

LEONARDO PROGRESS REPORT - 2006 CALL

Please complete this report in full, and send to the UK National Agency¹ with the requested annexes by the date given in Article I.5.1.1 of your Agreement (contract) with the National Agency at the latest. The report should cover activities and expenditure for the **first quarter** of the project.

Agreement number:	UK/06/B/F/NT-162_583
Contracting period:	01.10.2006 – 30.09.2008
Project duration:	24 months
Title:	Discovering the Archaeologists of Europe
Contractor:	Institute of Field Archaeologists
Contractor's legal representative:	Kenneth Aitchison
Period covered by the report	From: 01.10.2006 To: 31.03.07
Contract amendments made since signature of the Agreement	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DECLARATION OF CONFORMITY

I, the undersigned, hereby declare that the attached information is accurate and in accordance with the facts. In particular the financial data provided in this report corresponds to the expenditure actually incurred by the project partners for carrying out project activities. This information has been approved by the authorities representing the partners involved in the activities set out in this Report.

 (Original signature of the person legally authorised to act on behalf of the contracting organisation and who signed the agreement)

Name of contractor's legal representative:	Kenneth Aitchison
Position within the contracting organisation:	Head of Professional Development
Place & Date:	Reading, 21 August 2007

¹ *Two copies of the report and 1 copy of its annexes should be returned to:
 Leonardo UK National Agency
 12 – 26 Albert Street
 Birmingham B4 7UD, UK*

A. CONTRACTING ORGANISATION

Information to be checked and updated, if necessary.

Name of the organisation in national language (<i>full and abbreviated if applicable</i>)	Institute of Field Archaeologists
Name of the organisation in EN, FR or DE	

Head Office

Street	University of Reading, Whiteknights
Number	PO Box 227
Post code	RG6 6AB
Town/city	Reading
Country	UK

Contact Person

Name	Mr <input type="checkbox"/> Ms?	Kenneth Aitchison
Position	Head of Professional Development	
Street	University of Reading, Whiteknights	
Number	PO Box 227	
Post code	RG6 6AB	
Town/city	Reading	
Country	UK	
Telephone	++44 /(0)114 281-0904	
Fax	++44 /(0)870 915-0697	
E-mail	kenneth.aitchison@blueyonder.co.uk	

Authorised signatory²

Name	Mr <input type="checkbox"/> Ms?	Kenneth Aitchison
Position	Head of Professional Development	

² This is the person legally authorised to act on behalf of the contracting organisation and who signed the agreement. This should be the same person who signs the report.

B. PROGRESS REPORT - ACTIVITIES

B.1. PROJECT PROGRESS

Aims and objectives of the period covered by the progress report (*please refer to the approved Work Programme in Annex 1 of your Agreement and any updates made at Contracting stage*)

Work Package I – Start-up Preparation

Aims:

I/1 present results of previous labour market research assessments

I/2 present overview of qualification transparency issues

I/3 agree methodologies for data collection

I/4 national and sectoral bodies made aware of the project

Work Package II – Data Collection

Aims:

II/1 collect information relating to necessity and transparency of qualifications

II/2 collect labour market information

Activities carried out in the period covered by the progress report (*please report by Work Package*)

WP1	<p>Project meeting held.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - results of previous studies discussed. - overview of qualification issues presented - methodologies for data collection agreed <p>Project website established National and sectoral bodies informed</p>
WP2	Planning started for data collection by individual partners.
WP3	Not yet started
WP4	Not yet started

Is the project on schedule? <i>(please explain any delays by Work Package, and provide details of actions taken to ensure the project meets the objectives and outputs in your Agreement)</i>	
WP1	WP1 began late as there were difficulties following the change of partner in the Netherlands and the withdrawal of the Maltese partner. Eventually the decision was reached to move on without a partner from that country in the interim (presented in revised Contracting Form dated 12 December 2006). The partners held the first project meeting in January 2007, rather than October 2006 as originally intended. This meant that WP1 effectively ran three months behind schedule.
WP2	WP2 began three months late owing to the run on of WP1 caused by the overall delay in the launch of the project. It is not now intended to complete WP2 to the original schedule (end August 2007), but will regain some of those lost three months and now aims to end at end October 2007.
WP3	WP3 will run to schedule (September 2007), and so will take place in parallel with WP2 (and not sequentially following it).
WP4	WP4 will now start one months late (start November 2007, not start October 2007), but will intend to conclude on schedule (end August 2008), so bringing the project back onto timetable.

