Historic Scotland

Scotland's Archaeology Strategy

Analysis of Consultation Responses

Report prepared by Tara McGregor of ODS Consulting.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

This report provides an analysis of responses to consultation on Scotland's Archaeology Strategy. This consultation was led by Historic Scotland and the Scottish Strategic Archaeology Committee (SSAC).

The strategy explores the role that archaeology should play in Scotland's future. It explores a vision of archaeology which aims to contribute to understanding the past, to our sense of identity and to our overall wellbeing. It stresses the vibrancy of Scottish archaeology, and how it can help to build strong, empowered communities, engaged and involved in their past, present and future. It emphasises that archaeology is inclusive – about everything, for everyone. The strategy also emphasises the contribution that archaeology can make to achieving the Scottish Government's national outcomes.

Overview of the response

There were 74[1] responses to this consultation.

Almost two thirds (62%) were from organisations, with just over a third (38%) from individuals. The organisational responses included voluntary, third sector and charitable organisations; local authorities; contractors, developers, consultants and freelancers; academic bodies; museums; and others.

Almost all (88%) said that they would like to be involved in taking the strategy forward. Just two individuals said they would not – because they were unclear of the aims of the strategy.

Vision

Most respondents felt that the vision within the strategy took account of their aspirations for archaeology in Scotland. Individuals (80%) were more supportive of the vision than organisations (63%). However, respondents also suggested that there was a need for:

- a vision which reflected everyone within archaeology and recognised archaeology as a discipline of discovery – including individuals, communities, amateurs and professionals;
- more reference to the need for collective protection, conservation, stewardship and management of archaeological resources and the need to leave a legacy for future regenerations;
- more specific use of language - with particular concern about the broad nature of the terms engagement, places and identities; and

---

[1] Only 73 responses have been included in the quantitative analysis. One organisational response was received after the closing date, so has not been included in the quantitative analysis. However, the views expressed in this response have been analysed during the qualitative analysis.

- more upbeat and aspirational wording – without overplaying the role of archaeology.

Respondents provided alternative visions, which emphasised themes around:

- involvement of all;
- making archaeology matter; and
- education and enjoyment.

Funding

Within strategic priority seven (improving archaeological projects), the consultation draft proposes undertaking a study of options for funding structures for Scottish archaeology. There were 54 responses to this question, 35 from organisations and 19 from individuals. Almost three quarters (70%) of respondents broadly agreed that a review of funding structures was needed, with agreement high among both individuals and organisations. Academic bodies and contractors, developers consultants and freelancers were most supportive of such a review, with voluntary organisations, local authorities, museums and others less so.

For those who supported a review of funding structures, there were varying views about its scope. Most respondents felt that a review would be useful if the parameters of the review were carefully considered, and there was a focus on evolving existing structures rather than fundamental remodelling.

Those who felt that a review was not needed questioned what it would achieve and why it was required. A number felt that it was difficult to answer the question based on the information within the consultation document.

Strategic priorities - overview

Overall, two thirds of respondents said that the strategic priorities were appropriate. Those who felt that the priorities were appropriate generally felt that they were well phrased, and that they had good links to other strategies such as Our Place in Time[2] (although some felt these could be further strengthened). Fewer organisational respondents (58%) than individuals (74%) felt that the priorities were appropriate.

The most common reason for feeling that the priorities were not appropriate was a belief that there were too many strategic priorities, and some overlap between these. A number of respondents indicated that they would prefer that the term 'improving' was not used within priorities, as it implied that the current situation was poor. Some additional priorities were suggested, including priorities around international links, learning, equality and diversity and urban archaeology.

---

[2] Our Place in Time: The Historic Environment Strategy for Scotland, Scottish Government, 2014

Strategic priorities – detail

There was a high level of support for most priorities. Support for the priority around 'celebrating' was lowest, with many suggesting that this should be merged with other priorities.

- **Encouraging Greater Engagement** – Almost three quarters (73%) agreed with this aim. Respondents suggested that it would be useful to expand on the contribution archaeology can make around learning, skills development and community empowerment. Many also suggested redrafting to recognise the good work already happening in this field, with some believing more should be done to set out where we are, where we need to be, what the gaps are, and how we get there.

- **Enhancing Understanding** – Over two thirds (69%) agreed with this aim. Many felt that this aim was crucial. However, there was a strong feeling that the section focused on enhancing understanding within the professional and academic community, with little recognition of the role of community based archaeology in enhancing understanding.

- **Caring and Protecting –** Over three quarters (78%) agreed with this aim. Most respondents strongly welcomed the inclusion of caring and protecting as a strategic priority. However, there were a number of suggestions including mentioning the role of local authorities and local people as experts, and careful use of the word 'incentives' in this section.

- **Celebrating** – Almost two thirds (62%) agreed with this aim. Many of the respondents reiterated the close linkages between the priorities around 'engaging' and 'celebrating' and suggested these were merged. Many respondents mentioned the proposed action around creating industry or developer funded bursaries to link fieldwork with dissemination. However, many felt that developer funded bursaries were not appropriate, and there should instead be a focus on planning gain and commercial input into activities such as museum displays in different ways.

- **Improving skills** – Over three quarters (78%) agreed with this aim. However, there was some confusion from respondents around who this section was aimed at, and who would implement it. There was a strong feeling that the section targeted the commercial market, and did not reference the range of skills which could be developed in members of the public, volunteers, voluntary organisations, universities, local authorities and other organisations.

- **Innovating** – Over three quarters (79%) agreed with this aim. Many respondents reiterated that they felt the priority around innovation would work better if it was merged with another priority which explored skills within the sector. A number of suggestions for developing the section were provided, including highlighting that innovative thinking as well as innovative technology was important, such as new ways to fund projects (such as crowd funding), to organise projects (such as citizen science) and to manage projects (including digital storage and access).

- **Improving archaeological projects** – Over three quarters (78%) agreed with this aim. Respondents felt that this priority was important, but many felt it should be mainstreamed across all priorities, rather than a separate priority. Many also felt that the language used within this priority required to be more positive, due to the negative connotations of the word 'improving'.

Delivery

Overall nearly two thirds (61%) agreed with the proposals for leading on the delivery of the strategy. Individuals had slightly higher levels of agreement than organisations. Just 12 per cent gave a clear negative answer, and the remainder gave mixed responses.

The main concern that respondents had was that the remit, role, authority and composition of SSAC was not clear. Some felt it would be helpful for the strategy to include a list of SSAC members and its remit. Some felt that it was important to consider the membership of SSAC to be sure that it had enough representation from lay members and all sectors and interests within the archaeological community. There were also concerns about how progress would be monitored. Both individuals and organisations suggested that the strategy required some clear, measureable actions which were attributed to organisations.

Overall two thirds (69%) said that they would be willing to use the strategy. Just four responses (8%) gave a clear negative answer. Two of these respondents were individuals who said they weren't really sure how they could use the strategy as an individual. Two were organisations which said that the strategy required significant reworking and they would not use it in its current shape. The remainder gave a mixed response. Many of these stated that they would use the strategy if it was redrafted in line with their comments.

Many respondents indicated that they would like to see the strategy redrafted in light of their comments. Some organisations felt that there was a need for another round of consultation on the revised version of the strategy, given that a large amount of change was required. Many commented that they would like to see more work done on building buy in from the broad spectrum of interests within the archaeological community in Scotland, and from key stakeholders such as the Scottish Government.

