

CHARTERED INSTITUTE FOR ARCHAEOLOGISTS

BUILDINGS ARCHAEOLOGY GROUP (BAG)

Committee Meeting, Friday 1 June 2018, at 09.00, via Skype

Minutes

Present

Charlotte Adcock (CA; Newsletter editor), Lara Band (LBa; Ordinary Committee Member), Megan Lloyd-Regan (MLR; Ordinary Committee Member), Tim Murphy (TM; Chairman), Nigel Neil (NN; Secretary), Jen Parker Wooding (JPW; CifA Senior Professional Standards and Practice Coordinator), Gillian Scott (GS, BAG Standards and Guidance)

1.	<p>Welcome new Committee Members</p> <p>All those present introduced themselves, and TM welcomed new committee members Megan Lloyd-Regan (voted-on at AGM) and Lara Band (co-opted at the AGM). TM expressed the committees thanks to Jen Parker Wooding for attending the meeting during the first week in her new post with CifA.</p>	Action
2.	<p>Apologies</p> <p>Lianne Birney (LBi; CifA HQ), Norma Oldfield (NO; Education and Outreach), Esther Robinson Wild (ERW; Treasurer), Jess Tipper (JT; Ordinary Committee Member)</p>	
3.	<p>Minutes of meeting (via Skype) on Monday 19th March 2018</p> <p>GS proposed that the Minutes be accepted, seconded by TM, subject to edits which TM would send to NN by e-mail.</p>	TM, NN
4.	<p>Matters arising, not covered below</p> <p>None</p>	
5.	<p>AGM & CifA Conference de-brief and actions</p> <p>The 2018 BAG AGM, held on 25th April, at 13.15, on the first day of Conference, had been very poorly attended (5, including committee members). LBa said that the lunchtime timing, with first-day-of-Conference glitches, and the clash with the Community Archaeology AGM, may have impacted. There was discussion about how to hold it in conjunction with a BAG event in future, ideally both 'high profile' and readily accessible. A venue such as the London Mithraeum was suggested as a possibility. LB recalled a previous BAG visit to the Bristol funicular railway. LBa and GS recommended holding the AGM at a weekend. LB and all present AGREED to bring some suggestions to the next meeting. The event needs to cover a CPD topic (e.g. covering typology, recording, and/or conservation), rather than be just a site visit, to enable CifA members to claim time/costs from employers. JPW suggested sponsorship as a possibility.</p>	ALL

	<p>At Conference, NN had discussed with LBi the idea of obtaining statistical information about BAG membership. At the BAG AGM LBa had suggested circulating a questionnaire (via Survey Monkey) to the BAG membership to nuance this, and also obtain information from the membership as to what would encourage them to be more active members. TM asked that all of the committee think of questions to include, to be discussed and the agreed questions passed to LBi at the next meeting (at Cressing). A launch / introduction article to accompany in the Newsletter - perhaps with a prize draw as a lure - and later a 'we listened to you' follow-up.</p>	ALL
6.	<p>Treasurer's Report</p> <p>In the absence of ERW, no report was available.</p>	ERW
7.	<p>Chartered Archaeologists update</p> <p>JPW said that ClfA members were still being encouraged to complete the Survey Monkey questionnaire. There appeared to be general agreement amongst the membership regarding the desirability of individual Chartered membership, and also towards university courses being Chartered certified. Whilst accepting that Chartered status in other professions was not delimited by areas of competence, NN said that he had raised at the Conference plenary session that BAG had concerns about the difference between Chartered status for an individual and ClfA working towards ensuring the competence of individuals for specific project roles and tasks. In built heritage – as with other specialisms, admittedly - skills sets needed to be defined and validated using competence matrices, and for those milestones to inform professional progression and CPD. TM asked if JPW or LBi could give an update to the Cressing meeting on the whole Chartered Status question.</p>	JPW, LBi
8.	<p>Advisory Council meeting, 7th June</p> <p>CA intended to attend as an observer and summarised the meeting agenda (<i>unfortunately, CA's work commitments intervened, and she was unable to attend</i>).</p>	
9.	<p>Building recording Standards and Guidance update</p> <p>JPW, who had only been in post as Senior Professional Standards and Practice Coordinator since 29 May, had had a short meeting with Kate Geary about the revision of the Buildings S&G, but had not made any decisions yet regarding the appropriate course of action.</p> <p>It was AGREED that everyone on the BAG Committee should re-read the existing S&G before the next committee meeting, and identify areas of immediate concern, with a view to next committee compiling a list of priority edits at least. Discussion then focussed on whether it might be appropriate to make some minor edits for the moment, concentrating on out-of-date planning terminology/links, etc., and for BAG to prepare a</p>	ALL

	<p>scoping document with which to seek funding, in anticipation of a more detailed Specification being prepared (authorship not discussed) at a later date for tendering purposes. It would be necessary to involve and have detailed discussions with stakeholders (e.g. ALGAO, Conservation Officers, Historic England, etc.). JPW outlined how ClfA (on behalf of the Finds Group) had commissioned Alice Cattermole Heritage Consultancy, under the supervision of a Project Board which included stakeholders, to undertake a review of the standard of artefact reporting in England. The Finds S&G is now likely to be revised on the basis of this report.</p> <p>https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/7090FinalReport.compressed.pdf</p> <p>TM noted that the previous BAG committee had attempted unsuccessfully to revise the S&G in-house. Those present felt that the proposed revision (and JPW confirmed that this applied to all S&G documents) should set 'high-level' principles and, as far as possible, be both future-proof to changes in legislation, and should apply in all the home nations and abroad. It should put greater emphasis on archiving, especially the need for Planning Conditions to specify the archiving of the <u>whole</u> of a buildings project archive (including digital media) and should also target the treatment of non-designated heritage.</p> <p>JPW AGREED to invite a representative of the Archives SIG to attend the Cressing Temple event and/or be available for the BAG committee to contact.</p>	JPW
10.	<p>Any other consultations and ClfA Guidance</p> <p>The NPPF update consultation had now closed and ClfA has made a strong representation.</p>	
11.	<p>Future BAG Events, committee meetings, and venues</p> <p>It was agreed that there should be 4 committee meetings <i>per annum</i>: the next at Cressing, then another via Skype c. 1 month later (aimed especially at those not at Cressing), hopefully to review Survey Monkey questionnaire results and S&G key edits and scoping for grant bid. At Cressing, discuss a venue for an Autumn meeting + event (?Northern England). TM, LBa, and CA had contacts in York re. the Minster. There would be a further Skype meeting to follow this. Consider London (?Mithraeum and/or Roman Amphitheatre – with acknowledgement to MoLA) for AGM/event in March/April 2019, possibly on the theme of Standards and Guidance for buildings archaeology, if the revision was progressing – LB to research venue.</p>	<p>TM, LBa, CA</p> <p>LBa</p>
12.	<p>BAG Newsletter and other publicity</p> <p>CA had nearly completed the next edition. She was awaiting contributions from Rob Lennox re. Chartered Archaeologist, and from ERW re. the Conference Session <i>Brick by Brick</i>.</p>	CA

