

Appendix 1

Re-imagining Scottish Archaeology: structure, funding, and delivery

Project summary

Jen Parker Wooding
Senior Professional Standards & Practice Coordinator
Chartered Institute for Archaeologists

Introduction

Three workshops took place in November and December 2019 in Inverness, Edinburgh and Glasgow with the purpose of generating new ideas about the structure, funding and delivery of archaeology in Scotland. This was to support the work of *Aim One - Delivering Archaeology* as outlined in [Scotland's Archaeology Strategy](#). The workshops were funded by Historic Environment Scotland (HES) and organised on behalf of the Scottish Strategic Archaeology Committee (SSAC) by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) with support from the Association of Local Government Archaeological Officers (ALGAO) and the Federation of Archaeological Managers and Employers (FAME). The topics of discussion at each workshop were focused on the following three themes:

- **Structure: How the sector is organised, managed and legislated**

Topics of discussion: self-regulation, Standard and guidance, licensing, quality management

- **Funding: Procurement and funding models**

Topics of discussion: different funding models, competitive tendering, design competition, models for assessing tenders on quality as well as cost

- **Delivery: Putting public benefit at the heart of what we do**

Topics of discussion: Embedding public/social benefit into WSI's and PERDS, ensuring we have the right skills

Workshop preparation

A series of written think pieces were commissioned to help frame the workshop agendas and stimulate discussion and debate ahead of the events. These along with a series of set questions were also discussed online in two lunch time Twitter chats.

Think pieces

Three think pieces were commissioned as part of the background preparation for the workshop series on the themes of structure, funding and delivery. These were produced by Kenny Brophy (University of Glasgow), Kirsty Dingwall (Headland Archaeology) and Alan Leslie (independent):

- **Structure: Delivering Archaeology – “Structure”** - Alan Leslie
https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/Delivering%20Archaeology%20Structure_ALeslie_0.pdf

- **Funding:** *Does competitive tendering work?* – Kirsty Dingwall
https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/Does%20competitive%20tendering%20work_KDingwall.pdf
- **Delivery:** *Putting public benefit at the heart of what we do* - Kenny Brophy
https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/Delivery_PublicBenefit_KBrophy.pdf

Alan Leslie's paper focused on the structure of archaeology in Scotland, specifically its delivery and emphasised the need for continued collaborative working. Kirsty Dingwall's paper looked in detail at how archaeology is commissioned and funded, highlighting the pros and cons of current practice with a focus on competitive tendering. Finally, Kenny Brophy's paper explored public benefit and how the sector currently supports its delivery whilst exploring how sector changes may help to increase public benefit delivery in the future. The papers were circulated to those who had booked onto a workshop but were also more widely promoted via social media, specifically Twitter and LinkedIn. This was to promote early discussions and to gain feedback ahead of the workshops. Those engaging in online discussions ahead of the workshops were encouraged to use the project hashtag (#RenewArch) so that feedback and comments could be more easily found at a later date.

Twitter chats

After the circulation of the think pieces, CIfA hosted two 1-hour lunchtime Twitter chats on Monday 18 November and Friday 22 November. These were promoted across various networks ahead of the chats to generate as much interest as possible. A total of 6 questions were posed for discussion that focused on the workshop themes also linking to the content of the think pieces. These were listed as follows (showing the way they were presented in Twitter):

#structure

Q1: Is our industry sustainable? Do the current structures enable us to #develop #innovate & #reward our people as well as deliver #value to clients and the public?

Q2: Who is best placed to coordinate and support regional and local archaeological research (#development-led #community and #academic)?

#funding

Q3: How can we add #value and #social benefit into commercial work driven by cost and efficiency?

Q4: Is it true that many funders don't care about arch work so long as it's undertaken quickly/cheaply? What effect does this assumption have on our aspiration to work to high prof standards, in the public interest?

#delivery

Q5: How can #value to the public be integrated into the concept of 'value for money' in a competitive commercial environment?

Q6: How can we communicate and evidence the public and commercial benefits of archaeology? Has anyone got some great examples they would like to share?

