

Consultation on Historic Environment Scotland's 2016-19 Corporate Plan

RESPONDENT INFORMATION FORM

Please Note - This form must be returned with your **response** form to ensure that we handle your response appropriately.

1. Name/Organisation

Organisation Name (as appropriate)

Archaeology Scotland

Title Ms

Surname

Macqueen

Forename

Eila

2. Postal Address

Suite 1a, Stuart House

Station Road, Musselburgh

Email e.macqueen@archaeologyscotland.org.uk

Postcode EH21 7PB

Phone 03000129878

3. Permissions - I am responding as...

Individual	/	Group/Organisation
		<i>Please tick as appropriate</i>
		x

(a)	Do you agree to your response being made available to the public (in the analysis of consultation responses published by Historic Environment Scotland)?
(b)	Where confidentiality is not requested, we will make your responses available to the public on the following basis Please tick ONE of the following boxes
	Yes, make my response, name and address all available <input type="checkbox"/>
	Yes, make my response available, but not my name and address <input type="checkbox"/>
	Yes, make my response and name available, but not my address <input type="checkbox"/>

(c)	The name and address of your organisation will be made available to the public (in the analysis of consultation responses published by Historic Environment Scotland).			
	Are you content for your response to be made available? Please tick as appropriate Yes			
	Group/Org Type (please tick one)			
	Academic Body	<input type="checkbox"/>	Advisory	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Local Authority	<input type="checkbox"/>	Land Manager	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Museum	<input type="checkbox"/>	Contractor / Developer	<input type="checkbox"/>
	NDPB / Agency	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consultant / Freelance	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Voluntary Organisation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Professional Body	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Other (please specify)	Charity		

(d)	We may wish to contact you again in the future, but we require your permission to do so. Are you content for the HES to contact you again in relation to this consultation exercise? Please tick as appropriate Yes
------------	---

CONSULTATION QUESTIONNAIRE

We are very interested in your views, but please do not feel obliged to answer every question.

We welcome responses in Gaelic.

Q1. Do you agree with our mission statement (p. 6) for HES?

Strongly agree / Agree / Neither agree or disagree / Disagree / Strongly disagree

Whilst we welcome the aspirations to enhance knowledge, protect and conserve and share and celebrate with a wide audience, the mission should grasp the opportunity HES has to work with others in the sector to deliver wider public benefits through the historic environment. HES, as an NDPB, should be a strong advocate for Scotland leading the way in how we integrate the historic environment into other policy areas such as health and employment, skills and quality of life. We feel that the mission falls short of being bold and innovative.

Q2. Do you agree with our vision (p. 9) for HES?

Strongly agree / Agree / Neither agree or disagree / Disagree / Strongly disagree

Yes although as with the comments above on the mission, we would like to vision to be bolder and stronger.

Q3. Do you agree with values (p. 9) for HES?

Strongly agree / Agree / Neither agree or disagree / Disagree / Strongly disagree

The organisational values will set the course for how the new body operates and therefore are very important in establishing a culture for HES. The key for the success of the mission and vision lies in HES being able to work in a truly collaborative way, building trust and valuing the diversity of the sector and reaching out to new audiences. The values as they currently stand still seem very protective of HES and inward looking. HES is the lead public body for the historic environment and civic society, private sector and voluntary bodies all have important parts to play in delivering Our Place in Time.

Q4. To what extent do you agree that the outcomes (p. 10, p. 12- 18) are the right outcomes for HES?

Outcome	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
I. Scotland's historic environment makes a strong contribution to the cultural, social, environmental and economic wellbeing of the nation	X				

and its people					
II. Scotland's historic environment is better known and understood	X				
III. Scotland's historic environment is cared for and protected	X				
IV. People value, celebrate and enjoy the historic environment	X				
V. HES is a high performing organisation	X				

As part of the move towards a more “outcomes” focussed approach, Historic Scotland asked grantees to set outcomes for the work funded by HS and offered training in setting outcomes and evaluating success. If the same principles are to be applied to the HES corporate plan as to the grant processes, it is questionable as to whether these are outcomes as they do not address the differences that they hope to achieve – the “so what” question is not answered but perhaps this is addressed in the objectives.

