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Autumn 2007 Number 65
In addition to carrying our obligatory annual report, this TA concentrates on IFA’s annual conference, held this year on our home ground of Reading. Thus, unlike the usual TA which covers a single theme, it ranges around a great spectrum of archaeological endeavour. We have articles on vital issues such as qualifications in archaeological practice (with a special plea for senior IFA members to come forward as future assessors), an update on the current chaotic state of government rulings on excavations of human remains and (of course) archaeologists pay, but our wider views take us as far as considerations of modern art and evidence of Elizabethan and modern piracy, fruitful workshops run by IFA groups, advances in archaeological sciences, and the important planning issue of the setting of monuments and how we should value this.

It seems that, when planning themes for this year’s TAs we were quite prescient in including climate change for the winter issue. Not only has that concern moved well up the agenda for government and other organisations but, at the time of writing, it has manifested itself spectacularly in wide-scale floods that have disastrous immediate impacts on the historic environment, with longer term impacts inevitable. For this issue I am looking for articles on aspects and evidence for climate change in the past, for likely impacts of global warming on historic structures and archaeological sites as sea levels rise, for changes we ought to make in our care of monuments and archives, and for the impact of measures to counteract climate change on the historic environment (such as windfarms).

If you have stories or opinions on such matters, in particular first hand data from this summer’s floods, do let me know.

Alison Taylor
Alison.Taylor@archaeologists.net

Michael Fullford shows archaeologists the real thing, at Stichuster’s Roman amphitheatre. Photograph: Mike Farley

IFIA Finds Group list of specialists
IFIA Finds Group is compiling a list of finds specialists as a service to anyone looking for specialists covering specific periods, subjects and regions, although it does not constitute any form of accreditation or endorsement. If you would like to be on the list please send the following details to Phil Mills.

- Name
- Organisational affiliation (or ‘freelance’)
- Email
- Phone no
- Address
- Specialism
- Period
- Geographical area
- IFA grade (if any)
- Three relevant publications (references to relevant work, which can include grey literature as well as formally published work)
- Other Information

Please send the following details to Phil Mills:

Dr Phil Mills BSc PhD MIFA, Honorary Visiting Fellow, School of Archaeology and Ancient History, University of Leicester CBMPhil@aol.com.

IFIA, on behalf of the Archaeological Archives Forum, has just published Archaeological Archives: a guide to best practice in creation, compilation, transfer and curation. Written by Duncan H Brown of Southampton Museums, this is a comprehensive and practical guide to archaeological archiving for both material and documentary archives, from project planning through to final deposition and the archive’s subsequent curation.

The Guide is available for download in PDF format from the Publications page of the IFA website, or http://www.archaeologists.net/modules/incontent/inPages/docs/pubs/Archives_Best_Practice.pdf. Printed copies will be sent to all Registered Archaeological Organisations. Members who would like a printed copy can request one from the IFA office.

Archaeological Archives: a new guide

Understanding the Scottish Town

AHSS National Conference 2007, held with the Universities of Stirling and Dundee, 19-20 October 2007, Lesser Albert Hall, Stirling. Recent Burgh Surveys have advanced new ways to investigate and interpret the development of Scottish towns. This conference brings together heritage managers and conservation professionals with historians, archaeologists and architectural historians to explore how we might set about understanding our urban heritage. It will include cases studies on work at Arbroath, Govan and Ralphoch, an interactive guided walk around the historic burgh town of Stirling, speakers from Ireland and Denmark, and reports on recently completed work at Linlithgow, Dundurmerie, Whitthorn and Tain, and Wigton and Fraserburgh.

Tickets for the two days cost £28 for AHSS members (£35 for non-members and £18 for full-time students) or £18 for a single day. For more information visit www.ahss.org.uk or contact Dr Susan Buckham at the AHSS National Office on 0131 557 0019 or nationaloffice@ahss.org.uk


Lord (Sandy) Bruce-Lockhart took up the job of Chair of EH on 1 August, following the retirement of Sir Neil Cossons. He is currently Chair of the Local Government Association and was the Conservative leader of Kent County Council from 1997 to 2005. He has been involved in various local government and public and voluntary sector organisations and is currently a trustee of Leeds Castle Foundation, chair of Rochester Cathedral Council, president of Kent Thameside Development Board and trustee for East Malling Trust for Horticultural Research.

New chairman for English Heritage

Lord (Sandy) Bruce-Lockhart took up the job of Chair of EH on 1 August, following the retirement of Sir Neil Cossons. He is currently Chair of the Local Government Association and was the Conservative leader of Kent County Council from 1997 to 2005. He has been involved in various local government and public and voluntary sector organisations and is currently a trustee of Leeds Castle Foundation, chair of Rochester Cathedral Council, president of Kent Thameside Development Board and trustee for East Malling Trust for Horticultural Research.

FROM THE FINDS TRAY
FROM THE FINDS TRAY

APPAG inquiry into pay and conditions in archaeology

The All Party Parliamentary Archaeology Group report The Current State of Archaeology in the United Kingdom (2002) commented forcefully on the ‘urgent need to improve pay and conditions for employment in field archaeology’. Five years on APPAG is aware that there are initiatives under way to implement some of its recommendations and intends to hold a short inquiry how far these have got. Initially APPAG is seeking brief written submissions from those taking an active role in seeking to improve pay and conditions, setting out what they are doing and how they intend to implement any reforms. Submissions of up to 1000 words should be sent to inquiry@appag.org.uk by 30 September 2007. APPAG will then invite oral evidence at inquiry hearings during the autumn. After considering the evidence, APPAG will produce a report making targeted recommendations, and may organise debates in Parliament.

Archaeology Labour Market Intelligence: Profiling the Profession 2007–08

This project, which will again gather comprehensive and up-to-date information about the size and state of archaeology as a profession, has just been launched and will be published in spring 2008. Previous Profiling the Profession projects were carried out five and ten years ago (see http://www.archaeologists.net/modules/icontent/index.php?page=34), and so will again give us a snapshot of archaeology at this point in time. In September, the project will send questionnaires to all archaeological employers and self-employed archaeologists in the UK. Individual archaeologists are asked to please support their employers in completing the questionnaires as fully and accurately as possible. Individual, self-employed archaeologists (such as specialists) are particularly encouraged to email Rachel Edwards at lmi@archaeologists.net with their contact details to ensure that they are on the mailing list to receive questionnaires.

Kenneth Aitchison
IFA Head of Professional Development

Qualification in Archaeological Practice: ASSESSORS NEEDED

The long awaited Qualification in Archaeological Practice was launched at the City of London Marketing Suite on the 25 April 2007 to an audience of archaeologists, training and skills specialists, trade unionists and (we hope) future assessors and candidates.

As guest speaker, Francis Pryor spoke about the need for standards in archaeology and the importance of training the next generation, and called on the sector to support the qualification. Mike Heyworth, on behalf of the Archaeology Training Forum, stressed the importance of the qualification as a measure of competence for amateur as well as professional archaeologists and Kenneth Aitchison, IFA head of professional development, described how the new award will work.

The Qualification in Archaeological Practice results from collaboration between IFA, the Archaeology Training Forum and EDI, with support from the Sector Skills Council. Implementation will involve training more assessors, ensuring that IFA’s validation procedures are adapted and promoting its value as a professional qualification within the sector and beyond.

IFA must now build a network of assessors across the UK. As well as training our own staff, assessors may work on a freelance basis or for organisations acting as satellite centres. Assessors, or their employing organisations, will receive a fee per candidate for this work. Assessors must be occupationally competent in the areas they are assessing – including working in that area for at least two years within the last five. Assessors must also have, or be working towards, the ‘A1’ assessors’ qualification, which is offered by EDI and other awarding bodies and is assessed in the same way as an NVQ, ie you are assessed as you work with your own NVQ candidates. All assessment work of trainee assessors is checked and overseen by the awarding body. In addition to Assessors, we need a network of ‘expert witnesses’ - experienced archaeologists who can advise to assessors in particularly specialist areas.

If you are interested in training to become an assessor, or in registering as an expert witness, contact Kate Geary. In time, dedicated pages on our website will be created for the Qualification.

Kate Geary
IFA Training and Standards Co-ordinator
kate.geary@archaeologists.net
01782 320867
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Kenneth Aitchison, IFA’s head of professional development, explains how the new award will work.
Registered Archaeological Organisations

Beth Asbury

IFA now has 55 RAOs, up from 51 in January 2006, with two more applications being assessed. Since January 2006 seventeen inspections have been carried out, eighty recommendations for improvement made and four conditions of registration imposed, all aimed at raising standards of archaeology and of staff welfare staff. Three RAOs are hosting HLF workplace bursaries and seven more have shown interest. These have proved to be invaluable projects and we hope to increase the numbers of RAOs involved in the future.

Minimum employment package
In November 2005 we asked RAOs to consider the implications of changes to the IFA recommended pay minima to include a package of employment benefits. Incorporating suggestions, this new scheme came into effect on 1 April and is binding on all RAOs. As a minimum, an employment package must now contain:

1 6% employer pension contribution subject to any reasonable qualifying period
2 average 37.5 hour working week
3 paid annual leave of at least 20 days plus statutory holidays
4 sick leave allowance of at least 1 month on full pay subject to any reasonable qualifying period

Any shortfall in the above increases the minimum salary requirement, although betterment of the stated terms does not justify a reduction in basic pay. The amended scheme will be kept under review and its operational impact monitored. In support, we reworded Principle 5.5 of the Code of Conduct so that action may be taken against individual IFA members (as opposed to RAOs) paying less than this. This was agreed at the 2006 AGM. SCAUM is also in the process of preparing good practice guidelines for its members, covering pay and conditions of employment. These will complement the new IFA scheme, as will BAJR’s initiative, the IFA salary benchmarking exercise (p7) and the Diggers Forum campaign for a living wage.

For the RAO scheme to maintain its quality assurance value, those who commission RAOs must be assured that any allegations of professional misconduct will be investigated under a formal complaints procedure. RAOs are subject to sanctions if they fail to comply with the scheme and in serious cases can be removed from the Register. Two such cases have been investigated since January 2006. In both cases, which involved financial disputes, investigating panels found in favour of the RAOs after contractual documents and correspondence were scrutinised. Two further complaints are currently being investigated.

Looking ahead
Application forms and guidance notes are currently updated, and a new easy reference format has been used in the 2007 Yearbook for listing services offered by our RAOs. The scheme itself is continuously reviewed to make it more applicable to solely curatorial, academic or avocational bodies, as well as bringing in more commercial organisations that have achieved necessary assurance value. A joint statement with ALGAO was sent out to curatorial groups promoting the benefits of registration.

For more information about the scheme and the procedures for joining, please consult the RAO page of the IFA website, or contact Beth Asbury.

Beth Asbury
beth.asbury@archaeologists.net
0118 3786446

Improving archaeologists’ pay

In April 2007, as described by Beth Asbury (p6), IFA introduced an expanded set of minimum pay recommendations, recognising the fact that pay is only one part of the total employment package and setting minimum standards for working time, holiday and sick pay, and employer pension contributions. The new pay minima, which are binding on RAOs, are an important step but are still based on minimum salary levels which do not compare well with other professions. In order to raise minimum pay levels, a robust methodology is needed to allow reliable comparisons to be drawn with salaries in related professions, leading to pay minima which reflect more accurately the qualifications, skills and experience of professional archaeologists.

In order to move this issue forward IFA has employed a consultant to facilitate the process of benchmarking archaeological salaries against those in other industries. Frank Price is an experienced human resources consultant with a background in other industries. ‘Benchmarking’ archaeological salaries against those employed a consultant to facilitate the process of surveying and architecture, although others may be suggested along the way. Information from this comparison will inform future revisions to the IFA minimum salaries. If, as we suspect, the results indicate that archaeologists’ qualifications and skills are not being reflected accurately in their pay, significant increases in IFA minimum salary levels will be subject to extensive consultation and staged over a number of years.

The timetable to complete data gathering this summer and analysis in September, with the aim of reporting preliminary results at the IFA AGM on 1 October. Other initiatives on pay and conditions, such as the Diggers Forum Campaign for a Living Wage, SCAUM’s recently published statement of good practice and the revised BAJR pay levels are increasingly putting pressure on the archaeological sector to deal with the issue of pay. Although there are many factors contributing to low pay, we are confident that real progress will have been made before the 2008/9 pay minima are announced next year.

Kate Geary
IFA training and standards co-ordinator
Kate.Geary@archaeologists.net
Outreach to developers: advice available

Blair Poole

Archaeologists can feel unwelcome on construction sites, in part because developers may not understand what is required to satisfy planning conditions, compounded by not understanding what archaeologists actually do. It is important therefore that we communicate, amongst other things, the extent of post-excavation work that is essential.

