

CHARTERED INSTITUTE FOR ARCHAEOLOGISTS

BUILDINGS ARCHAEOLOGY GROUP (BAG)

Committee Meeting

Monday 22 Oct at 12.00 hrs

In The Garden Room at Somers Town Coffee House, 60 Chalton Street, London, NW1 1HS

Minutes

Present

Charlotte Adcock (CA; Newsletter editor), Tim Murphy (TM; Chairman), Nigel Neil (NN; Secretary), Megan Lloyd-Regan (MLR; Ordinary Committee Member [OCM]), Gillian Scott (Standards & Guidance), Esther Robinson Wild (ERW, Treasurer).

1.	Apologies Lara Band (LBa; OCM) Lianne Birney (LiB; ClfA), Norma Oldfield (NO, Education & Outreach), Jen Parker-Wooding (JPW; ClfA Senior Professional Standards and Practice Coordinator), Tiffany Snowden (TS, OCM), and Jess Tipper (JT, OCM).	
2.	Committee membership TM stated that he wished to stand down as Chairman at the 2019 AGM. He would decide whether to remain on the committee in some other role for his last year dependent on progress with the Standards and Guidance document, which he wished to see through to the tendering stage. TM said that he felt that members of the committee should commit to attending in person or <i>via</i> Skype at least twice per year. Those present again discussed the problems of finding committee members who are suitable (i.e. ClfA accredited members, ACIfA or MCIfA) for the elected officer positions. NN reported that Norma Oldfield is standing down from the committee with immediate effect, because she has been unable to attend meetings due to work commitments. Beverley Kerr, who would like to join the committee, works as a heritage consultant for Purcell, and was previously a conservation officer for CBA; she is a member of IHBC and VAG. We invited her but she had pre-existing commitments. ERW proposed, seconded by GS , and those present unanimously agreed, that Beverley be co-opted with immediate effect. Post-meeting update LiB subsequently informed NN that there was already a full complement on the committee. Therefore, we have asked Beverley to be an observer (i.e. non-voting) until the next AGM.	TM ALL

	ERW noted that Suzanne Lilley, BAG's Specialist Adviser, has left her current role. A decision as to whether to retain her advice was held over until the next meeting.	
3.	Minutes of Skype meeting Monday 20 Aug TM proposed that the Minutes be accepted, subject to final checking by him on or before 25 Oct. They could then be sent to ClfA for uploading onto the Group webpage.	NN
4.	Matters arising, not covered below None	
5.	Treasurer's Report ERW provided a written report that 5 new members (3 of whom were non-ClfA) were signed up during the year, raising £50. Including estimated travel expenses, we have a balance of £44.30. ERW believed that the travel expenses for the cancelled London (27 Feb) meeting had been met by ClfA and agreed to check this. Some BAG committee members were able to claim travel expenses from their employers. NN noted that ClfA had now appointed an Events Manager, Elizabeth Durst and the committee agreed to contact her at an early stage in planning and costing CPD and other events (e.g. having a stall at the Leeds 2019 Conference). ED will be at the Groups Forum on 6 Dec, which NN is attending.	ERW
6.	Survey Monkey BAG questionnaire The online survey had run throughout September and had received 80 responses. Survey Monkey has provided an automated analysis of the answers to each question (which were circulated). LBa had supplemented this with an interim further analysis of selected questions, based on the spreadsheet of information received. Please see Appendix 1. Those present expressed their gratitude to LBa for her careful and useful work on the Survey. After the meeting The committee received news about the Voluntary and Community SIG survey of community archaeologists, to help inform the direction and the focus of the SIG over the next few years. https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/ClfA%20Vol%20SIG%20Community%20Survey%20Report%20Nov%202018_0.pdf V&C considered their data carefully over a year before completing this report, so BAG need to consider very carefully how to present <u>our</u> survey information. NN's view is that, we could agree at the December Skype meeting to put a summary on the Newsletter, but this could be very much an interim statement, to indicate that we value the participation of those who answered, and that we are acting on their concerns within practical constraints. We should discuss how to report the results of the Survey in more detail, and ClfA views on	ALL

