- Advise on how the outcome may be reached: the **guidance**
- Are formulated *by the sector*, based on current understanding of good practice
- Are used when commissioning or designing archaeological work in order to define measurable *quality standards*
- Are not optional: compliance with the *Standard* is a *professional obligation* for ClfA members and Registered Organisations

The procurement of historic environment services to implement that advice **must**

- ensure that work is fit for purpose and is undertaken by appropriate experts in accordance with the ClfA *Code of conduct, Standards and guidance* and regulations

Ethical dilemmas and conflicts of interest

Professionals in all industries face ethical dilemmas and potential conflicts of interest daily; it's one of the reasons professional bodies exist, publish ethical codes and issue guidance on how to comply with them. Identifying potential conflicts does not imply there is anything amiss with the way the professional conducts themselves or their business, but having a clear and transparent process to deal with them as they arise demonstrates a commitment to professional behaviour and high standards.

The *Standard and guidance* says

1.1 More specifically, in the context of this *Standard and guidance*, a member may face ethical dilemmas concerned with reconciling the needs of their client with those of the historic environment. In these circumstances, a member must act in accordance with the ClfA *Code of conduct*.

3.2.1 Those advising the commissioners of archaeological services or procuring those services themselves must

- f. ensure that a clear and transparent process exists for dealing with real or perceived conflicts of interest. In particular, archaeologists whose professional responsibilities combine recommendations about investigation and/or management with its execution must clearly indicate the combination of these interests to all relevant parties and ensure formal protocols or codes of practice are put in place to prevent any conflicts of interest

Reconciling the professional obligation to conserve and enhance significance in the historic environment, the needs and wishes of a client and the requirement to run a successful business can lead to potential conflicts of interest and even ethical dilemmas. In such circumstances, ClfA members and Registered Organisations must act in accordance with the *Code of conduct* and this *Standard*. Documented compliance with the guidance will provide evidence of professional behaviour in the event of a complaint or allegation of misconduct.



Your chance to vote on a proposal for Chartered Archaeologist status

At the AGM in a few weeks' time, ClfA members will be asked to vote on whether or not to approve a proposal for a Chartered standard for archaeologists. The proposal outlines the basic framework for how a Chartered Archaeologist grade might be assessed, and its positioning in relation to the existing ClfA membership structure. If you approve the outline, ClfA staff will start drafting an amendment to the Charter and developing the supporting regulations for further consultation, with the aim of seeking final approval at the 2018 AGM and, if granted, submitting to the Privy Council Office shortly after that.

Being able to confer Chartered Archaeologist status on our members means that archaeology will become a **chartered profession** like architecture, engineering or surveying. Our Advisory Council and Board firmly believe that such a move will

- increase professionalism
- add value, for clients and the public
- promote best practice and improve career pathways
- increase recognition of professional skills and accreditation
- attract new people into membership

The proposal follows extensive research and consultation with members, stakeholders, other professional bodies and the Privy Council Office and has been benchmarked against the requirements for chartered status in other professions. Our research has shown that although there are a variety of ways to approach a Chartered standard, there are some common themes, with the majority being based around these three pillars:

Our vision of a Chartered Archaeologist is a competent professional who can demonstrate


- a high level of technical competence appropriate to his/her career path (assessed by the current Validation process for MCIfA)
- appropriate understanding of the legislative and policy framework(s) relevant to his/her work (an additional assessment process for Chartered Archaeologists)
- a high level of ethical competence and understanding of professional ethics, standards and regulation (an additional assessment process for Chartered Archaeologists)
- a commitment to his/her own development and to the development of the profession/discipline (an additional assessment process for Chartered Archaeologists)

We recognise the need for the standard to be both rigorous and accessible. It is proposed that the Chartered Archaeologist grade will be open to all archaeologists and historic environment professionals who are directly and actively involved in investigating, managing or conserving the historic environment, whether in a paid or a voluntary capacity.

This is a significant moment in the development of the Institute and the

development of the profession. The standard needs to be a mark of quality and professionalism and be recognised by clients, employers and the wider public. We have been discussing the draft with our members, with stakeholder organisations and with the wider sector and feedback has shown a wide range of views. There are also a number of questions of detail that will need to be considered if we move to the next phase. The Board of Directors would like to take this opportunity to encourage members to have their say at the AGM, vote on this important issue and shape the future direction of the profession and the Institute.