L – P: Archaeology offers a range of services including consultancy, field work and post excavation analysis. One of our additional services is a CPD programme for other professionals in the property industry. Short presentations are given for free and longer courses are offered at an hourly rate. Funding for the time spent on this comes from an existing outreach budget with the free presentations viewed as an investment.

Members of our staff visit developers’ offices to present an in-depth view of the role of archaeology in the planning process, inviting quantity surveyors, project managers and site managers etc to presentations, opening dialogue, informing each other of our various requirements and discussing the role of heritage within the planning process. We engage the developer with a sense of the significance and finite nature of our shared heritage, and discuss legislation and both statutory and non-statutory policies. We introduce MAP 2, and stress the importance of good relations with curators.

We discuss the various forms of archaeological investigation, stressing the difference between pre-determination investigations and those that are part of planning conditions. Developers can confuse evaluation and excavation, leading to surprise when evaluation leads to excavation. Clarifying evaluation as data gathering to aid the design strategy and give curators enough information to advise the planning department is integral to the presentations. Specialist analysis, reporting and archiving are addressed to show that site work is only a small percentage of what we actually do. By communicating the importance and scale of post-excavation work developers feel more aware of what we do and more involved in the process.

Has it worked? The presentations have been a success with developers, who begin to ask more relevant questions regarding archaeology and how they can improve their project designs. They take away an idea of the scale of post-excavation works and are more inclined to include funding in their budget. Relations with these developers have become easier, facilitating better planning on everyone’s part, and site managers in particular can develop a scheme of works to allow for archaeology.

More information can be found on L – P: Archaeology’s website, www.lparchaeology.com. Please contact us if you might be interested in this free service.

Blair Poole
L – P: Archaeology
Unit 580, Chester Enterprise Centre
Hoole Bridge, Chester CH2 3NE
01244 313100
london@lparchaeology.com
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Excavating human remains: latest (but still interim) guidance

Alison Taylor

In May 2007, the Ministry of Justice (having taken over this responsibility from the Home Office) decided that the Burial Act 1857 and the Disused Burial Grounds (Amendment) Act 1981 (under which archaeologists were expected to apply for licences) should not have been applied to burial grounds which had passed into different use, and they are no longer able to issue licences for these sites. Their letters recommended that archaeologists seek legal advice (an advice note would have been more helpful – lawyers would find it hard to give clear advice at the moment).

After some weeks of confusion English Heritage, urged on by IFA and many archaeological organisations who found themselves in the front line, held discussions with MoJ that resulted in an interim advice note. As this says, it appears that

♦ for excavations of burial grounds which have passed into other use, neither Act applies and therefore no applications and licenses are required

♦ for burials in churchyards and other burial grounds under ecclesiastical jurisdiction, the Burial Act 1857 still applies and faculties and licenses should be applied for as in the past (license applications to MoJ)

♦ in disused burial grounds which have not passed into other use and are still set aside as burial grounds, the Disused Burial Grounds (Amendment) Act 1981 applies (applications to the MoJ for “directions” under that Act. Remember to leave plenty of time for public advertisements).

Where there is uncertainty, archaeologists should ask MoJ for advice in good time.

However, there are still a number of problems and uncertainties, such as

♦ MoJ has drawn attention to the possibility of prosecution for offering indignity to the remains of the dead – a common law offence set out in a 140-year-old judgement and not, as far as known, ever tested by case law. It is very unlikely a prosecution would succeed if an archaeologist was excavating in response to a PPG 16 requirement, and treating remains respectfully as set out in relevant guidance, but the possibility is one that archaeologists are reasonably concerned about.

♦ MoJ has indicated that where the two Acts do apply, they must require reburial of excavated human remains within a reasonably rapid timescale. This may not allow sufficient time for proper study for large and important sites, nor retention of important assemblages. EH are working to try to address this problem with MoJ.

Although there are still uncertainties, and the changes may be more restrictive in a few cases, many sites will lose red tape. Removal of impediments to retention of human remains from these sites for future examination is welcomed. Also, when human remains are encountered unexpectedly it should no longer be necessary to stop and ask for a section 25 licence: if the pre-excavation evaluation was done properly, it is likely that neither Act applies and that all you need to do is think about informing the police.

Alison Taylor

General guidance


Following the Heritage White Paper’s proposal to make it a statutory requirement for local authorities to have access to a Historic Environment Record (HER) it was timely that June saw publication of a new edition of Informing the Future of the Past, which had first been published in 2000 by English Heritage. This second edition is the result of a partnership of English Heritage, Historic Scotland, RCAHMS, RCAHMW, Cadw, ALGACO UK and ADS. This edition is an entirely digital publication and completely free. For each chapter there is an HTML page and a pdf file so if you want you can download and print the sections that interest you and bind them to create a hard copy version.

At over 300 pages with 69 illustrations (mostly full colour), 13 panels and 54 separate contributors this edition constitutes a major revision and expansion from the original, covering the latest developments in what is now a dynamic sector (as demonstrated by the session on HERs at the IFA conference in Winchester in 2005). It is also illustrated with numerous case studies showing how the challenges facing HERs have been addressed across Britain.

Designed to assist those who manage and work in HERs the Guidelines will also be useful to anyone who uses their services or contributes information to them. They will also be of interest to anyone studying Cultural Resource Management or heritage information systems as they provide an introduction to HERs as well as setting out agreed guidelines for working practices in all aspects of HER management.

The guidelines were formally launched as part of the summer HER Forum meeting at Peterborough Museum on the 27 June by Stuart Jeffrey from the ADS on behalf of the Steering Committee.

Informing the Future of the Past: Guidelines for Historic Environment Records edited by Paul Gilman and Martin Newman is available online at www.ifp-plus.info.

Martin Newman
English Heritage
Martin.Newman@english-heritage.org.uk

A record number of delegates attended IFA’s three-day conference in Reading this year. There was an excellent range of exhibitions, several social events, workshops organised by IFA Groups, trips out to see Silchester guided by Michael Fulford and around Reading led by Adam Sowan and of course a full programme of lectures, in three parallel sessions, some of which are represented by papers in this issue of TA. The full text of several papers can be downloaded on the Conference pages of the IFA website. We are immensely grateful to all our session organisers and speakers, and also to our sponsors, acknowledged on this page. Without their support we could never put on an event on this scale.
In 2006 the conference included a session responding to major structural and political shifts affecting our approaches to the historic environment today. We recognised that our profession needs to discuss the strategic and long-term implications of these changes and how they affect the intellectual, philosophical and physical framework in which we work. Different constituencies have different insights: last year speakers from the national heritage bodies address these issues from their personal perspectives (see TA 61). In 2007 it was the turn of the professional associations, which face particular challenges over the next few years if they are to fulfil their responsibilities and the expectations of their memberships, government and its advisors.

‘NO MONEY – NO SUPPORT’

Simon Thurley, Chief Executive of English Heritage (and MIFA 1814) gave the opening address. He introduced the Heritage Protection White Paper, setting out its provisions and emphasising the importance of local authority services in making the system work, and of IFA and BHBC in setting standards. He was candid too about the importance of proper resourcing, and stressed that English Heritage’s support for government’s proposals was conditional on adequate funding. ‘No money – no support’. On the cuts to English Heritage’s budget – an issue on which the IFA has lobbied repeatedly – he explained why the Historic Environment Enabling Programme budget had had to be cut. We have had to reduce the HEEP budget by £800k and our buildings grants by £1m. I hope that this will be temporary. Four years ago we were forced to dip into our grants budgets and then reinstated them. That is our intention this time. Finally he looked to a future, with better training, compulsory CPD for professional institute members and with a modernised Planning Policy Statement covering archaeology: ‘I want to see what we have better protected, better funded, better understood and better enjoyed. In making that happen IFA has a crucial role. It has enjoyed 20 years of extraordinary success, it now needs to arm itself to meet the changes and challenges ahead.’

GRASPING WIDER TRENDS

Seán O’Reilly, Director of BHBC, gave a presentation on ‘Scotch conservation tomorrow’ and argued that in an ideal world we would do just that – get rid of conservation as a separate discipline – on the basis that ‘conservation within a discipline only reflects the average standard that that discipline should adopt’. He also argued that there are key differences between the approaches and philosophies of archaeologists and others involved in conservation of the historic environment, including corporate structures, the role of aesthetics, the value placed on records/education, and epistemological approaches.

BIG IMPACTS

For IFA I indulged in a review of the possible impacts of technology, global warming, the shifting focus of world economy, and changes to health, mortality and reproduction, social perceptions of travel and work, domestic political structure, and mass global migration. I proposed that in its review of its strategic plan IFA should:

• plan for unlikely events with big impacts
• back Heritage Protection Reform to the hilt
• find archaeological applications for new technologies
• get heritage in the Olympics
• prepare its position on heritage and energy efficiency
• be alert for projects required by rising seas, changing ecosystems and a shift from suburbia to rural or city-centre living
• make sure government understands our needs and contribution
• get heritage on all feasible political agenda
• campaign for local authority historic environment services
• anticipate new patterns of working and volunteering and encourage more participation
• anticipate massive population and cultural shifts
• market research what people feel is heritage (all sectors, and overseas)
• identify those heritage we have ignored
• join up the sector – properly – while building partnerships with other built and natural environment professions.

Debate on unification of the historic environment sector, and particularly of its professional bodies, was informed by a contribution from Christina Williams of the Professional Associations Research Network (PARN). She focused on the PARN 2006 ‘Professionalisation of Professional Associations’ UK survey and summarised how professional bodies promote professionalism via CPD, ethical codes, accreditation schemes and relations with government. Her observations on such matters and Council’s discussions are setting the agenda for the future of your institute, of which more in future editions of TA.

The texts of papers by Simon Thurley, Peter Hinton, Anne Locke and Christina Williams can be downloaded from the IFA website (Conference page).

Peter Hinton
Chief Executive, IFA
Peter.hinton@archaeologists.net

USING FUTURES TECHNIQUES

Anne Locke

My paper looked at ways the heritage sector may be able to identify shared areas of concern or gaps in knowledge, and to highlight action needed, now through exercises in futures techniques.

To manage the historic environment for future generations heritage professionals need a vision of what those generations might want: research material, recreational and educational access, a sense of place and identity? My paper suggested there were differences between the way archaeological heritage professionals and civil servants working on related subjects see the main influences, and introduced techniques used in government to look at the future.

Last year I combined work on future trends for DCMS with an MA at the Institute of Archaeology, UCL. My MA dissertation Future Past compared the views of 28 archaeological managers with those of civil servants working with culture, media and sport. Archaeologists saw a need for more joined-up working and better leadership within the historic environment professions but few mentioned social developments like the ageing population or inequalities in society. While both groups thought environmental, technological and economic issues would be important, heritage people were more uncertain about the prospects for liberalism and tolerance. The differences suggest that the archaeological sector would raise its profile with government by demonstrating its grasp of wider trends and seeking opportunities to become involved in current external debates on social issues, for example ‘cultural value’, well being/quality of life, identity and citizenship.

Modern futures techniques have been used for around fifty years. Importantly, they cannot predict what will actually happen, and they become less reliable beyond a decade or two, but they can help organisations to plan by presenting a plausible range of scenarios built up from current observations about trends and ‘drivers’ influencing the present. Typically, scenarios are developed for three or four possible versions of the future, based on different combinations of outcomes for a couple of key areas of uncertainty.

My presentation outlined two sets of scenarios I had devised. For the civil servants the main uncertainties over the next fifteen years or so were technology take-up and social and cultural engagement: for the archaeologists they were social and economic inequality and social liberalism and tolerance: Some aspects may sound quirky or far-fetched, but they are useful for exploring fundamental questions for a sector or organisation such as:

• where do we think we will be in x years’ time?
• where would we like to be, and what can we do to help get there?
• where would we not like to be, and what can we do to avoid ending up there instead?

I am now working as a freelance archaeologist and part-time civil servant, and am keen to build on my futures work with archaeology and heritage organisations. Please contact me if you would like a copy of Future Past.

Anne Locke
01273 475381
anne.locke@uclmail.net
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In 2003, after more than twenty years of working in archaeology, I took a year out to study for an MA in Creative Writing at St Andrews. It was a great experience and I found myself re-thinking both my fiction writing and archaeology; hence this paper.

LANGUAGE AND VOICE

Seamus Heaney has twice described Bann Clay: in a poem of that name in *Door into the Dark* (1969)

*Slabs like the squared off clots Of a blue cream. Sunk for centuries under grass.*

and in *To a Dutch Potter in Ireland,* (from *The Spirit Level,* 1996).

