

Committee Meeting: Wednesday 22 May 2024, 11:00-12:30 Online – Microsoft Teams Minutes

Present: Cara Burton, David Ingham, Hazel O'Neill, Helen Parslow (Treasurer), Jasmine Tomys, Jen Parker Wooding, Jessica Irwin, Katherine Hamilton, Kerry Whitehouse, Samantha Paul (Chair), Teagan Zoldoske, Victoria Sands (Secretary)

		Action
1	Analogies for absonce	(Initials)
1	Apologies for absence	
2	Minutes of last meeting	
_	accepted	
	decepted	
3	Matters arising	
	Introductions including CB, the new CIfA Member Engagement Co-ordinator	
	AAG Conference 26 September 2024	
	@ Chester House, including tour of archives	
	Many thanks to DI for his support with this conference.	
	No immediate public transport access to the site itself, DI will be driving minibus from train	
	station to venue for those coming via public transport which HP and DI will organise.	
	Call for papers has been sent out – celebrating archives	HP DI
	 SP forwarded call for papers to SMA and FAME 	
	 KH – suggested Bronze Age seed project that could be interesting 	
	 VS - happy to talk if not enough papers received. 	D.
	 Deadline for call for papers is mid-June. David will send papers around and we can have 	DI
	mini meeting in July to discuss.	VS
	HP and DI explained proposed costs for event and showed spreadsheet.	
	AAG will pay a contribution towards speaker travel costs [currently set as £60.00 for up to four]	
	speakers]	
	 Depending on how many speakers we decide on/distance they are travelling etc, we might have to amend speaker costs for flexibility 	
	Price for attendance	
	 Previously £10 members/£25 non-members 	
	 Want to raise this in line with other groups. This conference will also include lunch and a 	
	tour of the archives which is more than last year.	
	 Lianne suggested £35 members/£45 non-members 	
	 Will include five bursaries for students at £20/head 	
	Aiming to breakeven on this conference, it is not about making a profit.	
	SP – Unsure how conference being in Northampton will affect numbers	
4	Advisory Council feedback	
	SP - About salary minimum. Rehashed a lot of conversations had previously, interesting points	
	made. No real progress on the issue.	
5	Group documentation	
	5.1 Chair's report SP	
	Mostly already covered.	
	We have look at quite a lot of different items in a short period of time. Not sure how this	
	compares to other CIfA groups.	

	 5.2 Treasurer's report HP Only additional point, we asked for £800, have been given for £1000 for this year's budget. 	
	 5.3 Secretary's report VS Requires figure from HP for Treasurer's report in AGM minutes Advised that she is starting a PhD in October, and checked that committee were happy with her staying on. Agreed that she would finish her 3-year term [May 2025] and then review. 5.4 3-year plan 	
	• N/A	
6	 Communications 6.1 Group's social media, email, webpage etc ALL AGM recording and committee biographies are on AAG website JI and JT been posting on the social media, had some engagement with this. Email received about Duncan Brown's 1975 Frere Committee report the Principles of Publication in Rescue Archaeology. This stimulated some lively discussion. SP will write response. 	
		SP
7	Representation to CIfA governance and in all CIfA activities 7.1 AAG teabreak • HP will collate survey responses and we can discuss. Then we can decide on topics.	НР
	 7.2 CIfA2024 conference feedback – 24 and 25 April 2024 SP went. Liked that it was two days. Comments around salary minimum. Tried to conduct a large discussion panel at the end, but it didn't raise anything too provocative. 	
8	Focus on issues of standards, best practice, advocacy and access	
	8.1 Transfer of Title Toolkit and Model Contract	
	 Nuch discussion, and some issues noted both via email and in meeting. All recorded in detail by JPW as feedback, should be noted as individual responses from AAG members, and AAG have not had enough time to review this as a group. Issues include some inconsistencies within the information. For example, ownership. Deed suggests that if you cannot get conversion from landowner, units can take ownership of finds just because they have processed the finds. This does not seem right. Also, if landowners keep finds, they have to open a publicly accessible repository. This doesn't seem legal. Does this apply to legacy archives in units as well as in units – unclear. SP – Needs and glossary of terms and maybe page numbers to make it clearer. HON – Asked will all museums sign up to this, how will it be enforced. JPW is unsure. HON & KH – if this is to be sent out to landowners, this is too long as we struggle to get landowners to sign 1 page Transfer of Titles. KH – how will this be implemented? At beginning of projects – fieldwork management would need to be involved, not just archivists, HP – unsure if FAME has been involved in this. SP – if there is a person in the middle, it says they have to sign another type of/extra documentation, but this is not provided. Same for units if they cannot get landowner signature, units need extra documentation. Not clear what it wants us to do. JI – Some landowners might keep finds to avoid paying archive costs. Had an example where they said that they had to make finds accessible, they did pay and deposit in the end. SP – units are not publicly accessible repository to SMA definition Jen – was talking to Kate about bit in the deed about implication that people should follow SMA guidance. Was this sector agreed? SP not sure that it went out to consultation, decided by SMA. 	JPW

