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Editorial

This editorial comes to you from the IfA office rather than our Editor, Karen Bewick, who was on paternity leave in January. We are grateful for stepping temporarily into her role. From now on, the role of Editor will be taken on by Amanda Forster.

The Archaeologist (July 2011)

The Institute of Archaeologists (IfA) aims to showcase good practice and, as Gill Chitty says (p6–7), ‘community archaeology, and archaeology as a socially and environmentally responsible business, must surely be one of the most productive ways in which the discipline can contribute to a sustainable future’. This edition of TA therefore looks at how we inspire excellence in public engagement. Archaeologists are well situated to reach out to local communities, and to assist those communities in exploring a widespread interest in the past. Abby Guinness’ article on the project at Sayers Cross is a good example of how archaeology can provide an opportunity to learn new skills, while Hannah Cobb, Melanie Giles and Siân Jones consider which is developing skills in future community archaeologists, while his colleague Suzie Thomas discusses the Standards and guidance in archaeological practice project.

IfA believes that as a sector we need to develop new ways of involving the public in making decisions about the future of their historic environment, and in researching it. We also need to ensure that public engagement, community archaeology and amateur archaeology meet our established standards of professionalism. Any community-based group undertaking archaeological projects can work to the appropriate standards, irrespective of whether they receive payment or not. Similarly, whether or not they draw a salary from archaeological work is not a consideration when individuals are assessed for IfA membership.

At our AGM the membership voted in favour of removing the requirement to adhere to the Code of conduct for Student and Affiliate members. This underlines the difference between these non-Corporate grades, and the Corporate grades of Practitioner, Associate, and Member. Non-corporate members are not accredited professionals in the same way that Corporate members are, and so we cannot therefore with confidence expect them to be bound by the Code of conduct. We have written to our non-Corporate members explaining this and we hope that those who are able to will upgrade their membership so that they take on the additional responsibilities that accredited membership requires.

We would be keen to hear from anyone with ideas for articles covering this area. We would also like to hear about potential contributions considering the report’s relevance to the wider heritage sector, looking beyond its application within commercial and planning-led investigations. Please send suggestions and articles to Amanda Forster at amanda.forster@archaeologists.net.

IAA Conference update

Conference planning for 2012 is now in full swing and we have selected the sessions and workshops. We have an exciting agenda covering the theme of Partnership. Proposals for sessions have been diverse and we have eight discussions covering topics which include cross-disciplinary training, the academic and professional worlds, community archaeology, visual communication, heritage crime, archives and information, and the natural and historic environments. A Call for Papers will be circulated with this edition of TA, and will be posted on our website and Facebook pages. Building on the idea of training and professional development, the 2012 Conference will include nine workshops, covering geophysics, forensic archaeology, Environmental Impact Assessments, international heritage, excavation and recording, National Occupation Standards, information technology and CDM regulations. In addition, this year’s conference will be launching the IAA Debate, involving a panel of expertise and an open discussion with the audience. The topic for discussion will be the future for local Planning authorities and archaeology – something highly on the agenda for all working in the heritage sector. Bookings opened in December and the conference page of the website will be regularly updated.

Scottish HAE courses

IAA’s Scottish Group is offering sessions on health and safety awareness for archaeologists from HSE Solutions Ltd. The first session was in Edinburgh in November, but further sessions will be held in Inverness and Glasgow. To book your place contact the IAA offices at admin@archaeologists.net or call 0118 378 6446. Course fees are £60 per delegate. Please keep an eye on the IAA website for more details.

Notes to contributors

Themes and deadlines

Spring
Northport and beyond: the impact and wider relevance of the Northport Group report (July 2011)
deadline: 15 February 2012

Contributions and letters/emails are always welcome. TA is made digitally available through our website and if the sizes copyright issues with any authors, articles or photographs, please notify the editor. Accesed digitally, with links are especially useful in articles, so do include those where relevant. Short articles (max. 1000 words) are preferred. They should be sent as an email attachment, which must include captions and credits for illustrations. The editor will edit and shorten if necessary. Illustrations are very important. These can be supplied as originals, on CD or as email attachments, at a minimum resolution of 300 dpi. Copyright of content and illustrations remains with the author, but that of the final design with IAA (who make it available on its website). Authors are responsible for obtaining reproduction rights and for providing the editor with appropriate captions and credits. More detailed Notes for contributors for each issue are available from the editor. Opinions expressed in The Archaeologist are those of the authors, and are not necessarily those of IAA.
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The Historic Environment report

Members are reminded that they can receive Maney’s journal The Historic Environment: policy and practice for a reduced price as part of their IAA membership. The most recent issue (volume 2, issue 2) includes a review article covering PPS5, the Southport Report, and the linking of conservation to communities.
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Graphic skills are now more integrated and people need to work across dividing lines.

The leaflet designed by Richard Bryant advertising AAI&S's first conference, The Draughtsman in Archaeology in Manchester 1977
Investigating sustainability: archaeology & a carbon-neutral future

‘Some of the knowledge created through archaeology is about how lower carbon economies operated in the past and how human society has adapted to macro and micro changes in climate and environment over time.’

Gill Chitty

IIA’s October seminar on Greening the historic environment (p5) took a look at the responsibilities of archaeologists for carbon reduction. What does this mean for the way archaeologists work, for standards in practice and for professional behaviour that will support good environmental outcomes? Archaeology in a changing climate has to engage with measures for carbon reduction in the context of many forces for change, not least the weather. This poses a different and bigger question – how can we, as a discipline and profession, move towards a more sustainable model for practising archaeology? This means archaeological practices that are socially, economically and environmentally sound and in balance; and that result in outcomes which mean, as a society, we move closer to living within environmental limits, respect the need for social equity, and support ethically-responsible economic growth. It is a much bigger question than carbon neutrality. Perhaps this is the time to start thinking about how we might benchmark sustainable archaeological practice?

Archaeology and greenhouse gas

All IAA members have a responsibility for environmentally sustainable practices under the Institute’s Code of Conduct (Principle 2) to ‘conserve archaeological sites and material as a resource for study and enjoyment now and in the future and … encourage others to do the same’. The Greening the historic environment seminar suggests that archaeological practice related to historic buildings and landscapes is where we can make the greatest contribution. But we should be concerned whether archaeological training and professional development are keeping up with this aspiration. No landscape archaeologist, for example, should be ignorant about the part that wetland conservation – upland or lowland – plays in managing Europe’s single largest carbon sink – or the risks, not just to archaeological preservation but for release of greenhouse gases, caused by falling groundwater levels and peat degradation. Building archaeologists should be conversant with the principles and practice of sustainable conservation, and the opportunities of working with clients, contractors and building professionals, ‘advocating beneficial change and altering perceptions’ (in line with IAA’s Standard and guidance for stewardship of the historic environment). The smart money is on building archaeologists who are also qualified to advise on, and issue, energy performance certificates and who can offer added value with their understanding of how historic materials are used in construction and how they perform over time.

Environmental credentials

Sustainable economic practice includes procurement of services and goods from businesses that have sound ethical and environmental credentials, sourcing local materials, using local transport, local contractors, offering staff incentives for doing the same. Do we know the overall value of the archaeological economy in the UK and what, for example, the multiplier effect may be in the local economy, in a community where an archaeological project is underway? Archaeology will need to diversify like other businesses. Is there potential to work actively with local green tourism and visitor businesses; or for developing archaeological heritage projects as social enterprises to attract investment through a community share offer?

Understanding past changes?

And lastly socially sustainable practices; the primary reason we pursue our discipline is to create new understanding about the historic environment and to share this knowledge – but how does that play into a low carbon economy? Some of the knowledge created through archaeology is about how lower carbon economies operated in the past and how human society has adapted to macro and micro changes in climate and environment over time. One of the most important things the discipline has to offer is the lessons learned from major climatic events in the past. But how does it help people living in Hull (which an environmental scientist tells me will allegedly be left on an isthmus surrounded by water with most communication and service routes cut within 25 years) to know that most of the sea bed to the east of them was once rich and habitable hunting grounds in prehistory and yet, despite it being inundated by the North Sea for thousands of years, the human race has continued to thrive … Why worry? It is clear that what we do as archaeologists with all these valuable lessons from the past will need to be deployed in some much smarter way. Archaeologists are supremely well placed to use this perspective but so far we have made only a tiny impression on what is possible.

