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Themes and deadlines

TA14 Using geophysical investigation for heritage management: For more than 30 years, geophysical survey has played a major role in developer-funded archaeology. With urgent priorities such those in the recent White Paper Planning for the Future (Aug 2020) and recommendations in the Tailored Review of Historic England (Nov 2020) the TA will investigate how geophysical survey is used effectively in archaeological projects and showcase the added value it can provide. Deadline: 1 August 2021.

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 100–500-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 CIfA house style guidance, which can be found on the website: www.archaeologists.net/publications

TA is made digitally available through the CIfA 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 CIfA. 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 CIfA.
The historic environment, like the natural environment, is a shared, irreplaceable resource. It is managed — and researched, cared for and conserved — on behalf of, and for the benefit of, society. Through their commitment to comply with CIfrA’s ethical Code of Conduct, professional archaeologists have accepted a duty to work in the public interest. The concepts of public interest, public benefit and value are closely entwined (and often used interchangeably). Over the next twelve months, we will be taking a closer look at what they mean for archaeologists, for the public and communities we serve and for the private and public funders of our work.

Working alongside our Voluntary and Community Group, through a series of events and publications, our aim is to share research, resources and good practice from across the sector and to communicate the message that archaeology matters to funders, decision makers and clients.

Archaeologists deliver public benefit in many ways. Some are direct and tangible: we can see how participation in the process of discovery or engagement with archaeological collections touches peoples’ lives. Others are indirect or intangible and more difficult to measure as a result: the sense of place created by rooting a new development in its historical context, the enjoyment of a piece of public art inspired by archaeological discovery or the use of increased understanding about the past to inform current responses to the climate crisis.

At the beginning of our ‘Year of Public Benefit’, this edition of The Archaeologist takes a look at some of the more tangible ways archaeologists deliver public benefit.

Sadie Watson and Kathleen Faccia discuss the need for a better understanding of what public benefit might look like from the perspective of communities affected by development in two articles drawn from their UKRI-funded research project Measuring, Maximising and Transforming Public Benefit from the UK Government Investment in Archaeology, led by Sadie and hosted by MOLA. Brendan Wilkins of DigVentures picks up and develops this theme, emphasising the need for a structured approach to the delivery of public benefit and evaluation of impact.

Gail Boyle, Senior Curator of Archaeology and World Cultures at Bristol Museums and Leigh Chalmers, Heritage Inclusion Development Specialist at Wessex Archaeology, consider the engagement potential of archaeological collections. Gail highlights the role of the museum archaeologist in identifying and breaking down the barriers to engagement with archaeological collections through a constant evaluation of their public offering. Leigh emphasises the mental wellbeing benefits arising from the Historic England-funded Lost and Found project, which has created opportunities for members of the public to engage digitally with the archaeological material and the specialists who study and care for it, and to create their own stories.

Stephen McLeod and Sarah Ricketts of Iceni Projects describe a new approach to public engagement at their flagship project on the site of the Covent Garden Workhouse. This has empowered the whole project team to devise new ways of communicating the project’s results and has engaged the media to tell the story of the site and the archaeologists investigating it. Alison James and colleagues from MSDS Marine illustrate the importance of engaging a range of communities in protecting heritage at risk, in this case the designated wreck of the Rooswijk, and describe the first site open day held on the sea-bed! And finally, Philip Wise of Colchester Archaeological Trust discusses the potential of partnership working between community heritage...
Archaeology and Development Guide, which CIJA has been pleased to contribute to, a new-look CIJA client guide and a new public benefit professional practice paper produced in partnership with HS2, all with the same message: archaeology adds value to society and to industry and, if it doesn’t, it’s not being undertaken to professional standards. Demonstrating that archaeology matters has never been more important, whether in the context of proposed planning reform, an increasingly urgent conversation about who defines, values and experiences heritage, or the contribution that understanding the past makes to our present experience and quality of life. Your work delivers benefit, and we are looking forward to promoting and celebrating more of it over the coming year.
Public engagement and the ‘new normal’

Stephen McLeod ACIfA (8838) and Sarah Ricketts ACIfA (11481), Iceni Projects

Public engagement and outreach have become an increasingly important part of the planning process. The impact of Covid-19 on the standard approach to public engagement has been well documented; however, can we still provide innovative and wide-reaching alternatives?

Iceni Projects, a dynamic development consultancy that embarked on a foray into commercial archaeology in 2019, strives towards a pioneering approach to community engagement. Our aim is to engage with communities, peers in the archaeological industry, and other contractors and companies within the planning and development industry, to share the public value of development-led archaeology.

Iceni’s flagship archaeological project, the Middlesex Hospital Annex, is the site of the Covent Garden Workhouse constructed in the mid-1770s for the parish of St Paul Covent Garden and an associated cemetery that was operational between 1790 and 1853. From 1836, the Grade II listed building became a workhouse of the Strand Union parishes, before transitioning into the Central London Sick Asylum and later the Middlesex Hospital Annex. The ongoing cemetery and workhouse excavation is enabling the redevelopment of the site through the refurbishment of the original workhouse building for mixed-use private residential and public amenity space.

The site’s historic interest stems from it being a rare surviving example of an 18th-century London workhouse and its association with the broader socio-economic issues related to the workhouse institution and its residents. During this period, the workhouses were built by parishes according to poor-relief legislation and were often seen as a deterrent to the able-bodied pauper, as their often-terrible conditions meant only the most destitute in society were desperate enough to enter. Dr Joseph Rogers, who played a significant role in 19th-century workhouse reform, was Chief Medical Officer in the 1850s and his experiences at the Strand Union workhouse led to his involvement in the reform of Poor Law healthcare provision, a significant step towards providing more accessible medical care in Britain. Additionally, the abhorrent conditions of the workhouse may have provided key inspiration for the famous workhouses portrayed by Dickens in Oliver Twist and
later works, as Dickens resided for a period on Cleveland Street, a few doors down from the Strand Union workhouse.

The engagement scope and delivery for the project undertaken in collaboration with L - P: Archaeology centres around the empowerment of the archaeological team. This approach is focused around a project symposium open to staff of all grades and both organisations, and is born out of an earlier symposium concept that L - P: Archaeology implemented for its 100 Minories project. The main objective is about providing opportunity for everyone’s voice to be heard by allowing people to suggest new ways to look at and present the archaeological material on site. It involves them taking ownership of the archaeological interpretation, while creating valuable project designs that will be delivered to a wider audience through online blogs, vlogs, local interest group presentations, online school presentations, and other avenues.

Not only does the symposium fulfill the obligations of the planning condition, but it also demonstrates a unique opportunity to upskill, develop, and hopefully retain the archaeological professionals who will become the industry’s future supervisors, project officers, project managers, and consultants.

The symposium has also provided the opportunity to explore the use of an alternative medium for engagement, initiating a conversation with a local potter to begin using the ubiquitous ceramic sherds excavated on site as a starting point for public conversations on Victorian workhouse society. We also realised that ceramic technology is crucial evidence for any archaeologist working on site and can be used as a tangible proxy of socio-economic conditions, particularly at the birth of mass production of utilitarian wares in the Victorian era. Through social media, publication, and experimental pottery throwing and reproduction, we hope to explore the similarities and differences between Victorian and modern ceramic production, raise awareness of the site, engage the public through a tangible medium, and provide technical training to on-site field staff from a present-day expert.

To complement the other outreach projects, we have commissioned extensive filming on site with a TV production company, who hope to broadcast a documentary relating to the archaeology and history of the workhouse. This will capture interviews with key figures of the archaeological team and members of the construction team on their experiences of, and contribution to, the archaeological site works. The filming of the site works enables us to demonstrate tangible evidence of how the historic environment can be used as a place-making tool and how archaeological work can be successfully interfaced with demolition and construction works within the development process. Additionally, journalist Sean
We felt that the memorialisation should be demonstrated by something illustrative of this major contribution and show a respect that was perhaps not afforded to them in life.

As we settle into the 'new normal', the fundamental changes in society have given us the opportunity to reflect on archaeological engagement and public outreach and enabled us to reframe our approach. By engaging all stakeholders involved in a large development project and empowering the boots-on-the-ground archaeologists to take ownership of – and pride in – their contribution, we have given a voice to the previous inhabitants of the Sirand Union workhouse through the very people intimately involved in its present story. We hope that some of our frameworks and approaches will be retained as part of the new normal of public engagement, which also reaches and engages our peers and others in the development industry in a post-Covid-19 world.
Stephen McLeod

Stephen is a senior archaeologist for Iceni Projects, a development consultancy that established an archaeology team in August 2019. Stephen has worked within developer-led archaeology for numerous commercial archaeology units in Ireland and the UK over the last ten years. Prior to joining Iceni, Stephen was a field archaeologist, predominantly on complex urban sites within London and on large rural infrastructure schemes throughout the UK. Stephen is passionate about interacting with local communities regarding the importance and wide-reaching benefit of archaeology.