	this.	
7.	<p>BAG Newsletter and other publicity</p> <p>CA commented on the difficulty of persuading group members to write articles for the Newsletter and noted that several promised pieces had not yet materialised.</p> <p>GS suggested offering a prize for the best article (e.g. on a CPD topic). The idea was considered viable and ERW said that she would find out whether ClfA approved.</p> <p>NN suggested that a summary of the main findings of the Survey Monkey in the Newsletter should be a priority, perhaps focussing on the CPD topics suggested by respondents, with a view to seeking feedback from the membership as to what they considered the priority topics to be. NN to contact LBa about drafting a summary report.</p>	<p>CA</p> <p>ERW</p> <p>NN, LBa</p>
8.	<p>Group Business Plan 2018-2021</p> <p>Postponed until next meeting. ERW said that she would begin to draft a report. The feeling was that we should only make minimal changes, the message from the Groups Forum on 6 Dec was that we should review the Group's work in relation to its Business Plan at every committee meeting, and 'aim high' with the new Plan.</p>	ALL
9.	<p>Future BAG Events, committee meetings, and venues (inc. ClfA Conference 2019 & BAG AGM)</p> <p>ClfA Conference 2019, Leeds</p> <p>CA had submitted a proposal for a session, but this was not accepted. Disappointment was expressed, and discussion was held about whether to have a stand / poster session, to raise the group profile, but no decision was taken. Since she was the closest to Leeds, CA agreed to discuss with her employers whether display panels could be borrowed.</p> <p>Date of next committee meeting: Monday 10 December 2018, 09.00 to 11.00, via Skype.</p> <p>ERW said that she was keen for BAG to arrange a meeting to coincide with the visit of Eva Garbutt, a New Zealand-based archaeologist (Wellington City Council Senior Heritage Advisor) who is coming to York. CA suggested we consider having a CPD session during the morning, our AGM after lunch, and an evening reception and talk by Ms Garbutt. As a venue, TM suggested House Mills, which has a café, licenced bar, meeting rooms, etc. http://www.housemill.org.uk/</p> <p>All committee members were asked to consider for the next meeting about when we could have a CPD meeting in York - as discussed at Cressing.</p>	<p>CA</p> <p>ALL</p>
10.	<p>Building recording Standards and Guidance (S&G) update</p> <p>As requested at the August, NN had re-sent the existing 'immediate edits' to the committee for final inspection. No further edits were received, so JPW was asked to upload the revised text.</p> <p>TM had 50% completed a draft scoping document for the purpose of seeking grant aid for the full revision/re-write and agreed to complete and circulate the draft document before</p>	<p>JPW</p> <p>TM</p>

	<p>the December committee meeting.</p> <p>In the context of the BAG Survey Monkey and co-working (e.g. re. the <i>Standards and Guidance</i> re-write), NN will speak to LiB re. the status of ClfA discussions with IHBC.</p> <p>TM gave some case studies from his own experience of badly flawed Heritage Statements resulting from the developers ignoring or trying to circumvent national policy and guidance regarding (for example) assessment of significance, the status of 'positively contributing' and 'non-designated' heritage assets in Conservation Areas, and the 'setting' of heritage assets. In his view, developers were currently able to exploit loopholes in the existing guidance. However, whether BAG's revised S&G could be used to address this problem remained to be seen.</p>	NN
11.	<p>Chartered Archaeologists update</p> <p>Postponed until next meeting.</p>	
12.	<p>Any other consultations and ClfA Guidance</p> <p>Postponed until next meeting.</p>	
13.	<p>AOB</p> <p>None</p>	
	The meeting closed at 15.15	

See below for Appendix 1

Appendix 1

NN stated that, in view of the relatively low percentage response (8.69% of the group membership of 921), he felt it was now important to try to determine whether the Survey data accurately represented the whole membership. Whilst there was a view among those present that we should focus on those who had taken the trouble to complete the Survey, and it was made clear that ClfA would be bound by Data Protection legislation, NN was given permission to obtain from ClfA additional information on the whole group membership re. Questions 2, 3, and 4.