The actions in 1d “engaging fully with the SHEF and its working groups” and “actively participating in CPPs” are potentially resource heavy and we would be interested to see how this will be delivered and more clarity on the relationship and roles of HES and the Scottish Government Culture & HE Division (CHED).

Q5. Do you have any suggestions for amendments to the outcomes? Is there anything missing?

We would like to see recognition of the [shared principles of sustainable development](#) in the outcomes.

Q6. Do you have any comments on the objectives (p. 10, p. 12- 18) we have assigned to the outcomes? Is there anything missing?

1b – we would like to see recognition of the standards, practice and guidance that other bodies [Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA), local authorities, Scottish Government, voluntary sector etc.] have developed that inform decision-making and a more joined-up approach to sharing advice and guidance. Guidance such as our Adopt-a-Monument handbook for community archaeology, our rural land use guidance and other information would benefit from endorsement by HES and cross promotion but there needs to be a mechanism for doing that and working with HES to share expertise and knowledge.

We have a long-standing interest in protecting the rural historic environment which is under threat from existing farming practices and we would like to see a commitment to shaping the next Scottish Rural Development Plan to better protect archaeological sites.

1c – We would like to see reference to the [Shared Principles for Sustainable Development](#) agreed by UK government and devolved administrations.

We would like to see mention of Scotland's Archaeology Strategy and the Scottish Historic Environment Data Strategy

3a – We would have concerns about the lack of commitment to continue to support the voluntary sector through a grants programme in the Corporate Plan. This section seems to be the only section that mentions grants. The voluntary sector enables hundreds of volunteers to engage with the historic environment each year and support for the sector is crucial for the continuation of public engagement.

4a – the objective to increase diversity seems to be focussed on HES properties and tourism and we would like to see explicit support for other initiatives that widen audiences to the historic environment such as Scotland's Urban Past, Scottish Archaeology Month, Dig It and Adopt-a-Monument etc.

Q7. Do you have any comments on the measures of success (Annex, p. 24-26) that we have assigned to the outcomes?

KPI 5 – research partnerships should be broad and recognise the extent of knowledge and expertise in the sector.

KPI 6 – the grants programme does not just relate to the condition of the HE. The voluntary sector grants programme enables volunteers, public outreach, educational initiatives as well as community-led conservation and protection and local advocacy etc.

Q8. Do you think any of the objectives in the Corporate Plan will impact differently on people who share protected characteristics? (for example, in relation to their age, disability, gender, pregnancy/maternity, marital status, gender identity, sexual orientation, race, religion or belief). (please see the draft Equalities Impact Assessment)

Yes. Barriers that inhibit public participation with Scotland's historic environment include institutional or perceptual barriers, skills and funding. Institutional or perceptual 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. Skills are also a barrier with many community groups feeling that they do not have the expertise to care for and research their heritage. Funding is another barrier with many community groups finding it difficult to know 'where to start' and how and what they can apply for. Through our Heritage Heroes and Adopt-a-Monument projects, we have seen these issues first hand, and we have also seen the positive and sustainable impact professional support can have on community groups who take part.

The Heritage Lottery Fund produced a practical set of headings that represent the different overall barriers to participation identified in their study. Based on more detailed research of the barriers that face under-represented and excluded groups, the following broad barriers have been identified:

- Cost of entry/taking part
- Management ethos – staff attitudes, rules, direct and indirect discrimination
- Lack of information / awareness – lack of knowledge of facilities
- Poor physical access at the resource – transport, opening times
- Lack of specific facilities – for those with disabilities or young children etc.
- Limited intellectual access – inappropriate facilities for those with poor basic skills
- User perception – lack of sense of ownership, fears for personal safety

A Council for British Archaeology (CBA) study, *Participating in the Past* (2003), identified the following:

- Lack of opportunities for “amateurs”
- Need for basic level training
- Archaeology is not just digging things up
- Publicity and communication need to be improved
- Diminution of the field role of societies compounded by a decrease in the numbers especially young people

The CBA suggested that the answers to these problems were:

- Need for National projects
- Need for Professional input e.g. community archaeologists

Q9. Are there any key issues or opportunities we should consider to make sure that the Corporate Plan works for different equality groups? (please see the draft Equalities Impact Assessment)

The HLF Catalyst Fund enabled partnership projects such as [Resourcing Scotland's Heritage](#) (a collaboration of AS, BEFS, Arts and Business Scotland, Greenspace Scotland and Museums and Galleries Scotland) to set up low cost training across Scotland for people to develop their fundraising skills. Initiatives such as this should be supported and continued and promoted by HES.