You can find details of the proposal and the consultation so far on our website at www.archaeologists.net/charter/chartered_archaeologists. The motion which members will be asked to vote on has been sent to all members with the AGM papers. If you have not received yours, please contact the ClfA office.



Chartered Archaeologist development timeline

2015 – 2016

Research, initial workshops, member survey

April – July 2017

Development of outline proposal for a Chartered Archaeologist grade

August – September 2017

Informal consultation on outline with members and stakeholders

Informal consultation with Privy Council Office

October 2017

CIfA members asked to approve outline proposal at AGM



November 2017 – April 2018

Detailed drafting of regulations and supporting procedures

Costing

May – August 2018

Formal consultation with members, stakeholders and the wider sector

Publicity campaign

October 2018

CIfA members asked to approve wording of a formal petition to amend Royal Charter

November 2017 – March 2018

Further discussion and consultation leading to a revised proposal

April 2018

CIfA members asked to approve revised outline at Conference EGM

May – August 2018

Detailed drafting of regulations and supporting procedures

Formal consultation with members, stakeholders and the wider sector

October 2018

CIfA members asked to approve wording of a formal petition to amend Royal Charter



November – December 2018

Formal submission of petition to Privy Council Office

RTPI and ClfA heritage seminar: Layers of London

On 5 July, RTPI London ran an inter-professional event with ClfA, kindly hosted by Jones Lang LaSalle. This event focused on the heritage challenges and opportunities in London development projects and the benefits of considering heritage aspects at the outset of a project and consulting experts in heritage.

Tim Howard chaired the event, and started off by outlining the potential challenges in managing heritage assets, particularly a lack of resources to deal with complex applications, deregulation and site designations that do not adequately consider any potential archaeological remains. He stressed the need for these issues to be considered at the outset of a development project and recommended caveats be attached to prevent any important historic resources from being lost.

Our first speaker was **David McDonald**, a heritage consultant and President of the Institute of Historic Building Conservation (IHBC). David spoke about the harmful loss of non-designated heritage assets that have

significance (eg associated with a historic figurehead) and/or character (where a building forms part of the quality of a place), making specific reference to some pub appeals he was successful in winning whilst working in the Royal Borough Kensington. He also touched on the difference between the obligations within the NPPF and the statutory tests contained within the legislation, saying it is important for practitioners to consider the requirements of both when dealing with an application involving heritage assets.

The second speaker was **Sandy Kidd**, principal archaeologist at the Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service. Sandy outlined the special challenges of working within London, where a substantial proportion of land is of archaeological interest. He stressed the importance of engaging communities in heritage – for example, by opening up sites of interest to members of the public during the construction period. This had been particularly successful at the Curtain Theatre site in London, where the archaeological remains form a key component of the identity and offering of this development site.

The next speaker was **Josie Murray**, heritage consultant for High Speed One and closely involved in the redevelopment of St Pancras International Station. Here the heritage significance of the station was instrumental in delivering a rail station of international importance. She discussed the complex legislation that governed this redevelopment, which included the 1996 Channel Tunnel Rail Link Act. She said continuous collaborative working with Camden Council has been essential in delivering this project in a timely manner and highlighted the benefits of engaging key stakeholders early on in the process.

The final speaker was **Janet Miller**, CEO of Museum of London Archaeology (MOLA). Janet highlighted how heritage assets can enrich place design and add identity and value. She discussed some of the ways that MOLA has been engaging and encouraging interest in heritage assets within communities, including a 'time truck' and recruiting local volunteers. She said that heritage assets need not be viewed as a defining constraint and can be used positively in a proposal, for example as at Guild Hall, London, where the archaeology is reflected in the surface treatment and forms part of the streetscape.

Drinks, nibbles and networking provided by our host followed the talks.

ClfA and RTPI continue to work closely together and plan to hold future events and other initiatives.