<p>Have there been any changes to the project activities or the project partnership since the signature of the Agreement?</p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>If yes, please describe these changes and their effect on your project.</p>

B.2 PARTNERSHIP, MONITORING, VALORISATION & EVALUATION

<p>How well is your partnership working together? Please comment on the project partnership giving details of any positive points, or issues.</p>
<p>The partnership is working very well together – having good attendance at the first project meeting helped to bring people together, and incorporating social events (such as team meals) helped considerably. The team communicate well with each other, and share</p>

ideas and discuss objectives effectively.

Have signed partner agreements been received from all your partners?

Yes No

If not please list the partners who have not yet returned their signed agreement and explain any issues.

Partner	Reasons why the signed agreement has not been received

Partner Meetings

Date	Location	Partners attending	Issues discussed
24-25 Jan 2007	Reading, UK	P1- Institute of Field Archaeologists P2 - University of Leuven P3 - Department of Antiquities P4 - Archeologicky Ustav Praha P6 - Verband der Landesarchaeologen in der BRD P7 - Syllogos Ellinon Archaiologon P8 - Institute of Archaeologists of Ireland P10 - Vestigia P11 - Univerza v Ljubljani	1. Introductions & Apologies for absence 2. Purpose (why we are doing the project) 3. Partnership and Roles 4. Principles (objectives of the project - what data we will collect) 5. Process (how we will do the project) 6. Administration and project documentation 7. Evaluation 8. Cost & staffing review 9. Change requests 10. Team & meeting management (including date of next meeting) 11. AOB (any other business)

Please detail the financial and administrative monitoring systems in place to measure project progress and to keep track of expenditure by your organisation and your partners (including staff costs).

Partners have been informed of the financial data and other administrative reports that they will have to provide to the project manager at the Partner meeting. This was discussed in detail.

Partners are then responsible for providing data or reports as identified through timetabled action points, and are then also contacted directly by the project manager if material is overdue.

--

Please detail the valorisation activities carried out by your partnership (*you should give details of activities carried out by all your partners and the production of any websites or dissemination materials*)

Website established at www.discovering-archaeologists.eu.

Please detail internal and external evaluation activities carried out by you, your partners or an external evaluator.

The external evaluator has prepared an evaluation plan, and will request evaluation reports from the partners during WP2 and in advance of each successive partner meeting (more details in document included as annex d).

C. PROGRESS REPORT - EXPENDITURE

C.1 SUMMARY OF EXPENSES INCURRED

	Contractual budget (euro)	Amount already spent (euro)	% already spent
A. Staff costs	€277,379	€23,131.73	8%
B. Operating costs			
1. Travel & Subsistence	€69,649	€7,264.03	10%
2. ICT	€0	€0	-
3. Production	€23,000	€0	0%
4. Overheads	€31,565	€2,243.98	7%
5. Others	€5,000	€1,590.23	32%
Sub-total B	€129,214	€11,098.24	9%
C. Subcontracting costs*			
1. Evaluator	€8,250	€1,650.00	20%
2. Consultant	€4,000	€0	0%
3. Translation	€63,500	€0	0%
Sub-total C	€75,750	€1,650.00	2%
TOTAL (A+B+C)	€482,343	€35,879.57	7%