*Until I found Bann clay. Like wet daylight or viscous satin under the felt and frieze Of humus layers. The true diatomite*

*Discovered in a little sucky hole, Grey-blue, doll-shining, scentless, touchable – Like the earth’s old ointment box, sticky and cool.*

He calls it ‘touchable’, inviting us to touch the ‘viscous satin’, and we feel that we almost could. Here is a different description

*Very compact, Bluish-grey to white, 10YR 8/1, pliable, clay 90% silt 10%, 35–17 cm, probably natural.*

Where Heaney’s description gives us great richness of language what we have here is, surely, poverty. It is worth looking briefly at how we arrived at this.

On my early excavations I was given a notebook in which to write not just the descriptions of what we found, but also what I thought. And I chose from the language I had, not from a list. Later, I was introduced to the context sheet, with its standardised fields, and to the spurious search for objectivity. The space for interpretation on the context sheet got smaller and often it was left blank – interpretation became something to be done later.

Archaeological language was sometimes further impoverished through translation into code or ‘keywords’ for a computer. Excavators, whose written ‘voice’ had been diminished by all of this, came to be seen as technicians, which did nothing for our pay, conditions or self-esteem.

The wheel of archaeological process is like the wheel of an ancient site caravan – rusty, mud-caked, even punctured, and yet it turns. There is now a move back to allowing excavators to write what they think and imagine as, for example, on Framework Archaeology’s Heathrow Terminal 5 excavations (Barratt 2006, 15). I think of it as writing outwards and upwards – writing not just about the posthole you have dug, but the other postholes in your area and in surrounding areas, and (upwards) about the posts that once stood in them, and even about the people who put the posts up. Archaeologists are getting their voice back.

CHARACTER AND STORY

I find that when writing fiction I often start with place, with landscape; after all, place is what archaeologists always have. I have had to learn how also to start with people, with characters. But what of characters in archaeological writing? A site report will typically only contain some names (authors and those acknowledged) while people from the past will typically only contain some names (authors and those acknowledged) while people from the past may actually be excluded through the chosen language, eg, in Phase 2, Pit 735 was backfilled with clay. The first major publication by Framework Archaeology, where the research design explicitly considered the character of the people who put the posts up, and of the posts that once stood in them, and even about the people who put the posts up. Archaeologists are getting their voice back.

Edmonds’ characters feel a little abstract, partly because they lack names, but his work is important – he recognises that ‘the study of the past is an act of the imagination, bound by convention and by evidence, but creative nonetheless.’

My other examples are taken from *The Early Meso-American Village* by Kent Flannery (1976). Flannery interspersed conventional archaeological papers with vignettes featuring three characters - the Great Synthesiser (GS), The Real Meso-American Archaeologist (RMA), and the Sceptical Graduate Student (SGS).

*While the waiter filled our order, RMA drew on a paper napkin the outline of the Rio San Jacinto drainage and the pattern of sites he had found so far. Reaching the end of the paper, he concluded, ‘and to the south, it looks as if there were no more Formative sites – just early Classic, and some small post-Classic sites.’*

*Near his elbow the SGS quickly added, ’but we can’t be sure, because our sample of sites is inadequate and our survey so far has been haphazard and unsuccessful.’*

*New, short of calling his attention to a whole projectile point on his backpack pile, there is probably no easier way to make an RMA angry than by telling him his survey techniques are inadequate. In fact, RMA is still overheated from having read Binford’s 1964 article ‘A consideration of archaeological research design.’ (p. 133)*

The characters (except Binford) still have representative titles instead of names, but they are vivid, and the characters are us, the people who do the archaeology. The writing is funny and memorable, and we nod when we read it in recognition of knowing people like that, because what shines through the fiction is the truth. This piece also shows that we are interested in ourselves.

We – archaeologists, visitors, developers, contractors – are the characters that inhabit the site. Other people want to meet us on open days and watch us working, or come to work with us at weekends – they practically want to be us. When they can’t actually experience excavation, they want to experience stories which have archaeology and archaeologists in them, a formula which has been successful for Time Team.

*The tea hut may now be a portacabin, the donkey jacket has been replaced by the hivi jacket, and the Eilan has given way to the portaloo, but the story goes on. I can’t remember which pits I dug at Winmill Down in 1977, but I can remember what happened at the dig hostel on the night the digger driver presented us with a barrel of scrumpy. We all sit in portacabins, in offices, in vans, in pubs or round fires, and we tell stories about characters. We have a great time and drink too much and what do we do the next morning? We get up and go to our offices and we write, ‘In Phase 1 ditch 761 was recut (794) along part of its length.’*

Surely, we can do better.

David Wilkinson

0 xford Archaeology
dwilkinson@oxfordarch.co.uk


Decent pay may be a holy grail for the archaeological profession but training should not be underestimated as a route to advancement. Parallel industries such as engineering and architecture prove this is a powerful tool. Individuals with a wider skill set get promotion, expect a wage rise, and impress potential employers.

Following the success of the Diggers Forum session at last year’s conference, the Forum focused this session on the issue of training within the industry. The subject has been rising up the agenda of many organisations over recent years, but what changes have been occurring on the ground? This session looked at where was developing issues of training, the initiatives promoted, and the results produced.

Kate Geary (IFA) looked at the relationship between the IFA and training, initially highlighting where the IFA’s role, remit and responsibilities lie in relation to professional archaeologists. IFA takes several approaches which include identifying skills gaps and training needs, identifying sources of funding, encouraging improvement of training provisions, and developing exemplar training projects. Also, through the RAQ scheme, IFA monitors training provisions provided by commercial organisations. At the core of the standards and guidance associated with training, IFA developed National Occupation Standards (NOS) which define the skills a competent person needs in order to undertake their job role. These standards underpin IFA’s HLF Workplace Learning Bursaries and the English Heritage-funded EPPIC placement schemes (p18).

The most recent application of the NOS has been as part of the NVQ qualification in archaeological practice (p5).

Hannah Cobb (University of Manchester) and Phil Richardson (CFA Archaeology/University of Newcastle) concentrated on archaeological training provisions within degree courses, highlighting the wide variations that occur. As an example of theoretical and practical training occurring side by side, the speakers used the Ardnamurchan Transitions Project at the Neolithic chambered tomb of Cladh Aindreis in western Scotland as a case study. The project explored the nature of the Neolithic/Mesolithic transition in the area, and less conventional training techniques were used alongside traditional ones to great affect. Academics and practising field archaeologists together enhanced student training, with a key aim being to transform student attitudes towards the integration of theory and practice. Students were allowed to transform themselves through developing self-reflexive aspects of the excavation process. Taking advantage of the relatively small team and high staff/student ratios, the excavation invited students to develop key interests, take responsibility for excavation and interpretation and to reflect upon transferable skills they were gaining whilst directly considering issues of employability.

Chris Perry and Rachel Bennett (Prospect) described the services their trade union provided to members. They highlighted plans to improve the pay and conditions of archaeologists across the country, which frequently involves employer pay bargaining and contractual negotiations. With closer liaison with industry bodies such as the Diggers Forum, IFA and BAJR, much more can hopefully be achieved. They also focused on the role of Union Learning Reps (ULRs) and how they can assist archaeologists to gain greater access to training. In their basic role ULRs promote training and development, and should add the possibility of workplace training bursaries and recent launch of archaeological NVQs.

Natalie Kershaw (Archpeople Recruitment) identified current practices in archaeology in terms of recruiting and training, with a view on what will happen if these practices do not change. Many archaeologists are not aware of employment issues that dominate across the country; there was little awareness of training opportunities that are available and no clear understanding of who to ask, where to go, or what subjects there were available. Organisations need to communicate these issues in terms of their professional and financial development, and should add the possibility of business training to provide a proper explanation of archaeology as a business.

Chris Clarke
Hon Chair, Diggers Forum
Chrisclarke600@hotmail.co.uk
This session showcased workplace learning placements designed by IFA for the Heritage Lottery Funded Workplace Learning Bursaries Scheme and the English Heritage funded EPPIC scheme. The HLF scheme will deliver at least eight placements a year for four years aimed at new and experienced practitioners. EPPIC is aimed at archaeologists in the early stages of their careers and consists of around five placements each year with EH teams.

The variety of HLF placements and specialisms was illustrated as Eliza Gore talked about learning to lecture with the University of Winchester, Foxy Demeanour described her training to become a finds/environmental officer with English Heritage, Tessa Poller recounted experiences surveying in the Scottish Highlands with RCAHMS and Emma-Jane O’Riordan spoke about working with digital data and e-publishing at ADS. We also heard from Oliver Russell and Victoria Bryant, trainee and supervisor at Worcestershire County Council, and their work enhancing the Worcestershire HER. The speakers were all at different stages in their placements and they gave an excellent overview of the scheme, the benefits they had gained and the challenges the placements had provided.

EPPIC placements have been run in previous years by English Heritage but were taken under the IFA wing last year. We heard about the challenges Kate Page-Smith faced learning non-intrusive archaeological surveying techniques with the south west team and the experiences of Naomi Archer and Matt Bentley, respectively architectural investigation and architectural graphics placements in York. John Lord, now of CgMs, completed an EPPIC placement four years ago and summed up the benefits and deficiencies of the scheme.

Debate then followed on the value of work-based learning and placements, the potential job market (or lack of, in some cases) for the skills gained and how future placements might be funded. Many speakers were talking for the first time at a conference but gave a thought provoking and inspiring session.

More details on the Workplace Learning Bursaries Scheme, including case studies and an evolving workplace learning diary, can be accessed from the Bursaries page on the IFA website. Between eight and ten Heritage Lottery funded bursaries will be available every year for four years across the UK, until 2010. Through Workplace Learning Bursaries, IFA aims to address identified archaeological skills gaps and create opportunities for all sectors of the community to gain professional skills in archaeology.

Kate Geary and Natasha Kingham

Bursary holders who gave papers at Reading (with Natasha Kingham, centre)
The last year has been an important one for the IFA. We have significantly improved our influence with government and decision-makers through active involvement in the development of the Heritage Protection White Paper and through consultations on a range of urban and rural, terrestrial and marine policies affecting our heritage. We have continued to communicate within the sector. The Reading Conference was a great success with more delegates attending than ever before. Throughout the year our publications, notably The Archaeologist and the Yearbook and directory, have continued to illustrate our role in and responsibilities to the historic environment.

This year has seen the culmination of several major initiatives in professional development. The launch of the NVQ in Archaeological Practice in April, with the highly successful workplace bursary scheme that provides archaeological apprenticeships (supported by HLF, English Heritage and sector partners), sustained emphasis on the importance of CPD and a decision to phase it in as a condition of membership all reflect our commitment to training and career development; and we have continued the development and provision of training courses in partnership with the Archaeology Training Forum, English Heritage and Historic Scotland. The Institute continues to make progress with the improvement of pay and conditions for archaeologists, with reformed minimum salary recommendations.

The institute has continued to promote professional practice with two new Standards and guidance – one on stewardship of the historic environment and another on maritime practice. These will be presented to the 2007 AGM.

These are significant achievements and are evidence of the Institute’s commitment to our membership in all areas of professional practice. It is a great pleasure to see that the Institutes membership continues to rise. We now have 2448 members.

Financially, too, this has been a successful year and we look forward to a celebrating the Institute’s first quarter century in 2008. My thanks go to Council and committee members, to the groups and our staff and to all the individual members who, through their hard work and support, have contributed to these major achievements. There is of course much more to be done and the next year will be especially important. The Institute operates in an increasingly challenging world. New legislation is promised and new planning guidance. But conservation of the historic environment and its study through archaeology continue to be viewed in false opposition to economic progress by the governments of the UK.

With our Chief Executive I have recently written to you to emphasise just how extensively the IFA represents professional practice in the historic environment. Our individual roles and professionalism are found in all areas of the historic environment. As archaeologist we are committed to the assessment, evaluation and informed decision making which have become the underlying principles of our professional practice. These principles have been recently captured in the new Stewardship Standard and guidance and in so many areas from excavation to building conservation, from planning to education, understanding, benefiting and managing have become the watchwords of our practice. Whatever our individual role, we all work as curators of the past.

Many perceive us differently. Many do not see beyond a job title and see only divisions in the sector. Many fail to recognise how valuable it is that our professional environment is becoming more integrated, how this is reflected in the way we work, how our workplaces are structured and in plans for legislative change. Attitudes like these stand in the way of our profession’s development in parts of the sector where we have legitimately much to say and much to do.

I believe we must make some fundamental changes to the Institute to allow it to represent the breadth of our professional practice. We must

- change the name of the Institute to reflect its broad role in archaeology and historic environment conservation
- build on the Stewardship standard and guidance developed with IBBC and ALGAO
- focus the published output of the Institute on the broadening needs and interests of our membership, including production of relevant professional papers
- give greater emphasis to CPD, professional training and practice qualifications
- reform membership validation processes to encourage applications from across the sector
- increase co-operation with other professional institutes, associations and organisations through joint committees, groups and projects.