Q1 Please tell us your employment status

Student 2 (2.50% of responses)
Employed full-time 47 (58.75%)
Employed part-time 5 (6.25%)
Self-employed 16 (20.00%)
Retired 3 (3.75%)
Other 7 (8.75%)

Q2 Please tell us your ClfA membership grade

Student 2 (2.50% of respondents) [Whole group membership 31, 3.37%]
PClfa (Practitioner) 7 (8.75%) [Whole group membership 164, 17.81%]
AClfa (Associate) 16 (20.00%) [Whole group membership 198, 21.5%]
MCIfA (Member) 46 (57.50%) [Whole group membership 405, 43.97%]
HonMCIfA (0) [Whole group membership 4, 0.43%]
Affiliate 8 (10.00%) [Whole group membership 119, 12.92%]
Not a ClfA member 1 (1.25%) [Whole group membership no data, ?included in Affiliate]

The whole-group data suggests that the membership is somewhat less skewed towards MCIfA than the survey data suggested, with a significantly higher percentage of PClfas across the group as a whole.

Q3 - Which area of the UK do you live/work in?

East Anglia 13 (16.25% of respondents)
East Midlands 21 (26.25%)
London 20 (25.00%)
North 11 (13.75%)
Northern Ireland 2 (2.5%)
North West 14 (17.50%)
Scotland 5 (6.25%)
South 13 (16.25%)
South East 28 (35.00%)
South West 21 (26.25%)
Wales 8 (10.00%)
West Midlands 18 (22.50%)
Yorkshire 19 (23.75%)
Non-UK resident 5 (6.25%)

LBa further break down
Work in 1-3 regions = 66
4-6 regions = 3
7-9 regions = 6

10-12 regions = 4
12-14 regions = 1

It is clear from the survey data that c. 20% of BAG members work in more than one region, and a smaller percentage work very widely. There is a clear South-East bias among those who answered the Survey, and this suggests that that should be our priority area for providing CPD. **GS** said that, if we decided to hold an event in Scotland or Wales (indeed also London, **ERW**) we should do so in conjunction with the CifA Regional Group there, to tap-into existing successful advertising routes. **NN** said that he was keen for the group to get the experience of running some successful events (most probably in the SE) before contemplating events further afield. It was agreed that as much notice as possible should be given about events, so that participants could book train travel when it was cheapest.

The whole-membership data shows where people **live** (first two letters of post code), rather than where they work. This data in effect answers a separate question.

Re. the Survey question, **NN** may have made an error of judgement in choosing IHBC areas for the survey, which seem on reflection to be at odds with more typical regional splits - e.g. different Greater London, East Anglia and East/West Midlands boundaries, a South region as well as SW and SE, etc.. There is undoubtedly a Southern England bias to the membership, but maybe not as overwhelming as the Survey data suggested. It would need more in-depth analysis to get the most out of the Survey + whole-membership data.

Q4 - Which other CifA Area and Special Interest Groups do you subscribe to? (alphabetical)

Buildings Archaeology Group (BAG) Only 39 (48.75% of responses)

Deutschland 2 (2.50%)

London 15 (18.75%)

Scottish 8 (10.00%)

Wales/Cymru 4 (5.00%)

Archives (AAG) 15 (18.75%)

Diggers' Forum 11 (13.75%)

Equality and Diversity 9 (11.25%)

Finds 14 (17.50%)

Forensic archaeology 3 (3.75%)

GeoSIG 7 (8.75%)

Graphics (GAG) 8 (10.00%)

Human Osteoarchaeology 0

Information management (IMSIG) 8 (10.00%)

International practice 8 (10.00%)

Marine archaeology (MASIG) 9 (11.25%)

New generation 3 (3.75%)

Project management (PMSIG) 8 (10.00%)

Research and impact (RIG) 9 (11.25%)

Voluntary and community 12 (15.00%)

LBa comments some people ticked BAG only then went on to list other groups of which they were a member, so the true figures are 31 people BAG only and 50 people BAG plus other CifA groups. London, Finds, and Archives are the other groups of which people are most likely to also be members. Archives might reflect the number of people who are also involved with local authority/curatorial roles.