C.2. SUMMARY OF EXPENSES INCURRED BY PARTNER

	Total	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	P8	P9	P10
A. Staff costs	€23,131.73	€6,647.69	€0.00	€1,742.74	€2,298.00	€0.00	€4,551.65	€1,114.00	€2,058.00	€1,829.65	€2,890.00
B. Operating costs											
1. Travel & Subsistence	€7,264.03	€4,318.83	€171.80	€630.02	€843.60	€0.00	€281.40	€267.87	€125.75	€244.76	€380.00
2. ICT	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00
3. Production	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00
4. Overheads	€2,243.98	€883.94	€12.03	€166.09	€219.91	€0.00	€338.31	€96.73	€152.86	€145.21	€228.90
5. Others	€1,590.23	€7.81	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€1372.00	€210.42	€0.00
Sub-total B	€11,098.24	€5,210.58	€183.83	€796.11	€1,063.51	€0.00	€619.71	€364.60	€1,650.61	€600.39	€608.90
C. Sub-contracting costs *											
1.	€1,650.00	€1,650.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00
2.	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00
3. ...	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00
Sub-total C	€1,650.00	€1,650.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00	€0.00
TOTAL (A+B+C)	€35,879.97	€13,508.27	€183.83	€2,538.85	€3,361.51	€0.00	€5,171.36	€1,478.60	€3,708.61	€2,430.04	€3,498.90

* Please refer to the Administrative and Financial Handbook

C.3. BANK TRANSFERS FROM THE CONTRACTOR TO PARTNERS*

N°	Partner Name	Amount (Euro)	Date of Payment	Currency
P2	Katholieke Universiteit Leuven	€4,305.60	23 March 2007	Euro
P4	Archeologicky Ustav Praha	€2,086.20	18 January 2007	Euro
P6	Verband der Landesarchaeologen in der BRD	€6,061.40	5 January 2007	Euro
P7	Syllogos Ellinon Archaiologon	€2,775.20	10 January 2007	Euro
P8	Institute of Archaeologists of Ireland	€3,941.40	16 January 2007	Euro
P1 0	Vestigia BV	€5326.00	30 January 2007	Euro

* If payments were made by cheque, please fill in the table and include evidence of payment and receipt with your report. This might include evidence that funds have left your bank account (e.g. bank statements), and evidence that funds have been received by your partners (letters of confirmation). Please note that these documents should include information showing the bank account credited.

D. COMMENTS & ANNEXES

D.1. Comments

Do you have any comments on your project not already covered in this report?

No payments had been made to partners 3 and 11 by the reporting date for this report. These payments were delayed by confusion over the recipient bank accounts. These were subsequently resolved, and the payments made outside the period of this report, on 14 May 2007 and 15 May 2007 respectively.

The returned and signed letter of subcommission issued to Rachel Edwards, project evaluator (included here in annex g) also functioned as an invoice for subcontracting expenditure incurred during the reporting period, totalling €1,650.00, corrected from €1661.13 (tables C1 & C2 updated)

In table B2, the Partner numbers for P10 & P11 have been corrected (was showing as P9 & P10).

D.2. Annexes to be sent with the Progress Report

- Organisation chart for the project
- Copies of monitoring documents e.g. timesheet templates, financial spreadsheets, travel and subsistence forms
- Minutes of partner meetings
- Copies of dissemination/evaluation materials
- Copies of timesheets for the contracting organisation
- Copies of official bank transfer documents to show payments to partners
- Copies of subcontracting documents (plus evidence of tender for contracts worth over 10,000 euro)
- Copies of partner contracts (if not already received)

Annex a: Organisation chart for the project

No organisation chart has been produced for the project.

Annex b: Copies of monitoring documents e.g. timesheet templates, financial spreadsheets, travel and subsistence forms

No monitoring documents issued.