Sarah Ricketts

Sarah joined Iceni Projects as an archaeologist in October 2020 in the midst of the Covid-19 pandemic. With over ten years’ experience working across both the commercial and academic sectors in the United Kingdom, Egypt, Australia and New Zealand, she is enthusiastic about communicating the value of archaeology to contemporary audiences, delivering positive outcomes for developer-led projects, and meeting and working with the diverse groups of people that are brought together for the purposes of archaeology.

She has a proven track record of delivering complex fieldwork projects, delivering cultural heritage management solutions, providing advice on heritage policy and legislation, and diverse stakeholder consultation. Her work has had a strong focus on large infrastructure projects and Indigenous heritage management, across both urban and rural settings.
In early March 2020, I was employed by Wessex Archaeology as their Heritage Inclusion Development Specialist, an innovative new role created to explore the mental wellbeing benefits that engagement with archaeology and heritage can bring to individuals. Six days after I started the country went into lockdown. By the end of that month, I had begun to plan what I now know was the pilot that formed the foundations for a seven-month project, Lost and Found.

F

unded by Historic England’s Covid-19 Emergency Response Fund, Lost and Found is a digital heritage wellbeing project. A museum created by the public for the public, Lost and Found gives participants a unique insight into the work at Wessex Archaeology and presents them with an opportunity to meet some of the experts who work there. A number of groups each met for a designated number of sessions and participants were invited to curate an interactive digital museum using some of the objects and artefacts from the vast archive collection at Wessex Archaeology.

In addition to and complementing the live sessions, participants were also given the option to take part in creative activities that reflected the theme of each session. Their responses in photography, drawing and the written word were also added to the museum, so the result is an immersive project that facilitates not only learning and discovery but allows for personal response and reflection.

I am not an archaeologist, so my relationship with archaeology is new and fascinating. I remember the day I first saw the archive facilities at Wessex Archaeology Head Office – boxes and boxes of unearthed objects, each object associated with a story, each story linked to a person, each person a conduit for a connection. This is a dream room; every object is the beginning of a new story.

The experts are also the greatest resource because they are the ones who can bring the stories of the objects to life. This tracks all the way back from the archaeologist who found the object in the first place, to the creative team who enable it to be shared through photography or detailed drawing or 3D scanning. The journey of the object after it has been found and the care that goes into recording and looking after it are as inspiring as the history of the object itself.

These two simple ingredients, objects and experts, were present at every Lost and Found session and they were the two things that the participants commented on week after week.

‘I felt a connection with those objects emotionally. I loved their stories of what they were and how they were found...’

Over the duration of Lost and Found we worked with such broad groups of people that every time we ran a session, we learnt something new. Although the bare bones of the project were the same, how these bones were fleshed out very much depended on the groups we worked with. This archaeology project was as much about the community participants as it was about the archaeology itself. We were diversifying our engagement.

The success of the project was the triangulation between the participants, the resources and the technology. The project was delivered digitally because we had no other option; the pandemic forced these things together at an opportunite moment, and the lack of choice meant that we had to be innovative.

We have achieved a great deal. We have reached new audiences and we have embedded this work within our company. The sharp edge of crisis has given a clear focus for activity; these innovations have been fast and have been funded. Quick progress has been made in a time of need. A simple idea has reached new and more diverse communities. The possibilities of digital technology have shone a spotlight on the objects in our archive, and the incredible voices of our staff.

I was new to this post before the pandemic, but the last year has shown with such clarity the direction the work should take. If diversification within the heritage sector is to be embraced, then roles such as mine need to be nurtured. The very nature of who engages has so much potential to reach far beyond those who are already interested, to those who will benefit from engagement, resulting in a step change for the sector.
Montage showing Wil Foster, Graphics Office, Erica Macey Bracken, Finds Supervisor, Phil Harling (pictured with Erica) and Leigh. Alongside these are images of scans and objects from a series of the courses. Credit: Wessex Archaeology

This drawing is by one of the group participants, Lesley Seif, who was part of our NHS group, and this was a response to a home task of drawing an object from several different angles. Credit: Wessex Archaeology

Leigh Chalmers

Leigh works for Wessex Archaeology as their Heritage Inclusion Development Specialist. Here she develops and leads the heritage wellbeing programme of work. Prior to working at Wessex Archaeology, Leigh had a broad and varied career working in community, heritage, early years, mental health and tourism. She has extensive knowledge and first-hand experience of creating and delivering creative arts and heritage engagement projects for underrepresented groups. She was the Outreach Officer at Salisbury Cathedral and created and delivered their mental health community support offer. She has run several projects at Erlestoke Prison including Unearthed, a project about archaeology and identity. She also has worked in heritage tourism and in early years education.

Leigh is also the founder of TEDx Salisbury and continues to lead its work in ideas worth spreading.

Links

Animated and downloadable toolkit for heritage wellbeing projects: https://www.wessexarch.co.uk/our-work/thousand-lost-and-found-stories-how-run-your-own-wellbeing-project
The Museum of the Lost and Found: https://www.wessexarch.co.uk/museum-lost-and-found
What do we mean by ‘public’?

Sadie Watson, MCIfA (5532)

The definition of public benefit can be as wide-ranging and multi-faceted as those of us who seek to promote it, but key to understanding the concept is the need to define what we mean by ‘the public’. Similarly, the persistent belief that archaeology happens so that archives can be created for ‘future generations’ leaves us grappling with vague notions of a homogenous mass of humanity, with little idea of who they might be or how they could potentially benefit from our archaeological work. Currently, we know that the people who engage with archaeology or heritage tend to be in the more comfortably off economic groups, and while their own participation can of course offer them benefits, it is likely that this in fact serves to increase the gap between them and those who do not currently benefit from archaeology. We tend to know much more about people who do participate than those who don’t, and it is of course easier to provide materials and experiences for people we think we know, or have motivations we can recognise.

We are beginning to understand the inequalities inherent in archaeology and there are practitioners who are committed to enabling more equitable experiences. This has been explored further within the field of science museum communication and Emily Dawson’s book (2019) is well worth reading for pragmatic and innovative proposals for upsetting these structural problems. Key is the careful use of our expert status, with the understanding that everyone is expert in something. All these things will contribute towards an enjoyable and positive experience, whether they be knowledge-based, personal experience, interpersonal skills or cultural backgrounds, to choose a few examples from the myriad possibilities. The challenge for archaeologists working in the development-led sector is how we can establish what we could be defining as public benefit on a local and site-specific level so that we can steer our projects to positive conclusions for communities and individuals. It is hardly surprising that we struggle with identifying who we need to be providing benefit for, as we don’t generally assess local populations and impacted communities when talking about (or reporting on) development-led archaeological work.

One practical thing we can do as archaeologists is to investigate who our potential public might be. Audience mapping is not a new tool and is well used in the museum sector to assess current visitors and to establish where potential new audiences might be. However, these mapping exercises are often done by static establishments (museums), whereas development-led archaeology can be far more mobile.
with teams moving to where the projects are located for the duration of the fieldwork and then moving away. It is not often likely that we will have any great understanding of who the local community is, and it is also often the case that we won’t come into much meaningful contact with them beyond using local businesses such as shops, hotels and (most likely) pubs.

There are several tools that could be used to define who lives close to an archaeological project, and some of this data could be collected at desk-based assessment stage to provide a more rounded impression of the area. Of particular value when looking at local demographics is DataShine (datashine.org.uk), which maps all the Census data onto spatial maps for England, Scotland and Wales. (Northern Ireland is not included in this dataset but can be researched using Nomis (https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/reports/mpg/contents.aspx)). It is possible to interrogate these maps for all categories of data collected, and thereby establish details such as which languages are commonly spoken in proximity to your site. For example, the image at the bottom of page 10 shows the prevalence of East Asian languages (defined as Cantonese, Mandarin, Korean, Japanese, Thai) spoken in the proximity of Curzon Street, Birmingham, where extensive excavations took place for HS2. All the detailed data could be used to refine the public benefit provision of your project, from providing materials in different languages to outlining the specific need to provide wellbeing outcomes for specific cultural groups as part of the project’s public benefit.

