Scottish Strategic Archaeology Committee Meeting
Monday 10 March 2014
11am – 3pm

1. Welcome and apologies
Present: Professor Stephen Driscoll *(Chair)*, Dr Chris Bowles, Mike Elliot, *(Minutes)*, Dr Simon Gilmour, Mark Hall, Peter Hinton, Dr Rebecca Jones, Susan Kruse, Dr Alan Leslie, Rod McCullagh, Dr Karen Milek (joined by video conference at 1.35pm), Matthew Ritchie, Richard Strachan, Simon Stronach, Robin Turner, Luke Wormald

Apologies: Eila Macqueen

2. Minutes of the October meeting and matters arising: RHJ initially received comments on the Strategy when the minutes were first circulated. All other action points were either complete or covered by the agenda.

SCOTLAND's ARCHAEOLOGY STRATEGY

3. Introduction to the latest version of the Strategy: RHJ asked if the 'key challenges' should be kept in. These have now been removed from the Historic Environment Strategy to make the document shorter and "more punchy". It was agreed that the key challenges should be kept in, either in the main body of the document or as an appendix with a numbered reference in the text, as it would be a point of reference when discussing what will be done/ achieved and what they aim to do.

4. Values and benefits, & key challenges: RHJ had asked everyone to give feedback to her by 21 March on the reordering of the pillars, which are currently ordered;

1. Culture
2. Society
3. Economy
4. Environment

It was agreed that the order would be;

1. Culture
2. Environment
3. Society
4. Economy

- **Action Point:** Feedback to be emailed to RHJ by 21 March. It may be relevant to have a longer version for consultation that may be reduced in the final strategy.

It was agreed to remove the reference to Richard III.

RHJ asked if the appendix should be taken out?
- **Action point:** Feedback to RHJ by 21 March.

Section 4: Vision. RHJ has received mixed messages over whether we should have our own vision or if it should be a contribution to the HES. Suggested it should be both. Also suggested the vision should be a series of aims.

Agreed to do a rough vision – potentially at the next SSAC. RM advised that if the final product is to be a text document then it should be as broadly correct as possible the first time round. Matt advised that the images in the document should be well considered and be tied to the text as archaeology is a very visual field. Everyone to think about this and email feedback to RHJ.

5. **Strategic priorities:** RHJ asked everyone to consider what was missing or superfluous in the objectives, and how do the examples meet the strategy? The Knowledge Cycle still needs a considerable bit of work.

It was agreed that the next meeting would have a focus on the Strategy Priorities. The themes were then divided up between SSAC members - two people to take on each theme and give a presentation (c. three slides), with potentially one person acting as a "devil's advocate" if appropriate.

Divided up as follows:

I. Encouraging Greater Engagement: Alan Leslie & Luke Wormald
II. Enhancing Understanding: Simon Gilmour & Peter Hinton
III. Protection and Management: Rod McCullagh & Chris Bowles
IV. Championing our past: Susan Kruse & Matt Ritchie
V. Improving Skills: Robin Turner & Simon Stronach
VI. Innovation: Karen Milek & Eila Macqueen
VII. Improving the Knowledge Cycle: Stephen Driscoll & Mark Hall

- **Action point:** All to take the themes allocated and give a presentation at the next SSAC. Emails and ideas to be circulated in advance where possible.
  before the meeting, the sooner the better.
  Everyone to consider the aim and objectives for their priority, what should be changed, any added with the following questions:
    o What should the key aim be?
    o What are the objectives?
    o What should the supporting text narrative say?
    o What are good examples of best practice to highlight? (N.B. We will also need to consider potential images for these)
  Consult with colleagues from across the sector on your strategic priority as necessary / appropriate.
  Consider what funding requirements may be required to achieve these aims (although this will be part of the longer term discussions on strategy implementation).

  DEVELOPING AND DELIVERING THE VISION

6. **Related developments**
   a. **ScARF Science:** A small project board has been set up comprising Karen Milek, Richard Jones, Rebecca Jones, Rod McCullagh & Jeff Sanders together with a wider advisory board drawn mainly from people involved in the ScARF Science

report. The project is looking at ways to deliver the Vision for Science outlined in the Science report, starting with the creation of a network of specialists through an online directory of scientists. Landward Research Ltd have been commissioned to undertake the work. The directory will be hosted on the ScARF website and have the potential to add resources for potential use by archaeological scientists working on Scottish materials. The focus is on Scottish archaeology, but it is not exclusive to Scotland. Comms pieces have been written for the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, Association for Environmental Archaeology and Scottish Group IfA newsletters. It was noted that Scotland does not have a series of regional science advisors unlike England. Wales are shortly to appoint their first science advisor. It was advised that the legal responsibility of the directory should be considered; the nature of the directory may incur challenges. The directory will be self-policed and anyone can put themselves on it.

   b. **Archaeological Archives:** Kirsty Lingstadt at the Commission is taking the lead on a project on archaeological archives in Scotland. Project board also includes RHJ, RM, MH & SG. Wales have followed England's lead in undertaking a survey of collections and capacity in museums. KL is working with colleagues to draw up a brief to assess collections (storage) and capacity in Scotland. This will also follow on from some of the systemic challenges recognised through the ScARF process.
   • **Action Point:** RHJ to email the ScARF systemic challenge document and also the Scottish Southport report by Andrea Smith (IfA)