Business and equality impact

Overall half (50%) said that the proposals would increase costs for businesses, the third sector or public sector organisations. Most respondents felt that the strategy would result in at least a short term requirement for additional resources. There was broad agreement that public sector costs would increase to resource the proposals within the strategy. Many also highlighted that strategy management and delivery would also require significant time input from the archaeological community, across different sectors. It was also felt that developers were likely to see an increase in costs in order to meet the proposals within the strategy.

Overall a third (30%) said that the proposals would impact differently on any equality groups. Many indicated that they did not feel qualified to answer this question.

Respondents who did comment largely indicated that they found the ethos of the strategy very inclusive, and that there were particular opportunities to promote equality within priorities one (engaging), two (understanding) and four (celebrating). However, some respondents suggested that more could be said about promoting equality explicitly, to raise awareness that some groups or individuals may need additional support. One respondent also felt that more reference could be made of the potential of archaeology in helping to understand the diversity of Scotland's past.

1. INTRODUCTION

About this report

1.1 This report provides an analysis of responses to the consultation on Scotland's Archaeology Strategy. This consultation was led by Historic Scotland and the Scottish Strategic Archaeology Committee.

Background to the consultation

1.2 In 2012, Historic Scotland reviewed how it supports, funds and uses the archaeology sector. The review found that the archaeology sector had huge potential, and recommended that Historic Scotland should help develop leadership, partnership and policy across Scotland, through the development of a long term strategy for archaeological resources within Scotland.

1.3 The review also recommended that Historic Scotland establish an archaeology forum to provide advice on strategy development. In response to this, Historic Scotland convened a Scottish Strategic Archaeology Committee (SSAC) in 2013.

1.4 Together, Historic Scotland and SSAC developed a ten year strategy and consultation draft of Scotland's Archaeology Strategy.

1.5 The strategy explores the role that archaeology should play in Scotland's future. It explores a vision of archaeology which aims to contribute to understanding the past, to our sense of identity and to our overall wellbeing. It stresses the vibrancy of Scottish archaeology, and how it can help to build strong, empowered communities, engaged and involved in their past, present and future. It emphasises that archaeology is inclusive – about everything, for everyone. The strategy also emphasises the contribution that archaeology can make to achieving the Scottish Government's national outcomes.

1.6 The consultation on Scotland's Archaeology Strategy sought views on:

- the vision and funding structures for archaeology in Scotland;
- the strategic priorities:
  (1) encouraging greater engagement;
  (2) enhancing understanding;
  (3) caring and protecting;
  (4) celebrating;
  (5) improving skills;
  (6) innovating;
  (7) improving archaeological projects
- delivering and using the strategy; and
- business and equality impacts.

1.7 The consultation ran from 17 March to 9 June 2015. The Archaeology Strategy team at Historic Scotland and members of the Strategic Archaeology

Committee ran workshops and meetings across Scotland to stimulate responses to the consultation.

Analysis methodology

1.8   Historic Scotland received and organised all consultation responses. Where required, Historic Scotland liaised with respondents to ensure that the correct information and permissions were received in line with the Respondent Information Form. Historic Scotland also typed up all hand written responses. All responses were passed to ODS securely, for analysis.

1.9   All responses were input to an online survey system (Survey Monkey) allowing for data organisation and analysis. The 16 consultation questions were separated into their component parts, allowing for both quantitative and qualitative analysis. Where closed questions were asked within the consultation, space for open comment was provided. Each response was read carefully, and sorted into a relevant quantitative category – such as yes/ no; agree/ disagree; or broadly support/ don't support. Quantitative analysis and correlations between respondent groups were produced using Survey Monkey.

1.10   The main focus of the analysis was qualitative. The qualitative coding analysis available through Survey Monkey was complemented by a detailed process of manual thematic coding. This involved a researcher reading each response to each question carefully, and coding these along main themes. This process allows for rich and detailed analysis of complex points.

1.11   The qualitative analysis drew out the main themes emerging within each of the questions posed and the range of views being expressed. It also highlighted any specific trends among and across respondent groups.

Profile of respondents

1.12   There were 74[3] responses to the consultation. Almost two thirds (62%) were from organisations, with just over a third (38%) from individuals.

1.13   Of the 46 organisational responses, 37 agreed to their response being published by Historic Scotland. These are listed in Appendix One. Of the 28 individual responses, 25 agreed to their response being published by Historic Scotland.

1.14   While all responses have been included for the purposes of analysis, we have not quoted from either organisations or individuals which did not give permission for their response to be published by Historic Scotland. Where individuals are quoted, we have followed Scottish Government practice by not identifying any individual respondents.

---

[3] Only 73 responses have been included in the quantitative analysis. One organisational response was received after the closing date, so has not been included in the quantitative analysis. However, the views expressed in this response have been analysed during the qualitative analysis.

1.15 To allow similarities and differences in responses to be considered, organisational responses were analysed using six sub categories. These broadly followed the organisational categories used within the Respondent Information Form for this consultation. However, some categories were merged, with agreement from Historic Scotland, due to very small numbers of responses within some sub categories. The categories used for analysis and the number of responses within each is detailed below.

Group	Number	Percentage
Individual	28	38%
Organisation	45	62%
Total	**73**[4]	
Organisation response sub groupings		
Group	**Number**	**Percentage**
Voluntary, third sector or charitable organisation	13	18%
Local authority	8	11%
Contractor, developer, consultant or freelancer	6	8%
Academic body	5	7%
Museum	4	5%
Other	9	12%
Total organisations	**45**	

1.16 The 'other' group included responses from professional bodies, non departmental public bodies and agencies, advisory groups and membership organisations and a land manager.

---

[4] An additional organisation response (received late) has been included in the qualitative but not the quantitative analysis.

2.   VISION, STRATEGIC PRIORITIES AND FUNDING

Introduction

2.1   This chapter analyses the responses received in relation to questions one, two and three of the consultation. These relate to vision, strategic priorities and funding structures. The question wording is highlighted within each section, to set the context for analysis.

Question One - Does the vision take account of your aspirations for archaeology in Scotland? What is your vision for Scottish archaeology?

2.2   The consultation sets out a vision for Scottish Archaeology:

> "The vision for Scottish Archaeology is to enrich and improve the quality of people's lives through greater engagement with, and understanding of, Scotland's places, collections and identities."

2.3   Overall, 51 respondents answered this question. Almost a third of both organisations and individuals did not respond.

2.4   Of those who responded, almost two thirds (63%) of organisations felt that the vision took account of their aspirations for archaeology in Scotland and a fifth (22%) did not. The majority (80%) of individuals felt the vision took account of their aspirations and under a fifth (16%) did not. A small proportion gave answers which didn't clearly indicate whether they felt it took account of their aspirations or not.

2.5   Analysis by sub category indicates that academic bodies were the most likely to indicate that they did not feel the vision took account of their aspirations. Contractors, developers, consultants and freelancers were most likely to feel that it did.

2.6   Overall, those who broadly supported the vision felt that it was succinct. A small number of organisational respondents indicated that the vision linked with their own organisational visions.

"Yes. We welcome and strongly support the publication of a ten-year strategic plan for archaeology."

(Forestry Commission Scotland)

2.7   However, those who broadly supported the vision often also suggested small changes, including:

- more reference to the need for collective protection, conservation, stewardship and management of archaeological resources and the need to leave a legacy for future regenerations;
- considering use of the word 'identities' at the end of the vision, which a number found confusing;

- using more upbeat and aspirational words, with some feeling the vision was a little high level or "bland"; and
- emphasising the links between past and present that archaeology can make, and how archaeology changes over time.

"We support in principal the aspirations as set out in the vision statement however we would like to see a stronger vision which recognises the need for protection and management, as well as engagement. Furthermore, we would like to see a more positive use of language, both in the vision and throughout the rest of the strategy."