I believe that now is the time for us to create an institute that embraces this evolution and aspires to work for all professionals in the historic environment. I hope that you will all join me in making 2008 not just a time to celebrate 25 years of successful practice but to usher in a new Institute better able to face the challenges of a more integrated future.

Michael Dawson
Hon Chair of Council

In line with the IFA Strategic Plan, Council has continued to pursue the following strategies

- S4.9: we will ensure our long-term financial security so that we are well placed to implement our strategies and activities for the benefit of members and others
- S4.9: we will generate income
- S4.10: we will manage our investments
- S4.11: we will pursue a sound pricing policy
- S4.12: we will manage the key risks to our financial security
- S4.13: we will maintain adequate financial controls and procedures

As reported in 2005/06 Council had agreed to invest some of the reserves in a recruitment strategy to increase the levels of individual and organisational membership. The increases in individual membership exceeded expectation in the past year, increasing by 11% and this has been a significant contributor to the unexpected surplus this year.

The Institute continues to maintain sufficient reserves to provide a financial base on which to plan expenditure to further the aims of the Institute’s Business Plan, in particular the future of the Institute as reported by the Honorary Chair, the promotion of the new Qualification in Archaeological Practice, continued recruitment within the profession and the wider historic environment, and development of membership services following the results of the membership questionnaire.

Gerald Wait
Hon Treasurer
The directors are responsible for preparing the Annual Report and the financial statements in accordance with applicable law and United Kingdom Generally Accepted Accounting Practice. Directors are required by company law to prepare financial statements which give a true and fair view of the company’s state of affairs at the end of the financial year and of the profit or loss of the company for the period ending on that date. In preparing these financial statements, directors are required to:

- select suitable accounting policies and apply them consistently;
- make judgements and estimates that are reasonable and prudent;
- prepare the financial statements on a going concern basis unless it is inappropriate to presume that the company will continue in business.

The directors are responsible for keeping proper accounting records which disclose with reasonable accuracy at any time the financial position of the company and enable them to ensure the financial statements comply with the Companies Act 1985. They have general responsibility for taking such steps as are reasonably open to them to safeguard the assets of the company and to prevent and detect fraud and other irregularities.

The following directors are to retire from the board at the Annual General Meeting in accordance with the Articles of Association and are eligible for immediate re-election and may therefore be re-nominated:

- Joanna Bacon
- Kasia Galaniec
- Victoria Hunns
- Clare King
- Philip Mills
- Geoff Morley
- Martin Newman
- David Parham
- Jayne Pilkington
- Roland Smith
- John Soden-Woodhead
- Jack Stevenson
- Jeremy Taylor
- David Thackray
- Andy Towle
- Rob Woodside
- Roger White
- Gerald Wili

The directors who served the company during the year were:

- Joanna Bacon
- Beverley Ballin-Smith
- Peter Barker
- Mike Bishop
- Stephen Briggs
- Kayt Brown
- Catherine Caranagh
- Christopher Clarke
- Patrick Clay
- Hester Cooper-Reade
- Verity Cooper-Musgrave
- David Devor
- Michael Dawson
- Veronica Fiorato
- David Gaimster
- Kasia Galaniec
- Victoria Hunns
- Clare King
- Philip Mills
- Geoff Morley
- Martin Newman
- David Parham
- Jayne Pilkington
- Roland Smith
- John Soden-Woodhead
- Jack Stevenson
- Jeremy Taylor
- David Thackray
- Andy Towle
- Rob Woodside
- Roger White
- Gerald Wili
- Hester Cooper-Reade
- Verity Cooper-Musgrave
- David Devor
- Michael Dawson
- Veronica Fiorato
- David Gaimster
- Kasia Galaniec
- Victoria Hunns
- Clare King
- Philip Mills
- Geoff Morley
- Martin Newman
- David Parham
- Jayne Pilkington
- Roland Smith
- John Soden-Woodhead
- Jack Stevenson
- Jeremy Taylor
- David Thackray
- Andy Towle
- Rob Woodside
- Roger White
- Gerald Wili

Employees of the Institute:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>PERIOD OF OFFICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Aitchison</td>
<td>MIFA Head of Professional Development</td>
<td>Full time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Asbury</td>
<td>AIFA Membership Administrator</td>
<td>Full time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynne Bevan</td>
<td>MIFA JBS Bulletin compiler</td>
<td>Part time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Geary</td>
<td>MIFA Training &amp; Standards Co-ordinator</td>
<td>Full time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Hinton</td>
<td>MIFA Chief Executive</td>
<td>Full time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Howard</td>
<td>Recruitment &amp; Marketing Co-ordinator</td>
<td>Part time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gina Jacklin</td>
<td>Finance &amp; Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>Full time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natasha Kingham</td>
<td>HLF Workplace Learning Bursary Co-ordinator (Apr 06)</td>
<td>Part time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandra Llewellyn</td>
<td>MIFA Head of Administration</td>
<td>Full time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Taylor</td>
<td>MIFA Editor</td>
<td>Part time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Whittington</td>
<td>FIPA Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>Full time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naomi Archer</td>
<td>EPIC scheme placement (to Mar 07)</td>
<td>Full time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathew Bentley</td>
<td>EPIC scheme placement (to Feb 07)</td>
<td>Full time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gemma Bryant</td>
<td>EPIC scheme placement (May 07)</td>
<td>Full time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Doherty</td>
<td>EPIC scheme placement (to Mar 07)</td>
<td>Full time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Fawkes</td>
<td>HLF workplace bursary placement (Jun 07)</td>
<td>Full time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliza Giov AIFA</td>
<td>HLF workplace bursary placement (Sep 06)</td>
<td>Full time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Grundley</td>
<td>AIFA EPIC scheme placement</td>
<td>Full time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma Houghton</td>
<td>EPIC scheme placement (to Feb 07)</td>
<td>Full time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Jones</td>
<td>HLF workplace bursary placement (Jan 07)</td>
<td>Full time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Madgwick</td>
<td>HLF workplace bursary placement (Dec 06)</td>
<td>Full time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Martin</td>
<td>MIFA EPIC scheme placement (Apr 07)</td>
<td>Full time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Millward</td>
<td>FIPA EPIC scheme placement (Mar 07)</td>
<td>Full time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnieszka Sadrasi</td>
<td>EPIC scheme placement (Apr 07)</td>
<td>Full time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Page-Smith</td>
<td>MIFA EPIC scheme placement (to Feb 07)</td>
<td>Full time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tessa Fuller</td>
<td>HLF workplace bursary placement (Jul 06 to Jan 07)</td>
<td>Full time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We have audited the financial statements of the Institute of Field Archaeologists (Company Limited By Guarantee) for the year ended 31 March 2007. These financial statements have been prepared under the accounting policies set out therein and the requirements of the Financial Reporting Standards for Smaller Entities (effective January 2005).

This report is made solely to the company’s members, as a body, in accordance with Section 235 of the Companies Act 1985. Our work has been undertaken so that we might state to the company’s members those matters we are required to state to them in an auditors’ report and for no other purpose. To the fullest extent permitted by law, we do not accept or assume responsibility to anyone other than the company and the company’s members as a body, for our audit work, for this report, or for the opinions we have formed.

We conducted our audit in accordance with International Standards on Auditing (UK and Ireland) issued by the Auditing Practices Board. An audit includes an examination, on a test basis, of evidence relevant to the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. It also includes an assessment of the significant accounting policies set out therein and the requirements of the Financial Reporting Standards for Smaller Entities (effective January 2005).

We report to you our opinion as to whether the financial statements give a true and fair view, in accordance with United Kingdom Generally Accepted Accounting Practice applicable to Smaller Entities, of the state of the company’s affairs as at 31 March 2007 and of its loss for the year then ended;

the financial statements have been properly prepared in accordance with the Companies Act 1985; and

the information given in the Directors’ Report is consistent with the financial statements.

We read the Directors’ Report and consider the implications for our report if we become aware of any apparent misstatements within it.

BASIS OF AUDIT OPINION
We conducted our audit in accordance with International Standards on Auditing (UK and Ireland) issued by the Auditing Practices Board. An audit includes an examination, on a test basis, of evidence relevant to the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. It also includes an assessment of the significant estimates and judgements made by the directors in the preparation of the financial statements, and of whether the accounting policies are appropriate to the company’s circumstances, consistently applied and adequately disclosed.

We planned and performed our audit so as to obtain all the information and explanations which we considered necessary in order to provide us with sufficient evidence to give reasonable assurance that the financial statements are free from material misstatement, whether caused by fraud or other irregularity or error. In forming our opinion we also evaluated the overall adequacy of the presentation of information in the financial statements.

OPINION
In our opinion:

the financial statements give a true and fair view, in accordance with United Kingdom Generally Accepted Accounting Practice applicable to Smaller Entities, of the state of the company’s affairs as at 31 March 2007 and of its loss for the year then ended;

the financial statements have been properly prepared in accordance with the Companies Act 1985; and

the information given in the Directors’ Report is consistent with the financial statements.

ROSS BROOKE LIMITED
Chartered Accountants & Registered Auditors, 21/22 Park Way, Newbury, Berkshire RG14 1EE
06/08/2007

Gerald Wait
Director

The financial statements have been prepared in accordance with the special provisions of Part VII of the Companies Act 1985 relating to small companies and with the Financial Reporting Standard for Smaller Entities (effective January 2005).

Approved by the Board on 6 June 2007 and signed on its behalf by:

Gerald Wait
Director
The audit of the company's annual accounts for the year ended 31 March 2007 and the financial statements an adjustment to the prior year was required as conference costs of £29,773 were accrued as income. The total gain recognised in the 2006 financial statements was £23,194.

The income, expenditure and funds held by these groups are incorporated into the accounts of the institute.

The balance of costs recognised that are in excess or deficit of invoiced costs are carried forward in accruals or work in progress. Provision is made in accruals for any foreseeable losses.

Operating leases are recognised in the profit and loss account as incurred.

Operating leases are charged to the profit and loss account as incurred.

Profit and loss account transactions in foreign currencies are translated into sterling at the exchange rate ruling at the date of the transaction. Assets and liabilities denominated in foreign currencies are translated into sterling at the balance sheet date and the exchange differences are included in the profit and loss account.

Depreciation on tangible fixed assets is charged to the profit and loss account as incurred. depreciation is provided on tangible fixed assets at a rate of 25% on a straight-line basis. 

Office equipment - 50% straight line basis

The balance of costs recognised that are in excess or deficit of invoiced costs are carried forward in accruals or work in progress. Provision is made in accruals for any foreseeable losses.

Operating leases are charged to the profit and loss account as incurred.

Operating leases are charged to the profit and loss account as incurred.

As at 31 March 2007 the company had annual commitments of £307,443.

The aggregate payroll costs of these persons were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wages and salaries</td>
<td>£195,183</td>
<td>£156,480</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Corporation tax is only chargeable on bank interest received.
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The 2006/07 IFA Council is made up of 23 corporate members of the Institute. They cover a wide perspective of the historic environment profession and include representatives from county archaeologists, conservation officers, national heritage agencies, historic environment advisers, universities, consultants and IFA Area and Special Interest Groups.

As ever, Council continues to oversee the strategic aims of the Institute and debate key issues facing the profession with guidance from six elected Executive committee members and eight committee members who cover issues of professional training, working practices in archaeology, applications for membership and RAOs, etc.

MEMBERSHIP AND PERSONNEL
The IFA has 11 staff members who are dedicated to the day to day running of the Institute. It also employs a number of individuals as part of the English Heritage Professional Placements in Archaeology, and the IFA Workplace Learning Nursery scheme which is now in its second year and making excellent progress, with thanks to a grant from the Heritage Lottery Fund.

Year 1 placements have been hosted by English Heritage, Wiltshire County Council, BCAHMS, Swiss Archaeological Society, and AAD/Internet Archaeology, RCAHMS and the Universities of Cardiff and Winchester. Two placements have recently been completed and the feedback from those has been extremely positive. Year 2 is set to include exciting new placements with AOC (Scotland), North Yorkshire County Council, ARCUS, English Heritage National Monuments Record Centre, Headland Archaeology, and others to be confirmed soon. There continues to be enormous enthusiasm for the scheme from both archaeological organisations offering to host placements, and applicants keen to gain new skills in the workplace.