The answers to these questions and general comments/feedback can be accessed via the CifA Twitter page and by using the project hashtag:

- See @InstituteArch <https://twitter.com/InstituteArch>
- Search #RenewArch
https://twitter.com/search?q=%23RenewArch&src=recent_search_click

Workshop summary

The workshops were held in Inverness, Edinburgh and Glasgow and involved a mixture of presentations and group discussions. Delegates were split into groups and each were assigned a facilitator to help keep the discussions on track. The facilitators included members of staff from HES and CifA but also included members of the SSAC committee and think piece authors. Each workshop followed the same overarching format focused on the structure, funding and delivery of archaeology in Scotland but the content of each differed slightly according to the location and the audience that the workshops were aiming to attract. These are summarised below.

Inverness

This workshop was held at the University of the Highlands and Islands (UHI) Inverness College on Friday 29 November 2019. This venue was chosen due to its virtual conferencing facilities as a way of engaging more delegates across Scotland (especially those located on the Scottish Islands) who may not be able to easily attend a workshop in person. The hope was to also encourage more student participation via this method across the UHI network. This workshop was run in partnership with the UHI campus in Orkney (Orkney College), specifically Martin Carruthers, who promoted the workshop across the UHI network in Scotland and facilitated the virtual access. In total 27 delegates signed up to attend the workshop with half a dozen calling in from Orkney and Shetland. Twelve organisations were represented with a good range from across the Historic Environment sector (Table 1).

Table 1 List of organisations represented at the Inverness workshop

Current Employer
AOC Archaeology
ARCH
Built Environment Forum Scotland
CifA
Forestry and Land Scotland
HES
Highland Archaeology Services
Highland Council
ORCA
Shetland Amenity Trust
UHI Orkney
Western Isles Archaeological Service

The workshop was Chaired by Euan Leitch, Built Environment Forum Scotland (BEFS) and included an introductory presentation from Kirsty Owen (HES) which provided the background to the workshops and highlighted the work undertaken by HES and the SSAC in line with Aim 1 of Scotland's Archaeology Strategy. Cara Jones (CifA) provided a presentation reviewing the think pieces and the feedback from the Twitter chats which set the scene for the workshop discussions. The workshop was organised to include two discussion sessions focused on **Collaboration and public benefit** and **Structure and**

funding. A series of questions were posed for these sessions (Figures 1-2) which were split by group before being opened for wider discussion.

Figure 1 Workshop session 1 questions: Collaboration and public benefit

Discussion topic (TABLES 1 & 2) (1 hour)

1. Who are the 'public' and how do they benefit? Are we all talking about the same thing?

Please consider:

- Communication – do 'the public' understand what we mean by public benefit?
- How we can sustainably fund community projects?
- How can the community become more involved in developer-led projects?

Discussion topic (TABLES 3 & 4) (1 hour)

2. Are we delivering value to the public?

Please consider:

- How could we be doing things better?
- What are the barriers to delivering public benefit?
- How can we overcome them?
- Are there some 'quick wins' that can be achieved now?

Figure 2 Workshop session 2 questions: Structure and funding

Discussion topic (TABLES 1 & 2) (30 minutes)

- 1. If we were starting from scratch, what funding model(s) might we devise to support archaeological investigations within the planning system?**

Please consider:

- the pros and cons of existing models from elsewhere (e.g. the French model - developers pay a hypothecated archaeology tax, based on volume of earth moves x sensitivity score x rate set by ministers, the Brussels model - the regional government pays for archaeology out of general taxation and hands the 'clean' site to developers) etc.
- whether the existing structure of centralised HES and the regional Local Authorities works, or whether a dispersed HES structure embedded with the Local Authorities would offer better placed decision making at a local level (while increasing locally available resources)?

Discussion topic (TABLES 3 & 4) (30 minutes)

- 1. The current model for developer-led archaeology allows for competition. How can we best manage that and encourage competition on quality rather than price?**

Please consider:

How would we judge 'quality' and who would do it? For example, in Sweden contracts are awarded on quality with the equivalent of a local authority archaeologist making the decision on what is 'the best'. The developer is then told who will do the work and what it will be with. Could this work in Scotland? What are the pros and cons?