These tools for looking closely at communities that will be impacted by development are crucial to understand the wider context of our work. As archaeologists we are often complicit in the disruption and damage that construction can wreak on people but fall back on the accepted narrative of providing knowledge for them, rather than with them. For public benefit to be truly equitable we need to establish the parameters and design projects with outwardly facing benefits in mind.
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Sadie Watson

Sadie Watson (MCIfA) is undertaking a four-year Fellowship focusing on ensuring that development-led archaeological projects lead to meaningful and relevant research and genuine community participation. Sadie spent more than 20 years in the field supervising complex urban sites for MOLA in London and has in-depth knowledge of the profession and its pressures.
PUBLIC BENEFIT IN DEVELOPER-LED ARCHAEOLOGY: BEYOND THE HOARDING

Kate Faccio, PCiF (6502), Museum of London Archaeology

Development-led archaeology takes place as a result of both privately and publicly funded projects, and as such, operates within relevant government legislation. For publicly funded work, this includes the Public Services (Social Values) Act 2012 (https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2012/3/enacted), which mandates that social value is generated through the production of economic, environmental, and/or social wellbeing. Facets of social value are integral to the Considerate Constructor's Scheme and are highlighted in various Best Practice case studies (https://ccsbestpractice.org.uk/). Further, many developers now operate with social value frameworks in place and with dedicated teams to deliver these benefits.

But what is archaeologically based public benefit? And, who determines what this is?

In the UK, developer-led archaeology often considers knowledge creation as one of the bedrocks of its public benefit (or social value) output (Chartered Institute for Archaeologists 2020). Although knowledge production is important, the public impact of this is debatable: how much do publics actually benefit from a site report or a monograph? And how often does a local community, impacted by development, benefit from this type of output? We would argue that the answer is rarely, at best. Grey literature, monographs, and published articles are inaccessible for a number of reasons (e.g., cost, accessibility, technical language, etc), and often communities are unaware that archaeologists have been working nearby.

As part of a UKRI-funded research project (grant no. MR/S034838/1), we are working towards a better understanding of what public benefit might look like for the communities we work among, as well as how to integrate and deliver this more effectively. We have produced a survey, which is currently being published in multiple languages, that will form the basis of our understanding of what members of the public think of our field, as well as what they want to gain from our work. It incorporates personal and community wellbeing indicators (Brown et al 2017) deemed relevant by a range of organisations operating on various scales, from local to national levels. It also integrates questions about how members of the public wish to engage with our work, ranging from intentional non-participation to elements associated with co-production. Of course, we acknowledge that there are limitations to engagement that accompany site work specifically, which can also be influenced by the size and scale of a project, but, we also believe there is a range of opportunities, from pre- to post-excavation analysis, where locally affected communities can engage, contribute, and derive produce benefits from the work. Arnstein (1969) first modelled levels of community participation in her article 'A Ladder of Citizen Participation', more recently, González (2019) produced a toolkit modelling levels of community engagement. We intend to use the latter as a way to conceptualise the engagement levels that members of the public express desire in our work, to compare this with the opportunities that developer-led archaeology currently provides, and to assess what our potential might be.

In addition to surveying members of the public, we will also be asking heritage professionals and the development sector what they think is practical and what possible benefits our industry can generate. Particularly in relation to developers, if we can contribute to their social value targets, this has the potential to open up various engagement and funding opportunities for our sector, thereby facilitating our ability to maximise our public impact.
What is archaeologically based public benefit? And, who determines what this is?

Ultimately, developer-led archaeology sits at an inflection point in communities. We are part of an agent of change that impacts some communities for the better, while it teers at the social fabric of others. We would argue that, as we profit from this system, we should be morally and ethically obliged to provide opportunities for affected communities to benefit from our work, or at least use our work to help mitigate the negative impacts of development. In this vein, we should offer our platform as a means to generate outcomes that are useful and meaningful to affected communities, as expressed by the communities themselves.
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Kate is a field archaeologist and a Research Associate for the UKRI-funded research project Measuring, Maximising and Transforming Public Benefit from UK Government Investment in Archaeology, hosted by MOLA. She trained as an osteoarchaeologist, primarily focusing on northern complex Mesolithic foragers, and currently excavates anything that comes her way in the UK. She is interested in the potential impact our work can make beyond the construction site hoarding.
I have a wonderful cartoon by Sidney Harris that will bring a wry smile to anyone who’s read (or written!) a breezy account of how the public has benefited from a development-led project. It features two boffins, standing in front of a blackboard, pointing to two halves of a complex equation, with the words ‘... then a miracle occurs...’ linking the formula together.

‘Hmn’, says the first boffin, ‘I think you should be more explicit here in step two.’

It’s fair to say that our profession struggles with its own ‘step two’ problem: demonstrating the causal link between development-led archaeology and the ensuing public benefit it is assumed to perform. Without a logical frame of reference, it is unsurprising that there is no agreed methodology for collecting evidence to establish the positive difference we make to the world, no exactitude around how the word ‘impact’ is bandied about, and no way to compare the results of different archaeological organisations. What is surprising, however, is that our science-based discipline persists in making often highly aspirational claims of public benefit with a lack of rigour that would not be tolerated if it were applied to interpretations of the past.

The physicist Richard Feynman called this type of thinking ‘cargo cult science’, based on the anthropologically observed practice of isolated island communities in the South Pacific during the Second World War. Convinced that the soldiers, supplies and seemingly unending cargo brought by plane to neighbouring islands could be attracted through ritual observance, islanders flattened vegetation to look like landing strips, built mock control towers, bamboo planes, and even mimicked Air Traffic Control by whispering into bamboo radios, imploring the planes to land. ‘But it doesn’t work,’ said Feynman, drawing similar conclusions to Harris’s ‘step two’ satirisation of scientists’ taken-for-granted assumptions. No
airplanes land. So I call these things cargo cult science, because they follow all the apparent precepts and forms of scientific investigation, but they’re missing something essential, because the planes don’t land.’

As we emerge into a post-pandemic future, the incentive — social, political and economic — will be to further redefine archaeology’s ‘essential something’ in terms of public benefit, and to build this in a way that actually flies. In TA 108 I welcomed this loss of innocence, arguing that magical thinking could be replaced with a ‘new New Archaeology’ of public value, where claims could be hypothesised as a Theory of Change and impact accurately evaluated against Standards of Evidence. In TA 110 I proposed a platform approach to archaeology, challenging the assumptions of a knowledge production process that slices public benefit to the end of the pipeline, arguing that a crowd-based participatory model addresses the market failure inherent in client-funded investigations.

In this final instalment I want to point to the Gatehouse Project, Pontefract Castle, one of several recent examples where we have extended the DigVentures crowd-based model into a competitively tendered development-led context. The results were surprising — the published article and film can be found at the doi link below — detailed with a transparent and open-access evaluation of the project’s social impact.

The salient point with this project is that our involvement would have been highly unlikely if Wakefield Metropolitan District Council and Historic England had not structured procurement towards the best research and impact design, rather than selecting from several versions of the lowest possible price. This created the space for creativity, experimentation and collaboration, firmly in line with the requirements of the Social Value Model for public sector bodies to consider the social, economic and environmental benefits of contracts they award. As Marianna Mazzucato has argued in her recent book Mission Economy, this repositions government from a passive fixer of market failure to an active shaper and co-creator of public value. In Pontefract this partnership approach enabled us to propose a creative approach to investigation, with an intelligently designed mix of professional excavation and public participation, the results of which were a step-change improvement on the traditional standard fare of an occasional open day or interpretation board.

Doing good in any way is clearly a positive contribution to society, but procurement models need to go beyond generalities to a more sophisticated understanding of what public value is being created and how this is being measured. To a person with a hammer every problem is a nail; if the blunt instrument of archaeology procurement continues as a one-size-fits-all solution, our field will be full of bamboo planes delivering public benefit on a wing and a prayer.

... there is no agreed methodology for collecting evidence to establish the positive difference we make to the world...
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MAKING A SPLASH:
public engagement on the #Rooswijk1740 project

Alison James MCIa (6059), Angela Middleton, Martijn Manders and Willemien van de Langemheen

Since 2017 the #Rooswijk1740 project has been leading the way in delivering public benefit by creating opportunities throughout for visits, training and engagement.

The project aimed to provide as many opportunities as possible for the public to see the material recovered and to meet the team. Seven open days have now been held specifically for the project. This open day took place in Ramsgate in the onshore finds facility. The project even provided a British Sign Language guide for deaf visitors and had activities to engage all audiences from old to young. Many visitors stayed in touch after their visits through social media to stay up to date with the project. Credit: #Rooswijk1740 Project

After its designation in 2007, the Dutch East Indiaman Rooswijk was identified as at high risk of immediate loss on the Historic England Heritage at Risk Register. As a result, the Cultural Heritage Agency of the Netherlands (RCE) worked with Historic England (HE) to set up the #Rooswijk1740 project. MSDS Marine were identified as the UK project managers. A key aim of the project was engaging with and helping professional, volunteer and local communities to understand and care for the remains of the Rooswijk. Engagement was seen as a crucial way to increase the site’s profile and to reduce the risk to the remains from opportunistic recoveries.

The #Rooswijk1740 project undertook two seasons of excavation in 2017 and 2018 before moving into the post-exavagation assessment and analysis phase. Throughout, the project has acted as a hub for training and capacity building in the sector whilst additionally providing numerous opportunities for public involvement to raise awareness of the site. Providing opportunities for public engagement is written into the job descriptions of all international project staff, including numerous volunteers from mainly the Netherlands and the UK.