Localism, favourite flavour on the current political menu, is not news here – all archaeology is locally situated. But it needs to connect its stories of sustainability, and the fascination of discovering adaptation and change over time, with people and their neighbourhoods now. Community archaeology, and archaeology as a socially and environmentally responsible business, must surely be one of the most productive ways in which the discipline can contribute to a sustainable future: Whether it is working with young people, environmental stewardship of the countryside; a Young Archaeologists’ Club taking care of a local monument, a project engaging the homeless or Afghan veterans, or a community heritage project looking at low carbon lifestyles in the past – archaeology can potentially do so much more for a sustainable future by bringing together the stories and the people, the knowledge and understanding. In this issue of The Archaeologist is there is an opportunity to reflect on how sustainable communities and archaeological practice can work to mutual advantage and where we need to sharpen up?

Gill Chitty MIfA
Head of Conservation
Council for British Archaeology
gillchitty@britarch.ac.uk

For more information on the seminar see https://www.britarch.ac.uk/events/greening-the-historic-environment-

Gill Chitty

Gill Chitty MIfA
Council for British Archaeology

Greening the historic environment

The Archaeologist
Since last year’s AGM in 2010 there has been further work to prepare a case to the membership for applying to Charter the Institute. This includes

- addressing concerns raised by members
- retaining solicitors to advise on preparation of an application to the Privy Council
- seeking the views of other organisations that have recently obtained Chartered status
- reviewing the governance structure of IfA

At the 2011 AGM the issues were discussed, and members authorised Council to submit an informal application to the Privy Council. A draft memorandum of application is close to being finalised. Here we review updated information which was provided to the AGM in response to a variety of questions and concerns.

**Charter would produce ‘little return other than ... prestige’**

Increased profile, prestige and authority are keys to the advancement of the profession. Not only was this a view endorsed by many members, but recently Chartered organisations also reported positive feedback from their own members.

**An application to Charter would be very costly**

Estimates were sought from solicitors and, upon commissioning Field Seymour Parkes to advise, a fixed estimate has been obtained for work up to and including the submission of a formal application (petition) to the Privy Council. The cost, (including VAT and disbursements), should not exceed £5000. Thereafter, further input from solicitors may be required and some further expenditure will be incurred if a Charter is granted (for instance, the vellum Charter costs over £500), but the Institute is in a position to gauge further expenditure on a staged basis. It is of the opinion of IfA staff that the process can be managed within existing staff resources. Other costs are not excessive and represent good value.

**An application to Charter would lead to increased subscriptions**

There is no intention to raise subscriptions in order to finance an application and those costs to which we are committed are included in current budgets.

**Chartered status would impose a heavy administrative burden**

This has not been the experience of organisations to which we spoke: One recently Chartered professional body reported there is little or no difference in administrative terms upon the grant of a Charter and there is no significant ongoing expenditure. There was no increase in subscriptions as a result of Chartering the Institute. Another body suggested that “in some ways the administrative burden is less – for instance, Companies House no longer interested in the organisation.”

An important caveat, however, is that there is an increased burden if the body wishes to change its governance provisions since this would necessitate a further application to the Privy Council. With this in mind IfA is reviewing its governance structure, and at the AGM a resolution was passed instructing Council to conclude preparation of a revised governance structure which would be included in any petition to Charter the Institute.

One-off costs (new stationery, changing bank mandates and so on) need to be factored into the equation, but are unlikely to be a decisive consideration.

**Insufficient membership to support an application**

Privy Council Office guidelines suggest that a body applying to Charter should normally have 5000 members or more. IfA currently has 3200 members (of who over 2250 are corporate members). This is a matter that has been raised in informal discussions with the Privy Council Office and, given the size of the archaeological sector, we do not feel that this is necessarily an insurmountable obstacle.

Privy Council Office guidelines (which give further details as to the Charter process) can be found at [http://www.privy-council.org.uk/output/page45.asp](http://www.privy-council.org.uk/output/page45.asp).

**IfA membership and registration requirements and governance framework are insufficiently rigorous to support an application**

Much work has already been done to produce fit for purpose membership, registration and governance frameworks. Proposals have been considered at the AGM to improve governance of IfA, although an application to Charter is not dependent upon those governance reforms being endorsed. If further work is required this should be done regardless of an application to Charter, but it is not felt that radical intervention is required.

**Opposition of other bodies / risk of failure**

IfA wishes to work with others in the sector and is keen to discuss its aims and objectives in order to avoid misunderstandings. If Charter is the right step we should not be deflected by fear of failure. Nevertheless, we will take advice at every stage upon the prospects of success and act upon that advice.

**Consider other alternatives**

IfA has considered becoming a Constituent Body of the Society for the Environment (SocEnv), thereby allowing it to confer Chartered status on those of its members who can meet the relevant criteria. The fee to become a Constituent Body about £3500 with an annual subscription of £600. The main drawback is that qualifying members would become Chartered Environmentalists and not Chartered Archaeologists – similar considerations have led to limited interest and poor take-up from the members of some Constituent Bodies.

Some members feel that the ability to confer the status of Chartered Archaeologist on members is key to the application to Charter and should be pursued at the outset. Members should, however, be clear that Chartered status is not conferred as of right on any member of a Chartered organisation. It is only normally awarded to those who can demonstrate pre-eminence in their field (and the costs of rigorously vetting applications for Chartered membership will be reflected in the application fee for this new grade of membership). Furthermore, in informal discussions with the Privy Council Office it was indicated that the best approach would be to seek to Charter the Institute at the outset and thereafter to seek the right to confer Chartered Archaeologist status on appropriate members. That remains our preference.

**Is this the last chance for members vote upon issues relating to Charter?**

No. Members at the October AGM authorised Council to submit an informal application to the Privy Council. If a positive response is received, it will be necessary to draft a formal petition together with a draft Charter. That will have to be agreed by members in General Meeting.

Tim Howard, IfA Affiliate member
Policy Advisor, IfA
tim.howard@archaeologists.net
After a two-year freeze on IfA salary minima and starting salary recommendations, November’s IfA Council meeting voted to increase both from April 2012. Improving pay and conditions for IfA members is implicit within the Institute’s current strategic plan, where one of the principal aims is to improve the status of archaeologists by ensuring accredited, high quality, ethical and businesslike working practices. Fair pay for archaeologists and colleagues working within the heritage sector is not simply an aspiration but an area of employment where IfA intends to achieve a positive and sustainable impact.

In 1996, minimum recommended salaries for levels of responsibility equivalent to IfA membership grades were introduced which were, at that time, linked to Local Government pay scales. In April 2007 the IfA introduced wider pay criteria and set minimum standards for working time, holiday pay, sick pay and employer pension contributions.

Perhaps most important in the recognition of fair pay deals was the move in 2010 to make recommendations for starting salaries for each of the IfA corporate grades. The need to establish reasonable salary starting ranges for the three corporate IfA grades in order to bring them into line with recommendations made by professional institutions such as the Museums Association (MA), Institute of Conservation (ICON), Chartered Institute of Librarians and Information Professionals (CILIP) and others. While the IfA recognises the difficulty in introducing significant advances in pay during the ongoing economic climate, we strongly believe that it is these salary ranges that should be used as the guide for employers in setting salaries and for potential employees in deciding whether or not to take up a post.

New minimum salary recommendations (in effect from April 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>PIfA</th>
<th>AIfA</th>
<th>MIfA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current minimum salary recommendations</td>
<td>£15,054.00</td>
<td>£17,534.00</td>
<td>£22,704.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No employer pension contributions (+6%)</td>
<td>+£903.21pa</td>
<td>+£1052.04pa</td>
<td>+£1362.24pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per additional hour over and above 37.5 hpw</td>
<td>+£422.31pa</td>
<td>+£491.88pa</td>
<td>+£636.92pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No sick leave allowance (based on min. 1 month full pay)</td>
<td>+£1254.50pa</td>
<td>+£1461.16pa</td>
<td>+£1892.00pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended starting salaries</td>
<td>£15,957.51 – £19,500</td>
<td>£18,586.00 – £22,300</td>
<td>£24,194.16 – £29,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The update of 2010 also recognised that the salary gap evident from an earlier report of 2008 (with IfA minimum salaries recognised as 13% lower than the nearest) had increased from 35% at PIfA level and up to 17% for MIfA. In 2008 Council took the decision (after formal consultation with Registered Organisations and others) to increase minimum salaries by 13% over inflation over a five-year period. Unfortunately the recession and its impact on the development sector prevented the process of increase from starting, and while the intention of closing the gap on other sectors has been reaffirmed it is obvious that the trends in wages and the cost of living have changed company. In November 2011, Council considered the increasing cost of living and the negative effects of inflation on those working across the sector – and especially those in the lowest paid jobs.