*Tim Howard speaking at the RTPI and ClfA heritage seminar.
Credit: Stephen O'Reilly*

Member news

Jack Powell PCIfA (8022)

Jack graduated from Bournemouth University in 2016 after completing a BSc in Archaeology and has been a student member of ClfA since 2014. He developed a keen interest in aerial photography and remote sensing during his degree and whilst undertaking a placement with the New Forest National Park Authority.

In January 2017, Jack joined the team at Air Photo Services (APS) as an Aerial Imagery Analyst. He is responsible for analysis of air photos and lidar data for heritage assets, GIS mapping, and assisting with training. Jack works as part of a proactive team and gets to analyse fascinating multi-period sites from across the country.

Jack was encouraged to upgrade to the professionally accredited grade of PCIfA by members of the team at APS and was further

motivated to upgrade after learning more about accreditation at the ClfA early careers event at the 2017 ClfA conference. The upgrade from student to PCIfA demonstrates the progress in his career and has helped to highlight and set goals for his professional development for the future.

Jack is looking forward improving his skills as well as continuing to learn more about aerial archaeology.



Credit: Air Photo Services

Jack Powell

ClfA will be running another early career networking event at the 2018 conference in Brighton (www.archaeologists.net/conference/2018). This will cover topics such as

- the various options for career-entry training including NVQs and apprenticeships
- how to get a workplace training programme and why it's useful
- the experience you need to get your first job and what training you should look out for to add to your personal development plan
- how to get ClfA accreditation and access to our career pathway information
- what ClfA groups can offer in terms of specialist networks, training courses, good practice advice, joining a committee, and getting involved with ClfA
- how to set out your CV and promote yourself to employers
- what counts as Continuing Professional Development (CPD) and how to record it

You'll be able to speak to members of our Group committees and staff, and it's an excellent opportunity to network with other archaeologists. We look forward to seeing you there!

‘My job means it’s too difficult to join ClfA’ – or does it?

Helen Parslow MClfA (4672), Archives Officer Albion Archaeology (Vice Chair of Validation Committee)

I often hear people mumbling ‘it’s too complicated’ or ‘it doesn’t apply to me’ when they think about joining or upgrading their ClfA professional accreditation. I’ve even had similar thoughts myself: ‘I’m in a job which proves difficult to demonstrate my skills at MClfA.’

Let’s be truthful: it’s difficult to fill in the statement of competence, especially at a higher grade in a way that fully demonstrates your skills. The application takes time and effort to complete, and if you are already accredited, why bother going for a higher grade?

In all honesty, it *shouldn’t* be easy: you want to join a Chartered Institute which may lead to the opportunity in the future to become a Chartered Archaeologist and achieving accreditation is good for you to reflect your level of competence, for your employer to demonstrate a professional workforce and for ClfA – you are part of the Institute and your opinions matter.

I work in archaeological archives and (even though I’m a member of the Validation committee) found it hard to think what documentary evidence to use to demonstrate my skills. I was already an Associate (AClFA) and had often thought about upgrading to Member (MClfA), but felt

the main competence matrix did not fully explain what I needed, and that demonstrating my competence to the Validation committee at this higher level seemed very difficult.

To help with this, ClfA Special Interest Groups have developed a series of specialist competence matrices to support the main matrix – and they are designed to help both applicants and the committee.

These cover archives, buildings, fieldwork, finds, forensics, geophysics, graphics, information management, international heritage, museum archaeology, osteology (British Association for Biological Anthropology and Osteoarchaeology – BABAO) and project management. A lot of effort has gone into these – I know because I was involved in writing and structuring the archives matrix.

Recently I decided to bite the bullet and upgrade my membership using the archives matrix. Here’s some advice based on my own experience:

- make it clear in your application which matrix you’ve used. The committee can use this too to help assess your application
- send a copy of the specialist matrix to your referee, especially if your role is one in which it is difficult to document your skills and abilities. In this case, make sure



Helen Parslow

you choose your referees carefully. You can always nominate more than the two required referees (I used four!)