In order to provide as much access to the project as possible, and to reduce travel, the project held open days throughout the UK. This open day in landlocked Derby proved popular with families and was an excellent way to bring underwater cultural heritage to a new audience who wouldn’t traditionally engage with it. Credit: #Rooswijk1740 Project
Over 1600 people have attended the open days in the field and the laboratories, nearly 20,000 people have accessed material in virtual reality through either the virtual tour, the online exhibition of the Dutch Huygens Institute or the Sketchfab models, and over 34,500 people have visited the Gezonken Schatten exhibition at the Museum Prinseshof, where part of the exhibition was dedicated to the Rooswijk.

Public engagement was also achieved with an active media strategy. Apart from the news stories during the excavations, long-running productions were made together with mainstream media. Through series episodes and documentaries, including an episode of Drain the Oceans by National Geographic, Digging for Britain on the BBC, an hour-long documentary by Dutch public broadcaster WNL and an episode of Klokkuil, a very popular children’s programme in the Netherlands, millions of people were reached.

During the excavation the Ramsgate project base became a focus for events. The project undertook local awareness initiatives such as project information boards on the quay wall and presenting at local events such as the Ramsgate Festival. Providing a British Sign Language interpreter and hosting 50 home-schooled children and their parents allowed engagement with hard-to-reach audiences.

During the excavation the project ran two diving campaigns for avocational SCUBA divers, a non-traditional audience. One campaign allowed divers to dive on the site and see what the archaeologists were doing. On a terrestrial excavation it is commonplace to open the site to visitors but this is not normal practice on a site 25m under the sea. The project is the first of which we are aware to have held a site open day on the seabed. The second campaign enabled archaeological and volunteer divers to investigate an outlying anomaly to contribute to the main project.

#Rooswijk1740 has been a maritime archaeological project on a scale seldom seen in recent years in the UK or even north-western Europe, and has brought a great deal of attention to Ramsgate, from where the excavation was undertaken. Ramsgate is a Heritage Action Zone. This initiative aims to achieve economic growth by using the historic environment as a catalyst. #Rooswijk1740 has resulted in two types of impact that relate to Ramsgate Heritage Action Zone. The first is the directly measurable financial contribution to the Ramsgate economy. Calculations show that over £100,000 was directly spent in Ramsgate by the project, those visiting the project and team members in their own time whilst based there in 2017 and 2018. The second element is the impact that the high-profile project, and its associated media coverage, has had on the area by raising its profile. This is harder to measure in financial terms, but may have a long-lasting effect.

Connections across Europe have commonly been forged via water. Waterways were often the preferred and sometimes even the only way of transport.
Shipwrecks are the physical remnants of these tales. Their finds reflect the connection and thus the cohesion rather than the distances between cultures, and enabling those connections has been a huge part of the project’s public benefit. Shipwrecks reflect differences and similarities but also show the influences of these cultures on each other. Put simply, ships connect Europe. As a Dutch vessel lost in UK territorial waters, the Rooswijk is very much representative of the shared cultural heritage of Europe. Indeed, in an 18th-century vessel of the Dutch East Indie Company such as the Rooswijk it is likely that 50 per cent of the people on board were from elsewhere in Europe. Research by the #Rooswijk1740 project has already shown that of the 22 crew members identified to date, individuals came not only from the Netherlands but also from Norway, Germany and Sweden.

The success in raising awareness and connecting people to the Rooswijk will have a direct impact on future attitudes to the wreck and that of underwater cultural heritage in general. Increasing people’s knowledge of what lies beneath the waves will have a positive effect on people taking ownership and their care for heritage assets. Children who joined the public events may be the sports divers, heritage managers and policy makers of the future. Highlighting underwater cultural heritage in a positive way ensures it is placed high in the consciousness of future generations. When this – often still invisible – heritage becomes part of the conscious living environment of people, there will be a huge step forward in management and protection of that resource.

**Funding and organisation of the #Rooswijk1740 project**

The #Rooswijk1740 project is both funded and led by the Cultural Heritage Agency of the Netherlands (Ministry of Education, Science and Culture), working in collaboration with project partner Historic England and UK contractor MSDS Marine. The conservation work is largely undertaken by a multidisciplinary team of specialists in the research facilities of Historic England at Fort Cumberland.

---

**The authors**

Alison James is the MSDS Marine project manager for the post-excavation stage of the #Rooswijk1740 project. Angela Middleton is coordinating the conservation of the finds in Fort Cumberland on behalf of Historic England (HE). Marijn Manders is Project Director for the #Rooswijk1740 Project and Head of the International Programme for Maritime Heritage of the Cultural Heritage Agency of the Netherlands (RCE). Willemien van de Langenheer is senior communication officer of the RCE and also for this project.
THE FUTURE OF FUNDING FOR THE PAST

HERITAGE MANAGEMENT IN COLCHESTER

Philip J Wise MCIfA (5103)

Last year, my employer Colchester Borough Council asked me to advise on the acquisition of a section of Colchester’s historic town wall, usually referred to as the Roman Wall. This unusual circumstance of purchasing a Scheduled Ancient Monument set me thinking about how monument management has changed over the last 20 years. While inevitably the Covid-19 pandemic has had an impact, I believe this is only part of the story and that there are long-term processes at work that will have significant implications for the management of archaeological monuments in historic English towns like Colchester.

I arrived in Colchester in 1998 and amongst my principal responsibilities was the management of the town’s rich and varied portfolio of historic sites and monuments. I inherited a well-funded management regime from my predecessor Mark Davies, who had initiated the establishment by Colchester Borough Council of a special fund, the Heritage Reserve. The objective of this fund was to enable the Council to ‘Provide funding for an ongoing programme of care, maintenance, display, and interpretation of historic sites and buildings, ancient monuments and museum collections for which the Council is responsible’. The strength of the Heritage Reserve lay in the fact that it was an imaginative way of breaking free from the strait jacket of normal council expenditure. As a rolling fund, it was possible to build up financial
resources over several years to tackle major projects, including the maintenance and repair of the Roman Wall.

Unfortunately, this couldn’t last, and it became harder for the Council to pay into the Heritage Reserve each year. The last straw was the global financial crisis of 2007–08, after which the Council was usually only able to be reactive and fund emergency works on the Roman Wall, or major capital projects such as the redevelopment of Colchester Castle in 2012–14. These examples benefited from external funding from English Heritage/Historic England, the Heritage Lottery Fund (now the National Lottery Heritage Fund) and an EU European Regional Development Fund INTERREG IVA project, Norman Connections.

The funding landscape was already changing in 2010, and the Friends of Colchester Roman Wall was founded by the town’s mayor to promote and fundraise for the interpretation of this monument. The Friends raised £25,000 from their membership and from corporate and other sponsors including the Colchester Sixth Form College, a firm of local solicitors and the family of the town’s former MP, and were able to fund the installation of 14 panels around Colchester’s historic town wall.

The Colchester Civic Society also became increasingly involved in heritage conservation and interpretation. In 2014 it began its Concrete Legacy project, which celebrated the work of the Colchester artists Henry Collins and Joyce Pailot who pioneered the use of cast concrete panels in public art in the UK and produced murals for the four subways under Colchester’s Southway, constructed in 1972–73. These commemorate important figures in Colchester’s history, including the Roman emperor Claudius, the Norman baron Eudo and the pioneering Elizabethan scientist William Gilford. This project also received a grant from the Heritage Lottery Fund, ensuring these remarkable features of Colchester’s public realm were fully conserved.

More recently the Civic Society has been working with Colchester Borough Council on a project to interpret the historic churchyard of St Botolph’s Church, which contains the graves of three remarkable 19th-century Colchestrians: Capt Jesse Jones, a veteran of the Battle of Waterloo, Dr Roger Nunn, the town’s first hospital doctor, and William Hawkins, an MP and railway pioneer. As a well as a new interpretation panel, there are plans to conserve Capt Jones’s grave and install a new bronze memorial plaque.

This brings us to Colchester Borough Council’s purchase of a stretch of Colchester’s Roman Wall in 2020 from the multinational company JCDecaux. After the company lost the right to use the land for advertising hoardings, it decided to put it up for sale for £5000 plus costs. As a Scheduled Ancient Monument, the future of this stretch of the Roman Wall was never under threat. However, it was felt strongly by many in the local community that it should be in public ownership and £4000 was made available by the Colchester Civic Society, the Friends of Colchester Museums and the Colchester Tourist Guides Association.