- SP This should be agreed more widely.
- HP We need to find out who wrote this. It might be FAME has said they are happy with
 it.
- SP will find this difficult to implement.
- JPW this needs to go out more widely, canvas members for feedback.
- SP consistency for terminology and points. Needs a bit more work before it goes out to consultation. Needs better explanation for certain points.
- JPW needs to submit so any final comments by 5pm.
- AAG had not been involved in any of the previous discussions on this toolkit and wondered which other relevant organisations had been. Has a lot of SMA involvement, they are keen to get this on their website
- Underlining issue AAG haven't had time to fully review this. Did not go out to relevant parties. JPW – hopefully will open it up to further conversation with AAG

8.2 OASIS V Project Management Board update HO'N & JI

- Nicky Scott joined board representing SMA
- Made improvement to OASIS API ability to filter on dates
- Changes to public facing pages improved downloads
- Planning new reg log in to linked up OASIS and ADS better 2025
- Statistics from dashboard showed drop in records discussion
- People aren't using building module discussion.
- Paleobotany modules build time starting in summer 2024. Two modules fauna remains and plant
- Human remain modules due to be built 2024.
- SP do they use OASIS in Scotland. JI yes but its new. Are museums engaging with it? JI –
 not yet. TZ they way Scotland has done it is completely diff to England, run through
 Historic Scotland.
- HP ADS timescales. TZ ADS had a very large backlog, about to hire more people to help. At least 6 months. Changing ingest procedure, will significantly decrease time spent on this

8.21 OASIS issue – no space for monographs HO'N

- Spoke to Nicky Scott about monographs on ADS. As company they haven't decided whether they want to put monographs on ADS because it is paid. Spoke to OASIS and they won't take anything with a ISBN number on. What happens when we start making digital monographs?
- KH they have SAIR Scottish Archaeology digital monograph on there? Hosted on ADS.
 EAA monographs over 5 years, can go up as PDF on their website. Surely ISBN can be included as there are other places that support them.
- HON when we stop having ISBNs can we start putting them on OASIS? Sometimes have to make OASIS entries for monographs.
- KH strange grey area.
- HP could upload it and have an embargo.
- HON OASIS states that they take monographs. Hopefully when there are no ISBNs then hopefully OASIS can take monographs.
- KH there is section for ISBN.

8.3 Competency matrix SP

- No one has had a chance to look at it really.
- It's on google docs look and edit
- SP looks mostly good, no glaring issues. People that work in more traditional roles/larger units should take a look. Should someone from EDI take a look?
- SP and HP needs tweaking on ethical side.; No sure if we are the right people to do this. HP can have a look at it from validation perspective in next few weeks.
- Look at this at next meeting.

9	Any other business (AOB) 9.1 Information for webpage – list of previous members. Anyone missing/spelling VS	
	 Theodora Anastasiadou, Karen Averby, Steve Baker, Duncan Brown, Manda Forster, Deborah Fox, Katie Green, Helen Harman, Zoë Hazell, David Ingham, Lorraine Mepham, Anooshka Rawden, Stephen Reed, Roy Stephenson All fine. 	
10	 Date of next committee meeting and future events Short meeting in July about conference Next main meeting 5 or 6 September – VS will send Doodle poll. 	VS