- ask ClfA for advice over your choices of documents and referees, or approach the Special Interest Groups – they should be able to help, especially as they helped write the matrices for their specific areas

I also asked other recent applicants about their use of the new matrices and these were their responses:

‘I think it was very useful for both me and my referees to focus on the four main categories and their bullet points required at each level to demonstrate my competency’

‘A specialist competence matrix is long overdue, as especially in our group there are not a number of personal publications which you can support your application with’

I know that joining or upgrading can seem long-winded and difficult, but the new specialist competence matrices should make things clearer. By using these as a guide your application should be better and easier to read, and help the committee to understand your role, particularly if it’s unusual. Hopefully, this will mean you achieve the grade you applied for sooner!

Specialist competence matrix – To support applicants who work with Archives

	Knowledge	Autonomy	Coping with complexity	Perception of context
Member (MClfA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authoritative grasp of standards within field and without. • Full knowledge of local, national and international standards and areas of responsibility. • Detailed understanding of archive transfer procedures including copyright and ToT (Title of Transfer). • Full understanding of selection policies and research framework issues. • Writing/ facilitating discussions of policy documents and standards. • Full understanding of how to compile, use, check and make accessible complex digital archives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has responsibility for budgets; costings for archive materials, staff time and deposition costs. • Oversees the archive work carried out by others and ensures completion of all stages of the process throughout their organisation. • Oversees implementation of selection strategies, disaster management plans, managing collections and store conditions etc. • Provides and promotes access to archaeological archives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understands the interplay between differing repositories (for both physical and digital archives). • Responsible for the compilation and interrogation of the resource and facilitating access. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manages and facilitates the resource within their organisation and with external bodies. • Devolvement of potential of archaeological archives for future research and utilisation.

Extract from the Archaeological Archives Specialist competence matrix. Credit: ClfA

ClfA enrolment party for Dutch archaeologists

Marloes van der Sommen PCIfA (8981)

Recently a few Dutch archaeologists

decided to become members of ClfA. We had several reasons to do so. For one, ClfA has already accomplished many things that have not taken shape in the Netherlands, yet. Many an archaeologist is looking for answers to problems in Dutch archaeology. Looking over to the other side of the 'pond', we noticed that ClfA has a working system for lobbying, legal support and member services, like JIST for instance. Furthermore, the status of a chartered body will, in the long run, probably have a large impact: for other professions, even in the Netherlands, chartered status has become the international touchstone. We want to actively participate in the growth of ClfA and help mould the future of Dutch archaeology at the same time. It is a small step by a few people but we see possibilities to further both aims and achieve synergy over a wider part of Europe and have a larger impact together. We wish to avoid 'reinventing the wheel' and by using the available structures and mechanisms within ClfA hope to speed up the rejuvenation of Dutch archaeology as well.

We spoke to ClfA and were informed that of course we could register. And if 15 archaeologists working in Dutch archaeology registered, we would be able to start a ClfA Netherlands group. This, although small, would enable us to immediately increase our influence and be a partner in many a formal process in our country. Don't ask for an explanation – that's the way things are in The Netherlands.

ClfA supported our aims and goals and even waived the application fee for archaeologists living and working in the Netherlands if they joined before 31 December 2016. A Christmas gift!

Then we hit a speed bump. We noticed that people were interested in joining ClfA, but the registration process, especially for non-native English language speakers, seemed very complicated and time-consuming. So, we figured, what if we were to support each other in registering and make it a bit more attractive?

We picked a date for a get-together, with all the necessary forms for registration, and we had our own ClfA Christmas enrolment party! We did it together, helped each other, got assistance from Mark Spanjer MClfA (the

party was at his house) who, as a member, has gone through the process of registering and understands what is needed. Together we had a cosy, useful afternoon with lower stress levels than anticipated.

Sadly, in our first attempt we didn't manage to have enough people registered to be able to start the group, but... we're going to repeat this scheme and assist other archaeologists to apply for membership. This time we will try a nice little barbecue party in late summer. Could this idea be imported to the UK as well?