There is no doubt that local authorities will face real resource implications, both in terms of funding and specialist expertise, in the future management of the historic environment in historic towns such as Colchester. Councils can no longer go it alone as they once did and the experience in Colchester has shown that great success can be achieved through partnership working with heritage organisations in the local community. Encouragingly there remains a clear interest among the community and the town’s politicians in their heritage. The way forward is for the council to be an enabler,
encouraging people to become involved and do things themselves with specialist heritage management expertise provided by the council as required. This also has the advantage that future projects will be at least partly determined by the local community and will reflect its interests rather than being imposed by the council.

Philip Wise

Philip read archaeology and anthropology at Downing College, Cambridge and subsequently studied curatorship at the Department of Museum Studies, University of Leicester and heritage management at the Institute of Archaeology, UCL. He has worked in a variety of local authority museums since 1983 and is currently the Heritage Manager with Colchester and Ipswich Museums. Amongst his responsibilities is the management of Colchester’s archaeological sites and monuments.

He was Chair of the Society of Museum Archaeologists 2006–09 and the UK Archaeological Archives Forum 2007–11. He is an Associate of the Museums Association and a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries.

One of the murals from the Concrete Legacy project. Credit: Colchester Civic Society

Colchester’s Roman Church, one of many sites managed by the local authority. Credit: CWS
Communicating archaeology: beyond the echo chamber

Gail Boyle FMA FSA

Museum archaeologists engage a wide variety of different types of people with archaeological collections in order to maximise their public benefit and are doing so in increasingly creative and innovative ways.

The ability to diversify what is being offered is in part supported by the nature of archaeology itself, but what is being offered is also being driven by the need to deliver against wider museum agendas relative to, for example, health and wellbeing, public participation, creativity, inclusion and diversity. Aside from the requirements of museum funding programmes, campaigns such as the Museums Association’s ‘Museums Change Lives’, call for museums “to develop their role as socially purposeful organisations” and underline the relationship between the delivery of public benefit and continuing public investment. The SMA’s position was made clear in 2020 in its new Standards and Guidance in the Care of Archaeological Collections:

It is incumbent on those responsible for archaeological collections to not only advocate for the public benefit of their continued care, but also to demonstrate their relevance by ensuring collections are accessible and relevant to a wide variety of people. It is equally important to recognise and accept that for some, the outcomes of their use will be archaeological or academic, but for others they may be creative or social (Boyle and Rawden 2020).
Understanding audiences can be achieved using a variety of evaluation tools, but whilst some data is relatively easy to gather and some public benefits become immediately obvious, there are others that are unpredictable, intangible and unmeasurable, or which do not manifest themselves for many years. Museum archaeologists might be able to count how many researchers they respond to or host, how many objects are handled or exhibited, how many archives they collect and how many records they make available online, but it’s much harder to measure whose mood has been lifted, whose confidence has been improved, who felt they had relevance or belonged, who was inspired to be creative or who found a career or a new purpose in life. The challenge we face is to provide as many opportunities as we can, to enable people to engage with our subject at a level they choose to or are able to, and to embrace all the positive beneficial outcomes, whether they be strictly archaeological or otherwise. In this respect, all archaeological practitioners should be taking proactive steps to evaluate the audiences they are currently engaging with and to identify what they might do to democratise archaeological activity, whether that be in the field, through publication or intellectually.

It was with this in mind that SMA recently published a series of engagement case studies. Communicating Archaeology is a downloadable free resource that demonstrates the variety of engagement activities that archaeological collections are currently being used to deliver, as well as the benefits they bring.
Significantly, all contributors were asked to report on the impact of their projects, and it is also worth noting that some of those profiled were delivered in partnership with community groups and also in non-museum settings. This is because SMA believes it is important for museum archaeologists and others to share best practice across the wider archaeological sector and to learn from each other. It is equally important, however, to understand that in order to meet the widest public need and achieve the greatest possible benefit, we must seek to be effective communicators and collaborators not only with each other, but also with audiences, and especially those beyond our own inherent archaeological echo chambers. SMA’s new publication both celebrates and exemplifies the creative and innovative ways this can happen, with a wide variety of positive outcomes for all those directly involved and also, meaningfully, for audiences of thousands of people beyond.

Lost landscapes – bringing Ice Age Worcestershire to life. A project to enhance the countywide HER subsequently enabled the successful presentation of a ‘challenging period, often difficult to understand and complicated by scientific terminology, in an engaging way to a general and family audience.’ School group at the exhibition © Museums Worcestershire

1 https://www.museumsassociation.org/campaigns/museums-change-lives/#
2 Boyle, G and Rawden A (eds), 2020 Standards and Guidance in the Care of Archaeological Collections. Society for Museum Archaeology
3 https://collections.rust.org.uk/resource/communicating-archaeology/
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New Everyday ethics e-learning module

E-learning is electronic learning – taking short online courses to improve your skills in your own time and at a pace that suits you. Like many of our fellow professional institutes, to support members’ CPD, CIIfA has its own e-learning portal, accessible through the members-only part of the website using your member login details. This portal provides links to available short modules covering a range of historic environment practice, from aspects of planning change to core professional competencies. More modules will be added here as we develop them, and our most recent addition covers everyday ethics.

As archaeologists, we all make daily ethical decisions, and these decisions will have consequences for you, the people you’re working with, other archaeologists, clients, the public and potentially your and their families. They may affect how people trust you, your organisation, and archaeology.

The Everyday ethics module gives you an introduction to professional ethics and explains how the CIIfA Code of conduct, standards and guidance help us to avoid acting unethically. It gives some tips on how to develop your ethical knowledge and sets out a series of everyday ethical scenarios you might encounter, asking you to consider how you might react. You can go through the case studies on your own, but we suggest it might also be beneficial to discuss them with your colleagues as listening to and discussing a range of perspectives may help you reach a conclusion.

Here’s an example of one of the case studies in the module:

Site visitor: Found any gold?

Unusually, yesterday you did. How do you respond? What might the consequences be for the site, the client, your integrity and self-esteem? How do you weigh them up?

Alongside this module, the Code of conduct and Standard and guidance, CIIfA has other ethical resources available to members, including the archaeological ethics database, An introduction to professional ethics practice paper, ethical case studies, and The Archaeologist 106. All these can be accessed on our website at www.archaeologists.net/membership/ethics. From this summer onwards we will be running another series of ethics CPD workshops, which can be booked via our events page. We would also be happy to run bespoke sessions for Registered Organisations; if you would be interested in discussing these please contact elex llewellyn@archaeologists.net.

The other e-learning resources available to members are:

- Professionalism in historic environment practice, an introduction
- Making sense of the planning system: an introduction for CIIfA members
- Planning your career: understanding Personal Development Plans and Continuing Professional Development

www.archaeologists.net
Born digital: recording rebooted

Lucy Parker MSc MCIfA (4972), Archaeologist, Historic England and Thomas Cromwell MA, Grad Dip (Cons) AA, Archaeologist, Historic England

Direct-to-field recording is becoming increasingly common in the commercial sector, with the real potential to create a more accessible and comprehensive archive, as well as significant cost and time efficiencies. The archaeological sector has independently developed various systems and approaches; these are often incompatible in both application and resulting data. One area where there is agreement is that accurate metadata are essential to data longevity. Deposition rates for digital data remain low, with current estimates for 2013–2018 at around 3 per cent. As archaeologists, we have the responsibility to produce accurate, usable data, and to curate data appropriately to preserve archaeological remains through record – creating greater public benefit from excavations, and offering the potential for the re-use of generated data for wider interpretation.

A digital archive is commonly considered a ‘voluntary’ deliverable, although is stated as a requirement within some counties, resulting in a lack of cohesion within the archaeological record. Developer-led archaeology is undertaken on a competitive basis, so there is a perceived risk that any work over and above contractual requirements will lead to uncompetitive tenders. Adopting digital recording itself involves risk; there are considerable cost and resource considerations to procure or build a digital recording system. Updating and administering a system is an additional cost, which currently is difficult to estimate.

Digital recording brings undeniable benefits. Where software such as SharePoint is also used, data integrates seamlessly with the MS Office suite. Querying both inter- and intra-site data is possible, as well as supporting post-ex activities. The immediate nature of such data uploads has project management advantages too, allowing the generation of accurate daily reports. The issue of ‘big data’ has for some time been part of wider discussions between Historic England, CIfA and DigVentures – as seen for example in the funding of the Work Digital/Think Archive guide as part of Historic England’s Creating a sectoral standard and guidance for managing digital data project. Whilst new skills are required as we move into the digital age, there is also concern that some archaeological skills considered traditional, such as producing site drawings, may be lost and with them some of the normal means through which interpretation is established.

Historic England commissioned CIfA with ALGMAO to undertake the Building capacity through innovation project with the aim of exploring the perceived lack of innovation in developer-led archaeology, identifying potential barriers and/or issues inhibiting the wider implementation of innovative approaches and to present recommendations for improvement. As part of this project, CIfA held an Innovation Festival in January this year. Historic England’s Archaeological Projects team organised the session Born digital: recording rebooted to understand the position of digital recording within the archaeological sector and share our own experiences. The outcome was beneficial, providing education, comprehension and discussion. The session was followed up with a CIfA Tea Break in February to continue the conversation.