Discussion topic (ALL TABLES & PARTICIPANTS) (30 minutes)

- 1. Are current systems for managing quality fit for purpose, effective and widely understood? How might they be made more so?**

Please consider:

- How we define, measure and require appropriate professional competence
- Whether we have the right structure of professional standards, guidance and advice in place
- The balance between requiring, encouraging and enforcing standards for people, processes and products

Either side of the discussion sessions three presentations (including two case studies) were heard that fed into the overall themes. These were entitled *Community Archaeology in the Highlands & Islands: Projects, approaches and future directions* by Dan Lee, UHI Archaeology Institute, Orkney, *Leny Woods Community Archaeology Project* by Matt Ritchie, Forestry and Land, Scotland and *Obstructed vision: Delivering better archaeology through the planning system* by Peter Hinton, Chief Executive of CIFA. Dan Lee’s presentation provided an overview of the different community projects undertaken across Scotland by the Archaeological Institute in Orkney with Matt Ritchie providing an interesting overview of the planning and procurement of one specific community project (Leny Woods) as part of the planning system. Peter Hinton’s presentation focused on reviewing the current archaeology market, touching upon the topic of market failure, different delivery models and highlighting potential ways forward. These presentations supplemented the discussion sessions providing additional focuses for feedback, comparisons and comment.

Edinburgh

This workshop was held at HES offices at John Sinclair House on Friday 6 December 2019. The conference room was made available for use by HES and proved extremely popular with the workshop fully booked (32 bookings). A total of 18 organisations were represented on the day, again illustrating a good range of interest from across the Historic Environment sector (Table 1).

Table 2 List of organisations represented at the Edinburgh workshop

Current Employer
AOC Archaeology
Archaeology Scotland
CFA Archaeology
CIFA
City of Edinburgh Council
Durham University
East Lothian Council
GUARD Archaeology
Headland Archaeology
HES
National Museums Scotland
National Trust for Scotland
SLR Consulting
Society of Antiquaries of Scotland
Stirling council
University of Glasgow
Wessex Archaeology Ltd
WSP

The workshop was Chaired by Stephen Driscoll, Glasgow University and outgoing Chair of the SSAC. An introductory presentation to the workshops was again provided by Kirsty Owen (HES) as at Inverness and Cara Jones (CIfA) repeated her presentation that reviewed the think pieces and the feedback from the Twitter chats setting the scene for the workshop discussions. As at Inverness the workshop was organised to include two discussion sessions focused on **Collaboration and public benefit** and **Structure and funding**. The series of questions posed for these sessions were altered slightly to account for feedback from the first workshop – the updated questions are presented in Figures 3-5. As before the delegates were split into groups to discuss specific questions before they were opened for wider discussion.

Figure 3 Workshop session 1 questions: Collaboration and public benefit

Discussion topic (TABLES 1, 2 & 3) (1 hour)

1. Who are the ‘public’ and how do they benefit? Are we all talking about the same thing?

Please consider:

- Communication – do archaeologists understand what we mean by public benefit?
- Do planning authorities and developers understand what we mean by public benefit?
- How we can sustainably fund community projects, and community programmes?
- How can the community become more involved in professional led projects?
- How can we better promote collaborative models of working – are there any partnership examples you want to share?

Discussion topic (TABLES 3, 4 & 5) (1 hour)

2. Are we delivering value to the public?

Please consider:

- How could we be doing things better? (see Kenny Brophy’s think piece - schools example)
- What are the barriers to public engagement and other means of delivering public benefit?
- How can we overcome them?
- Are there some ‘quick wins’ that can be achieved now?

Figure 4 Workshop session 2 questions: Structure and funding

Discussion topic (TABLES 1, 2 & 3) (30 minutes)

1. If we were starting from scratch, what delivery model(s) might we devise to support archaeological investigations within the planning system?

Please consider:

- Is the planning-led, developer/applicant-funded model the most appropriate for Scotland?
- Which aspects of the current model work well and what (if anything) needs changing?
- Whether the existing structure of centralised HES and regional local authority advisors works, or whether a dispersed HES structure embedded with the regional archaeologists would offer better-placed decision making at a local level (while increasing regionally available resources)?
- How could we ensure that regional archaeologists are resourced to provide all the services originally envisaged?
- What do you think about the use of community hubs? (see Alan Leslie's think piece)

Discussion topic (TABLES 3, 4 & 5) (30 minutes)

2. The current model for planning-led archaeology allows funders to choose their archaeological service providers. Kirsty Dingwall's think piece highlights some of the challenges of managing competition through competitive tendering. What improvements could we make?

Please consider:

- How can we encourage greater use of procurement models that emphasise quality over price?
- Would a different delivery model help enhance our offer? For example, more focus on partnerships/collaboration?
- Are clients always well informed about what constitutes quality in archaeology?
- Are there case studies that we can share to help encourage 'informed clients'?

Figure 5 Workshop session 2 questions cont'd: Structure and funding

Discussion topic (ALL TABLES) (30 minutes)

3. Are current systems for managing quality fit for purpose, effective and widely understood? How might they be made more so?