*The party in full swing!
Credit: Mark Spanjer*



We want to actively participate in the growth of ClfA and help mould the future of Dutch archaeology at the same time

Essential items for the join up party. Credit: Marloes van der Sommen

New members



Member (MCfA)	Associate (ACfA)	Practitioner (PCfA)	
9168 Mark Adams	9022 Kate Brown	9249 Cameron Bate	9181 Mark Sargent
9245 Rupert Austin	9062 Rosalind Buck	9096 Lisa Bird	9217 Chris Sear
9135 Olaf Bayer	9112 Niamh Carty	9170 Sam Bithell	9119 Christopher Silvester
9102 Peter Boyer	9118 Donald Clark	9139 Roxanne Blanks	9280 Kelly Sinclair
9078 David Britchfield	9172 Harry Clarke	9180 Emily Brewer	9213 Dunia Sinclair-Julio
9100 Rob Brooks	9160 Steven Collison	9043 Ariane Buschmann	8945 Benjamin Sleep
1555 Paul Cope-Faulkner	9177 Martyn Cooper	9251 Ruben Cencerrero Alonso	9315 Marcin Szpila
9054 John Craven	9075 Thomas Davies	2723 Claire Corkill	8809 Anthony Taylor
9222 Andrew Daykin	6636 Rachel English	9248 Maggie Cox	9314 Yago Terroba Souto
9061 Ceri Falys	9165 Mark Gibson	9215 David Curry	9323 Mathieu Vandergucht
9246 Hayley Goacher	9053 Richard Gregson	9271 Isobel Curwen	9179 Edoardo Vigo
9138 Anthony Mackinder	9164 Victoria Hainsworth	9330 Adrianna Cysarz	9162 Daniel Wood
9077 Jeremy Meredith	9175 Richard Hewett	9016 Mark Davies	5976 Allen Wright
8983 Joep Orbons	9239 Aurea Izquierdo Zamora	8862 Margarita De Alba Romero	9115 Hannah Wynn
9157 Ken Pitt	9010 Rebecca Jones	9273 Mark Denyer	
9174 Ben Reeves	8962 Ray Kennedy	8999 Kim Devereux-West	Affiliate
9220 Mary Ruddy	9030 Peter Klemen	9302 Danae Divaris	
9101 Gary Taylor	800 Dorothy Low	9236 Strephon Duckering	9233 Eleanor Attwood
9020 Samuel Walls	9173 Fraser McFarlane	9117 Lewis Ernest	9375 Lauren Ayers
	9013 Suzanne McGalliard	9303 Emilien Estur	9153 Edward Burton
	9159 Lauren McIntyre	9195 Daniel Evans	9365 Anna Chaussee
	5495 Jane Phimester	9072 Robert Falvey	9334 Ross Compton
	1377 Gregory Priestley-Bell	9304 Bruce Ferguson	9191 Shannon Edwards
	9140 John Quarrell	9305 Sylwester Gebarowski	9207 Heidi Elsley
	9169 Adam Reid	7511 Eva Gonzalez Suarez	9189 Rachel Ford
	9024 Alexander Schmidt	9015 Jay Griffiths	9134 Vicki Fox
	9103 Francis Shepherd	9306 Laura Gutel	9372 Brett Fuery
	9052 Tudor Skinner	9288 Tamara Hadnagyev	9125 Hilary Oldfield Gould
	9060 Ioannis Smyrnaiois	9136 Brittany Hill	9122 Malinda Henderson
	9009 Alex Sotheran	1354 Isca Howell	9387 Sophie Holt
	6658 Timothy Spenbrooke	9171 Shanice Jackson	9120 Harriet Marshman Harris
	9241 Charlotte Tooze	6492 Tim Johnston	9412 Robyn Mason
	9069 Rebecca Trow	9292 Sarah Krischer	9156 Irina Oliveira
	9242 Richard Ward	9289 Alison Langston	9377 Hannah Rae
	9158 Robin Webb	9097 Nicholas Lawrence	9204 Moyra Simon
	8610 Wayne Weller	9068 Jaime Levell	9132 Mark Smith
	9167 Rebecca Wills	9214 Debbie Lewis	9416 Ramona Usher
		9308 Elena Lima Olivera	9104 Charlotte Wilkinson
		9328 Carlotta Marchetto	9378 Aimie Worrall
		6311 Owain Mason	9115 Hannah Wynn
		9183 Elena Matteacci	
		2732 Shuan McConnachie	
		9166 Lindsay Meaklim	
		9310 Sebastian Moya Garcia	
		9216 Joanna Nastaszyc	
		9074 Rui Oliveira	
		9317 Matteo Palombelli	
		9199 Lynette Parkinson	
		9178 Mark Richardson	
		9197 Callum Ruse	
		9319 Irene Sala	