Our session engagement was broad, with representatives from commercial archaeology, academia and national and local government. Papers were presented by Historic England, Archaeology Data Service, MOLA, AOC and Wessex Archaeology, demonstrating a wide-ranging practice within the UK. Additionally, a case study from Norway was presented where photogrammetry was integrated into the digital site record to provide a European comparison of deployment.
Historic England’s Archaeological Projects team’s central concept is to start with the archive and work backwards to define a methodology. The team began recording digitally three decades ago through early adoption and adaption. We use Intrasis, a tool designed by National Historical Museums, Sweden, with whom we have worked closely with to modify the system to suit our needs. As the public body for the historic environment, the methodology we have designed aims for best practice. Our paper highlighted both what we do and what we do not do, and whether this is by design or due to system functionality – both of which are contributing factors affecting development.

Overall, many of the insights throughout the sessions were recurrent. Given the stark contrast between current systems and capabilities, unification was considered vital by those in attendance, and would likely include the development of standards and/or guidance. The latter would allow organisations wanting to start down the route of digital recording to learn from our collective experience to date. The concern for the future of digital recording within archaeology is accessibility and interoperability. Not all factors were considered equal, and the ‘worthiness’ of data was cause for debate.

Historic England’s Archaeological Projects team continue to facilitate these discussions. Our aim is to promote an open dialogue and a collaborative approach to support the sector in navigating these new challenges. We thank the presenters who made the session possible, CIA for hosting the festival, and everyone who attended. The session is available to view on CIA’s event recordings webpage – www.archaeologists.net/events/event-recordings

Lucy Parker

Lucy is an archaeologist with extensive project management and survey experience. She has been active in the archaeological and geophysics sectors for 15 years. Her research interests include standard and guidance, digital archaeology and non-intrusive techniques. Lucy is Chair of the CIfA Advisory Council and the Geophysics Special Interest Group.
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A geoarchaeological approach to evaluating large land parcels

Clive Waddington MCIA (6214), Managing Director of Archaeological Research Services Ltd

Finding rapid, cost-effective ways to evaluate large land parcels for archaeological and palaeoenvironmental remains has always been a key challenge for archaeologists. The need for this has come into sharper focus with the advent of commercial archaeology undertaken in advance of development. Various methodologies have been utilised over the years with some such as aerial photograph transcription, and now remote sensing more generally, together with geophysical survey, making huge contributions to the number and location of new sites. For those areas where there is little pre-existing remote sensing data, or which have geologies, soils or ground conditions unfavourable to crop or soil mark formation, and/or which have restricted scope for geophysical survey, other approaches to drive evaluation of these areas need to be found. Following an in-depth study in the Till–Tweed basin (Passmore and Waddington 2009, 2012) a geoarchaeological methodology has been devised, termed the ‘Landform Element’ approach, whereby the evaluation of a given land parcel is initially mapped, cored and surveyed in order to partition the landscape parcel into a series of discrete landforms. For each of these landforms the archaeological potential and the types of methods most appropriate to their evaluation are identified and this is then used to drive the subsequent evaluation of the area. The case study from Killerbys Quarry, North Yorkshire was approached in this way. Here, as part of the desk-based assessment for this new quarry, a detailed geoarchaeological landform element map for the land parcel was created. This was followed by a phased programme of evaluation that included targeted sediment coring, range finder dating and assessment of palaeoenvironmental proxies on a range of deglaciation features that included encosed basins and kettle holes as well as palaeochannels on the Holocene floodplain. An extensive fieldwalking survey was undertaken at close-spaced intervals to maximise finds recovery, with a particular emphasis on chipped stone artefact recovery. Following on from these studies targeted geophysical survey and evaluation trenching were undertaken. Once this site received planning permission archaeological mitigation took place based around a scaleable watching brief–strip, map and sample condition, together with the targeted sample excavation of specific kettle hole and enclosed wetland basin features.

This approach was selected for use on this project as it provided an appropriate method for rapidly and accurately assessing a large land parcel in advance of large-scale development that required a high level of information to inform the planning decision and to give confidence to the developer of the scale and cost of the post-permission mitigation that might be required. This approach allowed what was considered to be significant about this landscape and the type of archaeological and geoarchaeological records it contained to be targeted from the outset while avoiding the need for digging several hundred evaluation trenches across this landscape. This meant that there was virtually no impact on surviving sub-surface archaeology during the evaluation phase; large scars in the field surface were avoided; speed of work and results was high and the cost of the works was considered good value for money. This meant that the approach by which the greater bulk of the financial resource could be spent on creating new and significant...
information gain during mitigation was achieved rather than expending large amounts on pre-determination evaluation, which would have reduced how much significant information could have been gained during mitigation.

The technique proved highly successful as, during mitigation, a kettle hole and enclosed wetland basins were targeted for their archaeological remains as well as their palaeoenvironmental sequence for one of the first times in British commercial archaeology. The results have been stunning and have added genuinely new knowledge and data to our understanding of the Late Glacial and Early Holocene. This has included the discovery of two Early Mesolithic pond-side camps, with the structural timbers and hearth of the tepee-like dwellings surviving in remarkable condition despite dating to c.9000 cal BC. A substantial Late Mesolithic timber platform dating to c.5500 cal BC was discovered extending out into a small pond inside the kettle hole along with finds of cattle teeth, chipped flints and a stone rubbing tool, as well as posts, postholes and other features that have led to its interpretation as a platform for processing animal skins and potentially curing hides in the pond. This site also had successive occupation in the Neolithic and Bronze Age stratified above the Mesolithic remains. In both cases these well-preserved archaeological remains also had preserved alongside them a continuous palaeoenvironmental sequence of deposits rich in environmental proxies that could be linked to landscape development and human activity in the immediate landscape surrounds. Although other archaeological remains have been found as well, these are remarkable discoveries that have been found as a result of the application of a specific evaluation technique and not by chance. It has ground-tested the approach in a real-world setting on a large scale and has proved effective in recovering what is significant about the archaeology of this area as well as in directing the best use of spend, at the right times, in the discharge of the planning system.

Clive Waddington

Clive has worked as a field archaeologist, consultant, lecturer and since 2004 the founder and Managing Director of Archaeological Research Services Ltd, amongst other things. With a wide range of specialisms, he continues to contribute to national archaeological initiatives, publish books and papers, develop innovative approaches, liaise with sectoral partners and lead the development and growth of ARS Ltd.
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Aerial view of excavations following initial stripping and sampling works on one of the kettle holes. Credit: Archaeological Research Services Ltd

View across the Late Mesolithic timber platform built out into the kettle hole pond, where chipped flints were found amongst the timbers as well as timber posts. Credit: Archaeological Research Services Ltd
New accredited application guidance

Lianne Birney
MCIfA (7472),
CIfA Membership Manager

At the beginning of December 2020, we were excited to launch our new and improved application guidance webpages. Since then we have made some further improvements based on applicants’ feedback and as a result, I have noticed the quality of applications has improved.

We have upgraded the joining webpages (www.archaeologists.net/join) to include all guidance in one place, which should make it easier to apply for accreditation. There are individual pages for each grade of accreditation (PCIfA, ACIfA, MCIfA) and an ‘apply online page’ with the deadlines and FAQs. For those interested in joining for the first time, we also have information about professional archaeologists, membership benefits, subscriptions and renewals, and testimonials from CIfA members of all accreditations and a range of historic environment backgrounds. You can read these at www.archaeologists.net/join/testimonials and submit one yourself for the TA member news section.

We also have a new professional pathways page, which is being populated with resources to assist in gaining skills and knowledge to work towards the next accredited grade. You can sign up to the relevant ProPathway bulletin in the Members Area using the ‘Update contact details’ form.

To help support applicants this last year, during the Covid-19 pandemic we waived the upgrade application fee and ran nine accreditation workshops digitally, which we plan to continue throughout 2021 alongside providing recordings of the information to assist those who are unable to attend a workshop. We can offer these workshops to Registered Organisations if they have many staff wishing to apply; please get in touch if you would like to arrange one.

We have also started working with neurodiverse members and non-members to help make the process more user friendly and offer alternatives when needed. I would be happy to work through the process with potential applicants as we want to support as best we can; the application process is not a test, but a means to demonstrate your application meets the required criteria for accreditation.

Over the last few years a suite of specialist matrices has been developed by CIfA’s Special Interest Groups and some external bodies to help applicants see how their role fits into the main competence matrix, and to assist the Validation committee in assessing applications appropriately. Recent additions include voluntary and community archaeology and a revised field archaeology matrix. You can see the full list of matrices at: https://www.archaeologists.net/matlces
Helen Parslow MCIfA, Chair of the Validation committee, says:

‘Try not to feel intimidated by the blank statement of competence or think you don’t fit the criteria. Follow Lianne’s advice and applying is easier than you imagine. Also do ask for help from Lianne or others you know who have already joined or upgraded or are on the Validation committee’.