Our recruitment campaign has continued and in turn the Validation Committee and Membership Team have continued to deal with an increased number of applications. In the last twelve months they have considered 333 new, 91 upgrade and 14 rejoiner applications, an increase of 19%. One new application was turned down and two were not accepted for the grade for which they had applied. Membership Appeals Committee considered two appeals against the decision of Validation. The current (June) membership is as follows (2006 figures in brackets)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honorary</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>(336)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practitioners</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>(214)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliate</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>(180)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>(911)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>(552)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,946</td>
<td>(2,220)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of IFA Registered Archaeological Organisations has also increased from 31 to 53. Two applications have been deferred by the RAO committee for further clarification.

OUTREACH

Staff and Groups have again continued to carry out a programme of outreach. The 25th anniversary conference in Reading was a success and attracted a record 460 delegates and a large number of display exhibitors. We would like to thank all those who sponsored the conference which includes Troweregate Risk Solutions, our principal sponsor and session and event-sponsors Archaeological, Forensic & Environmental Scientific Services, Beta Analytic, Council for British Archaeology, CGMs, English Heritage, Headland Archaeology and the Heritage Lottery Fund. Our 2008 conference will be held in Swansea.

During the last year The Archaeologist magazine has covered the topics of Archaeology and identity, Archaeology and urban regeneration, Archaeology and field survey and Post-medieval archaeology. From April 2007 the popular Jobs Information Bulletin has been provided as a free service to members along with Heritage Link Update newsletter both of which can be received by email. As reported last year we carried out a review of our publication strategy and as part of the implementation plan we have recently carried out a questionnaire survey of membership services to assist us in gaining a better understanding of what members would like to receive from their Institute.

Staff, Council and Groups have continued to represent IFA on external bodies including DCMS heritage protection reform sounding board and working groups, APPAG advisory group. The Archaeology Forum, the CCSkills Cultural Heritage Panel, ICE Site Investigations Steering Committee and the Archaeology Training Forum. They have also responded to 16 consultations such as RAB Pap and Conditions for 2007/2008, Historic Ships Consultations, DCMS Capability Review, Draft Marine Minerals Dredging Regulations & Procedural Guidelines, Understanding the Future: Priorities for England’s Museums paper and most recently the Heritage Protection for the 21st Century White Paper.

STANDARDS

The Committee for Working Practices in Archaeology, supported by Kate Gary, Training and Standards Coordinator, has continued to work towards improving standards. The new IFA pay minima came into effect from 1 April and will be monitored through established RAO monitoring procedures. Whilst for many this will represent an improvement in conditions of employment, there is still a need to improve basic pay. To this end, a consultant has been appointed to oversee the benchmarking of archaeological salaries against those in other sectors. This work will take place over the summer, with preliminary results expected by the AGM in October 2007.

The Standards and guidance for Stewardship, and a Standard for Nautical Archaeology Recording and Reconstruction are proposed for adoption at the 2007 AGM.

We have continued to make progress on improving opportunities for professional training and our Professional Training Committee has agreed a timetable for the introduction of compulsory CPD in 2010. Also, working with English Heritage and IBHC, another six EPIC placements have been appointed this year and the scheme has been aligned more closely with the HLF workplace learning bursaries scheme which aims to address identified archaeological skills gaps, build capacity within the heritage sector and create opportunities for all sectors of the community to gain professional skills whilst earning a realistic salary. Trainers on both placement schemes will be amongst the first candidates to undertake the new Qualification in Archaeological Practice which was launched on 25 April. The IFA will offer the Qualification alongside a network of assessment centres overseen by the awarding body, EDF. Work has started to revise the IFA’s validation procedures to take the new qualification into account.

As reported in TA 62 an independent review was carried out on our implementation of the Disciplinary by-law adopted at the 2005 AGM, which proved satisfactory. In the last year we have been dealing with six cases, three ongoing from last year and three new. Of these, two are continuing to be investigated. After discussion with an advisory recommendations, one was deemed to have no case to answer, and one resulted in expulsion from IFA. There have been three complaints against RAOs.

Over the past year there has been a sense of achievement in particular with regard to recruitment, the continued success of the HLF and EPIC placement schemes, and the launch of the Qualification for Archaeological Practice. Thanks are due to all staff who ensure the development of the Institute and maintain the smooth running of the IFA Council, Executive and other committees. Thanks are also due to our committee members who dedicate their time voluntarily to the Institute. We are always keen to see new faces on our committees, and if you are interested in assisting in the development of your Institute please contact the office staff for further information.

Hester Cooper-Reade
Hon Secretary
REPORT OF THE MARITIME AFFAIRS GROUP

Julie Satchell (Hon Chair), Mark Dunkley (Hon Secretary), Douglas McEwing (Hon Treasurer), Mark Littlewood, Paola Palma, David Parham and Jessy Rose.

Responses have been made to Delta's Marine bill and ICOMAR Marine minerals consultations, the Archaeological Archives Forum (Archive Best Practice document), CONWRE – Windfarms & historic environment, DCMS' Proposed designation of a historic vessel and Future of museums and the National historic ships committee consultation, and to the Scottish Executive Inquiry on marine heritage.

In September the Managing the marine cultural heritage II conference was organised by Paola Palma and Dave Parham, sponsored by English Heritage and the British Academy. Work now begins on publication of the proceedings. MAGIC seminars were Marine archaeological archives in policy and practice, organised by Jessy Rose, and IFA and Maritime consultation on cultural heritage designation, organised by Mark Dunkley in February. This event brought a range of views on the current and potential provision of advice in relation to marine historic assets. A successful session was held at the IFA conference in Reading (p30).

Regular communication with MAGIC members has continued through our 'Email Information Service' thanks to our secretary Mark Dunkley and the MAGIC Bulletin edited by Mark Littlewood.

Slipping through the net: maritime archaeological archives in policy and practice was published in support of the seminar held in December. It outlined the principal issues and challenges facing marine archives and was widely circulated for consultation. Standard and guidance for nautical recording and reconstruction, by Douglas McEwing, is proposed for consultation at the AGM. Managing the marine cultural heritage: defining, assessing and managing the resource – the proceedings of the first MAGIC conference, edited by Julie Satchell and Paola Palma, has been published through the CBA Research Report Series (supported by English Heritage). A special edition of the MAGIC bulletin Provision of advice in support of marine designation includes papers from the February seminar, with responses by delegates.

Julie Satchell, Chair, Maritime Affairs Group

REPORT OF THE DIGGERS FORUM

Chris Clarke (Hon Chair), Paul Everill (Hon Secretary), Jez Taylor (Hon Treasurer), Geoff Morley, and Kevin Wooldridge

The committee met on a regular basis, developing initiatives to improve pay and conditions of employment for non-management level field archaeologists and specialists. The most significant initiative we launched this year was the 'Living Wage' campaign which has been undertaken in co-operation with IFA, Prospect, and BAJR. The aims are to highlight poor levels of pay within the industry and to increase pressure on employers to raise wages. The campaign is now seeing good intentions by IFA and SCAUM IFA, Prospect, and BAJR. The aims are to highlight poor levels of pay within the industry and to increase pressure on employers to raise wages. The campaign is now seeing good intentions by IFA and SCAUM.

We held another successful session at IFA's Conference at Reading University, focusing on training and development (p6). We have also been developing greater contacts with UNISON to further engage public sector archaeologists, plus providing a response to the consultation of the Standard and guidance for stewardship of the historic environment. Two issues of the DF newsletter (the Forum Dispatch) have been published, while the DF webpage has been regularly updated.

The 2007 AGM will be followed by a seminar to discuss the progress of current DF initiatives.

Chris Clarke, Hon Chair, Diggers Forum

REPORT OF THE VOLUNTARY & COMMUNITY ARCHaeology GROUP

Jeff Morris (Hon Chair), Kate Clark (Hon Sec)

IFA Council has now sanctioned creation of the above group which is now organising its first AGM. Purposes of the group will be to:

• promote discussion between voluntary and community archaeologists and other archaeologists to foster greater understanding and improvement of relations, to further the overall pursuance of archaeological knowledge and research.

REPORT OF THE BUILDINGS ARCHAEOLOGY GROUP 2005–7

Marilyn Palmer (Hon Chair), Jonathan Mulvin (Hon Secretary), Jonathan Edis (Hon Treasurer), Heather Lindsay (Education Officer), Philip Thomas (Newsletter Editor), Germaine Franklin (Newsletter Designer), Oliver Jessop (Website Editor), David Connolly, Shamin Fraser, Frank Green, Bob Hill and Peter Owen.

We are grateful to David Divers for formally representing BAG on IFA Council. This report covers 2005–7.

BAG has 264 members, produces two newsletters a year, organises a session on buildings archaeology and a tour at each of the IFA conferences and makes representations on guidance and policy documents from government and other organisations. The group co-organised a training seminar in June 2005 with the IFA Finds Group on Buildings Archaeology and Building Materials, the papers for which are published on the Groups' pages on the IFA website.

BAG provided case studies and a model recording brief for English Heritage's Understanding historic buildings and areas policy and guidance for LPHs, and led on a major IFA representation to DCMS on their draft Revision to principles of selection: PPG 15 and on English Heritage's Conservation principles guidance. We have good links with ALGAC's Buildings Committee, the AIA and the Historic Farm Buildings Forum. We are looking to build improved links with IBRC and RICS.

We have three committee meetings a year followed by a tour of local sites, such as Battersea Power Station and cutlery works in Sheffield. New committee members are needed with the energy and time to help respond to consultations, revise IFA's guidance on building recording and analysis and set up training courses. In particular, we are seeking individuals to take responsibility for the website and newsletter.

Catherine Cavanagh, Outgoing Education Officer, Buildings Archaeology Group

Jonathan Smith, Outgoing Honorary Secretary, Buildings Archaeology Group

REPORT OF THE WALES/CYMRU GROUP

Jenny Hall (Hon Chair), Ffion Gale (Hon Secretary), Kate Jowett (Hon Treasurer), Stephen Briggs (Hon Editor), John Latham, Neil Johnston, Ian Brooks (Hon Treasurer from October 2006), Richard Hawkins, Jonathan Berry.

The AGM was held on 7 July 2006 and the Wales/Cymru committee also met on 7 July and 6 October. We held our spring day school on Prehistoric funerary and rural monuments: Where are we and where are we going? The theme of both day schools was informed by the ritual monuments: Where are we and where are we going?

The AGM was held on 7 July 2006 and the Wales/Cymru committee also met on 7 July and 6 October. We held our spring day school on Prehistoric funerary and rural monuments: Where are we and where are we going? The theme of both day schools was informed by the ritual monuments: Where are we and where are we going?

The AGM was held on 7 July 2006 and the Wales/Cymru committee also met on 7 July and 6 October. We held our spring day school on Prehistoric funerary and rural monuments: Where are we and where are we going? The theme of both day schools was informed by the ritual monuments: Where are we and where are we going?

Jenny Hall, Hon Chair, IFA Wales/Cymru group
• Archaeological organisations often infringe the rights of freelance illustrators in using and reproducing their work. John Hodgson, head of archaeological graphics at English Heritage, emphasised that EH can recommend good practice, run training courses and placements but is not in a position to police standards. A wide variety of graphics skills and software knowledge is required by employers today, yet when employees upgrade their skills this is rarely rewarded by career advancement.

Sarah Lucas (Oxford Archaeology) and Laura Templeton (Worcester County Council) outlined the experience of employees in their respective organisations, focusing on issues raised in discussion. Do employers support illustrators and surveyors by paying professional association and conference fees? This varies between employers. Do illustrators and surveyors get the acknowledgement they deserve in publications? Compared to the authors of often short specialist reports, illustrators are often not mentioned on the title page.

The meeting closed with an invitation to interested participants to sign up for the ISSIG (Illustrators and Surveyors Special Interest Group) which is being organised by John Hodgson, Jo Bacon and Laura Templeton. Contact them c/o IFA at Reading.

The session was an opportunity to air issues of concern to illustrators and surveyors. Short presentations were given to initiate discussion on various topics.

• How consistent is the standard of drawn recording and how reliable are survey data deposited in archives? Colin Berks is liaising with the IFA to build on the excellent general guidelines produced by English Heritage and to produce more detailed technical guidelines which can be promoted to the industry.

• Training is crucial in maintaining standards. Trevor Pearson, head of archaeological graphics at English Heritage, emphasised that EH can recommend good practice, run training courses and placements but is not in a position to police standards.

• Archaeological organisations often infringe the rights of freelance illustrators in using and reproducing their work. John Hodgson pointed out the need for proper copyright licensing agreements as developed by AAIS and supported by IFA. These need to be actively promoted to safeguard freelancers’ rights.

• Along with other specialists, illustrators fare badly in the salary league tables (see TA 60, p52). David Connolly told us about the new BAJR recommended payscales and highlighted the need to raise the profile of illustration work by defining jobs more precisely. A wide variety of graphics skills and software knowledge is required by professionals today, yet when employees upgrade their skills this is rarely rewarded by career advancement.