(City of Edinburgh Council Archaeology Service)

2.8 Seven organisations and three individuals felt that the vision did not take account of their aspirations for archaeology in Scotland. Many indicated that they understood the challenges in shaping a vision.

"Balanced recognition of the multiple identities expressed in the archaeological and historical record across the whole of Scotland is a challenge."

(Individual)

2.9 However, there were three main concerns. Firstly, some felt that the vision felt top down, and suggested that archaeology was owned by organisations and provided to individuals. Both organisations and individuals indicated that they got this impression from the vision.

"No, its tone if not its exact words suggest that archaeology is something that is owned by professionals and given to people."

(North of Scotland Archaeological Society (NOSAS))

"The vision appears to present archaeology as the provider of a static historical narrative or truth and not a discipline of discovery, renewal and revolution with regards to the comprehension of our shared past."

(Rathmell Archaeology Limited)

"It reflects the ethos of Historic Scotland and RCAHMS rather than the broader span of archaeological activity in Scotland where voluntary community groups, amateur archaeology societies and metal-detectorists play a significant role."

(Members of the Scottish Archaeological Finds Allocation Panel through the Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer)

2.10 Secondly, a number of respondents felt that the vision did not say enough about management, protection, conservation and stewardship. Thirdly, a small number reiterated that the strategy was too broad. There was particular concern about the broad nature of the terms 'engagement', 'place' and 'identities' and a feeling from some that this made the vision too generic. In addition, two respondents felt that the supporting text was over ambitious and detracted from the vision ('Archaeology is about everything and is for

everyone'). One respondent felt that the 'word image' within the strategy was not useful.

> "It would be more appropriate to define the vision with respect to the material remains of the past rather than places, collections and identities."
>
> (Wessex Archaeology Scotland)

2.11 A total of 28 respondents (10 individuals and 18 organisations) provided a suggestion of their own vision for Scottish archaeology. Alternative visions emphasised three main themes:

- **Involvement of all** – Many provided suggestions which emphasised joint working, particularly between professionals and amateurs, and a broad, inclusive and democratic approach to archaeology in Scotland.

> "An archaeology that explains the past in an interesting and non-technical manner and one that allows people to rediscover who they are and where they have come from."
>
> (Individual)

- **Making archaeology matter** – Many respondents felt that the vision should include more reference to making archaeology matter, enhancing its recognition, awareness, stature and level of interest across Scotland. A number highlighted the need for emphasising archaeology in understanding Scotland's place in the world and our national identity. Others highlighted its value in helping individuals and communities to understand their past at a local level.

> "Scottish citizens in all parts of the country are actively aware of the vital importance of archaeology to their heritage. They are inspired to continue learning about it locally, and find that experience both inclusive and relevant to the future."
>
> (Individual)

> "Archaeology allows people and communities to define their own identities and create their own sense of place."
>
> (Aberdeen Art Gallery and Museums, Aberdeen City Council)

- **Education and enjoyment** – A small number of respondents highlighted that there was a need to think about including concepts such as enjoyment, entertainment, discovery, empowerment and education within the vision statement, to demonstrate the range of impacts archaeology can have.

2.12 The Association of Local Government Archaeological Officers (ALGAO) provided an alternative vision bringing together ideas around inclusion, enjoyment and impact. A small number of other local authority respondents indicated that they supported the ALGAO vision, when setting out their alternative vision under this question.

"Scottish archaeology will provide opportunities for everyone to understand and celebrate the story of our country. The places, collections and identities which archaeology reveals will be professionally protected and managed, promoted and enjoyed, in order to ensure its economic, social and cultural benefits are fully realised for the people of Scotland and beyond."
(Association of Local Government Archaeological Officers Scotland (ALGAO))

2.13 However, the Institute of Historic Building Conservation (Scottish Branch) indicated that it did not seem appropriate to have a vision without thorough exploration of the scale and extent of problems to be tackled. It indicated that it had concerns with the vision and structure of the strategy overall, suggesting that the strategy needed more strategic perspective and direction – focusing on the stages of survey, analysis, diagnosis, planning, implementation, monitoring and review. The National Trust for Scotland also indicated that while it supported the need for a strategy, it felt the vision was not well enough defined to be able to produce a detailed plan.

Question Two - Are the strategic priorities appropriate? What different approaches would you suggest and why?

2.14 The consultation sought views about the strategic priorities of the Strategy across seven themes:

- encouraging greater engagement;
- enhancing understanding;
- caring and protecting;
- celebrating;
- improving skills;
- innovating; and
- improving archaeological projects.

2.15 There were 55 responses to this question, 36 from organisations and 19 from individuals. Overall, two thirds of respondents said that the strategic priorities were appropriate, a quarter said they were not and the remainder did not provide a definitive answer. Those who felt that the priorities were appropriate generally felt that they were well phrased, and that they had good links to other strategies such as Our Place in Time[5] (although some felt these could be further strengthened). However, a number indicated that the priorities were good, but that it would require more resources, support and advice to achieve these – and the extent of support available was not felt to be clear from the strategy.

2.16 Fewer organisational respondents (58%) than individuals (74%) felt that the priorities were appropriate. Organisational respondents who were contractors, developers, consultants or freelancers had the highest level of agreement, with local authorities having the lowest. Almost two thirds of the local authority respondents felt that the priorities were not appropriate.

---

[5] Our Place in Time: The Historic Environment Strategy for Scotland, Scottish Government, 2014

2.17 The most common reason for feeling that the priorities were not appropriate was a belief that there were too many strategic priorities, and some overlap between these. A quarter of all respondents to this question felt that there was overlap between priorities, or that there was potential to merge these. All of the local authorities which felt the priorities were not appropriate indicated that this was because they felt there were too many priorities.

2.18 Overall, 33 respondents suggested different approaches to setting out strategic priorities. A number of suggestions were provided around how to merge strategic priorities. Many respondents felt that there was particular overlap between priorities one (engaging) and four (celebrating). Some were unsure whether priority seven (improving archaeological projects) was appropriate as a strategic priority. Some suggested that the priorities around innovating, improving skills and improving archaeological projects could be merged. A number felt that two or three priorities would seem appropriate, rather than seven. However, others felt that having seven separate priorities gave each issue weight, and made clear links to certain fields such as the Museums and Galleries sector. Some felt that looking to Our Place in Time could provide a more succinct idea of themes for priorities.

2.19 Respondents suggested that it was important to think about the order of the priorities. However, some felt that they should be ordered in terms of importance while others suggested ordering these by audience or target group.

2.20 A number of respondents felt that it was important to distinguish between clear priorities, objectives, enablers, outcomes and measurement. For example, one respondent felt that three of the priorities were strategic priorities, and three were enablers. Another felt that some priorities clearly applied to members of the public while others applied to professional development.

"Maybe distinguish between overall aims (1–3) and enabling objectives (4–7)."
(University of Aberdeen, Museums)

2.21 A number of respondents indicated that it was difficult to determine the audience for the strategy as a whole, or to understand which aspects of the archaeological community each strategic priority was addressing. This view was expressed by one individual, and by organisations with business, contractor, developer or academic interests.

"We found it challenging to understand which aspects of the archaeology community individual strategic priorities were addressing – especially where the priorities of individual strategic priorities conflicted in their ambitions should they all be universally applied to the whole community."
(Rathmell Archaeology Limited)

2.22 A number of respondents indicated that they would prefer that the term 'improving' was not used in relation to priorities five (improving skills) and seven (improving archaeological projects) as it implied that the current situation was poor.