NN comments the whole-membership data confirms our suspicions that a high percentage of the membership are members of a myriad of other groups, and that that is maybe why they have less involvement in OUR activities. We clearly must work harder to become their CPD priority.

Q5 Are you a member of any other professional body/bodies relating to Buildings Archaeology?

Yes 34 (42.50%)

No 46 (57.50%)

(NN comments) 'Yes' includes Institute of Historic Buildings Conservation (24), Vernacular Architecture Group (5), Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries (2), local vernacular building groups, Construction History Society, VAF, FSG (not sure what these are), Historic Farm Buildings Research Group, DAC advisor, RIBA, Icon: Stone and Wall-paintings Group.

NN asked whether we should also consider enhancing our working relationship and co-working with IHBC and VAG (for example).

Q6 – I'm involved in the following aspect(s) of built heritage archaeology

LBA comments 34 (42.50%) ticked general interest, but quite a few people then went on to tick other built heritage roles, so there were actually only 4 with a general interest only. I was expecting that to be much higher actually, there's no way of knowing across the whole membership but perhaps those who didn't answer the survey are maybe more likely to be those with just a general interest.

The top 5 highest % were:

I produce reports for planning applications 37 (46.25% of responses)

I have a general interest 34 (42.50%)

I am in a Consultancy role e.g. private sector 31 (38.75%)

I undertake both specifications/tenders and built heritage fieldwork 28 (35%)

I am in a Curatorial role e.g. Local Authority / HER 20 (25%)

Q7 How many buildings related CPD events do you attend annually?

E.g. ClfA (but not ClfA conference), Historic England or other providers

None 29 (36.25%)

One to two 36 (45%)

Three to four 9 (11.25%)

Five or more 6 (7.5%)

Q8 How far are you prepared to travel to CPD events?

Locally 16 (20%)

Regionally 38 (47.5%)

Nationally 26 (32.5%)

Q9 - If you are employed, does your employer allow you to attend CPD events?

My employer fully sponsors my CPD 32 (40%)

My employer permits me time for CPD attendance 21 (26.25%)

CPD is attended in my own time 7 (8.75%)

CPD is attended at my own cost 11 (13.75%)

Other (please specify e.g. Not employed, Self-employed, Prefer not to say) 31 (38.75%)

LBA comments of the 31 that said 'other' the majority were self-employed or not employed; the next largest group were those that answered with a variation on the theme of that their employer would pay for some but not all, that it depended on their line manager etc.

Q10 I might be interested in attending CPD events on...

Saturday 40 (50% of responses)
Sunday 24 (30%)
Weekday daytime 64 (80%)
Weekday evening 32 (40%)
Half day course 56 (70%)
Full day course 63 (78.75%)
Two or three day course / a conference 36 (45%)
Online events e.g. webinars, online courses 48 (60%)
I'm not interested in attending CPD events 1 (1.25%)
Other 1 (1.25%)

NN comments highest % in favour of weekday daytime, full day, half day, and online. Lower % in favour of Sundays, evenings, and courses longer than 1 day. Fortunately, very few not interested in CPD.

Q11 - What subjects/skills would you like to see covered by CPD events? (Ranked)

New technologies 56 (70%)
Assessing significance 53 (66.25%)
Recording techniques 48 (60%)
Preparing Heritage Statements / Statements of Significance 46 (57.5%)
Field skills 34 (42.5%)
Reporting on schemes of building recording 29 (36.25%)
Industrial archaeology (specify type below) 27 (33.75%)
Preparing Written Schemes of Investigation (WSI) 25 (31.25%)
Other (e.g. Specific period(s) / Bldg types / Bldg materials or finishes / Interior décor) 23 (28.75%)
Archiving 21 (26.25%)

'Other' free text answers, vaguely grouped, with the number of times it came up in brackets.