Sarah Lucas (Oxford Archaeology) and Laura Templeton (Worcester County Council) outlined the experience of employees in their respective organisations, focusing on issues raised in discussion. Do employers support illustrators and surveyors by paying professional association and conference fees? This varies between employers. Do illustrators and surveyors get the acknowledgement they deserve in publications? Compared to the authors of often short specialist reports, illustrators are often not mentioned on the title page.

The meeting closed with an invitation to interested participants to sign up for the ISSIG (Illustrators and Surveyors Special Interest Group) which is being organised by John Hodgson, Jo Bacon and Laura Templeton. Contact them c/o IFA at Reading.
GREAT EXCAVATIONS
‘THE BEST OF TIMES; THE WORST OF TIMES’

John Schofield

The idea for this session came while having an evening drink after a conference session in Tasmania, talking with others about how far from conventional field archaeology my career was taking me. It seemed an odd contradiction that, despite the distance, the influence of my early training was increasingly evident: it drove my enthusiasm for archaeology as a discipline that provided a unique perspective on the past; but increasingly it helped me to see the contemporary world through an archaeological lens – a unique perspective on the present. I decided then that, whatever happens for the rest of my career, I will always be an archaeologist. We see the world in a particular way. We have remained archaeologists, following particular paths or specialisms, because of something we were taught, perhaps on one of these Great Excavations. As individuals we owe these excavations a great deal – as a digger I will never forget what I learnt at Hambledon Hill, the Sweet Track and at Pont Newydd. But as a profession the debt is greater still.

FUN AND FREEDOM
‘It was the best of times; it was the worst of times’. Great excavations were always both – there were times on each of my three great excavations when I hated archaeology! But what actually made an excavation ‘great’ was key here, and a point addressed by several of the eleven speakers. Do great excavators make great sites or vice versa? Great excavations were inevitably great fun. But is it still possible to have fun in these days of commercially-driven archaeological practice? There’s another ‘F’ too: Freedom. Is freedom to experiment still possible in the field, or are we driven too closely by inflexible project designs and rigid project management procedures? Indeed are Fun and Freedom closely related? Does lack of one preclude the other?

SHEER PHYSICAL EFFORT
Francis Pryor spoke of team dynamics, highlighting the importance of volunteers, directors and supervisors. Did the project have a good vibe? How important was sheer physical effort – clearly a factor for at least one participant at West Harlerton. And what about the women – weirdly absent from the list of speakers? Tim Schadla-Hall spoke of Clark’s excavations at Star Carr. He revealed the future careers of the men that worked there; but there appears no trace at all of the women. Changes of supervisors. Did the project have a good vibe? How important was sheer physical effort – clearly a factor for at least one participant at West Harlerton. And what about the women – weirdly absent from the list of speakers? Tim Schadla-Hall spoke of Clark’s excavations at Star Carr. He revealed the future careers of the men that worked there; but there appears no trace at all of the women. Changes of name make it more difficult to track them I guess.

LEARNING, LIVING AND WORKING
Before the session started one speaker asked ‘Is this session entirely self-indulgent?’ ‘Of course’, I replied. It was my hope that speakers would reflect on how these projects shaped them as professionals, but also how it shaped others that came to experience such a unique activity, one in which boundaries between learning, living and working blurred to the point of collapse. Alongside Tony Wilmott’s reminiscences on Birdoswald, Whitby, Chester and Richborough, Bob Croft’s review of Wharram Percy came closest to this ambition perhaps, with some wonderful insight and personal stories, not least on those greats of medieval archaeology: Hurst and Beresford. As with Geoff Wainwright’s ‘Antiquity’ piece some years ago, the excavation team photos were from another age – reminiscent of an Incredible String Band album cover. There’s surely a book of these team photos waiting to be published!

But it was OK to avoid self-indulgence too. Stephen Briggs conducted an eloquent review of British excavation in the period 1729-1876, and Martin Carver revealed four centuries of excavation at Sutton Hoo, culminating in his own work there. Paul Everill spoke about Sutton Hoo too, in the context of his recently completed research into ‘the invisible diggers’, and the changing conditions of field archaeology over the years.

PART OF THE HERITAGE
‘The future’ was raised in several presentations and in the discussion that followed. Richard Hall spoke of the new excavation at Hengate, in the context of his earlier ‘Viking Dig’, for example. All agreed that great excavations are needed, perhaps to maintain tradition; certainly to inspire and engage archaeologists in the future. If this session succeeded only in emphasising this fact it will have been worthwhile. It was a popular session, and fun: for those that had been there; and those like me for whom these great excavations are part of the heritage, the folk history and the mythology of British field archaeology.

The session is now being prepared for publication with Oxbow. The latest count is 22 chapters. Great Excavations will now become a Great Publication, I hope.

John Schofield
English Heritage
The last ten years have seen greater emphasis placed on social and other forms of inclusion in the workplace. Although driven by government legislation this also reflects changes in contemporary society, with multi-culturalism and recognition that all members of society have something to contribute. Archaeology is central to this radical shift in many ways. In this session we looked at current practical and research projects that have been exploring aspects of inclusion in archaeology and heritage. The papers described work with ethnic minorities, disenfranchised social groups and the disabled, as well as the non-professional sector of archaeology.

Rachel Hasted, head of Inclusion and Diversity Policy for English Heritage, discussed EH’s developing policy towards inclusion. Britain today is multi-cultural, and yet some groups are under-represented in heritage activities. She considered possible reasons for this, whether some groups do feel excluded, and the nature of ‘Englishness’ today. She concluded by asking whether English Heritage should continue to be called ‘English’ Heritage?

Don Henson, education officer for CBA, spoke about the future direction of public archaeology. He reviewed how archaeology had started as a rich man’s hobby but now attracted diverse groups. He argued that, despite mass participation in archaeology on television, the reality is fundamentally about uncovering a small-scale and geographically specific past that belongs to local people. True public involvement in archaeology is people investigating for themselves, giving meaning to the places in which they live. The increase in local groups means that archaeology is no longer just the preserve of professionals and he saw this ‘democratisation of archaeology’ as making a positive contribution to the discipline.

Tim Phillips of the Department of Archaeology at the University of Reading presented the results of the Inclusive, Accessible, Archaeology project which was funded by the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) to investigate disability and archaeological fieldwork training. Through questionnaire surveys, the project team had established that there were significant numbers of archaeology students and professional archaeologists with a recognised disability. In many cases these are not very visible, being conditions such as dyslexia and other hidden disabilities. To tackle the challenge of including disabled students in fieldwork training, the project developed a self-evaluation tool kit with which all students could assess their potential and developing abilities and archaeological and transferable skills. By emphasising people’s abilities, what they can do rather than their disabilities, the tool kit allows an individual to establish where reasonable adjustments may have to be made to ensure that they are included.

Sarah Dhanjal, Widening Participation and Diversity officer at the Institute of Archaeology at University College London, highlighted the fact that participation in archaeology does not reflect the diversity of today’s society. She spoke about the initiatives being pursued by the Young Archaeologists Club in Camden that were trying to encourage youngsters from ethnic minorities to become involved and perhaps consider archaeology as a subject to be taken in higher education.

Andrew Petersen of Lampeter University finished with a paper on Islam and Archaeology in Britain. He reviewed the rich but little known archaeological evidence for Muslims in Britain and their interaction with British society. This included artefacts from medieval and later excavations, as well as the period of the British Empire. He also considered Muslim representations in architecture such as the Royal Pavilion in Brighton and some of the first mosques to be built in this country by Islamic immigrants. The discussion highlighted that there is much in the archaeological record of Britain that Muslims can relate to and engage with directly.

Tim Phillips
Teaching Development Officer, Department of Archaeology, University of Reading
lj.phillips@reading.ac.uk

Andrew Petersen

A Turkic gun that, as an inscription on it says, was made by Murad son of Abdullah in 1524 and was ‘taken’ in Egypt by the British army in 1801. Now displayed in Horse Guards Parade, London.

A former coin of the Abbasid Caliphate, dating to the early 9th century.

Shoreditch Park excavations in Hackney formed the focus of the talk given by Faye Simpson of the University of Exeter. She emphasised that lack of appropriate learning can lead to behavioural difficulties, social exclusion and even criminal activity in later life. Inclusion of local people in Hackney who are in danger of being socially excluded had had rewarding results, allowing participants to learn life skills and build self-confidence and social skills so that they could become full members of society and train for employment. She argued that archaeological fieldwork is the perfect tool to deliver individual focused learning.

Sarah Dhanjal
Widening Participation and Diversity officer at the Institute of Archaeology at University College London
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Shoreditch Park excavations in Hackney formed the focus of the talk given by Faye Simpson of the University of Exeter. She emphasised that lack of appropriate learning can lead to behavioural difficulties, social exclusion and even criminal activity in later life. Inclusion of local people in Hackney who are in danger of being socially excluded had had rewarding results, allowing participants to learn life skills and build self-confidence and social skills so that they could become full members of society and train for employment. She argued that archaeological fieldwork is the perfect tool to deliver individual focused learning.
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Andrew Petersen of Lampeter University finished with a paper on Islam and Archaeology in Britain. He reviewed the rich but little known archaeological evidence for Muslims in Britain and their interaction with British society. This included artefacts from medieval and later excavations, as well as the period of the British Empire. He also considered Muslim representations in architecture such as the Royal Pavilion in Brighton and some of the first mosques to be built in this country by Islamic immigrants. The discussion highlighted that there is much in the archaeological record of Britain that Muslims can relate to and engage with directly.
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This paper was conceived as an examination of the lot of a museum curator in a commercialised archaeological profession. What emerged was an examination of the professional condition of the archaeological profession in Britain based around contemporary sources, including *Profiling the profession* (IFA, 2003) and the Review of archive standards (2004), produced by the Archaeological Archives Forum. Quotations from these were compared with more venerable views of archaeology. Some understanding was reached of how things have changed with regard to our perceptions of the archaeological profession and our expectations for its progress. This might best be summarised by a few of the quotations presented.

‘Project briefs are not successfully governing archaeological practice; the resources are not always there to enforce them and they are inconsistent from region to region’ (AAF, 2004).

‘…field archaeologists with no knowledge of, or interest in, research questions are dictating the scope and scale of finds work with the result that finds reports are no more than catalogues of data devoid of interpretation’ (IFA, 2003).

‘…the archaeologist is no mere clerk in a counting-house…Passion, enthusiasm… – that is the basic quality which our discipline exerts from us. And if you who are entering upon it have no vital urge within, turn, I beg you, to some less human avocation than the study of mankind. There are enough already of the house-painters who ape the artist.’ (Wheeler, 1954)

‘Too much conflict is talked up between consultants, curators and contractors. It is immature and we should move on from these entrenched positions. Our profession is not in a healthy state at all’ (IFA, 2003).

Boundaries between trade, privatisation and piracy were often blurred, and successful operators had mutually beneficial links with the court of Elizabeth I. One example was Henry Seckford, 16th-century merchant, courtier and privater, who captured two Italian ships off the Algarve in 1590. Litigation by the National Museum in Baghdad in 2003 has demonstrated that inhabitants and owners of our site were active at sea. Half of them could be linked to piracy and privatisation, and where no career could be identified links with pirates and privateers were frequently demonstrable (inheritance, marriage, business deals etc). During the 16th and 17th centuries the foundations were laid for pirate and privateer communities as companies of ‘adventurers’. Places where they could meet and lodge offered opportunities to exchange information and plan joint actions. Within these social networks pirate culture developed, and an identifiable material culture was associated with this specific social group.

The waterfront here was associated with maritime activities, and occupation coincided with expansion of English maritime power and with conflict with Spain. Documentary research by Chris Phillpotts has demonstrated that inhabitants and owners of our site were active at sea. Half of them could be linked to piracy and privatisation, and where no career could be identified links with pirates and privateers were frequently demonstrable (inheritance, marriage, business deals etc). During the 16th and 17th centuries the foundations were laid for pirate and privateer communities as companies of ‘adventurers’. Places where they could meet and lodge offered opportunities to exchange information and plan joint actions. Within these social networks pirate culture developed, and an identifiable material culture was associated with this specific social group.

The international antiquities trade is to an extent covert. It is for example common practice to quote lower prices in customs documentation than the actual ones charged in transactions. Common law in many European countries favours the rights of the innocent buyer of stolen goods and Switzerland has become a recognisable stopping off point to legitimise ownership of looted antiquities. Britain has the second largest art market in the world with sales totalling just under £3300 million in 2002.
Archaeological sites are looted by an assortment of people, from farmers to army units, organised criminal gangs to day trippers. Money made by looters is chickenfeed compared to that made by antiquities dealers and art buyers. Dealers obtain their purchases from local middlemen, they function on the international stage, share a common professional language and culture. Governments have been reluctant to introduce more than limited regulation.