> "Unfortunately there are negative connotations in the use of "improving" and it would be better to use wording that emphasises a desire to build on current successes."
>
> (West of Scotland Archaeology Service)

2.23   A number of additional priorities were suggested, including priorities around:

- international links and world class practice, research and learning in the field of archaeology in Scotland;
- creating and preserving an archaeological record for the future;
- education and learning for young people and communities;
- further and higher education and professional development within the sector;
- supporting the sector to contribute to economic growth;
- considering equality and diversity; and
- archaeology in urban areas.

2.24   Finally, one respondent suggested providing a list of all priorities at the beginning of chapter three of the strategy. Another suggested the use of roman numerals for the priorities was not appropriate. And another felt that there should be a graphic demonstrating links with relevant strategies, particularly Our Place in Time.

Question Three - The Strategy proposes a review of funding structures for Scottish archaeology. Do you agree that this is needed and is there anything in particular that you would like to see such a review address?

2.25   Within strategic priority seven (improving archaeological projects), the consultation draft proposes undertaking a study of options for funding structures for Scottish archaeology. There were 54 responses to this question, 35 from organisations and 19 from individuals. Almost three quarters (70%) of respondents broadly agreed that a review of funding structures was needed, with agreement high among both individuals and organisations. Academic bodies and contractors, developers consultants and freelancers were most supportive of such a review, with voluntary organisations, local authorities, museums and others less so.

2.26   For those who supported a review of funding structures, there were varying views about its scope. Some highlighted that there were challenges in funding structures – for example around research funding, grant funding and funding for volunteer based activity – and that a review should address these issues. Most respondents felt that a review would be useful if the parameters of the review were carefully considered, and there was a focus on evolving existing structures rather than fundamental remodelling. Some highlighted that while there were some weaknesses in funding structures, they felt the system worked reasonably well and that changes should be practical and mindful of the current financial climate.

> "ALGAO Scotland acknowledges that the current system for funding work can be improved, although the parameters of any such review would need careful

consideration. In the first instance the strategy should be looking to build upon what we have in place rather than looking to undertake wholesale change."
(Association of Local Government Archaeological Officers Scotland (ALGAO))

2.27   However, one respondent felt that it was important that all options were considered.

"Such a review should be wide-ranging and not rule out of consideration any reasonable alternatives."
(Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA))

2.28   Four respondents (8%) clearly expressed that a review was not needed, and the remainder (22%) provided a mixed response. Those who felt it was not needed questioned what it would achieve and why it was required. A number felt that it was difficult to answer the question based on the information within the consultation document. Some suggested that funding should be reviewed on an ongoing basis, and one respondent felt that funding structures should be reviewed as part of the preparation of the strategy rather than as an objective within it.

"Sustained funding appears to be an issue – so continual review would seem an appropriate objective for any oversight body."
(Individual)

Question Four - Does this Strategy look as though it will make it easier for you to engage with archaeology? How would you like to be involved in archaeology over the next ten years? What barriers exist now and what would help greater inclusion and should be included in this Strategy?

2.29   Overall 44 respondents commented on whether the strategy would make it easier for them to engage with archaeology. A third (36%) felt that it would, a third (36%) felt that it would not, and a quarter (27%) gave a mixed response. Organisations were most likely to provide a mixed response (38%), while individuals were most likely to say no (56%).

2.30   Those who felt that the strategy would make it easier for them to engage with archaeology highlighted the strong focus on engagement and collaboration. Some felt that this would make it easier for them to promote and support engagement work locally, due to links to a national strategy. And others felt that it might provide clarity at national level about priorities within archaeology.

"Most importantly it might clarify at a high level where the industry thinks its priorities lie, giving the likes of MSPs/MPs/local authorities something to hang decisions on."
(Headland Archaeology Limited)

2.31   Most individuals who did not feel that the strategy would make it easier for them to engage with archaeology indicated that they were already well engaged, and the strategy would make little difference. However, a minority of

individuals felt that the strategy wasn't really for them, feeling it was very much targeted at professionals (with one feeling there was an 'us, the professionals as providers' and 'them, the public as consumers' distinction within the draft). Two individuals indicated that the strategy was not useful, or did not provide a clear strategy.

2.32   Some of the organisations which didn't feel the strategy would make it easier for them to engage with archaeology also indicated they were well engaged, but acknowledged that a strategy was needed. However, some felt that it did not help because it needed greater clarity, logic and rigour; needed funded and supported; and needed a clearer description of who the audiences were for the strategy, how 'we' were going to make it happen and who this involved.

2.33   A total of 49 respondents commented on how they would like to engage with archaeology in the next ten years. This included 18 individuals and 31 organisations. The individuals indicated that they would like to be involved in a range of ways, including in their professional lives, on a voluntary basis and as visitors. Key areas of interest included research, advocacy, education, project design, archaeozoology, radiocarbon dating and family history.

2.34   The organisations indicated that they would like to be involved in a wide range of ways, with different organisational groups highlighting different priorities. Key themes included engagement:

- as key partners – a number of local authorities and ALGAO stressed their crucial role as important partners in bringing together a range of interests around archaeology, and some also highlighted their role specifically in relation to public engagement and active research;
- in research, training, learning, knowledge exchange and innovation with strong links across the UK and beyond;
- in engagement with the public, including engaging specific groups such as young people; and
- in setting standards and acting as critical friends – particularly professional bodies.

"ALGAO Scotland wishes to be a key partner in delivering not only this strategy but all the others which relate to the historic environment. As such, given that our members act as the focal point between the local and national, between academic and commercial, and between policy and practice, we would wish to continue in this pivotal role of coordination and management."
    (Association of Local Government Archaeological Officers Scotland (ALGAO))

"Orkney Islands Council has demonstrated the potential for active research archaeology to be a key contributor to economic and social development."
(Orkney Islands Council)

2.35   A total of 49 respondents commented on current barriers and what would help with inclusion. The key barriers identified were funding and communication. Many respondents highlighted that funding and resources were limited, particularly due to pressures on public sector budgets. This meant that some

found access to funding very challenging, some found the priorities of grant funders didn't match archaeological priorities, and some found that resources in terms of staff and local sites were reducing (for example with some local authorities perceived not to have dedicated archaeological resources, and some seeing museums closing or under pressure).

2.36 A small number of respondents also raised particular issues about a perceived lack of resources within the Treasure Trove Unit, which is responsible for ensuring that significant objects from Scotland's past are preserved in museums for public benefit.

2.37 A number of issues were raised in relation to communication. Some respondents felt that there was a gap between national and local activities, with national activity strongly concentrated in Edinburgh. Many felt there was a disconnect between different fields and sectors, including academic research, civic and community archaeological organisations and private and public sector organisations. There was a call for more sharing of resources and research findings, more cataloguing, research and information, and more sharing of data, illustrations and information free of charge.

"Currently the greatest barrier within the sector is the continued lack of genuine communication and partnership working between all organisations and groups. Without such communication there will continue to be instances of repetitive work, reinvention, and 'toe treading' that does archaeology's reputation no favours."
(Association of Local Government Archaeological Officers Scotland (ALGAO))

2.38 There was also a particular concern about the sharing of information about the outcomes of archaeological investigations related to the planning process, with comments about a lack of openness and delays in hearing about findings.

"This may be completely understandable from a business point of view – but discovery, investigation (and often destruction) of a site prior to public notification does not tally with the key message that such heritage should be viewed as important (worth respecting)."
(Individual)

2.39 Some respondents felt that communication could be improved through having a clear national strategy for archaeology which is relevant to the whole archaeological community. Others felt that there was a need for a clearer network of local contacts involved in archaeology and the establishment of linkages or 'hubs' for information sharing.