Annex c: Minutes of partner meetings

DISCOVERING THE ARCHAEOLOGISTS OF EUROPE

Title:	Minutes of partner meeting, Reading, 24-25 January 2007
Author:	Rachel Edwards
Derivation:	Partner meeting
Origination Date:	15 February 2007
Reviser(s):	KA
Date of last revision:	3 March 2007
Version:	1.2
Status:	Draft
Summary of Changes:	Detail amended following comment from Despo Pilides
Circulation:	Kenneth Aitchison
Required Action:	All named individuals to act on specific action points and on action points given to 'all'
File Name/Location:	
Approval:	Not required

1 Introductions and apologies for absence

The following representatives of the partner countries attended the meeting:

Kenneth Aitchison (*Institute of Field Archaeologists, United Kingdom*)
Marc Lodewijckx (*University of Leuven, Belgium*)
Despo Pilides (*Department of Antiquities, Ministry of Communications and Works, Cyprus*)
Martin Tomasek (*Archeologicky Ustav Praha, Czech Republic*)
Jan Frolik (*Archeologicky Ustav Praha, Czech Republic*)
Sascha Schmidt (*Verband der Landesarchaeologen in der BRD, Germany*)
Pantos Pantos (*Sylogos Ellinon Archaialogon, Greece*)
Margaret Gowen (*Institute of Archaeologists of Ireland, Ireland*)
Karen Waugh (*Vestigia, Netherlands*)
Vesna Pintaric (*Univerza v Ljubljani, Slovenia*)
John Collis (*Project Consultant, United Kingdom*)
Rachel Edwards (*Project Evaluator – Arboretum Archaeological Consultancy, United Kingdom*)

Apologies were received from:

Predrag Novakovic (*Univerza v Ljubljani, Slovenia*)
Anthony Harding (*European Association of Archaeologists, Czech Republic*)

Following individual introductions, delegates provided an informal outline of the archaeological profession in their countries. These summaries provided an excellent background to the meeting. It was agreed that each partner country would prepare a written summary in their own language (as applicable) which will form part of the final project report. It was agreed that each summary should be a couple

**Action:
all partners**

of pages long (*circa* 1000 words), although it was acknowledged that the variation between different countries made it difficult to be precise. The written summaries should include, as relevant:

- i) Historical background to modern profession
- ii) Outline of profession, including source(s) of funding, type of work carried out, extent of state or local government participation/control, roles and extent of remit
- iii) Education and training required for entry into the profession, where this can be obtained
- iv) Rough estimates of the numbers of archaeologists, to compare with the figures which will be compiled during the project
- v) Malta / Valetta convention
- vi) Import and export of archaeologists, of funding
- vii) Involvement of other European and international countries

A table setting out comparable statistics for all EU countries' populations, areas and population densities is included at the end of this report and will be posted on the website.

Action: KA

In summarising the morning's discussion, KA noted that it focussed on politics, economics and globalisation. He emphasised that this was appropriate, as the project has been funded to address employment and training issues in the archaeological profession across Europe.

Sample documents were provided for delegates, including the UK project carried out in 2002-03 (Kenneth Aitchison and Rachel Edwards *Archaeology Labour Market Intelligence: Profiling the Profession 2002-03*). Other relevant projects included the UK predecessor carried out in 1999 by Kenneth Aitchison, and the survey of archaeologists in Ireland carried out by CHL in 2002. Links to digital versions of all three reports will be added to the website.

Action: KA

KA thanked all for talking and listening in English.
KA thanked RE for offering to take minutes of the meeting.

2 Purpose (why we are doing the project)

The purpose of the project is described on page 16 of the full project proposal (available from the project website). This states:

This project seeks to improve understanding of the requirements for, and capacity to provide, transparent qualifications for archaeologists across Europe.

The project has a number of objectives at both European and individual state levels

- to identify barriers to entry to the profession of archaeology and to transnational mobility
- to identify labour market information and trends, including training investment, recruitment and career progression difficulties
- to establish the number of archaeologists working in each state
- to identify training needs and skills shortages
- to provide archaeological employers with information to aid business planning and improve organisational performance

It will achieve these objectives by identifying, collecting and disseminating information on archaeologists and archaeological employment across Europe (labour

market intelligence), in order for employers, professional associations, the European Association of Archaeologists, training providers and other bodies

- to develop knowledge of practices and conditions in order to facilitate transnational mobility of labour
- to define specific criteria and methodologies to identify training needs across Europe
- to improve analysis and anticipation of skills requirements
- to enable comparisons between skills requirements in states

Currently this kind of information is unavailable in most individual states and has never been collected or applied on a transnational basis before.