If you have been thinking about applying, it is not as difficult or as time-consuming as you may think and is a useful reflective process to see how much you have achieved in your career; it can also help inform your Personal Development Plan (PDP) for Continuing Professional Development (CPD). I am here to help if you have any questions, and if anything is unclear you can drop me an email at membership@archaeologists.net.

Members of CIIfA are professionally accredited and skilled in the study and care of the historic environment.

The Validation committee has delegated authority from the Board of Directors to assess applications for individual accreditation. The committee is made up of volunteers who are accredited members of different grades and they assess the statement, references and examples of work and benchmark these against the four areas of the competence matrix. This is a rigorous process of peer review, but we are happy to help you apply. If an applicant demonstrates the criteria, they will successfully be awarded their accreditation, but the committee can also make alternative decisions, which include defer/reject for more information, rejection, or offering a lower grade (and in some cases a higher one). The committee will explain the reasons for their decision and offer advice about how to demonstrate the grade in the future.

Helen Parslow, Chair of the Validation committee, says:

‘Joining the Validation committee is very rewarding, especially if you enjoy finding out about archaeological work that others are undertaking and enhancing your CPD with the knowledge and skills you gain from getting involved with your Institute. It is also a great networking opportunity, talking to others on the committee from different areas of the historic environment who you might not usually meet’.

If you are interested in joining the Validation committee, please send expressions of interest to Lianne at membership@archaeologists.net.
Member news

Tim Malim MCIfA (1826)

Clwyd Powys Archaeological Trust is pleased to announce the appointment of Tim Malim as its new lead for Field Services, taking over from Nigel Jones on his retirement. Tim joins CPAT from SLR Consulting, a global environmental planning consultancy, where he was Technical Discipline Manager for 14 years, advising clients as part of the design team, providing planning support and Cultural Heritage EIAs, as well as designing and implementing programmes of multidisciplinary heritage management, such as the pioneering Waterlogged Archaeological Deposits, Nanwich and Musi Farm preservation monitoring projects. Prior to this, Tim was a consultant with Gifford, after founding and directing Cambridgeshire County Council’s Archaeological Field Unit (now Oxford Archaeology East) in 1990.

Tim is a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries of London, Chair of the Federation of Archaeological Managers and Employers (FAME), and has published extensively, particularly in his research interests of ancient routeways, Anglo-Saxon dykes, and prehistoric monuments. Tim’s move to CPAT was influenced by the remit and ethos of the Trust, and our research interests, which reflects his own aspirations and the type of holistic heritage approach that was followed when he directed the Cambridgeshire Field Unit.

Obituaries

Karen Louise Gavin BA MCIfA (8758)
'The Volunteer Whisperer'

Karen Louise Gavin, née Halls, was born on 13 November 1963 in Withington, Manchester. Karen died at the Christie Hospital Manchester on 18 February 2021 aged 57. After almost two years of treatment for lymphoma, Karen contracted Covid-19, from which she was too weak to recover.

The funeral service was conducted by Dawn Davies, a celebrant accredited by Humanists UK, at the Flintshire crematorium on 15 March and live streamed to those who were unable to attend.

Karen graduated from Chester University in 2010 and after a short time volunteering with Big Heritage on community archaeology projects, she was recognised for her natural ability to enthuse and teach the other volunteers, many of whom went on to study archaeology at college and university. Karen was employed by Big Heritage as a community archaeologist and worked with primary and secondary school students, hospitals, and children’s and adolescents’ mental health units, as well as with elderly individuals and groups. She could put everyone at ease while at the same time pushing them to develop their capabilities.

Literally thousands of children and adults have happily muddled their hands alongside Karen in test pits and trenches – hence the affectionate title of ‘The Volunteer Whisperer’.

Karen is survived by her husband Tony, daughters Sally and Rebecca, grandchildren Olivia, Ben, Joe, Jack and Corey, her father Walter and brother Neil.

In lieu of flowers, the family ask that donations be made to:

https://www.gofundme.com/managa/karen-gavin-archaeologist-memorial-fund. This fund in Karen’s name will support students, schools and community projects in association with Big Heritage and Chester University Archaeology Department.
Karl Taylor MCifA (2396)

Since becoming a member of the IFA in 2002, my career has taken several twists and turns, and I have lived and worked all over the UK and abroad. My lucky break occurred straight after university, when I landed a job at Stratascan in Worcestershire and was fortunate to go out to Zeugma in Turkey to carry out GPR surveys over the remains of the city. However, being a Lancashire lad, I yearned for the North and landed a job at OA North, where I was very happy and progressed from site assistant to senior project manager during my 10-plus years there. Several consultancy, management and senior management roles later, I was running my own business following redundancy at the beginning of the Covid-19 crisis. After Christmas, I took up the role of Head of Archaeology at ARS Ltd and have recently upgraded to MCIfA. I have been lucky to gain many lifelong friends within the profession and I’d like to thank all those who have supported and helped me along the way. It’s been a blast!

Richard Ivens BA PhD FSA MCIfA (210)

by Brian Davison MCIfA (R)

It is just over a year since Richard Ivens died. He was 70 years old.

Richard joined the Institute almost from its beginning, being elected a member in 1984. This was a major professional commitment for a young man whose every instinct was to stay out of any possible limelight. It was another 15 years before his many achievements were recognised by election as a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries of London.

Northamptonshire through and through, in 1969 Richard moved to the Department of Archaeology at Queen’s University Belfast. After graduation, he took up a post as assistant to Professor Martyn Jope; helping to write up excavations at Deddington Castle, Richard built a remarkable working relationship with him which lasted until Martyn’s death.

Richard stayed at Queen’s for another ten years. For two seasons he acted as an exemplary assistant director on my own excavations at Sulgrave in Northamptonshire, another of Martyn Jope’s many projects. However, the medieval ceramic industry in southern England was his abiding interest and after being awarded a Doctorate in 1981 he spent a year at Bradford University, following up his own excavation of medieval pottery kilns and carrying out neutron activation analyses at Bril, Buckinghamshire. During this time he also worked for the Department of the Environment (Ni), directing work at many sites and collaborating with Professor Derek Simpson.

Richard moved back to England in 1988, spending the next six years as a senior field archaeologist with the Milton Keynes Archaeological Unit, managing extensive excavation and post-excavation programmes and eventually becoming responsible for most of the management of the Unit.

Always a shy and very private person who preferred to work in his own way whenever possible, Richard spent the last 20 years of his life freelance, working for English Heritage, the British Academy, the Commission for New Towns and the Ashmolean Museum, adding to an already impressive list of research publications. Richard had a patient and unassuming preparedness to take up the work of other authors and help bring their results to fruition. His contribution to seeing Martyn Jope’s Early Celtic Art through to publication was vital, and the present writer is hugely grateful for his help in reforming the field archive for his own excavations at Sulgrave, 20 years after Richard first took part in them.

The remaining work from Martyn Jope, alongside Richard’s own papers, is now being selflessly shouldered by his long-term partner, Dr Isabel Lisboa, as she tries to make sure all find their way to a safe and appropriate archive.
### New members

#### Member (MCIFA)
- 11482  Beccy Austin
- 11662  Josephine Brown
- 11465  Adrian Chadwick
- 11483  Oliver Cooper
- 9865  Hannah Firth
- 11730  Daren Glasier
- 11537  Thomas Limpert
- 11626  Donal Lucey
- 5894  Ross Murray
- 1690  Stuart Prior
- 11484  Win Scutt
- 11536  Richard Whitewright

#### Associate (ACIFA)
- 11592  Anne Allen
- 9832  Karen Batten
- 11740  Keeley-Jade Bingham
- 8302  Alexander Blanks
- 11655  Scott Gordon
- 8940  Edward Hawkins
- 10329  Eva Heimpel
- 9486  Rose-May Howard
- 11486  Matthew Jackson
- 11480  Christos Kavals
- 11506  Eduard Perez-Fernandez
- 11481  Sarah Ricketts
- 9560  Amy Talbot

#### Practitioner (PCIFA)
- 9064  Preston Boyles
- 11458  Conor Brabyn
- 11585  Anton Burrows
- 9462  Joshua Cameron
- 11455  Louis Carver
- 9080  Hannah Chad
- 11589  Anna Chmielowska
- 11728  Pewel Cichy
- 11729  Malgorzata Cichy
- 9874  Jana Michaela Coriela
- 11295  Isaac Derbyshire
- 11559  Collin Eder
- 10997  Michael Ferguson
- 11588  Michal Filipowicz
- 11724  Francesca Gordon
- 11720  Paul Haugh
- 11490  Daniel Kennedy
- 1711  Giselle Kiraly