"There is currently no clear framework that the wider archaeological community can use to promote the holistic potential of archaeology as described in the strategy. We feel that the strategy will provide this framework and enable collective use and promotion."
(Forestry Commission Scotland)

2.40   A number of respondents talked of barriers to the public engaging with archaeology. Some talked of barriers in terms of perceptions, feeling that disadvantaged or vulnerable groups may be less likely to engage. Others talked of the resources required to enable greater engagement within archaeology, which may be challenging at a time of austerity cuts.

   "Institutional or perceptional barriers include people's attitude to heritage, with a great many socially excluded, economically or physically disadvantaged and ethnic minorities feeling that heritage is not for them."

(Archaeology Scotland)

2.41   There were suggestions that barriers to engagement could be addressed through promoting and resourcing community approaches and involvement, providing training on engagement to archaeology professionals, and providing volunteers with the opportunities and resources they need, like access to collections and space for research within museums.

2.42   Finally, one respondent emphasised the need for archaeology in Scotland to include consideration of urban environments as well as rural environments.

3. THE STRATEGIC PRIORITIES

Introduction

3.1   The consultation explores the seven strategic priorities in turn, asking the same three questions about each:

- Does this aim reflect your ambition for Scottish archaeology?
- Do you agree with the priorities assigned to the Objectives?
- Do these suggested actions provide a reasonable basis to begin to take the Strategy forward?

3.2   This chapter explores responses in relation to each of the strategic priorities.

Question Five: Priority One - Encouraging Greater Engagement

3.3   There were 44 responses to this question. Overall:

- Almost three quarters (73%) agreed that the aim within greater engagement reflected their ambition for Scottish archaeology. This increased to 75 per cent for organisations, and fell to 69 per cent for individuals.
- Over half (60%) actively agreed with the priorities assigned to the objectives. More individuals (75%) than organisations (55%) agreed with the priorities.
- Most people did not provide a definitive response about whether the actions provided a reasonable basis to begin to take the strategy forward. Of those who responded, three quarters (74%) felt that they did.

3.4   Most respondents welcomed the focus on engagement. However, there were two main suggestions around strengthening the aim. Firstly, many respondents highlighted that it would be useful to expand on the contribution archaeology can make to wellbeing and more widely – including on learning and skills development, community empowerment, and promoting better care and protection of the historic environment. A number suggested considering the role of education and teachers here, and having a specific reference to fostering curiosity and active participation among young people. One suggested making a clear link to the Community Empowerment (Scotland) Bill in this section of the strategy.

"Engagement with archaeology creates powerful cultural bonds between people and places."

(Individual)

3.5   Secondly, many respondents felt that the section read as though there was not much already happening around engagement in archaeology, and suggested redrafting to recognise the good work already underway. Some were keen to see a clear approach within each strategic priority towards assessing where we are, where we need to be, what the gaps are, and how we get there. A number of practical suggestions were made including using

the word 'enhance' instead of transform, and being clear about whether it is 'greater' (more) engagement we wish to see, or if the focus is on 'deeper' or 'better' engagement. This distinction will impact on how success is measured.

"I think you need a baseline in the key aim statement: transform from (where we are) to (where we want to be)."

(Individual)

"By not establishing what the status quo is, the reader cannot assess what the needs are or how the proposed actions will deliver the required changes."

(The National Trust for Scotland)

3.6 Overall, there was clear support for the objectives around collaborative working. However, many found the text vague and sought more plain language and clearer links to other strategies. Respondents felt that there should be more reference to:

- community empowerment and capacity building;
- tackling inequalities;
- international engagement;
- inter-disciplinary approaches;
- engagement with the public in different ways – as finders of materials, as consumers, as visitors, as volunteers; and
- engagement with others, including the government, developers, museums and the commercial and academic community.

3.7 Some respondents emphasised the range of different ways that members of the public can engage with archaeology, and one questioned whether the focus should be on 'active' involvement (as within the key aim) or on the wide range of engagement opportunities that are possible.

"In terms of engagement people can be engaged at different levels... There is a risk that by ignoring the lower level engagement you run the risk of taking archaeology back towards the perception of 'elitist' (a problem that we still struggle with but are slowly moving away from)."

(East Lothian Council Archaeology Service)

3.8 A small number of respondents suggested that 'stewardship' should be included within the 'caring and protecting' priority, rather than here.

Question Six: Priority Two - Enhancing Understanding

3.9 There were 42 responses to this question. Overall:

- Over two thirds (69%) agreed that the aim within enhancing understanding reflected their ambition for Scottish archaeology. Organisations and individuals had similar levels of agreement.
- Almost two thirds (65%) agreed with the priorities assigned to the objectives. More individuals (75%) than organisations (61%) agreed with the priorities.

- Most people did not provide a definitive response about whether the actions provided a reasonable basis to take the strategy forward. Of those who responded, most (64%) felt that they did.

3.10 Many respondents felt that the aim of enhancing understanding was crucial. There was strong support for the creation of regional research frameworks. However, there was a strong feeling that the section focused on enhancing understanding within the professional and academic community, with little recognition of the role of community based archaeology in enhancing understanding.

"This section seems to be particularly aimed at professional archaeologists. Community-led initiatives such as Adopt-a-Monument enable local people to identify sites that are important to them and to work with groups to understand, conserve and promote these sites."

(Archaeology Scotland)

3.11 While some supported the focus on ethics, standards and guidance, two main concerns were raised. Some respondents felt that this would result in more prescriptive approaches which wouldn't actually increase understanding and may be challenging in a real working environment. Others felt that the suggested actions covered areas that other partners would be responsible for, and felt that this needed recognised within the strategy.

"Highly sceptical of the need for a license - this would inhibit greater community engagement and provide yet another hurdle for entry into the profession, which is already regulated by local authority archaeologists and the CIfA."

(GUARD Archaeology Limited)

"Many of the aims within this section already fall under established bodies, for instance the CIfA, and therefore should either be directly referred to as such, or the aims removed."

(Aberdeenshire Council)

Question Seven: Priority Three - Caring and Protecting

3.12 There were 48 responses to this question. Overall:

- Over three quarters (78%) agreed that the aim within caring and protecting reflected their ambition for Scottish archaeology. Individuals had slightly higher levels of agreement than organisations.
- Over half (58%) agreed with the priorities, with organisations and individuals having similar levels of support.
- The same proportion (58%) felt that the actions provided a reasonable basis to take the strategy forward.

3.13 Most respondents strongly welcomed the inclusion of caring and protecting as a strategic priority. However, there were a number of suggestions to develop the priorities and actions, including:

- mentioning the role of local authorities in providing expert advice;
- including local people as experts, to build connections and ownership;
- including a clear reference to sites as well as artefacts and collections within objective d;
- more reference to protection throughout the section;
- careful use of the term 'incentives' due to concerns about how this may be interpreted, and a need to reflect balancing both incentives and disincentives;
- recognition of the fragility of museums and archives, with more actions around keeping these places sustainable;
- clearer links to the strategic priority of 'understanding', particularly from objective c around accessible knowledge; and
- mention of climate change, development control and scheduled monuments, listed buildings.

"Given that it is local authority archaeological services that oversee the majority of change management to the archaeological resource in Scotland, specific reference to that expert advice residing within local authorities would be most beneficial."
(Association of Local Government Archaeological Officers Scotland (ALGAO))

3.14 There was recognition of the need to review the Treasure Trove system. There was also some concern about singling out metal detecting as a specific area to focus on in the strategy (as the draft strategy identified it as an example of an area where under-reporting may need to be reviewed).