Student

9374	Angeliki Adamantia Akrata	9235	Emlyn Evans	9154	Jacinth Kilmartin	9371	Caroline Schwarting
9415	Miriam Andrews	9148	Harriet Farr	9194	Gwendoline Maurer	9390	Sophie Scott
9226	Amy Arden	9155	Stella Fox	9127	Kathleen McCaskill	9144	James Scott
9366	Patricia Artl	9380	Georgia Foy	9373	Hannah Mills	9184	Rebecca Seakins
9332	Gemma Asbury	9339	Aaron Friar	9109	Katrina Moll	9225	Natalie Siegenthaler
9382	Lois Barker	9228	Sandra Garcia Perez	9333	Brodhie Molloy	9231	Katelyn Smith
9193	Fred Birkbeck	9205	Claire Gayle	9413	Joseph Moore	9335	Hector Smith
9364	Alexander Birkett	9208	Fiona Gibson	9209	Lucy Morrison	9362	Matthew Smithson-Shaw
9384	Andy Bliss	9056	Roxana Gomez	9370	Rowan Munnery	9234	Jacob Spriggs
9229	Alistair Branagh	9147	Jonathon Graham	9145	Rachel Nesbitt	9188	Robert Steel
9091	Janine Buckley	9232	Raphael Hermann	9386	Thomas Oliver	9085	Alex Stephens
9150	Holly-Ann Carl	9050	Gordon Higgs	9185	Richard Patrick Goddard	9121	Charlotte Stocker
9385	Julian Carty	9388	Whitney Hoffman	9411	Benjamin Pennington	9414	Stella Sudekum
9146	Daniel Cockling	9151	Katelyn Holmes	9187	Gwendoline Pepper	9133	Elizabeth Thompson
9230	Jemma Collier	9337	Matthew Humphreys	9092	Emma Percival	9110	Kayleigh Topliss
9149	Madelaine Cromack	9338	Holly Jackson	9126	Amy Potts	9108	Florian Weber
9363	Maddison de Varennes	9129	Jet Jansen	9152	Harry Richardson	9203	Rachel Wells
9237	Shrijaya Dey	9379	Maria Kaehne	9123	Bradly Saint	9381	Amber Williams
9114	Chloe Emmott	9190	Michail Kaikas	9238	Megan Schlanker	9389	Matthew Worrall
9227	Adrian Espinosa-Valdor	9143	Meg Keates	9369	Nicole Schneider		

Upgraded members

Member (MCIfA)

8039	Theodora Anastasiadou
4765	Grace Jones
1849	Richard McConnell
2722	Richard Osgood
4793	Susana Parker
4672	Helen Parslow
1899	Ricky Patten
6540	Doug Rocks-Macqueen
4911	Daniel Stansbie
2129	Jo Vallender

Associate (ACIfA)

7261	Callum Allsop
7290	Zoe Arkley
8762	Charlotte Bellamy
8555	Andrew Brown
8261	Ashley Bryant
6668	Sarahjayne Clements
8291	Stephanie Duensing
5933	Karl Hanson
7220	Christina Hills
8744	Robert Lenfert
7353	Rob Lennox
6672	Nikki McConville
8717	Michael McElligott
8695	Manca Petric
7705	Thomas Piggott
8936	Joanne Robinson
7005	Charlotte Stodart
4871	Sian Thomas
7685	Julie Walker

Practitioner (PCIfA)

8365	Ian Atkinson
8642	Peter Bonvoisin
8380	Riccardo Caravello
8902	Sergio Carrelli
7296	Emma Fishwick
8032	Joe France
8005	Otis Gilbert
8431	Kay Hamilton
8192	Anne-Michelle Huvig
8507	Elsbeth Iliff
9322	Agata Kostrzewa
8864	Elliot McDonald
6546	Aimee McManus
8520	Nina O'Hare
8022	Jack Powell
7910	Lowri Roberts
8897	Li Sou
8368	Charlotte Willis

NOTICEBOARD

Dates for your diary

Cifa Annual General Meeting

Our next AGM will be held on **Friday 27 October 2017** (please note the change of date) at the University of Reading. The AGM notice and other documentation is on our AGM website page www.archaeologists.net/cifa/agm

Working together: how effective collaboration between universities and the commercial sector benefits us all

In advance of the AGM itself, we will be holding a CPD seminar, hosted by the Archaeology Department at the University of Reading, which will aim to promote closer working between Cifa and the academic sector and to highlight case studies where effective collaboration already exists between university archaeology departments and archaeological practices working in the commercial sector.