Additional research undertaken by Council members suggests that the majority of employers are in fact paying more than the current minima, and an increase of 5.2% was agreed. IfA appreciates that for those archaeologists already paid above current minima this increase may not have a tangible effect, but it is a positive step towards better pay and conditions and will at the least provide a safety net for those on who are currently receiving the poorest pay deals. The minima increase will take effect from 1 April 2012 and will be reviewed again in November 2012. In the interim, Council will be considering an increase to recommended starting salaries at the next Council meeting in January, with the intention of retaining their currency and promoting their relevance within the wider heritage sector and in ensuring the best deal for our members and Registered Organisations.

For more information on current salary recommendations, please look at the remuneration pages on the IfA website (http://www.archaeologists.net/practices/salary).
Between 1995 and 2008 an annual article was compiled called *Jobs in British Archaeology*, and was normally published in *TA* or its predecessors. These articles presented information on pay conditions in British Archaeology using data collected from the advertised pay rate of job postings on IfA’s Jobs Information Service Bulletin (JIS) and posted on the British Archaeology Jobs Resource (BAJR) website. These articles informed archaeologists about salary conditions between the larger *Profiling the Profession* publications, a census of British archaeologists taken every five years. This article restarts this tradition of yearly insights into UK archaeology jobs that was previously undertaken by Kenneth Aitchison, Seona Anderson, Robin Turner, Gordon Malcolm, and James Drummond-Murray.

Data were gathered from IfA’s JIS and BAJR from 1 April 2008 to 31 March 2011. Each job was treated as a single data point and the advertised pay rate counted. If the job posting did not specify the number of jobs advertised it was counted as a single job. Where a salary range was given, the middle point was used for analysis (as in past publications).

Hourly, daily or weekly wages were converted into annual salary equivalents. Due to the larger number of postings for conservators this position was split into 10 brackets. Where a salary range was given, the middle point was used for analysis (as in past publications). As can be imagined, the ‘Great Recession’ has taken a toll both on the number of jobs being advertised and average pay. Loss of pay can be seen most dramatically in the top level positions such as Senior CRM/SMR and Consultants. These same positions saw above average rises in the few years leading up to the recession and this loss of pay places these positions closer to their historical averages. An interesting occurrence was that wages continued to rise into the recession and did not fall until 2010, indicating some lagging in pay conditions compared to the general economy. It will be interesting to see if these declining pay rates continue.

Doug Rocks-Macqueen, IfA student member
University of Edinburgh
Researcher, Landward Research Ltd
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Average Pay Per Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>1995</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excavator</td>
<td>£5,957</td>
<td>£9,800</td>
<td>£11,311</td>
<td>£12,378</td>
<td>£12,903</td>
<td>£14,179</td>
<td>£15,078</td>
<td>£15,299</td>
<td>£16,032</td>
<td>£16,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Jobs Advertised</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>£11,911</td>
<td>£12,029</td>
<td>£12,700</td>
<td>£12,741</td>
<td>£14,765</td>
<td>£15,900</td>
<td>£17,017</td>
<td>£18,715</td>
<td>£18,926</td>
<td>£19,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Jobs Advertised</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Officer</td>
<td>£13,616</td>
<td>£13,404</td>
<td>£13,788</td>
<td>£15,572</td>
<td>£16,592</td>
<td>£17,398</td>
<td>£19,928</td>
<td>£21,200</td>
<td>£22,568</td>
<td>£22,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Jobs Advertised</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>£18,094</td>
<td>£16,806</td>
<td>£16,671</td>
<td>£20,081</td>
<td>£19,701</td>
<td>£22,259</td>
<td>£25,523</td>
<td>£28,532</td>
<td>£30,580</td>
<td>£30,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Jobs Advertised</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior CRM/SMR</td>
<td>£11,656</td>
<td>£12,619</td>
<td>£14,148</td>
<td>£17,532</td>
<td>£17,274</td>
<td>£17,992</td>
<td>£19,627</td>
<td>£20,354</td>
<td>£21,370</td>
<td>£20,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Jobs Advertised</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior CRM/SMR</td>
<td>£15,000</td>
<td>£16,658</td>
<td>£20,655</td>
<td>£23,013</td>
<td>£23,840</td>
<td>£26,024</td>
<td>£29,958</td>
<td>£32,475</td>
<td>£35,755</td>
<td>£32,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Jobs Advertised</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>£12,647</td>
<td>£13,076</td>
<td>£15,476</td>
<td>£16,531</td>
<td>£17,171</td>
<td>£17,013</td>
<td>£17,930</td>
<td>£19,691</td>
<td>£21,685</td>
<td>£22,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Jobs Advertised</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Jobs Advertised</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illustrators / Graphics officer</td>
<td>£11,820</td>
<td>£12,367</td>
<td>£13,272</td>
<td>£14,908</td>
<td>£16,914</td>
<td>£17,578</td>
<td>£19,928</td>
<td>£20,942</td>
<td>£21,656</td>
<td>£19,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Jobs Advertised</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>£20,000</td>
<td>£20,629</td>
<td>£20,629</td>
<td>£20,629</td>
<td>£20,629</td>
<td>£20,629</td>
<td>£20,629</td>
<td>£20,629</td>
<td>£20,629</td>
<td>£20,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Jobs Advertised</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total jobs advertised 150, 299, 573, 362, 127, 210, 305, 579, 472, 365

Average Pay Per Year

- Excavator
- Supervisor
- Field Officer
- Project Manager
- Junior CRM/SMR
- Senior CRM/SMR
- Consultant

# Jobs advertised: 150, 299, 573, 362, 127, 210, 305, 579, 472, 365

Doug Rocks-Macqueen, IfA student member
DESIGNATING ARCHAEOLOGY

Significance, as PPS 5 tells us and as the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is likely to reinforce, is the critical determinant of our approach to managing change in the historic environment. Does something matter, or doesn’t it?

CHAMPIONING MATERIAL REMAINS
Oh that things were that black and white! Obviously, this is seldom the case. PPG 16, issued in 1991, helped enormously in uncoupling the link between officially designated sites and protection in the planning system: sites that were unscheduled still warranted respect and careful consideration. Long may this last, and there is every reason to expect this prudent arrangement to continue: Realism is essential: designation cannot hope to ‘bag’ all sites of archaeological importance or potential – and sometimes it is the things we understand and cherish least that are the ones we should concern ourselves about. That said, there remains a strong case for flagging the importance of sites and structures of manifest note. Our heritage protection system, complex as it is, has evolved since the ground-breaking 1882 Ancient Monument Act into a forceful, pragmatic tool for championing the material remains of the past. Our best response to the understandable questioning of inherited systems of regulation is to demonstrate the importance of history as a cultural and economic positive. Today’s designation mission is that of identifying, articulating and celebrating.

PICKING UP THE PIECES
Scheduling has tailed off in recent years. Under the Monument Protection Programme, the newly-formed English Heritage embarked on a mission to schedule 10% of recognised archaeological sites: an increase of some 60,000 (later lowered to 50,000), back in 1986. Twenty-five years on, and the total has yet to pass the 20,000 mark. MPP wasn’t just about scheduling: working with county Sites and Monuments Records, it helped draw up lists of Nationally Important sites which amplified the number of recognised assets of archaeological significance, and the research which underpinned the MPP remains helpful today. What are we doing to rectify this situation? We have a number of initiatives under way that should reassure readers of TA: Scheduling cases going through the designation machine have already increased, and the new Unified Designation System – a major IT upgrade, plumbed into the recently launched National Heritage List for England (NHLE), which brings all designations together – will enable us to process cases more quickly. IT issues undoubtedly held us back from greater productivity: this should be a thing of the past.

NEW GUIDANCE DOCUMENTS
Scheduling procedures always placed a premium on communicating with owners. Sharing understanding was an important strand of Heritage Protection Reform’s stress on openness, and it has led to useful new guidance documents. Selection Guides are in preparation, in tandem with DCMS, which set out our designation approaches for scheduling. Articulating when listing is appropriate, and when scheduling is preferable, is an important step towards a more engaging system. We have also recently launched an updated, illustrated suite of guidance, Introductions to Heritage Assets, which unite and present afresh the information contained in the Monument Class Descriptions familiar from MPP.

OUR SCHEDULING INHERITANCE
We have also been revising the older, pre-MPP entries on the schedule as part of a general list upgrade in response to NHLE: the huge designation base, numbering about 400,000 entries which have been accorded protection on a national level, inevitably needs maintenance as well as additions. Modern scheduling entries are fuller and, we believe, clearer in setting out significance and the state of current understanding. The looming anniversary of the 1913 Ancient Monuments Act will remind us of our scheduling inheritance, but we also need to consider how all the designations work together. Listing is of relevance to archaeologists too.

THREAT AND PRIORITY
English Heritage is now in the first year of the National Heritage Protection Plan. A rolling programme of linked research and protection activities, involving the heritage sector more widely than has been the case before, this ambitious plan covers the asset range and has many archaeological projects, ranging from marine archaeology to assessment of sites relating to the First World War. Has a site of significance been identified that can be regarded as ‘Nationally Important’, and for which scheduling is the best means to secure its long-term preservation? An emphasis on following through such assessments should ensure a new chapter in the history of scheduling, and an emphasis on threat and priority should ensure that we are concentrating on areas under greatest pressure.

One of Heritage Protection Reform’s great achievements was to ask questions of all of us as to how our sector, small and separated as it still is, could work better together. Scheduling has an important place to play in 21st-century designation, and the extensive discussions and testing that went on during the HPR process has given us a clearer view of just what this should be.

Roger Bowdler
Designation Director, English Heritage
roger.bowdler@english-heritage.org.uk

The National Heritage List for England brings all designations together: this map would come up in a search on Avebury.
In April 2011 CBA launched its first Community Archaeology Training Placements (CATPs) across the UK, offering nine training bursaries within host organisations that already delivered strong and effective community archaeology programmes. The Community Archaeology Bursaries Project, supported by the Heritage Lottery Fund's Skills for the Future programme with additional support from English Heritage, Cadw and Historic Scotland, is enabling CBA to offer year-long workplace bursaries over a three-year period, designed to equip would-be community archaeologists with the skills, experience and confidence to work with voluntary groups and communities. Hosts come from a variety of sectors including government bodies, commercial archaeological organisations, museums and charitable trusts, and those for 2012/13 have recently been announced (http://www.britarch.ac.uk/community/bursaries).

Increasing Experience
CATPs primarily take place on the job, with experienced staff within host organisations responsible for training through shadowing, coaching and mentoring. Bursary holders also get a chance to enhance their professional credibility and employability by undertaking the Level 3 NVQ in Archaeological Practice, enabling them to demonstrate particular sets of skills, competencies or experience. This is particularly significant as one of the project’s aims is to widen the scope of people entering into archaeology as a profession. Applicants are expected to have a solid knowledge of archaeology, its theory and practice, but this knowledge may have come from formal education, paid archaeological work or voluntary experience – they may not necessarily hold an archaeological qualification. For many of our current bursary holders this is the first time they have been in charge of specific sections or of volunteers on site. Reports show that they are taking this in their stride and are enjoying the challenge.

Sharing Best Practice
As well as learning from organisations with a strong track record in community archaeology, CATPs have a robust network to share best practice across the UK, and it has been wonderful to see interaction between bursary holders. One took a week’s holiday to dig at a community excavation in order to keep her own skills fresh and to gain experience of digging on sand. This dig was managed by another of our bursary holders so the two got to work with each other and share knowledge and skills. Additionally, in Wales all host organisations agreed for CBA’s Festival of British Archaeology and our bursary holders worked together at these, assisting each other with activities such as children’s excavations and wattle and daub demonstrations.

Upskilling the Voluntary Sector
Match funding from English Heritage and Cadw has added an extra dimension to the project, enabling CBA to deliver training courses that support the voluntary sector. The training will be aimed at upskilling the voluntary sector to meet needs identified in a recent CBA survey (http://www.britarch.ac.uk/research/community), increasing capacity in the voluntary sector to understand the requirements of good practice in planning, excavation, survey, research, recording, archiving and financial planning. We have been able to tie this into the Bursaries Project by having courses led by bursary holders themselves, combined with professionals with specialist knowledge and skills and individuals from the voluntary sector where appropriate. Bursary holders will use their knowledge of local needs to develop courses in their areas. A pilot course led by Chris Gaffney, Roger Walker and a team at the University of Bradford centred on processing and interpreting data from geophysical survey was a particular success, with 100% of participants rating its usefulness to their future archaeological career as good or excellent. Further courses are in development and will be advertised through the CBA website and other outlets.

Beyond Archaeology
It is not just direct archaeological activities that are making the bursaries project so worthwhile. Partnership working is essential, as are experimental projects. One of our current hosts has established links with local groups working with people with disabilities and learning difficulties. Our bursary holder has undertaken family history research with the group, as well as giving site tours. The same bursary holder regularly works on site with young offenders, cleaning finds and giving them experience of digging. Another bursary holder has been drafted in as Archaeological Advisor to a community landscape project, where residents in a deprived inner city area are turning unused space into community gardens and exploring the history of the neighbourhood. Funding and sustainability are essential to community projects and our bursary holders have undertaken training in these too; one attended a workshop run by HLF on how to write funding applications and has been able to share what she learnt with her fellow bursary holders.

More information on the Bursaries project, including profiles of current bursary holders and details on how to obtain a placement for 2012/13 or apply to be a host in 2013/14, can be found at http://www.britarch.ac.uk/community/bursaries. You can also search for ‘Community Archaeology Bursaries Project’ on Facebook and ‘like’ our page, to keep up to date with project developments.

Phil Pollard
Bursaries Coordinator
Council for British Archaeology.
philpollard@britarch.co.uk

PHIL POLLARD

Training the next generation
An IfA Workplace Learning Bursary in small finds recording

Garry Grace

In 2010 I was awarded an IfA workplace learning bursary in small finds identification, research and recording with the Sussex Finds Liaison Officer (FLO). I had already been using the new Portable Antiquities Scheme (PAS) database to record my own and other people’s finds, and joined PAS with a degree in metallurgy. 36 years detecting experience and a few hundred self-recorded finds under my belt. As a detectorist I found the experience a fantastic learning opportunity, and to underpin the knowledge gained I am currently pursuing an NVQ in archaeology.

This placement has opened my eyes to what is involved in being a FLO, not only the diversity and extent of their professional remit, but the skill, time, and effort involved in creating quality records.

I was welcomed into the PAS community as one of their own, with trust, camaraderie and the very best of training. Protecting security is a fundamental priority for the PAS and in deference to the public whose finds I am recording there were a number of professional formalities to be undertaken, such as a confidentiality agreement, restricted find-spot access to the database and, for our outreach events, CRB checks. Within these parameters I was able to take part in the entire spectrum of PAS activity. One significant task was to record on the database a backlog of metal-detecting rally finds from Sussex and Hampshire: at the last count I have finished over a thousand records. The number of finds coming into Sussex for recording currently is unprecedented. Working with Stephanie Smith, the Sussex FLO, to prepare and process finds from ten Sussex detecting clubs, independent finders and museum intakes forms another major strand of activity, and pressing deadlines mean this work can become frenetic. I have also been involved in training detectorists who want to record their own finds, as well as working with teachers and children at outreach events.

This placement has opened my eyes to what is involved in being a FLO, not only the diversity and extent of their professional remit, but the skill, time, and effort involved in creating quality records. With ever-present deadlines looming they are helped by a team of local volunteers, who willingly measure, weigh, photograph and photo-edit, in order to meet pressing schedules.

I am honoured to be part of the Portable Antiquities Scheme and my bursary continues to be a great experience. It will be a sad day for me when my time is up, and if I cannot find a job in archaeology, I sense a volunteering opportunity coming on.

Garry Grace
IFA Bursary Holder
IFA.bursary@sussexpast.co.uk

Introducing ISGAP: Standards and Guidance in Archaeological Practice

In 2009, CBA commenced a research project into the nature, scale, location and needs of ‘community archaeology’ and, more broadly, voluntary-sector action in archaeological heritage contexts across the UK. One key issue that emerged was the need to raise the standards of volunteer-led archaeological projects (see www.britarch.ac.uk/research/community).

Whilst a number of volunteer-led archaeology projects are undertaken by knowledgeable and experienced groups and individuals, some groups have little or no experience and are funded by organisations which do not have a point of reference for good practice in archaeology when agreeing funding. There was also a feeling that existing guidance resources, while partially useful, were written in a style not necessarily accessible to voluntary groups, perhaps because the original intended audience was archaeologists working professionally.

The need for a document providing guidelines for the voluntary sector, for use by groups and by heritage bodies as a point of reference when undertaking projects and setting funding criteria, was recognised. Hopefully it could also be referenced by funding bodies such as the Heritage Lottery Fund, which has been consulted throughout the project’s development. CBA has developed the Introduction to Standards and Guidance in Archaeological Practice (ISGAP) with funding from English Heritage and with input and feedback from numerous individuals. It will be available online in the next few months as a free resource that any voluntary group working in the UK or UK Crown Dependencies can consult.

Furthermore, the comprehensive nature of ISGAP, covering legal and practical considerations for all parts of the UK as well as supporting further advice and guidance from IfA, English Heritage, Historic Scotland and others, means that it should prove useful to all those working in archaeology, not just to volunteers.

Standards and guidance covered in ISGAP broadly relate to IfA Standards and guidance, leaving scope for the range of topics covered to expand as IfA expands its own suite of literature. Ongoing maintenance of the website will primarily be by IfA’s new Voluntary and Community Special Interest Group (www.archaeologists.net/groups/voluntary) and, once the resource is online, readers will be able to suggest updates or changes, for example as legislation or organisations change.

Suzie Thomas MIfA
Council for British Archaeology
suzietomas@britarch.ac.uk

www.britarch.ac.uk/research/community)

Volunteers in action at the Chapel House Wood training excavation run by Dales Landscape Heritage. Photograph: Don Henson
Partnership in the park: exploring the past, inspiring the future in inner-city Manchester

Hannah Cobb, Melanie Giles and Siân Jones

Community archaeology is increasingly popular and it is often viewed as a straightforward endeavour: local people come together, often with the involvement of heritage professionals, to survey, dig and generally examine the archaeology of a site or area. Seemingly it ‘does what it says on the tin’. In reality, community archaeology is incredibly complicated (see Marshall 2009; Smith and Waterton 2009). Bottom-up projects, driven by local community groups, inevitably need expert help and the support of the heritage profession throughout the process. Thus a hierarchy of knowledge is created, complicating the community’s ownership and control over the project and their local heritage. Meanwhile top-down projects, driven by professional archaeologists, often engage with and enlist community groups for their work, but such a process can be equally alienating for the communities. Ultimately, community archaeology is always going to be an intervention into an existing social context where people are already actively producing and negotiating identities and where the past is plural and contested; constantly being remade, debated and already actively producing and negotiating identities and where the heritage profession throughout the process. Thus a hierarchy of knowledge is created, complicating the community’s ownership and control over the project and their local heritage. Meanwhile top-down projects, driven by professional archaeologists, often engage with and enlist community groups for their work, but such a process can be equally alienating for the communities. Ultimately, community archaeology is always going to be an intervention into an existing social context where people are already actively producing and negotiating identities and where the past is plural and contested; constantly being remade, debated and negotiated (Greer et al 2002; Iserwood 2011; Jones 2012).

Aware of such tensions and possibilities, the Whitworth Park Community Archaeology and History Project set out to develop another approach, bringing together common interests amongst a range of parties with a fundamental recognition that memories and identities are produced and negotiated through the act of community archaeology.

Magnificent heyday

The Project is set in the context of the decline and regeneration of Whitworth Park, Manchester, and its neighbourhood. The park opened in 1890 and was a magnificent place in its Victorian and Edwardian heyday, with a bandstand, large boating lake, observatory, various shrines, extensive formal flower beds, statues and a covered walkway. However, as with many public parks, most of these features were removed in the post-war period, reflecting changes in urban park management and funding cuts. Whitworth Park also developed a reputation for sex and drug-related crimes along with the adjacent area of Moss Side, which for a while became synonymous with gang-related gun and drugs crime. By the 1980s and 1990s, the Park was not a place to linger or a site of leisure. The Friends of Whitworth Park was formed to regenerate and rejuvenate this key urban green space, to challenge crime in the area and enable the local community to re-engage with the Park’s future. The Whitworth Park Community Archaeology and History Project arose as part of this important work, with the explicit aim of engaging with and inspiring the local community through investigation of the material, architectural and social history of the Park. By exploring the Park’s past, we hope to raise aspirations for its future, and by engaging with the cultural material and landscape through archaeological excavation we hope to provide an arena for the exploration of community identities and memories (Moshenska 2007, 2009).

Oral memories

After geophysical survey in 2010 we began the first of two seasons of excavation in September 2011. We targeted major Victorian and Edwardian park features, including the boating lake, pavilion and bandstand, and unravelled many uses and social spaces created and recreated here. Excavations also provided the opportunity for diverse public engagement. Volunteers were drawn from the local ethnically-diverse community, with a particular emphasis on the unemployable. As well as learning how to dig, archaeological work provided a connection to the local area and an opportunity to become part of a team, learning important transferable skills. Working alongside them were volunteers from the Friends of Whitworth Park, who brought age and experience to the project. We also worked with local schools, which had the opportunity to excavate, process finds, and participate in drama-based or archival-inspired workshops in the nearby Whitworth Gallery. In addition, we hosted a special day for our local Young Archaeology Club from Manchester Museum, a centre-piece for the Open Day which attracted many visitors. The Open Day produced vivid and insightful oral memories of the Park and how it has changed since the 1950s. Daily lunch-time site tours, chats over the fence and impromptu hands-on sessions attracted further stories, which will provide the framework for more in-depth oral history interviews adding to this archive of memories.

We are now evaluating the impact of the project on different communities. Initial feedback is positive, as two of the comments indicate:

‘Inspirational. Amazing that so many people are involved. A wonderful educational experience...everyone feels as if they are part of something important. I really like the change in dynamics...one minute there is great activity and the next, we’re doing painstaking work...And aged 70, I am surprised I can spend all day on my knees and it’s fine!’ Gill Reddick, Friend of Whitworth Park

‘We were given the independence to do our own work, and when we found things, we felt incredibly proud.’ Pupils from Manchester Academy

Over the next year we will be reflecting on our feedback and building on our success to create a further season of work. Avoiding the top-down or bottom-up approach we hope to situate archaeology within the dynamic relations of the local community – schools, residents and University working in partnership. Ongoing critical reflection on the relationship between the project and the production and negotiation of memories and identities will be an important part of this process.

Whitworth Park Community Archaeology and History Project is funded by the Heritage Lottery Fund, the University of Manchester and Manchester City Council. The Project is led by the Department of Archaeology at the University of Manchester, in association with the Friends of Whitworth Park, Manchester Museum, the Whitworth Art Gallery, and Ahmed Iqbal Ullah Race Relations Centre. We would like to thank the residents of Manchester who have engaged with the project and shared their memories and aspirations with us.

Hannah Cobb, Melanie Giles and Siân Jones

University of Manchester

Manchester Museum, the Whitworth Art Gallery, and Ahmed Iqbal Ullah Race Relations Centre. We would like to thank the residents of Manchester who have engaged with the project and shared their memories and aspirations with us.

Hannah Cobb, Melanie Giles and Siân Jones

University of Manchester

Manchester Museum, the Whitworth Art Gallery, and Ahmed Iqbal Ullah Race Relations Centre. We would like to thank the residents of Manchester who have engaged with the project and shared their memories and aspirations with us.

Hannah Cobb

University of Manchester

Manchester Museum, the Whitworth Art Gallery, and Ahmed Iqbal Ullah Race Relations Centre. We would like to thank the residents of Manchester who have engaged with the project and shared their memories and aspirations with us.

Hannah Cobb, Melanie Giles and Siân Jones

University of Manchester

Manchester Museum, the Whitworth Art Gallery, and Ahmed Iqbal Ullah Race Relations Centre. We would like to thank the residents of Manchester who have engaged with the project and shared their memories and aspirations with us.

Hannah Cobb

University of Manchester

Manchester Museum, the Whitworth Art Gallery, and Ahmed Iqbal Ullah Race Relations Centre. We would like to thank the residents of Manchester who have engaged with the project and shared their memories and aspirations with us.

Hannah Cobb

University of Manchester

Manchester Museum, the Whitworth Art Gallery, and Ahmed Iqbal Ullah Race Relations Centre. We would like to thank the residents of Manchester who have engaged with the project and shared their memories and aspirations with us.

Hannah Cobb

University of Manchester

Manchester Museum, the Whitworth Art Gallery, and Ahmed Iqbal Ullah Race Relations Centre. We would like to thank the residents of Manchester who have engaged with the project and shared their memories and aspirations with us.

Hannah Cobb

University of Manchester

Manchester Museum, the Whitworth Art Gallery, and Ahmed Iqbal Ullah Race Relations Centre. We would like to thank the residents of Manchester who have engaged with the project and shared their memories and aspirations with us.

Hannah Cobb

University of Manchester

Manchester Museum, the Whitworth Art Gallery, and Ahmed Iqbal Ullah Race Relations Centre. We would like to thank the residents of Manchester who have engaged with the project and shared their memories and aspirations with us.

Hannah Cobb

University of Manchester

Manchester Museum, the Whitworth Art Gallery, and Ahmed Iqbal Ullah Race Relations Centre. We would like to thank the residents of Manchester who have engaged with the project and shared their memories and aspirations with us.

Hannah Cobb

University of Manchester

Manchester Museum, the Whitworth Art Gallery, and Ahmed Iqbal Ullah Race Relations Centre. We would like to thank the residents of Manchester who have engaged with the project and shared their memories and aspirations with us.

Hannah Cobb

University of Manchester

Manchester Museum, the Whitworth Art Gallery, and Ahmed Iqbal Ullah Race Relations Centre. We would like to thank the residents of Manchester who have engaged with the project and shared their memories and aspirations with us.

Hannah Cobb

University of Manchester

Manchester Museum, the Whitworth Art Gallery, and Ahmed Iqbal Ullah Race Relations Centre. We would like to thank the residents of Manchester who have engaged with the project and shared their memories and aspirations with us.

Hannah Cobb, Melanie Giles and Siân Jones

University of Manchester

Manchester Museum, the Whitworth Art Gallery, and Ahmed Iqbal Ullah Race Relations Centre. We would like to thank the residents of Manchester who have engaged with the project and shared their memories and aspirations with us.

Hannah Cobb

University of Manchester

Manchester Museum, the Whitworth Art Gallery, and Ahmed Iqbal Ullah Race Relations Centre. We would like to thank the residents of Manchester who have engaged with the project and shared their memories and aspirations with us.
Buildings at Sayers Croft were constructed in 1939 as an evacuation centre for pupils from Catford Central Boys School in London during the Second World War. They include a dining hall, accommodation blocks and associated air-raid shelters, two of which are still extant. The archaeological project centred on an area of two demolished shelters, to discover their exact positions and state of preservation. The aim of the project was to provide a basic background in archaeology and field skills which could be built on in the future.

**Air raid experiences – and discoveries**

Sessions for young people were led by Nigel Randall and Laura Joyner from Surrey County Council Archaeology Unit (SCAU), with over 100 children from the local community involved in excavating the air raid shelters. The budding archaeologists started the day with an interactive presentation on archaeology, with a chance to handle and record artefacts found in Surrey, before heading into the trenches to learn basic excavation techniques. The children also learned what life was like during the Second World War by completing a History Trail and descending into a bomb shelter to brave the Sayers Croft Air Raid Experience. The dig was a fantastic opportunity for local children to discover archaeology and has provided a wealth of information about the structure and design of the shelters. Many artefacts discovered help tell the story of those staying at the evacuation centre during the war, including a bullet, a sixpence minted in 1944 and a baked bean tin with string running through it.

In August, there were two free 2-day training courses in Basic Archaeology Skills, plus a day of taster sessions for young people and adults from the local area. We continued to excavate both the shelters uncovered in June, revealing the entry steps, concrete bases and drains of both. Further finds included remains of a ginger beer bottle, plenty of concrete and even a stray worked flint. As well as excavation techniques, the students learned how to identify and lay out a trench and how to record the excavation through contexts, plans, section drawing and levelling.

**Accredited skills**

All the skills taught were part of a short syllabus for an AQA accredited unit in Basic Archaeology Skills. Everyone completed tasks on site safety, use of tools and equipment, digging and recording features – everyone passed! Two Skills for the Future bursary holders supported the delivery of the training. Laura Joyner (Community Archaeology) and Jennifer Coates (Archives and Learning) are both on 12-month placements with Surrey Heritage, and their assistance was key to the success of the courses. Feedback from participants was positive from both the courses and the taster day, and we will certainly look to run similar courses in the future.

**Continuing involvement**

Following the courses opportunities were offered at SCAU for volunteers to learn environmental processing skills and work on samples, with two course participants taking this up. Following any project we encourage people to continue their interest by promoting membership of a local archaeological society, signing up to the Surrey Heritage mailing list, taking part in another dig or becoming a regular volunteer.

BBC Surrey covered the project as a news item and the Community Film Unit shot a clip for YouTube (http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=K5sR0B7jSj). Sayers Croft held an Open Day as part of Heritage Open Days, when over 300 people visited the site and could take part in the dig and the air raid shelter experience, the latter now revamped with lights and sound through the HLF grant.

The project was initiated by Paul Bowen (Surrey County Council, Youth Development Service) and David Quoroll (Manager, Sayers Croft Field Centre), with archaeological input from SCAU. To find out more about this project see the Digging Surrey’s War webpages at www.surreycc.gov.uk/community-yarchaeology or contact Surrey’s Community Archaeology Team (below).

**Abby Guinness AIfA**

Community Archaeologist (SCAU)

**Laura Joyner**

Community Archaeology Bursary Holder

Surrey County Archaeological Unit

Surrey County Council

education.scau@surreycc.gov.uk

01483 518737

**Abbey Guinness and Laura Joyner**

‘It really was FAB. All the staff were great, genuinely interested and so engaging with the children. I feel we were very lucky to have such an opportunity; the only downside is that the time went far too quickly! If further sessions are planned we’d love to know.’

Caroline

**Processing samples back at the Surrey History Centre**
Being in loco parentis carries with it great responsibility and the range of parenting and teaching experience of our leaders has proved crucial. For however enthusiastic we are about the archaeology, however well we convey stories about the past, our priority is always the care of our Branch members. Each session is carefully assessed for potential hazards, with a Risk Assessment drawn up and acted upon as a ‘briefing’ before activities begin. CBA ensures that all leaders undergo criminal record Disclosure checks and are provided with First Aid training as necessary. Guidelines are supplied on the required ratio of leaders to children and male and female cover is provided at all times. Moreover, in case of any queries, the staff at YAC HQ are at hand for advice and practical support; we also have a thorough Leaders’ Handbook supplied by YAC HQ.

One challenge of teaching a mixed age range is organising tasks that will challenge older members whilst not outrunning the abilities of the younger ones. Similarly, it is necessary to consider the needs of members with dyslexia, dyspraxia and other learning difficulties. The practical nature of archaeology has proved a boon in this respect, with activities and exercises being more visual and tactile than traditionally found in the classroom. Furthermore, the wide age range of our members also allows them to socialise and make friends outside their school year. In this way we hope that we are providing ‘skills for life’ as well as spending enjoyable time together.

The principal strengths of YAC are:

- support by experienced staff at CBA
- leaders have valuable parenting and teaching experience
- leaders have (and are keen to share) a range of archaeological experiences
- activities are predominately practical and teach a range of new skills

York YAC Branch Leaders are pleased to acknowledge the additional support of our employers.

To enable the fantastic range of opportunities Branches offer young people to continue the CBA have launched a ‘Dig Deep for YAC’ campaign. To find out how you can support this vitally important work please visit the Dig Deep for YAC campaign pages at www.yac-uk.org/yaccampaign.

Tara-Jane Sutcliffe AIFA
Projects Officer: Air Photo Investigator
YAC Branch Leader (York)
tara-jane.sutcliffe@english-heritage.org.uk
Does archaeology need guidelines for ethical publishing?

This must seem an odd question to be asking, but it is a serious one which arises because of the many difficulties or irregularities I know others have encountered, or I have experienced personally in the process of publishing archaeological material. Even though some current publishing practices may obviously represent irregular behaviours, some seem to be slowly becoming institutionalised. Consequently, it seems important to explain such questionable practices which have the potential to be unethical, in the hope of provoking useful discussion and constructive debate. Such discussion should enable a greater understanding, and will hopefully encourage the establishment of useful guidelines that further add to our promotion of fair dealing and professionalism in this essential aspect of our work.

So what sort of problem arises in taking work to the press? As author and editor I have become aware of intellectual fraud, plagiarism and regular breaches of personal or institutional copyright. I have also developed serious concerns for the way that intellectual work is reviewed or refereed. At present, most journal and book publishers employ (though rarely pay) referees to adjudicate new work. Closed Refereeing – which this is termed – enables relatively fast scrutiny, though it is arguably open to abuse by those who feel it can be used to maintain an intellectual status quo. Without openness and accountability important novel or even iconic research can be suppressed or held up without the need to show clear reasons. On the other hand, operated respectfully, Open Refereeing – where authors are given their referees’ names – enables authors to be given frank evaluations to help improve their scholarship and find the best place to have it printed.

To help counter or reduce referees’ or reviewers’ self-interest, some British journals now request their declarations of relationship, friendship or outstanding hostility to authors and subjects under scrutiny. Referees willing to be identified are naturally likely to be more difficult to find than anonymous ones, though there is evidence of moves to introduce more transparent refereeing in areas outside archaeology. For example, The British Medical Journal has revealed the names of reviewers to authors since 1999. Some researchers believe this ‘can reduce abuses, make referees more accountable and give them more credit for their work’. This practice offers a valuable example for archaeology to follow.

Is there a panacea for these problems? Unfortunately, I fear we have such scant regard for the editor’s role generally, that many branches of academic seem content to appoint editors quite without training or guidance. This cavalier approach to what is arguably the key scholarly role in intellectual progress across all disciplines needs to be addressed individually by professions like our own. We can begin to help improve editorial training and standards by producing appropriate guidelines and advice on best publishing practice.