3 Partnership and Roles

3.1 Maltese partner

Following the official start date of the project in October 2006, the partner in Malta – the Superintendence of Archaeology – withdrew from the project, due to uncertainty over partner funding. Following discussion with the Leonardo UK Agency, the funding for the Maltese partner has been passed to IFA in the UK on a temporary basis, in order to allow the project to commence.

KA outlined three possibilities:

- i) A new partner could be found in Malta
- ii) An alternative partner country could be found which could carry out the work with the same level of funding from Leonardo
- iii) IFA could take on the work in Malta (not the option preferred by KA or IFA)

Discussion of options i) and ii) identified some possible contacts. It was agreed that a new partner would need to be in place by the end of March if at all possible.

It was agreed that

AH should be asked to contact EAA's contacts in Malta
KA would contact Anthony Pace at Heritage Malta directly
KA would request JF and JC to make contact with potential partners in Slovakia and Luxembourg on a provisional basis

Action AH
Action KA
Action KA, JF, JC

3.2 Project roles and responsibilities

IFA Project Management
Research in UK
'Valorisation' of the UK results in UK ('Valorisation' is the term used by Leonardo UK to describe all aspects of the publication and publicising of a project and its results.)
Contribution to the overall valorisation and publication

All partners

Research in respective countries
Valorisation of results in each country
Contribution to the overall valorisation and publication

RE Project evaluator – quality control

JC Consultant addressing academic aspects of the project
Contribution to the overall valorisation and publication

All partners and contributors have a responsibility to the project as a whole. The success of the overall project is dependent on the success of each separate element.

3.3 Financial roles and responsibilities

At the end of the project, the European Commission will check the quality of the project, check the project financial accounts, and give it a score. A good score means that all the money can be kept. A low score means that some money must be paid back, and a very low score would mean that all the money must be paid back. If any financial discrepancies are discovered, money may have to be repaid.

Leonardo project auditing of accounts can be extremely detailed. It is therefore essential to keep all receipts. All financial records must be accurate, and it is important to check data entry and avoid any errors.

“Work in kind” – non-cash contributions by partners, such as staff time – will need to be carefully documented.

The overall grant from the European Commission is fixed. The proportion of the grant allocated to staff must not be reduced, although it may be increased (by reducing other budget headings). The distribution of money between staff roles may be changed. Sums allocated to non-staff budgets can be moved to other non-staff items or to staff budgets. Financial contributions from partner organisations can be increased.

3.4

The role of each partner

Partners’ roles have been set out in the letters of agreement sent out for signature. KA asked all to confirm that they are content with their roles overall.

VP noted that the change of partner from the Faculty to the University of Ljubljana as a whole is being addressed in the formal documentation.

KW requested formal documentation that Vestigia had been accepted as the Netherlands partner (this change took place before the start of the project). KA agreed to provide a copy of the final agreement with Leonardo which documents this.

PP asked about the impact of the delayed start on the first formal report to Leonardo. KA confirmed that the official report was required 6 months after the start of the project.

PP asked whether a Researcher could undertake Translation tasks. KA said this would be possible, but they would need a separate contract for the translation work, as this falls under a separate budget heading.

All partners confirmed that they were content with their roles overall.

KA asked those partners who have not returned the signed letters of agreement to do so by 28 February 2007.

SS noted that his department had not yet received the first payment, although the contract had been submitted.

KA will look into this, as the payment has been processed.

Action: KA

Action: signed letters to be returned by 28 February

Action: KA

4 Principles (objectives of the project – what data we will collect)

4.1 Data collected by previous surveys

The two examples of surveys carried out five years ago in the UK and Ireland were presented as potential models for partner countries to consider. UK and Ireland will be basing their work for this project on these earlier studies, with additional questions in some areas, in order to look at trends in each case.