The type of inclusive work being done by Adopt-a-Monument and many others including Northlight Heritage, Scottish Waterways Trust in engaging with disadvantaged groups should be supported further beyond the current short-term nature of funding.

Forestry Commission Scotland, local authority archaeologists and land managers have a key role in implementing long-term management plans that address barriers to participation and the need for local stewardship of

sites.

Opportunities that could be explored include HES having “free access” days at some or all sites during Scottish Archaeology Month; developing closer links with Black History Month and LGBT History Month, International Women’s Day and other national and local events for equalities groups. Archaeology Scotland would be delighted to work with HES to explore these issues as this is an area where we have much to offer.

Q10. Do you agree with the results of the environmental assessment (please see the draft Environmental Report) and have the key issues associated with the environmental implications of the draft plan been identified?

yes

Q11. Are there any key areas relating to HES’s impact on our stakeholder’s interests that should be considered in our Plan?

There are other membership based organisations in Scotland and the impact of promotion HES membership is not fully explored or addressed. Opportunities such as joint ticketing and helping increase membership of voluntary sector organisations which rely on subscriptions as a source of unrestricted income should be taken forward. If HES want the voluntary sector to be less reliant on grant funding, there needs to be help in growing the membership offer for all.

Q12. Please use this section to provide any other comments you think are relevant to the Corporate Plan.

The Corporate Plan has a “business-as-usual” feel to it and the opportunity to be bold and innovative as the lead public body for the historic environment is not being grasped as currently drafted. The merger of HS and RCAHMS has created a new NDPB that has more scope to be a champion, leader and enabler, reaching out to a diverse audience and working in new ways with partners.

As currently drafted there seems to be confusion over HES’ properties and collections and the wider historic environment. HES has of course an important role as custodian and guardian of sites and monuments but it would make for a more dynamic Corporate Plan if there were a clear distinction between the HES portfolio focus on significant properties, sites and monuments and what HES can do to raise awareness of the c 90% of Scotland’s sites and monuments that are not designated and how it will support local authority services for example. Additionally, HES will still have a regulatory function and this is not clear from the Corporate Plan.

There is little (other than the mention of climate change) about addressing and tackling the big issues facing the historic environment in Scotland such as cuts to local authority services, skills shortages, funding, increasing diversity, health and land reform. The relationship and roles of HES and

Scottish Government CHED are not clear in terms of “mainstreaming” the historic environment and growing the cake for grants.

Cuts to local authorities are a particular threat, as, without a regional archaeologist attached to a Council’s Planning Department, the quality and quantity of developer funded archaeological research suffers significantly. The consequent danger that important archaeological remains are lost without record should, we believe, be highlighted as one of the most important issues facing the historic environment today.

There is a distinct lack of the mention of archaeology in the Corporate Plan, which is surprising as we now have an Archaeology Strategy for Scotland. We would have expected more crossover between the Corporate Plan and the Archaeology Strategy. The maintenance of skills within HES, promotion and recognition of the need to develop staff, skills shortages and training for the wider sector should feature prominently in the plan.

In summary, we would like the Corporate Plan to be more ambitious and cutting edge; to show support for the exemplary initiatives that other organisations operate; to address the big issues for the sector and to recognise that archaeology is a key component of the HES plan.

Responding to the consultation

Please send your completed response together with the Respondent Information Form (first pages of this document) by **8 February** to:

Email: HESconsult@gov.scot

Post: Adam Jackson
Room 2.6
Historic Environment Scotland
Longmore House
Salisbury Place
Edinburgh
EH9 1SH

Queries

The consultation documents are available online at <http://www.historic-scotland.gov.uk/hesconsult>.

Any queries about the consultation process, accessing the various documents, or responding to the consultation should be directed to the email and postal address above.

If you reply to the consultation by email, please note that you should receive a receipt acknowledging that your email has been received.