Question Eight: Priority Four - Celebrating

3.15 There were 37 responses to this question. Overall:

- Almost two thirds (62%) agreed that the aim within celebrating reflected their ambition for Scottish archaeology.
- Over half (60%) agreed with the priorities. Individuals (83%) had significantly higher levels of agreement than organisations (50%).
- Of those who responded, almost three quarters (72%) felt that the actions provided a reasonable basis to take the strategy forward.

3.16 Many of the respondents reiterated the close linkages between the priorities around 'engaging' and 'celebrating' and suggested these were merged. Some were unsure about the term 'celebrating' – preferring terms like sharing, promoting, sharing best practice, learning, discovery and active outreach. One respondent highlighted that there is an ongoing need for challenge and debate rather than celebration.

3.17 There was strong support for the focus on learning, for young people and for people of all ages.

"Moves to increase the profile of archaeology within the education sphere are welcomed. The multi-disciplinary nature of archaeology makes it an excellent vehicle for learning, and allows for broad participation. Aligning it with the Curriculum for Excellence would be a positive move."

(Dumfries and Galloway Council)

3.18 Many respondents mentioned the proposed action around creating industry or developer funded bursaries to link fieldwork with dissemination. However, many felt that developer funded bursaries were not appropriate, and there should instead be a focus on planning gain and commercial input into activities such as museum displays in different ways. Some felt this could be described better as "engaging with the business sector for sponsorship."

"ALGAO Scotland does not feel [development funded bursaries] to be possible or appropriate within a developer-funded context. However, opportunities for commercial input into benefits such as museum displays, site interpretation etc could be considered within Post-Excavation Research Design Agreements towards the end of the planning process. This would have to be examined on a case-by-case basis, and further work would need to be undertaken by ALGAO on this."

(Association of Local Government Archaeological Officers Scotland (ALGAO))

3.19 A number of respondents felt that there should be more reference to celebrating volunteer contributions, and to celebrating in many different ways.

"In-line with the ethos of archaeology being for everyone the focus should be on publicity and promotion for the work that is being done at a local and national level. Sharing and celebrating takes many forms from the purely scientific to storytelling and the expressive arts."

(Archaeology Scotland)

"There is no mention of community/volunteer archaeological societies in the Priority and they would seem to be an excellent platform to help achieve the aims, objectives and action plan."

(Aberdeen Art Gallery and Museums, Aberdeen City Council)

Question Nine: Priority Five - Improving Skills

3.20 There were 41 responses to this question. Overall:

- Over three quarters (78%) agreed that the aim within improving skills reflected their ambition for Scottish archaeology. There were high levels of agreement among both individuals and organisations.
- All individuals who provided a view agreed with the priorities, falling to just half of all organisations.
- Over half (61%) felt that the actions provided a reasonable basis to take the strategy forward. Again individuals had higher levels of agreement than organisations.

3.21   There was some confusion from respondents around who this section was aimed at, and who would implement it. There was a strong feeling that the section targeted the commercial market, and did not reference the range of skills which could be developed in members of the public, volunteers, voluntary organisations, universities, local authorities and other organisations.

3.22   There was significant concern that a skills gap was "looming" in the sector, and that skills were being lost as people retired. Respondents were keen to see a focus on retaining as well as developing (rather than improving) skills. However, many felt that developing skills would require innovative approaches and a substantial review of how the sector operates just now, including focusing on paying the living wage, addressing reliance on volunteers and considering how people with temporary positions could develop skills.

3.23   For commercial organisations, the size of project work and the instability of employment opportunities often acted as a barrier to skills development, apprenticeships and other training opportunities. Some organisations suggested joint working and coordination would be required, and welcomed, to support skills development in the sector.

> "We would support the creation of apprenticeships and making greater links between universities and commercial units to achieve this and also provide training to students. Placements would need to be supported by an umbrella system in order to be viable for commercial organisations."
>
> (Addyman Archaeology)

> "A fully-funded system of apprenticeships, perhaps rotated through several different contractors in the interest of fairness, might be a way forward. Student placements with contractors might also work, if experience could include post-excavation and archiving work, as well as unpredictable fieldwork."
>
> (Alder Archaeology Limited)

3.24   Some respondents also asked whether the strategy should say more about the required skills – which could be wide ranging, covering topics as diverse as equalities, engagement, intelligent purchase of archaeology services, underwater archaeology and many more. There was an interest in more detail on what the skills map would do, and who it would cover.

3.25   Many highlighted that the strategy would benefit from more information about who would take forward the skills mapping, highlighting that the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) has a clear role but that it wasn't clear whether they were (or would be) involved in the strategy and signed up to it. CIfA provided a positive response.

> "CIfA is ideally placed: to lead on supporting 'greater understanding of accredited skills and competence by clients and employers…' perhaps via the current HES grant to CIfA; to support further skills development generally."
>
> (Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA))

3.26 A small number of respondents suggested that it would be important to think beyond Scotland, given the scale of the issues the strategy aimed to address under this priority.

Question Ten: Priority Six - Innovating

3.27 There were 41 responses to this question. Overall:

- Most (79%) agreed that the aim within innovating reflected their ambition for Scottish archaeology. There were high levels of agreement among both individuals and organisations.
- Over half agreed with the priorities, with a higher proportion of organisations than individuals providing a mixed response.
- Almost three quarters (71%) felt that the actions provided a reasonable basis to take the strategy forward.

3.28 Many respondents reiterated that they felt the priority around innovation would work better if it was merged with another priority which explored skills within the sector. A very small minority felt that innovation already happened, and that it did not need to be mentioned as a priority.

3.29 A number of suggestions for developing the section were provided, including:

- highlighting that innovative thinking as well as innovative technology was important – including new ways to fund projects (such as crowd funding), to organise projects (such as citizen science) and to manage projects (including digital storage and access);
- ensuring that innovation did not take place at the expense of acknowledged good practice – and that it actually improved practice where needed;
- ensuring that innovation did not result in over specialisation, perhaps excluding community groups and amateurs from archaeology; and
- ensuring that specific technologies were not mentioned, and that review of innovation was ongoing – given the speed of change in the field.

"The strategy also needs to recognise innovation, not only terms of scientific techniques, but also in research approaches, community engagement, collaboration and dissemination."

(GUARD Archaeology Limited)

"There should be more explicit discussion of innovative thinking, as well as technology. Also, innovation should be particularly encouraged where it leads to improvements in sustainable practice."

(University of Aberdeen, Museums)

3.30 A number of respondents commented on the 'developer bursary', with many questioning how this would work. ALGAO and a number of local authority respondents highlighted that it was important to carefully consider the language used in this section – particularly around 'bursary', 'incentive',

'developers' and 'contractors' – to ensure that the language was precise and the audience was clear.

3.31   Some respondents indicated support for development of the ScARF Directory of Archaeological Scientists. They emphasised the importance of including all scientists in the directory, not just contractors.

> "Some kind of online resource (through ScARF?) with regard to scientific techniques that can be used, and what objects/material types they can be used upon, would be really helpful, along with links to individuals/ companies/ universities who are specialists in these."
>
> (Glasgow Museums (Glasgow Life))

3.32   Many respondents suggested making further links within this section, including with the university sector, communities, museums and links with the arts and Creative Scotland.

Question Eleven: Priority Seven - Improving Archaeological Projects

3.33   There were 43 responses to this question. Overall:

- Over three quarters (78%) agreed that the aim within improving archaeological projects reflected their ambition for Scottish archaeology. Levels of agreement were high among both individuals and organisations.
- Over half agreed with the priorities, with individuals having higher levels of agreement than organisations.
- Two thirds (67%) felt that the actions provided a reasonable basis to take the strategy forward.