What 16th-century pirates have in common with unethical art dealers, auctioneers, middlemen, art buyers and government officials therefore are a common interest in a specific material culture, elements of a common culture and language, a presence in the international market, participation in illegal and illicit trade, and protection by and collusion with government agencies and powerful patrons.

Frank Meddens
Pre-Construct Archaeology
fmmeddens@pre-construct.com

WHERE ARE ALL THE IRAQI ARTEFACTS GOING?
Neil Brodie

Before the 1991 Gulf War Iraq's archaeological heritage was supervised and protected by a large and professional Department of Antiquities and remained relatively free of theft and vandalism. In the aftermath of the 1991 war, eleven regional museums were broken into and approximately 3000 artefacts and 484 manuscripts were stolen, of which only 54 have been recovered. By late 2003 archaeological looting in southern Iraq had escalated out of control. There was extensive digging at Larsa and hundreds of looters were reported at work at Adab, Umma and Isin, and other sites too had been badly damaged. As the security situation has worsened there have been no systematic surveys. But eye-witness reports and satellite photography suggest archaeological looting has continued unabated. After UN Security Council Resolution 1483 unprovenanced Mesopotamian artefacts offered for sale at the main London and New York auction houses have dropped off to nothing, but they are easily found on the Internet.

In retrospect it is easy to see that during the 1990s political and academic apathy allowed the illegal trade in looted Iraqi antiquities to develop and prosper. Despite the best efforts of a small number of academics and journalists, most of academia and the media seemed unaware of what was happening. Those profiting from the trade, either commercially or academically, looked the other way. If decisive action had been taken in the 1990s to ensure the effective enforcement of regulatory controls, the illegal trade in Iraqi antiquities could have been stopped from taking root. Then there would have been no point in robbing the National Museum in 2003, as there would have been no market for the stolen material.

Neil Brodie
Illicit Antiquities Research Centre, Cambridge
njb1012@cam.ac.uk

NIGHTHAWKING
Jill Hind

Oxford Archaeology has been commissioned by English Heritage to investigate nighthawks and nighthawking, and the extent of illegal metal detecting, across Britain. Our aims are to

- produce targeted baseline data on the extent of damage to the archaeological heritage caused by nighthawking
- foster a climate of opinion that the illegal search, removal and sale of antiquities is unacceptable
- collate data on the sale of illicitly recovered archaeological material online and elsewhere
- collate information on prosecutions and convictions of ‘heritage crime’

The project is therefore solely concerned with those who break the law, not the majority of detectors who follow good practice. Incidents of damage from nighthawking and illicit sale of items will be collected by questionnaire (online or paper). Although key organisations will be contacted, it is hoped to attract information from the wider public. Some follow-up interviews will also be carried out.

The questionnaire is available at www.nighthawking.thehumanjourney.net and will stay open until the end of 2007. For further information contact nighthawking@oxfordarch.co.uk

Jill Hind
Oxford Archaeology
j.hind@oxfordarch.co.uk

IN THE METAL STORE WITH A LEAD PIPE...
Roy Stephenson

How can we deal professionally with storage of oversize objects? The London Archaeological Archive and Research Centre (LAARC) is well known for its serried rows of well ordered boxes, but unfortunately there are objects that do not fit into the standard sizes. These include lead pipes, one in excess of 2.5m long. For this we proposed a sampling methodology to preserve sufficient for future analysis of lead and formation. For large portions of whale bone we use plastic crates. Waterlogged timbers have always been problematic in London. Many are sampled for dendro analysis, but avoiding fungal growth and degradation after freeze drying is avoided by regular inspection. Worked stone assemblages can always be dealt with by using the phrase ‘take good advice’, and reading Mark Samuels’ recent paper in the Society of Museum Archaeologists’ newsletter is especially recommended. Pots should not be stuck back together.

Staff need to be trained properly for the essential processes of ‘manual handling and slinging’, with slinging in particular only undertaken by trained and certified staff.

The next LAARC open day on the 20 October – all archaeologists are welcome.

Roy Stephenson
LAARC
The IFA’s been here for 25 years and buildings archaeology for even longer, but it was more recently that the profession really woke up to the academic and commercial potential of buildings analysis. This session looked at how buildings archaeologists can contribute to planning and regeneration over the next quarter century.

**Value Added**

Conservation delivers social, economic and environmental benefits, as Dave Chetwyn (Planning Aid England, RIPI and IIBC) demonstrated. Policies such as supporting creative industries with grants schemes are vital to avoid ‘city cloning’ and loss of local distinctiveness, variety and choice. Heather Lindsay of Purcell Miller Tritton emphasised the wide range of skills required to understand the context, history and significance of buildings, to identify vulnerability to change and inform future management decisions. In practice, buildings analysis at Wallsuches Bleachworks, Bolton by Mike Nevell (University of Manchester) effectively shaped the new scheme, from retention of historic fabric to informing the design. The result is a new community based within an industrial textile complex of the late 18th to early 20th century, a model of reuse. We saw more examples of regeneration initiatives on a tour of Reading, arranged by Paulina Drzewinska of Reading University.

So buildings archaeology can contribute to regeneration, but how do we make the process more effective?

**Multi-Disciplinary Work**

The traditional approach to conservation was challenged by Stephen Bond, TFT Cultural Heritage and RICS. Conservation of building has expanded into significant new areas of interest and now needs an increasingly multi-disciplinary approach. Project teams must work flexibly and cover a wider range of expertise (he even made the bold suggestion that IFA and IHBC should work together, as long as specialties don’t lose their separate identities). Marilyn Palmer (University of Leicester) described a very different approach in the USA, where the study of buildings has been the concern of architectural historians rather than archaeologists, reconstruction is favoured over conservation, and costumed interpreters to guide books. 19th and 20th-century buildings were demolished in 1933 to rebuild the 18th-century Governor’s Palace at Colonial Williamsburg, Virginia. This raises questions of authenticity and the dangers of concentrating on a single period of a building’s history, overriding the multifaceted understanding gained by archaeologists.

**A Wider Heritage**

Multi-disciplinary working needs to take place alongside community involvement, responding to the increased democracy that Dave Chetwyn highlighted in his paper. Sylvia Wilson of Homes Under Threat (www.fightforourhomes.com) spearheaded a successful community campaign to save terraced houses at Whitefield, Nelson, and won the support of CBA, English Heritage and others. Grass-roots opinion was key in articulating the significance of a much-maligned building type in the face of demolition proposals. Sylvia reminded archaeologists that physical remains are only a part of heritage; people and communities must be remembered too.

**Future Challenges**

Jason Wood, Heritage Consultancy Services, led a considered debate about the role of buildings archaeology in the world of regeneration, development, and social policy. We identified the challenges:

- value-based management, understanding the contribution of intangible and cultural landscapes
- increased democracy, accommodating community and management needs, accompanied by more interconnected government, especially DCMS and DCLG
- a shift in the focus of heritage sites from visitors to users and occupiers
- new approaches to heritage protection, including identification of buffer zones

To be relevant to wider historic environment work, the profession will need to

- raise its profile, through increased promotion and communication at all levels
- undertake more research on the social, economic and environmental impact of heritage, so that it is not seen as a barrier to investment and development
- support increased use of Historic Environment Records
- use multi-disciplinary teams to increase awareness of wider contexts
- ensure co-operation between professional bodies with related interests
- increase training. Professionals benefit from working closely together but should not attempt to do a job for which they’re not qualified or experienced.

Catherine Cavanagh, Victoria County History Catherine.Cavanagh@sas.ac.uk
Planning guidance says that heritage sites should be preserved ‘in an appropriate setting’. This sounds straightforward, but how do we define this setting? Are there consistent criteria? This session was planned to highlight divergences in opinion and practice rather than hope for instant consistency.

**FRAMEWORK FOR SETTING**

Setting is often the issue of greatest concern for key heritage sites affected by developments: changes to valued landscapes provoke passionate debate that can become entrenched and acrimonious if handled insensitively. There is therefore a strong case for a framework within which setting and historic heritage sites affected by developments: changes to valued landscapes provoke passionate debate that can become entrenched and acrimonious if handled insensitively. There is therefore a strong case for a framework within which setting and historic landscape can accommodate this change.

**SENSITIVE BUT RIGOROUS**

In the absence of clear guidance, consultancies have developed their own methodologies for setting, producing results that are not necessarily comparable. The methodology used for the A303 Stonehenge Environmental Statement, for example, relies on scoring systems and matrices. This approach is systematic and allows easy comparison of alternative options, as required by the EIA process but, as other speakers argued, over-reliance on quantitative methods gives an illusion of objectivity. Analyses may appear rather dry, abstract and remote from the embodied, holistic experience of place that is the core of most people’s appreciation of landscape. But reliance on common sense description and professional judgement can make assessment little more than a matter of opinion. An effective methodology must start from a sensitive understanding of how a particular site ‘works’ in its landscape context, but must also be systematic and rigorous.

**LANDSCAPE CHARACTER ASSESSMENT**

Differences over the criteria we use are even more problematic. For a start, there is little agreement on the definition of setting, which is often equated with the views from and towards the site. George Lambrick saw this as the wrong starting point, since setting has more to do with physical fabric and comprises elements of topography, vegetation, built environment, routes and approaches that contribute to intrinsic character. Landscape character assessment is often ignored and conflated with visual assessment, but it is a powerful tool for identifying elements that contribute to setting. Applying the rubric of EIA is not straightforward and can lead to some abstruse, though necessary, debates. For instance, there is confusion over the term ‘receptor’: should it refer to the physical site, people visiting the site, the wider landscape or all three? What criteria should be used to determine ‘sensitivity’? Criteria for determining the ‘magnitude’ of an impact, along with related terms such as ‘dominant’ or ‘noticeable’, also need definition. Finally, cumulative impacts from multiple developments are seldom assessed effectively.

**‘CONTEXT’ NOT ‘SETTING’?**

Setting is a deeply problematic concept. Graham Fairclough advocated ‘setting aside setting’, proposing ‘context’ as a more useful term for describing the ideas that ‘setting’ has tried, and can lead to some abstruse, though necessary, debates. For instance, there is confusion over the term ‘receptor’: should it refer to the physical site, people visiting the site, the wider landscape or all three? What criteria should be used to determine ‘sensitivity’? Criteria for determining the ‘magnitude’ of an impact, along with related terms such as ‘dominant’ or ‘noticeable’, also need definition. Finally, cumulative impacts from multiple developments are seldom assessed effectively.

Graham Fairclough advocated ‘setting aside setting’, proposing ‘context’ as a more useful term for describing the ideas that ‘setting’ has tried, and can lead to some abstruse, though necessary, debates. For instance, there is confusion over the term ‘receptor’: should it refer to the physical site, people visiting the site, the wider landscape or all three? What criteria should be used to determine ‘sensitivity’? Criteria for determining the ‘magnitude’ of an impact, along with related terms such as ‘dominant’ or ‘noticeable’, also need definition. Finally, cumulative impacts from multiple developments are seldom assessed effectively.

In the short term, however, we have to work within the existing framework of planning guidance, and this involves getting to grips with setting. Many delegates expressed their frustration with the current situation, and there was agreement that guidelines on best practice are an urgent matter. Stephen Carter, concluding the session, suggested that Headland Archaeology could mediate further discussion, and we have a growing mailing list of people and organisations interested in participating in such an initiative.

The next step will be to set up a Working Party to commission a draft document for interested parties to discuss. If you would like to contribute suggestions or offers of help please contact Stephen Carter (Stephen@headlandarchaeology.com).

Paul Masser

paul@headlandarchaeology.com
Our Senses and a Sense of Place

For me, it is explicit that if we have profound questions about our relationship with landscape, and for what it can reveal for us the eye is useful only up to a point. After this other senses must come into the equation. The ears serve to alert us to changes in physical material as the trowel runs over and through it. Vibration through the trowel is a direct and physical indicator of changes in soils, fills or natural that the eye cannot always detect especially in changing light and weather conditions. This strengthens my gut feeling that the stress in the visual arts – as made evident by the very term – actually establishes the parameters of what can be communicated and sets limits to what can be gained. For art (and archaeology) to really communicate a sense of place it must engage the attention of all our senses or it will risk limiting the range of what can be expressed.

Simon Callery

This paper looks at the relationship between contemporary art and archaeology in the context of the Thames Gateway Project, an AHRC fellowship carried out in collaboration with Oxford Archaeology. The research objective is to investigate how we respond to landscape in change within the Thames Gateway regeneration zone, through contemporary art. Traditionally, landscape-based art has played the role of guardian to a notion of landscape as enduring. I am concerned with the reality that landscapes are constantly changing – as they have done throughout history – reflecting our changing needs and demands.