Architecture styles, classical terminology
Specific periods
Building types (in general)
Ecclesiastical
Agricultural (x2)
Lead industry
Warehousing
Lime kilns
Vernacular architecture
Domestic scale industry
Interior decor, furnishings and fixings
Item specific courses like windows or chimney pots for example

Building materials and finishes (x4)
Bricks
Building construction and methods, dating
Understanding historic fabric
Traditional skills
Petrography (not basic)
Scientific dating developments

ERW said that Assessment of Significance was probably the real priority, based on anecdotal evidence, with a need to offer CPD of a range of complex examples, of all periods, to illustrate (for the benefit of early career archaeologists) that significance did not equate to age/date or condition.

Q12 - What would you like to see more of from the BAG?

(LBa comments) The answers can be divided into 4 themes (or issues that could be addressed by one of the four themes):

Standards and guidance

Advocacy

Events/courses/CPD

The Newsletter

(plus a single mention within a fourth theme which I'll call 'harsh criticism!').

Below I've pulled out some of the more in-depth answers. A couple mentioned joint working either with the IHBC or Construction History Society.

Standards and Guidance (4 comments)

Mostly comments re. updating them; maybe it would be worth highlighting that we're already on that on our ClfA page and in the next newsletter.

Advocacy (5 comments) i.e. comments on the role BAG should fulfill:

- 'A greater understanding that buildings are part of our living culture, not to be treated in the same way as buried archaeology/monuments, and that significance is actually very different and is much more nuanced. I'm a conservation officer and nearly every report I receive from an 'archaeologist' takes a very different stance from Historic England and IHBC.'
- Advocating for the role of buildings recording / analysis in conservation
- 'Greater push for recognised accreditation within ClfA for those archaeologists who are trained and experienced in conservation of archaeological sites (including built fabric).'
- Heritage preservation concerns
- Pushing publication of HBR reports

Events/courses/CPD (16 comments)

- 'An accredited long term course affiliated with a university would be great, especially distance learning? Probably a big ask but there are so few historic building courses out there there are accessible for people already working in the sector.'
- 'I like the idea of "bite-size" webinars / podcasts / or similar on current topics, especially entry-level "how to" guidance from people (e.g. local government officers) who have seen the good versus bad of (say) assessments of significance.'
- 'More of the same - but maybe more on how we can link building recording to specific research questions or contribute to gaps in our knowledge and then highlight these contributions ...'

LBa comments some, like the last comment here could possibly be addressed through newsletter articles? Most were along the can we do more events, located in different regions and with better advertising line.

Newsletter (5 comments)

- Quick to read summaries for non-specialists, to improve knowledge in the sector
- More in the newsletter on examples of work undertaken
- Research findings on historic buildings; interesting information about interesting work.

- Small section on method/ theory/ recording/ assessment in newsletter. Ongoing bibliography of 'key' books and articles.

With the first two above it might be worth also pointing people to the SPMA summaries. The BAG were actually meant to do a joint newsletter with the SPMA, about 3 years ago, but it never happened. Could we look at that again in the new year? With the last comment I thought the CHS had an online, ongoing, bibliography that anyone could search, but only members could add to, but maybe it's not launched yet. They do have a lot of resource links, which cross-over with BAG; so maybe we could publicise that, do a joint article in the newsletter with them or something? That would also be a good cross working thing.

'Strong criticism'

I think this actually goes against what most people have said in the survey but still worth noting that a member said that the CPD events/newsletter contents etc. seem rather basic and may not be relevant to a professional with extensive experience. Many buildings archaeology colleagues are non-CIfA members too. They suggest a change to the CPD events and newsletter articles to appeal to those undertaking more complex projects.