3.34   Respondents broadly agreed that this priority was important, and was a fundamental issue underpinning archaeological work in Scotland. For example, the Association of Certified Field Archaeologists indicated that this priority would be its top priority for the strategy. However, many felt it should be mainstreamed across all priorities, rather than included as a separate priority. Many also felt that the language used within this priority required to be more positive, due to the negative connotations of the word 'improving'.

> "While ALGAO Scotland recognises the reasoning behind having this theme as a separate priority, it should be mainstreamed throughout all of the priorities. The wording is relatively negative as it appears to suggest that the process as is, is currently failing when in fact relatively few projects are 'problem' ones compared to the overall volume of work completed."
>
> **(**Association of Local Government Archaeological Officers Scotland (ALGAO))

3.35   Many respondents felt that the priority, aim and actions were good, but had questions about whether it was possible to achieve the aim of improving the way that projects are funded. Some felt that it was vital to recognise the lack of capacity within many institutions and suggested considering approaches such as the Portable Antiquities Scheme for England and Wales. A number highlighted the need to review the Treasure Trove system.

3.36   Many respondents commented on the issue of backlogged projects, agreeing that action needed to be taken to address this. Both individuals and organisations commented on this. Some suggested that the strategy should include a clear statement on expectations of open access to findings.

"The objectives should explicitly address the issue of public dissemination on a timely basis. The typical lapse time from field-work to report seems excessive at the moment – and often availability remains limited."

(Individual)

3.37   Some also highlighted that the section read as though it focused on excavation, rather than all archaeological projects. There was a feeling the section should cover all projects. Some suggested the actions could go further, to include a requirement to meet certain standards rather than best practice guidance.

"CIfA would wish to see this aim expanded to include ensuring that projects are designed and executed in accordance with standards by accredited practitioners."

(Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA))

3.38   Finally, a number of respondents felt that the section should include more about international links, to develop practice in Scotland.

4. DELIVERY AND IMPACT

Introduction

4.1 This chapter explores the final consultation questions around delivering Scotland's Archaeology Strategy and assessing its business and equality impact.

Question Twelve - Delivering Scotland's Archaeology Strategy

4.2 Question 12 includes four sub questions:

- Do you agree with the proposals for leading on the delivery of the strategy?
- Would you be willing to use this strategy and if so how will you use it?
- How would you like to see this strategy taken forward?
- Would you like to be involved? In which case, how and where?

Do you agree with the proposals for leading on the delivery of the Strategy?

4.3 There were 51 responses to this question. Overall two thirds (61%) agreed with the proposals for leading on the delivery of the Strategy. Individuals had slightly higher levels of agreement than organisations. Just 12 per cent gave a clear negative answer, and the remainder gave mixed responses.

4.4 The main concern that respondents had was that the remit, role, authority and composition of SSAC was not clear. Some felt it would be helpful for the strategy to include a list of SSAC members and its remit. Some felt that it was important to consider the membership of SSAC to be sure that it had enough representation from lay members and all sectors and interests within the archaeological community. However, there were some concerns that people within the archaeological community may not have the time to dedicate to volunteering to support the delivery of the strategy. These concerns were raised by both individuals and organisations.

"The membership of the SSAC going forward should be subject to open consultation. Such a committee would be invaluable for overseeing the strategic direction of the document, but in its current form it may suffer from a perceived lack of authority if seeking to be responsible for its implementation."
(West of Scotland Archaeology Service)

"It is most unclear who will actually do anything. The wide variety of organisations and groups named is confusing especially if we don't say what each is expected to do. It would help aid understanding if you were to set out a table showing each organisation and what they expect to contribute to deliver of the strategy."
(Individual)

4.5   There were also concerns about how progress would be monitored. Both individuals and organisations suggested that the strategy required some clear, measureable actions which were attributed to organisations.

"Largely the strategy has identified a number of aims rather than activities: further work is required to produce a number of activities or actions to give substance to the strategy."
(Institute of Historic Building Conservation (Scotland Branch))

4.6   One respondent indicated that to date it had not been involved in the work of SSAC, and suggested that it be invited to become a member. Other organisations stressed that they were keen to stay involved in the process.

Would you be willing to use this Strategy and, if so, how will you use it?

4.7   There were 49 responses to this question. Overall two thirds (69%) said that they would be willing to use the strategy. Just four responses (8%) gave a clear negative answer. Two of these respondents were individuals who said they weren't really sure how they could use the strategy as an individual. Two were organisations which said that the strategy required significant reworking and they would not use it in its current shape. The remainder gave a mixed response. Many of these stated that they would use the strategy if it was redrafted in line with their comments.

4.8   A number of local authorities, and ALGAO, welcomed the concept of a national archaeology strategy, but emphasised the need for it to be robust and fit for purpose.

4.9   Some individuals were unsure about how they would or could use the strategy. One suggested that it would be helpful to have some guidance on how individuals (and not just organisations) could take the strategy forward. Other individuals said that they would make most use of the strategy when designing projects, making funding applications and building links with others.

"Specifically to guide, design and justify my research projects, develop collaborations, promote archaeology as widely and specifically as possible, and particularly teach my students about this strategy."
(Individual)

4.10   Organisations also said that they would use the strategy to evidence and direct archaeological activity, and in project design, planning, delivery and funding applications. Some said that they would integrate the aims into their own strategic plans, and may use it to guide collective decisions about resource allocation within a field or sector of work.

"I would use it as part of my work as an Archaeology Curator, other staff who contributed to this document would use it with regard to Learning Provision and Management, Digital Content Curation, Community Outreach Provision and Management, and Curatorial and Research Management."
(Glasgow Museums (Glasgow Life))

"The Strategy will be an excellent advocacy tool for supporting work programmes to clear backlogs in documenting archaeological excavations and archives, as well as being part of the framework for designing any community projects involving archaeological fieldwork."

(Aberdeen Art Gallery and Museums, Aberdeen City Council)

How would you like to see this Strategy taken forward? Would you like to be involved? In which case, how and where?

4.11   There were 43 responses to this question. Almost all (88%) said that they would like to be involved in taking the strategy forward. Just two individuals said they would not – because they were unclear of the aims of the strategy.

4.12   Many respondents indicated that they would like to see the strategy redrafted in light of their comments. Some organisations felt that there was a need for another round of consultation on the revised version of the strategy, given that a large amount of change was required. Many commented that they would like to see more work done on building buy in from the broad spectrum of interests within the archaeological community in Scotland, and from key stakeholders such as the Scottish Government. In particular, one respondent indicated that it did not feel part of the process so far, and would welcome future involvement through the SSAC.

4.13   Both organisations and individuals were broadly content with being involved in meetings, working groups and work to take forward actions from the strategy. A small number indicated that their time may be limited, and many indicated that they would get involved if there was a clear link between the strategy and their area of work. Some respondents, including those working in remote areas and national representative groups, indicated that there would be a need to think about how those living and working beyond the central belt could be involved meaningfully. Some suggested a budget for travel while others suggested a regional element to strategy and action development in the future.

"If the less populated rural areas are not to be marginalised much of the thinking and planning needs to be regionally and locally based in partnership with local and regional bodies. The emphasis at national level should be predominantly co-ordination."

(Historic Assynt)

4.14   A small number of respondents gave practical suggestions about promoting the strategy, including putting the strategy online and presenting it at conferences.

Question Thirteen - If you could nominate one critical issue that needs to be addressed or an idea that you feel would significantly improve archaeology and the public's understanding and engagement with it, what would it be and why?