The UK survey in 2002 used postal questionnaires, addressed to employing organisations and individual consultants. The questionnaires asked about the organisation, and subsidiary questionnaires were completed for each post in the organisation (eg if 20 individuals are employed by an organisation as 'Project Officer', a single form would be completed).

The Irish survey in 2002 was based on postal questionnaires addressed to individuals working in archaeology, and additional data were derived from a separate study of employing organisations.

4.2 Core data to be collected for all partner countries

The core data must include the information identified in the project design and reproduced above (agenda item 2).

Following extensive discussion of what data should be collected, how an archaeologist should be defined, and how significant job titles are, the following core data were agreed by all:

1. 'Archaeologist' should be defined and justified by each country. Definitions should be as broad as possible. Education should not be regarded as of primary importance in determining whether an individual is to be regarded as an archaeologist.
2. How many people work in archaeology?
3. Age and gender of individuals working in archaeology. (The 2002 UK survey identified ages in ten-year bands, <20 years old, 20–29, 30–39 etc, then '60 and over'.)
4. Disability status of individuals working in archaeology.
5. The country of origin of individuals working in archaeology.
6. Whether individuals are employed part time or full time.
7. Were more or fewer people employed in archaeology one year ago, three years ago and five years ago?
8. Is it expected that more or fewer people will be employed in archaeology next year and in three years time?
9. The highest qualification obtained by individuals, to include post-doctoral level Habilitation or equivalent. Whether this qualification was obtained a) in the partner country, b) in another European country, or c) elsewhere. Whether this qualification included archaeology. Both academic and technical/craft qualifications should be included as applicable.
10. Information on training needs and skills shortages from the point of view of employers. Whilst this is a core data area, the specifics will vary from country to country. (The way in which these areas were considered by the 2002 UK survey is demonstrated in the

- questionnaire on pages 122 and 123 of the report.)
11. Salaries or wages paid for archaeological work. It was emphasised that this area of investigation needs to be treated anonymously and confidentially. One advantage of the 2002 UK survey approach to organisations was that salary bands could be provided by employers, eg £20,000 to £25,000 per annum.

5 Process (how we will do the project)

5.1 Project structure and links

The project is officially termed a 'Transnational Network', in accordance with the grant which was obtained. This was the only successful bid in the UK for a TN, out of a total of 15 applications. The European Commission is strongly in favour of TNs, and was impressed with the number and range of countries involved in the project. It will therefore be very important to maintain the partnership not just during, but after the project work is complete. The longer term objective is to repeat this project in about five years, so trends can be identified.

Links which will assist with this include committees of the EAA, including the Committee for Education and Training, and the Committee for Professional Associations in Archaeology.

JC requested permission to add all partner representatives to the circulation list for the EAA Education Committee, to enhance understanding of relevant discussions and initiatives which may be relevant to the project. All agreed.

Action: JC

KA suggested that the EAA Committee for Professional Associations in Archaeology could provide a means for continuing the partnership in the future.

From the EAA perspective MG considered that this could be a positive move, as it would have the effect of widening both the committee, and this partnership in the future. She offered to take this to the EAA project board. KA agreed to draft a proposal to the board requesting approval for the expansion of the committee and formally inviting the partnership onto the committee.

Action: KA, MG

SS queried whether his formal status would make him an inappropriate member for this committee. KA did not believe this would be a significant problem.

ML expressed concern that he was perhaps not the best representative of his country. KA responded that as a member of the partnership, he would be an appropriate person, but if there are others from Belgium who could be included in the future continuation, this could be considered as well.

5.2 How each country will carry out the project

In the UK, it is proposed that the project will be carried out in a similar manner to that undertaken in 2002-03. Questionnaires will be sent by post to organisations for completion in relation to the organisation and to each job / post with employees. The questionnaires will be

anonymous, but linked to the database of organisations by code number. Only the project researcher will have the list linking organisations and code numbers. In 2002-03 this was used to check which organisations had not returned the questionnaires, which in turn allowed the estimates for the total number of archaeologists to be made. