

Appendix 4 Workshop summary feedback

This document presents summary notes of the workshop feedback. It is not a comprehensive record but demonstrates the variety of views presented and helps to illustrate where the suggested recommendations originate from. The comments have been paraphrased to ensure their context is clear.

➤ Structure

Main question:

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

Sub-questions:

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

Main points

- Define what is meant by quality as it can mean different things to different audiences (developers/clients/archaeologists/CifA/ALGAO etc)
- Community sector and academic projects – how well do they perform against industry standards?
- Look at ORCA/Welsh Trusts to see how quality management and review can be embedded in the process all in one place
- Already have well developed quality system in place via CifA S&G
- Monitoring compliance with CifA S&G
- Monitoring quality – this should not be client led but a third party
- The need to promote/invest more in ALGAO services to enable them to strengthen their role
- Improvement needed on ethical matters - more focus on active pursuit of higher standards in areas such as creating equal employment opportunities (promoting diversity and inclusion) for all potential professionals and other participants
- Only accredited archaeologists should be undertaking work
- The system of licencing needs to be administered which would need resources
- Ethical questions to address concerning who makes the decisions
- A concern that licencing would not guarantee quality and might discriminate against local community groups
- Could licencing drive up costs?
- Should refrain from referring to 'minimum standards' and just stick with standards - communication

- Ongoing promotion and campaigning for professional standards both internally and externally. Companies and organisations external to the heritage sector should be demanding high standards in archaeology
- Community hubs to help projects and organisations leave behind a legacy of high standards
- Monitoring of compliance to ClfA S&G by non-member advisors is a potential weakness in the system

➤ Funding

Main questions:

- If we were starting from scratch, what delivery model(s) might we devise to support archaeological investigations within the planning system?
- The current model for planning-led archaeology allows funders to choose their archaeological service providers. Kirsty Dingwall's think piece highlights some of the challenges of managing competition through competitive tendering. What improvements could we make?

Sub-questions:

- The pros and cons of existing models from elsewhere (e.g. the French model - developers pay a hypothecated archaeology tax, the Brussels model - the regional government pays for archaeology out of general taxation).
- How would we judge 'quality' and who would do it? For example, in Sweden contracts are awarded on quality with the equivalent of a local authority archaeologist making the decision on what is 'the best'. The developer is then told who will do the work and what it will be with. Could this work in Scotland? What are the pros and cons?
- Which aspects of the current model work well and what (if anything) needs changing?
- How could we ensure that regional archaeologists are resourced to provide all the services originally envisaged?
- How could we ensure that regional archaeologists are resourced to provide all the services originally envisaged? What do you think about the use of community hubs? (see Alan Leslie's think piece).
- How can we encourage greater use of procurement models that emphasise quality over price? Would a different delivery model help enhance our offer? For example, more focus on partnerships/collaboration?

Main points

- There are some problems with the current model, which include archiving
- Difficult to postulate how other models would/could work in Scotland – cultural and political variations need to be considered
- The removal of the tendering process (as in the Swedish model example) would impact on the development of relationships with repeat clients based on trust. This in turn could impact on the use of innovative approaches to projects
- Need to look at approaches that already exist in the UK for ideas:
 - The Landscape Partnership model offers possibilities – a mix of funding and linked to regional research frameworks and community or regional hubs
 - Orkney (ORCA/UHI)

- The Welsh Trusts
- A review of the structure of HES - investigate a more dispersed set up across Scotland with colleagues embedded in LA's to encourage greater collaboration and wider impact
- There is a lack of HES expertise in some areas (battlefields and designed landscapes)
- Investigate use of museums as community hubs for more consistent engagement
- The public need to understand better the roles of LA's and HES
- LA's need more resourcing to support their role in the current model (a theme throughout the workshops)
- The current model needs to be sustainable – would introducing specialised levies help? For example, levies that feed back into LA's to help with resourcing. Comparisons with the Aggregates Levy Sustainability Fund
- LA's need the authority/power to implement exemptions or to rescind permitted development in certain circumstances. More lobbying required for future permitted development allocations.
- The standards underpinning planning conditions need to be applied more consistently (links to LA structure and resourcing across Scotland)
- The role of ClfA and enforcement/self-regulation
- For academic projects, can ClfA address compliance with standards as a condition of grant with, for example, Research Councils?

➤ **Delivery**

Main question:

- Who are the 'public' and how do they benefit? Are we all talking about the same thing?
- Are we delivering value to the public?

Sub questions:

- Do 'the public' understand what we mean by public benefit?
- How we can sustainably fund community projects?
- How can the community become more involved in developer-led projects?
- How could we be doing things better?
- What are the barriers to delivering public benefit?
- How can we overcome the barriers?

Main points

- How is public benefit defined elsewhere? It is different to community engagement. Needs to be clearly understood by all
- How can the impact of public benefit and social value be evaluated and better understood?
- Identify a baseline for comparisons (quantification of current levels of engagement)
- A greater understanding of short-term impacts vs long term benefits would be beneficial
- Consider comparisons with practice elsewhere
 - Welsh Trusts
 - Orkney-UHI
 - Organisations set up as charities
- A focus on fostering more cross sector partnerships with non-archaeologists to engage a wider audience e.g. writing plays around archaeology
- Using local museums more actively as regional/community hubs to engage audiences

- Communicating more innovatively the wide range of impacts associated with archaeology and public benefit (economic – tourism - employment, education – school visits - teacher training, wellbeing – engagement – mental/physical health).
- Publish case studies
- All stages of the archaeology process are important for public benefit, from excavation right through to post-ex and archiving
- Developers obligation to provide outreach – advocacy/promotion of the benefits
- Look in more detail at WSI's and condition sign off
- Local Authorities (LA's) need more resourcing