Here are some suggestions as to what a code of practice might encompass. Archaeologists should:

- promote best practice in the use and evaluation of evidence;
- encourage greater understanding of copyright law and sensitivity to the ownership of intellectual property;
- avoid plagiarism, fabrication, falsification and deception in proposing, carrying out and reporting the results of research;
- declare any interests, including financial ones that bear on publishing research findings;
- always give due and appropriate acknowledgement of assistance received, financial or otherwise, encouraging that particular care be taken when more than one author is involved;
- follow the most rigorous procedures for the citation of sources, including materials obtained from the internet;
- report any conflict of interest, for example, by normally refusing to participate in the formal review of work of anyone for whom they feel a sense of personal obligation or enmity.

Other points might be usefully added to this list, which is adapted from the Royal Historical Society’s website. Readers’ views are welcomed on the development and adoption of such a code.

The problems of good publishing are global and affect many disciplines. Research into climate change, medicine and GM agriculture is riddled with factions alleging irregularity, if not even with claims of scientific fraud that appear to be protected by one form of media manipulation or another. In common with these other professions, archaeology is continuously under pressure to deliver more published products at greater speed. Today, many of the world’s academic publishers and scientific societies advertise their bespoke Ethical Practice policies or Codes of Practice on the web. Some include stiff codes about Ethical Publishing. Unfortunately, up to the present time, archaeology has not loomed large among them, though the IfA members’ developed Code of Practice is cast in a good progressive spirit. We might therefore now usefully focus on refinements in that Code to address some of the problems touched upon above. Paying greater attention to the detail of how publication is delivered will certainly help avoid the unwitting loss of quality and truth.

Stephen Briggs MIA
Independent Researcher, Aberystwyth
cstephenbriggs@yahoo.co.uk

Stephen Briggs is a member of IfA’s Editorial Board. He is preparing a Best Practice Paper on Ethical Publishing for IfA’s Professional development and practice committee.

**Announcement of the result of a Disciplinary Investigation**

The Institute’s Disciplinary Regulations set out the disciplinary procedure by which the Institute will determine whether an allegation requires formal investigation, and if it does how that investigation will be carried out. If formal disciplinary proceedings take place, each party is given an opportunity to present his/her case or to defend themselves against the allegations. The procedures also allow for representation and appeal against the findings and any sanctions.

If a breach of the Code of conduct is found, resulting in a suspension or expulsion, the Institute will publish an account of the case and the identity of the member concerned.

In the event of a formal reprimand the Institute will publish an account of the case and may identify the member concerned.

A Disciplinary Inquiry Panel conducted a hearing on 27 January 2011 and 4 July 2011 to investigate allegations that Dr Richard Whaley had breached various clauses of the Code of conduct. The Disciplinary Panel found that Dr Richard Whaley, who had been an Associate member of the Institute at the time, had not acted in accordance with Rules 1.1, 1.8, and 5.2 of the Code of conduct. Recognising the circumstances of the case, it was agreed in accordance with clause 25 of the IfA’s Disciplinary Regulations, that the appropriate sanction is a formal reprimand: “In accordance with clause 25 of the IfA’s Disciplinary Regulations you are formally reprimanded for:

- the failure of Dr Richard Whaley to provide evidence that insurance or adequate Health & Safety documentation and procedures were in place for the NEHHAS Field Archaeology Branch fieldwork. This is in breach of Rule 1.1 of the Code of conduct.
- the statement on the NEHHAS Field Archaeology Branch website that “our work has been validated by IfA” misrepresents the position of the IfA in relation to the work of NEHHAS Field Archaeology Branch and Dr Richard Whaley and therefore misrepresents the IfA. This is in breach of Rule 1.8 of the Code of conduct.
- the continuation operation and advertising of the field school against the background of the ongoing dispute between NEHHAS and NEHHAS Field Archaeology Branch. These actions both the profession and the Institute to disrepute and therefore in breach of Rule 1.1 of the Code of conduct.
- the failure of Dr Richard Whaley to provide evidence that insurance or adequate Health & Safety documentation and procedures were in place for the NEHHAS Field Archaeology Branch fieldwork. This is in breach of Rule 5.2 of the Code of conduct.

The IfA should publish an account of the case in accordance with article 37 of the Disciplinary regulations.

---
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New members

ELECTED

Member (MIfA)
Stewart Annows
Steven Almes
Philip Armstrong
Jill Atherton
Ian Atkins
Serena Barnes
Richard Bryant
Graeme Barners
David Connolly
Brenda Craddock
Michelle Dance
Charlotte Davies
Garth Denning
Andrew Gammon
Jane Goddard
Lorna Gay
Gillian Greer
Erica Guttmann-Bond
Julian Hault
Susan Holden
Mark Hoyle
Carolyn Hunt
Sylvia James
Hugh Kayavan
Phil Kenning
Milko Krik
Stephe Lamb
Carlos Lemes
Sarah Lucas
Thomas Mace
Cecily Marshall
Hazel Mentingill
Cai Mason
Barbara McNee
Maria Medcott
Debbie Miles-Williams
Jonathan Morris
Peter Moore
Timothy Morgan
David Neal
Sara Nyuld
Ewan O'Deochagh
Ruth Parlin
James Patience
Amanda Patton
Ann Preston-Jones
C. Read

Associate (BAIA)
Andrew Bates
Rebecca Clark
Luke Craddock-Bennett
Olive Davis
David Doyle
Adam Garwood
Prudence Manning
John Nicholls
Rebecca Peacock
Samantha Powell
Emma Tevworth
Stephen Yates

Practitioner (PIFA)
Sam Ali-Ridallo
Caroline Adams
Andrew Bain
Amie Bassir
Julia Bastek
Julian Bap
Jonathan Bedford
Steven Bellshaw
Fabiana Benetti
John Bootbyrd
Katherine Brandon
James Bridgen
Bert Bouwenseten
Katherine Card
Matthew Charlton
Jacqueline Churchill
Ken Collier
Heather Anne Cope
Attila Cusa
Lesley Davidson
Inaki Diegueru
Luribondo
David Dobson
Joanne Dupia
Tara Fairclough
Tonisa Ferreira
Angela Gallagher
Claire Gosse
Jennifer Gutzett
Christina Hills
Nick Hogan
Vickie Jamieson
Patricia Johnson
Paul Jones
Anthony Kroll
Anne Leaner
Edward Lyons
Brian Luck
Dombiannl
Rafael Maya Tercello
Merrily McCarthy
Sharon Ann Murray
Seamus O’Donovan
Jasmine Parker
Aidie Patterson
Trevor Pearson
Neil Pinchbeck
David Pirncco
John Pollack
Cheryl Quin
Hans Rashbrook

Stuart Anslow
Graham Argyle
Tania Brown
Stephen Bryant
Gavril Bulescu
Marianne Butts
Martin Byf
Tanya Binks
Nilsa Coeber
Sanzio Corino
Alexandra Croom
Maria De Vos
Gaelle Delacourt
Sam Driscoll
Tina Drury
Joe Eaves
Barbara Eaves
Eduardo Echeverria
Katherine Finlay
Alexis Finlay
Tori Foulke
Jason French
Penny Frew
Martin Freeman
Kirstofer Frimley
Sibylle Fuchs
Dominic Furness
George Furman
Steve Gascoigne
Brian Gates
Linda Gawley
Anita Genockey
Suzanne Gielkens
Richard Gibbons
Sam Gough
David Gourley
Steve Graham
Sammy Grant
Lynne Grainger
David Grayson
Elizabeth Greatorex
Suzanne Greig
Tim Gribble
Mark Gregory
Ged Grout
Garth Greenwood
Jodie Hannah
Pete Hardman
Richard Harrison
Brian Hart
Ruth Harwin
Michael Hasske
Allison Hawkins
Peter Herring
Willie Hewitt
Barbara Higgan
Nicholas Kelly
Margaret Matthews
Jonathan Millar
Sarah Nouwens
Caroline Norman
Chris Philp
Carolyn Powell
Shelley Probert
Jill Quirke
Gary Rathbone
Matthew Rawson
Susan Redman
Margaret Reid
Rachel Reeves
Samantha Rees
Christian Reynolds
Julian Reeves
Derek Reynolds
Mike Rhys
Binazier Rizvi
Nicola Roper
Jeremy Rose
Judy Ross
Paul Ross
Andrzej Rutkowski
David Rutledge
Lynne Ryan
Thomas Sayers
Jean Smith
Joseph Smurthwaite
Kerrie Snell
Miriam Snaith
Linda Southgate
Raymond Soper
Wendy Soper
Virginia Soper
Melvyn Soper
Shane Sullivan
James Swann
Eliza Swift
Gary Sykes
Jim Taylor
Alistair Taylor
Sara Taylor
Steve Taylor
Heather Taylor
Pamela Taylor
Jen Taylor
Dave Taylor
David Taylor
Ric Taylor
David Telford
Katherine Tell
James Thomas
Andrea Thomas
David Thomas
Margaret Thomas
Benjamin Thompson
Barbara Thomson
Ruth Thomson
Carol Thomson
Dennis Thompson
Alasdair Thom."
Scotland and the North of England (http://www.albergheritage.co.uk/20/blog/post/7/new-alb-heritage-office-opens). The new office will be headed by Gareth Talbot, who previously worked with Glasgow City Council on the Strategic Environmental Assessment for the 2014 Commonwealth Games and who was previously Senior Heritage Consultant at Atkins Ltd. Gareth has particular experience working on CIA, SIA and cultural heritage management strategies.