Please consider:

- How we define, measure and require appropriate professional competence
- Whether we have the right structure of professional standards, guidance and advice in place
- The balance between requiring, encouraging and enforcing standards for people, processes and products
- If there were a licensing system, how we could run it to encourage and enhance community participation as well as ensuring commercial project leaders in have the right competence for the project
- Balancing the need for defined 'minimum' standards for outcomes with the desire to promote

During the second half of the workshop, two case study presentations were heard from commercial organisations based in Edinburgh and Glasgow. These showcased two different commercial projects that fed into the overall themes and discussion topics. These were entitled *The Aberdeen Bypass* by Kirsty Dingwall at Headland Archaeology which focused on the excavations associated with large infrastructure project and *Balmachie Road, Carnoustie: a commercial case study* by Ronan Toolis at Guard Archaeology which highlighted a project involving the excavation of a prehistoric settlement and bronze age hoard. These presentations supplemented the discussion sessions providing additional focuses for feedback, comparisons and comment.

Glasgow

This workshop was held at The Albany Learning & Conference Centre on Saturday 7 December 2019. A weekend date was chosen for the final workshop to try and attract a more varied audience and to accommodate anybody who may not have been able to attend a weekday event. This workshop followed the same structure as the two previous, but the case study presentations focused on community engagement and the contribution and impact of two specific Landscape Partnership projects. A total of 23 delegates booked onto the workshop with 11 organisations represented, including the Association of Certified Field Archaeologists (ACFA). As with the previous workshops there was a good range of different organisations present from commercial, voluntary and advisory through to academic and research (Table 3).

Table 3 List of organisations represented at the Glasgow workshop

Current Employer
Association of Certified Field Archaeologists (ACFA)
AOC Archaeology
CifA
Dumfries and Galloway Council
GUARD Archaeology
HES
Northlight Heritage
Rathmell Archaeology Ltd
University of Glasgow
West of Scotland Archaeology Service
York Archaeological Trust

The workshop was Chaired again by Stephen Driscoll, Glasgow University and outgoing Chair of the SSAC. An introductory presentation to the workshops was provided by Kevin Grant (HES) and the presentation previously given by Cara Jones reviewing the think pieces and the feedback from the Twitter chats was this time repeated by Kate Geary (CifA). This helped to bring together the earlier discussions and helped set the scene for the workshop content. As at both previous workshops there were two substantial discussion sessions focused on **Collaboration and public benefit** and **Structure and funding**. The series of questions posed were the same as in Edinburgh (see Figures 3-5). As before the delegates were split into groups to discuss specific questions before they were opened for wider discussion.

Either side of lunch, three presentations were given (including two case studies) that provided the community focus that the workshop was aiming for but also included an overview of planning-led archaeology in Scotland that illustrated how the two work together. These were entitled *Digging the Galloway Glens – Archaeology within a Landscape Partnership* by Thomas Rees at Rathmell Archaeology Limited, *Apples, Archaeology and Art - historic environment and biocultural heritage of the Clyde and Avon Valley Landscape Partnership* by Gavin MacGregor at Northlight Heritage and Paul Murtagh at CFA Archaeology and *Planning-led archaeology - digging the dirt on developer funding. Cui bono?* By Hugh McBrien, Manager at the West of Scotland Archaeology Service. The case studies highlighted the contribution and impact of two different Landscape Partnership projects to archaeology in Scotland and the presentation on planning-led archaeology provided an opportunity to explore the planning system in Scotland and emphasise the role of ALGAO. These presentations supplemented the discussion sessions providing additional focuses for feedback, comparisons and comment.

Summary: What next?

The workshops were well attended, and all motivated a great deal of engaging, in depth and frank discussion about the delivery, structure and funding of archaeology in Scotland. The think pieces and Twitter chats were well received and encouraged early discussions ahead of the workshops which helped to keep the workshops themselves focused on addressing the specific questions posed. The questions were amended after the first workshop as the result of feedback to ensure that the discussions were varied, relevant and continued to generate useful feedback. The case studies and presentations also provided additional information which helped to frame the discussion elements of the workshops and showcase different projects and approaches to archaeology in Scotland. The initial feedback to date has been positive and at present the notes taken are being

summarised and written up to highlight the main themes of discussion and any action points identified for future development. A draft report of these notes will be available in time for the next meeting of the SSAC.