#### Affiliates
- 11675  Rory Bateman
- 11535  Thia Bitha
- 11594  Franziika Domen
- 11586  Alison Edwards
- 11598  Alicja Erston
- 11544  Nereide Gilhead
- 11676  Eliza Greenwell
- 11589  Isobel Grove
- 11731  Ezme Heffer
- 11512  Steven Henry
- 11508  James Johnson
- 11657  Wendy Joss
- 11576  Douglas Kilpatrick
- 11621  Katarina Kompeuerova
- 11640  Richard Lang
- 11517  Rhys Martin
- 10498  Luis Martin Villasanta
- 11694  Tom McCabe
- 11543  Joseph McMullen
- 11593  Anthony Moore
- 11523  Callum Nye
- 11519  Sverja Parthiel
- 11588  Abigail Peham
- 11701  Aleksandra Peniazek
- 9873  Sophie-Marie Retemund
- 11565  Sylvia Kozinska
- 11209  Nathan Lawson
- 11586  Tom Learmont
- 11489  Aiden Anett Leibinger
- 11584  Tanera Lewek
- 11607  Charlotte Lockwood
- 11472  Immogens Lyons
- 11706  Ryszard Moenda
- 11540  Cristina Monteiro
- 11705  Iwona Mosinskia
- 11457  Jon Ortiz
- 11487  Anna Parczen
- 11566  Tomas Radon
- 11723  Dominika Rossi
- 11549  Giancarlo Ruta
- 11625  Krzysztof Ryniec
- 11694  Victoria Sands
- 10873  Alexander Schupp
- 11717  Graham Snackell
- 11587  Benjamin Swain
- 11488  Maria Torbas de la Cruz
- 11529  Malo Vannet
- 11719  Christopher Warturton
- 11479  Rebecca Watkins
- 11721  Leslie Watson
- 11590  Michael Shaman
- 11510  Nathan Shepherd
- 11610  William Sibley
- 11473  Philip Sim
- 11476  Alen Strong
- 11673  Rachel Swallow
- 11670  Ruth Tipton
- 11683  Silas Trille

#### Students
- 11629  Nigel Allen
- 11572  Ashley Allison
- 11564  Craig Appleby
- 11542  Miles Armstrong
- 11556  Elizabeth Ashcroft
- 11509  Eleni Athanasiadou
- 11511  Melissa Bailey
- 11580  James Balantyne
- 11493  Mercedes Baptiste Halliday
- 11613  Jacob Bennett
- 11537  Georgina Bolton
- 11585  Annie Bones
- 11554  Michael Booth
- 11646  Christopher Brown
- 11609  Natalie Bryan
- 11468  Joanna Bynl
- 11555  Ioan Budau
- 11526  Adam Butler
- 11697  Sophie Butler
- 11577  Jenny Carey
- 11583  Lucy Carr-McClave
- 11579  Elleanor Carter
- 11632  Jennifer Cartledge
- 11568  Eleanor Chestderton
- 11618  Bridget Choctolek
- 11475  Sabrina Ceeveely
- 10309  Miles Clifford
- 11515  Alice Connolly
- 11525  Michael Cooke
- 11533  Jamie Corless
- 11691  Yuanne Gillan Creber
- 11658  Jasper Curson
- 11654  Alicja Czajka
- 11495  Kristian Davison
- 11736  Rosalind Davison
- 11570  Harry Dennis
- 11546  Isabelle Diggel
- 11558  Alexander Donaghy
- 11516  Foein Dorri
- 11499  Benedict Dyson
- 10501  David Eastham
- 11552  Eduard Edelman McCabe
- 11696  Geoffrey Edgson
- 11678  Antonia Edwards-Freshwater
- 11561  Ibie Evans
- 11557  Rosalind Fish
- 11477  Jaxxon Folon
- 11581  Evelyn Foye
- 11612  Jade Frazer
- 11602  Ruth Gentile
- 11556  Rhian George
- 11500  Molly Gibson
- 11608  Michael Gillbrand
- 11695  Sophie Gingell
- 11498  Neil Godfrey
- 11669  Isabel Gooch
- 11657  Kelsey Graham
- 11549  Corey Greening
- 11655  Stuart Griffiths
- 11567  Elisabeth Hainsworth
- 11679  Calum Hall
- 11582  Neve Harris
- 11524  Kirstie Hartlett
- 11735  Rebecca Hathaway
- 11680  Alex Haycock
- 11494  Isobelle Haynes
- 11597  Hannah Henderson
- 11614  Gina Hides
- 11545  Andrew Hill
- 11591  Alice Holland
- 11504  Christopher Hoyle
- 11732  Victoria Ignay
- 11552  Chelsea Ingham
- 11559  Patti Jain
- 11737  Iwan John
- 11539  Sarah Johnson
- 11630  Roseanne Jones
- 11684  Tomoya Kawakami
- 11501  Samantha Key
- 11595  Elisabeth Koch
- 11563  Jacob Laughton
- 11633  William Leather
- 11573  Sue Lee
- 11619  Michael Legge
- 11716  Elizabeth Legge
- 11681  Emily Le-Hegaret
- 11544  Marco Leonardi
- 11532  Felix Leinert
- 11436  Niuyong Li
- 11521  Emme-Louise Longworth
- 11599  Charnaine Lovatt
- 11518  Daniel Lovett
- 11541  Georgia Lowe
- 11730  Evelyn Lynch
- 11547  Hal Maitland-Jones
Upgraded members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member (MCIFA)</th>
<th>Associate (ACIFA)</th>
<th>Practitioner (PCIFA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2460 Joanne Barzer</td>
<td>9835 Silvia Barlassina</td>
<td>9189 Rachel Ford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4593 Charlotte Coles</td>
<td>9309 Aeneas Michealopoulos</td>
<td>10831 Guy Forster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9965 Dara Dabul</td>
<td>8310 Joe Turner</td>
<td>10799 Lauren Reid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5786 Hannah Kennedy</td>
<td></td>
<td>10671 Laura Vetterlein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9353 Hannah Masey</td>
<td></td>
<td>10758 Rosa Volpe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8299 Lachlan McKeggie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8575 Elizabeth Murrey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5793 Ruth Pelling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2253 Adam Single</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Directory of accredited professionals

We have launched the new online Directory of accredited professionals. This includes details of our professionally accredited (PCIfA, ACIfA and MCIfA) members who have agreed to be listed. Clients and colleagues are able to search for specific individuals or job titles and contact them, so it is important to keep your details up to date.

You can choose your preferred listing and/or change your details at any time by using the update contact details form in the members’ area of the website (www.archaeologists.net/members).

Get involved with CIfA!

Did you know that in 2020, 218 people volunteered with CIfA by contributing their time and expertise to our 21 Area and Special Interest Groups, our Advisory Council, our Board of Directors, the Validation Committee, the Registrations Committee, consultation advisors and our CPD workshops?

Being part of CIfA allows you to take an active role in supporting and shaping the profession. We draw on the expertise and knowledge of CIfA professionals in all our work. The best way to influence is to get involved.

In CIfA you are part of an active community that promotes high professional standards and strong ethics in archaeological practice, and that aims to make archaeology beneficial to all.
- Connect with our Area and Special Interest Groups to shape policy and practice in your specialism or geographical area, and stay up to date
- Assist the Registered Organisation Scheme by joining an inspection panel
- Join the committees that accredit individuals and organisations and be part of our peer review and self-regulation process
- Get elected to Advisory Council and guide future policy and priorities, or to the Board of Directors to lead the Chartered Institute

Find out more about the different committees and how to get involved on our FAQ page (www.archaeologists.net/involved). Our volunteers come from a variety of backgrounds, such as fieldwork, finds, academia and museums. They may be self-employed, retired, students or in part- or full-time employment, and working at all levels of responsibility.

Increase in members involved in committees 2018–2020.
Oxford Radiocarbon Accelerator Unit
http://c14.arch.ox.ac.uk

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

- Advice on sampling strategy
- Sample-specific chemical pre-treatment
- Isotope and elemental analysis (δ13C, δ15N, CN)
- Precision AMS measurement
- Prompt reporting
- Comprehensive quality assurance
- Interpretation, calibration and modelling

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

ISO-9001
FS-53284

Director
Prof Tom Higham

Administrator
Emma Henderson

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

Telephone 01865 285229
Email orau@laaha.ox.ac.uk
Website http://c14.arch.ox.ac.uk

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

RM Frobisher
A leading UK innovator of near surface geophysical and remote sensing technologies

DFG-1 Magnetic Gradiometer
Complete system £6,584

Visit our website for information on our range of products
www.rmfrobisher.co.uk

TAR-3 Meter

TAR-3 with 5 + 2 multiplexing
Complete system £4,536

Prices correct June 2021
N° 09467149