Full details of the seminar and speakers are on the Cifa website at www.archaeologists.net/cifa/agm and you can book to attend via our Eventbrite page www.eventbrite.co.uk/o/chartered-institute-for-archaeologists-6515701863.

Cifa conference 2018

Sponsored by Towergate Insurance

Cifa2018 will be held from 25 to 27 April 2018 at Brighton Racecourse, Brighton.



The theme for the conference will be *Pulling together: collaboration, synthesis, innovation*. Sessions and CPD workshops will cover the different aspects of research communities and the results of developer-led research, and how these can be pulled together to innovate and improve archaeological practice.

Further details about the sessions and workshops can be found on our website at www.archaeologists.net/conference/2018 and we are now running our Call for Papers.

The conference will also include the usual selection of excursions, networking and social events.

Yearbook amendments

The following entries should have been included in the Yearbook 2017. We apologise for any inconvenience caused.

CROFT Mr Robert BA FSA MCifa (148) 1984 South West Heritage Trust, Somerset Heritage Centre, Brunel Way, North Fitzwarren, Somerset TA2 6SF Tel 01823 347430
Email bob.croft@swheritage.org.uk

LORD Mr John BSc MSc MCifa (2274) 2002/2014 Archaeology Collective, 19 Eastbourne Terrace, London, W2 6LG Email john@archaeologycollective.co.uk

PROUDFOOT Mrs Edwina MA DipEd FSA FSA Scot MCifa (786) 1989 Westgate, 12 Wardlaw Gardens, St Andrews, Fife KY16 9DW Tel 01334 473293
Email proudfoot.edwina@gmail.com

SMALL Mr Thomas MAAIS MA MCifa (5482) 2007/2011 Small Finds & Design, 27 Douglas Crescent, Longniddry, Edinburgh EH32 0LH Tel 07947 140127
Email contact@smallfindsdesign.co.uk

Photos for *The Archaeologist*

We are always looking for new images for TA and other Cifa publications to represent the work professional archaeologists undertake. If you'd be willing to let us use your images (with appropriate credit) please get in touch with us (admin@archaeologists.net).

QUEST

QUATERNARY SCIENTIFIC

 University of
Reading

YOUR ONE STOP SHOP

for Archaeological and
Environmental Scientific Services

We draw on an extensive range of analytical equipment, laboratory facilities and technical expertise. We provide a hassle-free solution for all your environmental archaeological needs, at competitive prices.



Whatever you need, get in touch

Rob Batchelor
c.r.batchelor@reading.ac.uk | 0118 378 8941

www.reading.ac.uk/quest
f /Quaternary Scientific
t @Quest_UoR

SUMO...

**30 years at the
forefront of geophysics
for archaeology &
engineering**

sumo

Survey

Survey services you can rely on

SUMO are the largest provider of archaeological geophysics in the UK. Incorporating GSB and Stratascan we have over 30 years' experience in near surface geophysics.

01684 592266


email : geophysics@sumoservices.com

www.sumoservices.com

SUMO Group
Companies

STRATASCAN
GEOPHYSICS FOR ARCHAEOLOGY AND ENGINEERING

GSB
PROSPECTION LTD



Open Access Publishing for Archaeology

internet
archaeology 

Broaden your Readership and Impact

Dynamic, data-rich, and rapid
publication of fieldwork analysis,
survey, methodology and research

One-off Publication Fee – Estimates Provided

<http://intarch.ac.uk>

Judith Winters (Editor)

+44(0)1904 323955 editor@intarch.ac.uk



Miller Building
University of Reading
Reading
RG6 6AB
www.archaeologists.net