KM joined the meeting via video-conference at 13:35

7. Internationalisation Agenda
   a. **Scotland-Ireland archaeological collaboration:** RHJ reported that the Cabinet Secretary is encouraging archaeological collaboration with Ireland. She is making a Cultural visit to Ireland in May and also utilising the opportunity to visit an archaeological site and meet colleagues. In order to develop the collaboration, RHJ & RM are organising a seminar with Irish colleagues at Edinburgh Castle on the 30th October, followed by an evening reception in the Irish consulate hosted by the Irish Consul and potentially with a speech by the Cabinet Secretary. The intention is to look beyond our borders and put Scottish archaeology into a European context. On the back of this collaboration, Professor Gabriel Cooney (UCD) has agreed to be an external referee for the Scottish Archaeology Strategy and is hoping that it may be a catalyst for a similar strategy for Ireland.

   b. **Learning from the Irish National Strategic Archaeological Research (INSTAR) Programme:** RM gave a brief overview of his visit to the Heritage Council with RHJ and SD. INSTAR is a project working with universities and archaeological bodies to promote the understanding of archaeology in Ireland. It has an open web-based mentality, which SD suggested we emulate. RM stressed that INSTAR's approach is very internationalist and suggested we take their lead. SD cautioned that this has implications for the archaeology budget if we go down this route. INSTAR is not a "ground up" organisation; archaeologists very much feed into the body and decide what it is. SD thought it was worthwhile taking their lead as long as there is a sense of moving forward. SG felt that the universities are more involved in Ireland and we need to bring universities in as much as we can. PH advised that we should look at

3

commercial projects and see how their projects change. RT suggested that we have some form of international research selection criteria for the projects that arose through anything of this nature in Scotland to help provide a decision-making criteria, which can be changed and adapted as necessary. CB pointed out that there is huge variety of archaeology being undertaken by different people in Scotland. SD noted that we are missing out on interaction across and beyond the sector. MH noted that the current strategy is missing guidance on what government archaeologists will be doing, if we do provide funding, in an INSTAR fashion. KM advised that we will need to look ahead past September as the outcome of the referendum may have implications for funding for universities and archaeology in Scotland and there may be a need to engage with the Scottish higher education council.

Question: How to better integrate academic and commercially-based archaeology?

c. **Learning from Ireland's Discovery Programme**: The Discovery Programme has made a significant contribution to Irish Archaeology since it was established in 1991. This body is dedicated purely to archaeological research and is funded through the (Irish) Heritage Council. Its work has focussed on finite field-based projects (such as the survey of Tara), although it has done some national surveys (e.g. Archaeology of Lake Settlement). These projects have been successful at generating deeper understanding of the heritage, have stimulated new research initiatives across the sector in Ireland and provided the training ground for many of the Irish archaeologists sector who occupy leadership positions. In addition it has developed a high public visibility in the communities where it works and contributed to nationally significant public debates about the heritage.

d. **European Association of Archaeologists**: SD reminded everyone that the EAA conference would be in Glasgow in September 2015. Up to 1,500 delegates from Europe and further afield are expected to attend. SD advised that everyone needed to start thinking soon about the sessions that they want to have at the conference. Sessions need to have at least two proposers from different countries (but preferably not neighbouring ones).

e. **Potential international collaboration**: Further opportunities for international collaboration should be explored.

8. Communications strategy: MR was thanked for providing a first draft of a Communications Strategy. There followed a general discussion on whether to use a form of "kite mark" for projects adhering to the Strategy. SG cautioned that there could be a danger that if the Committee folds who is then liable if various projects are carrying the approved kite mark as a symbol? MH advised that the kite mark would simply be a form of identifying that the various projects meet the standards and ethos of the committee. A kite mark will also give us a form of visual identity. It was agreed to keep communication strategy as a standing item on future meeting agendas.

A web presence for the SSAC is desired. A Facebook page was one option. SS advised that the sooner we are aware of our audience and let them know we are meeting the better. PH suggested a quarterly press release outlining what we've been doing which will allow us to reach a wider audience. KM suggested that an e-zine, rather than a website

or Facebook page may be easier and more effective on keeping our audience updated. One to each university, one to each commercial unit will help to disseminate the information being generated by the committee. CB also suggested using BAJR for communication.

- **Action Point:** RHJ to create a press release / note on the Committee for the IfA conference.
- **Action Point:** RHJ to explore a web presence for the SSAC and the potential for e-zines etc.

9. Timetable and next steps: It was agreed that the IfA Conference would be a good opportunity to promote the SSAC and the development of the Strategy.
- **Action point:** ME to set up a Doodle Poll for next meeting to focus on the Strategic Priorities. RJ advised that not everyone may not be able to make it, but that there must be at least one person from each pair.

It was suggested that the acronym for the Archaeology Strategy be considered – perhaps Scotland's Archaeology Strategy. It was agreed that this needs to be out for / in 2015. Deliverables will also need to be planned and mapped out; deliverables within 5 years are easier, but then deliverables in 10, 20 and 100 years become more challenging. The strategy will be underpinned by a series of strategic initiatives, including ScARF.

10. AOCB
None reported.

The meeting closed at 3pm.