4.15   A total of 58 respondents commented on this question. The responses were very varied, with many identifying different and wide ranging issues. The main theme which emerged related to building public awareness and understanding of the role and potential of archaeology. Many respondents felt that it was vitally important that archaeology was shown to be "alive and changing" and relevant to people's lives. A number of stakeholders felt that it was important to focus both on quality and outcomes to achieve this.

"Only through the delivery of quality information within archaeological projects will the value of our discipline and its contribution to society be sustained over time."

(Rathmell Archaeology Limited)

"Moving the public mindset from seeing archaeology as little more than 'interesting' at best, to an awareness of its cultural and economic importance."

(Historic Assynt)

4.16   However, respondents reiterated that it was important that members of the public were not perceived only as consumers of archaeology, and that local knowledge was respected and recognised.

"At all levels if local people are involved their knowledge will inform the professional understanding of sites and in return the local community will value and protect their heritage."

(North of Scotland Archaeological Society (NOSAS))

4.17   Some respondents reiterated the need for better cross sector communications and joint working. A number of wider issues were mentioned, including:

- the need to restructure the strategy;
- the need to address the loss of specialist knowledge in the archaeology community;
- the need for involvement and interaction in archaeology policy and practice from local to national level;
- the need to share results of archaeological projects;
- the need to support those with a role in curating;
- the need to support the services provided by local authority archaeology services;
- the need to highlight the role of archaeology in urban environments;
- the need to address perceived contracting and payment issues between archaeological contractors and developers; and
- funding for archaeology.

Question Fourteen - Do you think that the proposals in this Strategy will increase or reduce costs for businesses, the third sector (e.g. charities) or public sector organisations?

4.18   There were 44 responses to this question. Overall half (50%) said that the proposals would increase costs for businesses, the third sector or public sector organisations. Just two organisations said that it would reduce costs. The remainder gave a mixed response.

4.19   Most respondents felt that the strategy would result in at least a short term requirement for additional resources. There was broad agreement that public sector costs would increase to resource the proposals within the strategy. Many also highlighted that strategy management and delivery would also require significant time input from the archaeological community, across different sectors.

4.20   It was also felt that developers were likely to see an increase in costs in order to meet the proposals within the strategy. Some were concerned that extra costs would result in longer timescales, more reluctance to undertake archaeological work as part of development and negative perceptions of archaeology.

4.21   A small minority identified opportunities for reducing costs. Some respondents felt that better co-ordination may reduce waste and result in long term savings from better strategic working.

4.22   However, a number felt that the strategy did not contain enough detail to assess likely impacts. One respondent felt that it was important to take time to explore in detail the economic threats and opportunities offered by this strategy.

Question Fifteen - Will any of the proposals impact differently on any equality groups? Are there any key issues or opportunities we should consider to make sure that the strategy works for different equality groups?

4.23   There were 23 responses to this question. Of these, a third (30%) said that the proposals would impact differently on any equality groups. Many indicated that they did not feel qualified to answer this question.

4.24   Respondents who did comment largely indicated that they found the ethos of the strategy very inclusive, and that there were particular opportunities to promote equality within priorities one (engaging), two (understanding) and four (celebrating). However, some respondents suggested that more could be said about promoting equality explicitly, to raise awareness that some groups or individuals may need additional support. One respondent also felt that more reference could be made to the potential of archaeology in helping to understand the diversity of Scotland's past.

"The Strategy should not impact differently on any equality groups. However, some equality groups will need extra support to engage with the Strategy being from non-traditional user groups."

(Aberdeen Art Gallery and Museums, Aberdeen City Council)

"While, I do not think that any of the proposals will impact differently on any equality groups, I think that the strategy could place more emphasis on understanding the multi-ethnic and/or multi-cultural aspects of Scotland's past.

(Individual)

Question Sixteen – Any other comments

4.25   A total of 47 respondents provided further comments. This included 31 organisations and 16 individuals. Respondents raised a number of issues, which they had also raised throughout their responses. The key themes included:

- **Purpose and focus** – Many found the strategy general and vague, and were unclear of its overall purpose. In particular, respondents questioned who the target audience was and who 'we' was in terms of producing and delivering the strategy.

- **Tone** – Many respondents highlighted the need for more positive, inspiring language which recognised successes and enthused people about the future. Many felt that Scotland was already doing well in many areas, and that this achievement should not be underplayed. There was particular concern about a feeling of 'us' the professionals and 'them' the amateurs and public, which many felt needed addressed. Many respondents were keen to see more recognition of the community and voluntary contribution to archaeology in Scotland.

- **Context and actions** – Some respondents felt that more had to be done to set the strategy in context, particularly through exploring the current situation, the intended outcome, and what could help move from one to the other. Some felt that some short examples could help to set the context. This context would then help to develop specific informed actions, with clear accountability.

- **Links** – Some respondents felt that the strategy should make better and clearer links with other strategies, perhaps showing these graphically. A small number suggested thinking beyond linkages with historic environmental strategies, to national priorities around employment, health and wellbeing where archaeology could make a contribution.   However, a small minority felt that the strategy tried too hard to have similar priorities as other strategies, and questioned whether these wider priorities really reflected what was important within archaeology.

- **Priorities** – Some respondents re-emphasised points made earlier about potential merging of priorities, and the need for more emphasis on care

and protection. Others suggested that there was a need for more around a range of topics, including:
  - o the role of archaeology in planning and regeneration;
  - o the importance of Research Frameworks;
  - o the role of commercial archaeologists, local authority archaeologists, universities, colleges and others; and
  - o archaeology in a marine environment.

- **Resources** – Many respondents felt that the strategy required more information about the resources available to support its delivery, and some questioned whether the strategy was achievable in the current context. One individual suggested the strategy may help to identify new funding opportunities.

- **Consultation Process** - A number of respondents felt that further consultation and engagement was required, and asked questions about the consultation process so far – particularly whether it involved community and local groups.

- **Format** - Some respondents suggested better use of plain English and avoidance of jargon. For practical use, a number suggested that paragraphs and bullets should be numbered.

Appendix One – Consultation Respondents

The following organisations responded to the consultation, and agreed for their responses to be published. A further nine organisations did not agree to have their responses published.

Aberdeen Art Gallery and Museums, Aberdeen City Council
Aberdeenshire Council
Addyman Archaeology
Alder Archaeology Limited
Association of Local Government Archaeological Officers Scotland (ALGAO)
Archaeology Scotland
Association of Certificated Field Archaeologists
Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA)
City of Edinburgh Council Archaeology Service
Dumfries and Galloway Council
East Lothian Council Archaeology Service
Forestry Commission Scotland
Glasgow Museums (Glasgow Life)
GUARD Archaeology Limited
Headland Archaeology Limited
Historic Assynt
Institute of Historic Building Conservation (Scotland Branch)
Joint Nautical Archaeology Policy Committee (JNAPC)
Lennox Heritage Society
National Trust for Scotland
North of Scotland Archaeological Society (NOSAS)
Orkney Islands Council
Planning Aid for Scotland (PAS)
Members of the Scottish Archaeological Finds Allocation Panel through the Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer)
Rathmell Archaeology Limited
Renfrewshire Local History Forum
Rescue (The British Archaeological Trust)
Rogart Heritage Society
Scottish Universities Environmental Research Centre (SUERC)
Shetland Amenity Trust
Society of Antiquaries of Scotland
The SCAPE Trust
University of Aberdeen, Museums
University of Oxford
University of Stirling, Centre for Heritage, Environment and Policy
Wessex Archaeology Scotland
West of Scotland Archaeology Service

In addition, 28 individuals responded.