Landscape as Contemporary Art

My involvement with archaeology has primarily been through time spent on excavations, most recently with OA in Kent. On site I am in a position to witness the process of excavation and to confront the physical and material changing landscape directly as a subject for contemporary art. It is not difficult to understand why an artist might be attracted to working with archaeologists – but to what extent does an insight into the work of a contemporary artist resonate across the discipline and inform the work of an archaeologist? Rather than drawing conclusions I intend to describe the point where my experience of excavation dissolves into the process of art making.

Adapting to Communicate

As a painter it is my opinion that painting must adapt to communicate new ideas and experiences if it has a chance of enduring. I am frustrated with the traditions that define painting exclusively as the domain of the eye. In my work an ambition has developed to find new forms for painting that can convey a broader sensory-based equivalent of place. Since imagery, picture making and illusionistic values have been thrown out of my painting there exists no obstacle to question conventions of presentation. My new paintings need not hang at eye level but may be found on the floor, low on the wall or in the corners of rooms. They activate the architectural space around them and ask the viewer not to be static but to be drawn close to examine edges, to peer into the body of the opened stretchers and sub-frames and to measure their perceptions against the fully pigment-saturated cloth. If all is well the sense of place migrates and becomes internalised as the viewers perceptive route leads into themselves, radically shifting the dynamic, rendering the works invisible and the art forgotten.

In the presence of these new works I find a parallel with my experience of quietly sitting by a recently excavated Iron Age storage pit.
The session concentrated on recent advances in archaeological science which are relevant to the commercial world.

David Dungworth (English Heritage) opened by focusing on techniques which identify processes and products on glass works and metal smelting furnaces, showcasing new English Heritage guidance (www.belm.org.uk/upload/pdf/Science-Historic-Industries.pdf) applicable to post-medieval industrial sites. He showed that many early industrialists jealously guarded their techniques, so these were not always recorded. He demonstrated how long-established laboratory techniques can be used to reconstruct historic processes even where the evidence is locked in uninspiring lumps of slag (see TA 64, 50–51).

**Dating questions**

Jane Siddell, Alex Bayliss (English Heritage) and Chris Thomas (Mol,AS) used St Mary Spital in London as an exemplar of use of Bayesian modelling. The technique was advocated because it can save money and increase the chronological resolution on your site. The point was that we should no longer be dating ‘things’ but dating questions; for example, when were people first buried at St Mary Spital? Bayesian modelling can assist in this, as well as providing dates for material submitted. If the stratigraphic model is suitably robust and samples are selected well, then date ranges may be estimated for questions for which no physical material exists, for instance, the construction date of the stone channel house. This paper showed that the cost of really tight dating and the ability to answer an unexpectedly wide range of questions could be below 1% of excavation costs.

**Multi-instrumental GEEP**

Ian Hill, University of Leicester, described a new technique using a multi-instrument array or GEEP (Geophysical Exploration Equipment Platform), product of a joint project by Leicester University and Geomatics Earth Science Ltd (and here began a little competition between geophysicists in the room as to who could drive fastest!). The advantage of the GEEP system is that up to six different sensors (magnetic/resistance/EM, or combinations of these) can be towed across a site simultaneously, at a rate of up to 5ha per day. Instrumentation and mode of survey (density of sampling) can be varied to suit circumstances, and the output viewed in real time, allowing flexible and immediate response to survey and (or) mitigation strategy. We were shown impressive images from Wroxeter, West Heslerton and Northmoor, where there was good correlation with more conventional data.

**Changing Lincolnshire**

Michael Wood, Archaeological Project Services, spoke on environmental change across a Lincolnshire landscape settled in the Roman period. The Fenlands have always been susceptible to environmental change, but the land is highly productive and worth exploiting. The difficulties of dating Late Iron Age and Roman sites are well known and the techniques used in this case included conventional artefactual dating plus archaeomagnetism applied to a saltery, combined with optically stimulated luminescence and radiocarbon dating in both settled areas and creek sediments formed before and after settlement. Bayesian modelling was used to refine standard chronological frameworks to answer archaeological questions. The paper also showed that thorough understanding of environmental change assists interpretation of archaeological events – multi-proxy environmental analysis which showed how the environment changed and shifted, leaving some parts of the site unusual at certain times.

**Offshore environments**

Stuart Leather, Wessex Archaeology, took us underwater to demonstrate that the offshore environment is now accessible to archaeologists through marine geophysics and geotechnical data available from clients. He showed how a combination of geophysics and geotechnical modelling could be used to select locations for drilling vibrocores to test the models produced. Case studies included modelling and tracking Pleistocene deposits off the East Anglian coast. Such cores enable detailed palaeoenvironmental analysis, and of course the potential for dating horizons initially observed in the geophysical dataset.

**Changing Horizons**

The session finished by looking forward to future geophysical developmental possibilities and at ways archaeologists should adapt their questioning and broaden their horizons. Chris Gaffney, University of Birmingham, drew attention to the new technologies being applied, and to the greater breadth of investigation they offer. Increasing emphasis on multiple geophysical sensors, where greater sensitivity and sample resolution can be combined with ever-faster ground coverage, was re-emphasised. In addition, Lidar and ground-based laser scanning offer a fine-tuned topographic dimension and more integrated digital presentation and analysis. For instance, modern imaging software and commercial seismic data have allowed virtual reconstruction of buried submarine landscapes below the North Sea. Like the new chronological resolution offered by Bayesian methods in scientific dating, such new developments in exploration and analysis dramatically extend the horizons of archaeological enquiry.

Jane Siddell, Andrew David and Vanessa Straker

English Heritage
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MARITIME ARCHAEOLOGY GROUP SESSION

THREE SHEETS TO THE WIND?
NATIONAL STRATEGIES FOR SHIP AND BOAT REMAINS

Mark Littlewood

To complement the new IFA Standards and guidance for the recording and reconstruction of nautical archaeological remains MAG held a session on national strategies for ship and boat remains. The speakers addressed approaches, issues and challenges for recording ship and boat remains.

Damian Goodburn argued that maritime archaeology is lagging behind terrestrial and intertidal archaeology in wood archaeology and timber recording and that this situation has declined since the high point of the Galleon boom back in the 1970s. He argued that it is fundamental to record these raw materials in sufficient detail and that modern computer drawings can fail to match the detail of pencil. He stressed that current commercial environments, with increased job fluidity, have led to loss of in-house expertise, and that standards of teaching for recording have declined. He argued that recording can be done to a higher standard on the foreshore, after recovery, rather than underwater.

Nigel Nayling agreed, and advocated use of computerised recording as an additional tool for 3D interpretation, manipulation and understanding, rather than a replacement for pencil drawings. As ship and boat remains need a high level of interpretation they require a high level of understanding by the recorder. This is still true when using equipment such as Faro arms on the Newport ship.

Martyn Heighton, National Historic Ships Committee, outlined challenges posed with recording, preserving or deconstructing historic ships. Remains should be recorded as found rather than to ship architectural standards. Agreeing with Damian and Nigel that hand-recording is more intuitive, Douglas McElvogue outlined how modern naval architecture methods can provide incorrect solutions to ancient ship and boat remains. This was demonstrated by a new reconstruction of the Mary Rose, which discarded the original bow reconstruction provided using modern standard naval architecture methods, resulting in a reconstruction closer to the one depicted in the Anthony Roll.

Finally, Anthony Firth presented approaches developed by Wessex Archaeology for management of ship and boat recording projects. These have been developed within the framework of contract archaeology to demonstrate to consultants and clients the requirements of maritime remains and the process of investigation.

These papers provided context for discussion of the new IFA Standard and guidance, which will act as a top-level strategic tool within which individual recording methods can be developed.

Mark Littlewood

New members

ELECTED

Member (MIFA)
David Adams
Robert Armour-Chatel
Paul Belford
Colin Berkis
Paul Bidwell
James Bonner
David Bowsher
Ben Ford
Mark Himan
Isabel Holroyd
Julia Huddle
Richard Jones
Michael Lewis
Richard Lewis
Jonathan Lowe
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Natacha Powers
Robert Read
Peter Rowson
David Score
Nick Shepherd
Gary Trimbble
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Associate (AIFA)
Katharine Barber
Mark Beattie
Michael Boyle
Julia Candy
Niall Donald
Bruce Eaton
Emma Firth
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Toby Jones using Faro Arm and Rhinos to record timber at the Newport Ship Project. © Newport Museums and Heritage.
This summer saw changes at Cadw and Cambria when Gwilym Hughes, director of Cambria, succeeded the late Richard Avent as Chief Inspector of Ancient Monuments and Historic Buildings for Cadw, and Ken Murphy became trust director of Cambria.

After studying archaeology at Southampton, Gwilym excavated in Italy and Wales and then worked in Zimbabwe, establishing conservation programmes at the World Heritage sites of Great Zimbabwe and Khami. Back in Britain he directed excavations for Birmingham University, publishing numerous books and articles. In 2000 he returned to his native Wales to take over Cambria Archaeology.

Ken Murphy joined Cambria Archaeology in 1979 on a six-week contract and has worked there ever since. Working initially on late prehistoric sites, he has developed an interest in late-18th and early-19th century picturesque landscapes. Recently he has returned to late prehistory, undertaking surveys of hill-forts and defended enclosures across south west Wales and excavation and survey on Iron Age enclosures in Pembrokeshire and Ceredigion.

Kate Clark (MIFA 861)
Kate Clark has just left the Heritage Lottery Fund to set up her own business, Kate Clark Associates. Kate graduated from Cambridge in Palaeolithic archaeology although she ended up more interested in industrial topics. After graduating she worked in Greece, Honduras, Kenya and Zanzibar (and Repton and St Albans), and had a brief stint at the BBC before becoming archaeologist for Ironbridge Gorge, running the field unit. Moving to CBA, she was their conservation officer for two years and then joined EH. As head of Historic Environment Management she was the author of Informed Conservation (EH, 2001). At HLF she was involved in developing guidance for managing heritage sites, evaluating heritage projects and programmes and looking at the economic and social benefits of heritage conservation. In her new role she offers help with conservation planning, research and evaluation, heritage problems and training. Contact kate@kateclark.co.uk

Hedley Swain (MIFA 424)
This May Hedley Swain was appointed head of Museum Policy for the Museums, Libraries and Archives Council (MLA) changed with delivering policies for the long-term transformation of museums services in England. Hedley has been head of Early History and Collections at the Museum of London since 1998, overseeing creation of two new permanent galleries and also the LAARC and the Centre for Human Bioarchaeology at London Museum. Hedley has been chair of the Society of Museum Archaeologists (SMA) and the Archaeological Archives Forum, he is currently the editor for SMA and Meetings Secretary for the Royal Archaeological Institute. He is a member of the Museums Association Ethics Committee and convener of the Human Remains Subject Specialist Network.

Bruce Eaton (AIFA)
Bruce Eaton has just joined IFA after working as a professional archaeologist since 1998, being involved in over 150 fieldwork projects which included Glastonbury and Wells Cathedral. He is also a small finds illustrator with a particular interest in the post-Roman/Early Medieval period. He has just left C&N Hollinrake Ltd in Glastonbury after many years to become freelance, and is keen to hear about any interesting projects in the South West. Contact: bruceeaton1066@yahoo.co.uk.

Bob Bewley (MIFA 231)
Bob Bewley joined the Heritage Lottery Fund as Director of Operations this May. Prior to this he was regional director for English Heritage in the South West, and before that was head of survey for English Heritage. He studied archaeology at Manchester and Cambridge, and spent much of his career specialising in aerial archaeology with RCHME, an interest he maintains with flying projects in Jordan and other countries.

Robina McNeil (MIFA 709)
Just as we were going to press we heard the sad news that Robina McNeil, head of the Greater Manchester Archaeological Unit, stalwart of our Buildings Archaeology Group before her illness, has died of cancer. A fuller appreciation will be in next TA.

Kate Clark (MIFA 861)
Kate Clark has just left the Heritage Lottery Fund to set up her own business, Kate Clark Associates. Kate graduated from Cambridge in Palaeolithic archaeology although she ended up more interested in industrial topics. After graduating she worked in Greece, Honduras, Kenya and Zanzibar (and Repton and St Albans), and had a brief stint at the BBC before becoming archaeologist for Ironbridge Gorge, running the field unit. Moving to CBA, she was their conservation officer for two years and then joined EH. As head of Historic Environment Management she was the author of Informed Conservation (EH, 2001). At HLF she was involved in developing guidance for managing heritage sites, evaluating heritage projects and programmes and looking at the economic and social benefits of heritage conservation. In her new role she offers help with conservation planning, research and evaluation, heritage problems and training. Contact kate@kateclark.co.uk