Beverley Ballin Smith MIfA 294

Following the closure of GUARD by the University of Glasgow at the end of 2010, Beverley, previously a project manager for many years with responsibilities for post-excaavation and archives is now a self-employed archaeological consultant and researcher. The change in employment has allowed her to start the process of assessing the largely pre-digital and paper-based archives of the Udal project, excavated by Iain Crawford between 1961 and 1996 in North Uist, Western Isles. This massive project is one of the largest and most important rural excavations ever undertaken in Scotland that has not been published. It comprises three main sites and produced c. 40 cubic metres of finds and samples. This assessment year is being funded by Historic Scotland and the Western Isles Council. If anyone worked at the Udal site and has information on or photographs of the site please do get in touch (bballinsmith@gmail.com.

Andrew Fitzpatrick MIfA 926

Andrew, Head of Communications at Wessex Archaeology, has just been appointed as Visiting Professor in the School of Archaeology and Ancient History at the University of Leicester.

landscape in Eskdale, and continues to undertake research into the area. Since undertaking her PhD, Amanda has retained her research interest in the Viking and medieval periods in the North Atlantic Region, and hopes one day to fully publish her ongoing research into soapstone vessels, and their manufacture and use, across the region.

Amanda joined IfA in November 2011 and is looking forward to promoting the work of IfA to its membership. Registered Organisations and the wider world. She is keen to involve as many members as possible in shaping and developing the Institute to their benefit, and in making sure everyone is aware of the work that goes on from day-to-day, just as much as reporting the significant news and events. From December, Amanda will be the main contact for The Archaeologist – so if you have any ideas for new content or how we can add to the magazine, please get in touch with her at amanda.forster@archaeologists.net.

Anna Maria Brindle-Slowikowski BA MPhil MAAIS

PGCE MIfA 849

1955 – 2011

Anna graduated from Sheffield University in 1976, gained a PGCE and then returned to her home town of Nottingham to work more voluntarily for the City Valley Archaeological Research Committee. After voluntary work at the Broughouse Museum and a short spell at Nottinghamshire County Record Office, she returned to the Broughouse Museum as finds assistant, with digging and outreach work included.

In 1980 Anna moved to Leeds and to West Yorkshire Archaeology Service. This was a hugely influential period in her professional life, in particular working alongside Stephen Moorhouse. She always stayed in close contact with friends and colleagues she met there. Her continuing interest in Yorkshire medieval pottery was evidenced by her MPhil dissertation — ‘The character and uses of medieval pottery in the lowlands of West Yorkshire’ — and involvement in the Wharram Percy publications, for which she managed all ceramics from excavation to publication, including compiling a type series, fabric descriptions, statistical analysis and illustration. Anna was an accomplished pottery illustrator and became a full member of AAS in 1988, was Technical Papers Editor 1988-89 and chair of the association 1989-1992.

Anna came to Bedfordshire in 1987 as a pottery researcher with Bedfordshire County Archaeological Service, now Albion Archaeology, where she remained until her death. Her achievements here are manifold and include work on the Bedfordshire Ceramic Type Series and publication of key backlogs. She was an active member of MPRG and also Regional Organiser for the South East Midlands Pottery Research Group during the 1990s. Anna’s regional synthesis of late medieval reduced wares, Genoa in a cracked pot, was published only months before her death and will become a key work for medieval pottery research.

Anna enthusiastically shared the wealth of her knowledge and was the driving force behind Albion’s successful outreach programme. Her colleagues will always remember her quiet determination to work as normal throughout cancer treatment. Patient, generous and kind, an enthusiast for archaeology and an exceptionally talented ceramics specialist, we will miss her.

Anna leaves a husband Philip and son Harry.

Hester Cooper-Reade and Holly Duncan

Albion Archaeology

Obituaries

David William Hopkins BSc MIfA 779

1967 – 2011

It is with great sadness that we report the early death of David Hopkins in a tragic boating accident while working on an archaeological project in Uzbekistan.

After graduating from the University of Bath, Dave undertook archaeological illustration, first at Leicester and, since 1998, at Archaeological Project Services/Heritage Trust of Lincolnshire. At the latter he contributed his unique finds illustrations and highly detailed reconstruction drawings to the Fenland Management Project volumes and numerous other publications. More recently he contributed to various community projects where his infinite patience, charm and good humour won him many new friends. His career with APS/HTL was interspersed with excavations abroad, working as illustrator for many British and overseas universities.

He worked extensively in the Mediterranean, North Africa and the Near East. His creative side always to the fore Dave had recently devised board games for organisations such as the National Trust and National Horse racing museum. His love of the garden and countryside manifested itself in many articles on ancient plants he wrote and illustrated for gardening periodicals, notably Lincolnshire Good Taste magazine. A hugely talented and imaginative illustrator Dave will be sorely missed by his family in Leicester and his many colleagues and friends the world over.

Tom Lane
tom.lane@apsarchaeology.co.uk
Richard Andrew Hall BA PhD FSA MIFA 159
1949 – 2011
He was born in Ilford, Essex, grew up in Northern Ireland and graduated from Queen’s University, Belfast, followed by a doctorate at Southampton University on the Anglo-Scandinavian towns of the Danelaw. He became excavations supervisor in York in 1974 and worked for the York Archaeological Trust for the rest of his life, as deputy director and then director of archaeology.

Richard’s excavations at Coppergate between 1975 and 1981 transformed understanding of pre-Norman urban development and made Jorvik a place of international renown. Archaeological techniques developed there revolutionised urban archaeology. He and Peter Addyman were early proponents of public archaeology and their work in York touched the public imagination in unprecedented ways, with Jorvik Viking Centre becoming one of the most successful archaeological exhibitions in the world, with 17 million visitors. This side of his work never ceased and he was tremendously proud of involvement in the DIG centre and ongoing Hungate excavations.

Richard was also an expert in the conservation and analysis of church fabric, exemplified in his work recording St Wilfrid’s Anglo-Saxon crypt under Ripon Cathedral, on the Cathedrals Fabric Commission and as consultant archaeologist to York Minster. He served on the Council of the Society of Antiquaries, was president of the Society for Medieval Archaeology, president of the Yorkshire Archaeological Society, a trustee and secretary of CBA, chair of The Friends of York Archaeological Trust, trustee for the Sheldon Memorial Trust and member of the Historical Towns Atlas Committee. He has been a British representative on the Viking Congress, a member of the Lübeck International Urban Archaeology Symposium and the Kaupang Norway Project Council.

Richard was Chair of the infant IFA (then IFA) 1987 and 1988, and was a steadfast supporter throughout his working life. Writing for TA (50), he described how, during his chairmanship, the debate was raging over what sort of an organisation IFA ought to be – a setter of standards and a fairly passive provider of useful information, or should it be more proactive in assisting its members and in influencing the profession? Archaeologists were under terrible pressures as public funding dwindled every year, but developer funding (pre-PPG 16) was rarely possible. ‘We had to tackle issues thrown up by the novel world of competitive tendering and contract archaeology before any curatorial controls were really in place. ... We were able to make a ruling against “volunteer” levels of pay, and we set up the PIFA grade so they would have better representation.

MSC (Manpower Services Commission) projects were both a blessing and a curse at this time, so we issued a Guide to archaeology on community programmes which I hope stopped some of the worse abuses’.

Numerous publications included academic articles, contributions to conferences and more popular works such as Exploring the World of the Vikings (2007). Richard leaves his wife, Ailsa Mainman and two sons, Alasdair and Guy.

With contributions by Brian Ayers and Peter Addyman

Richard Hall, with Peter Addyman, keep Prince Charles informed on progress.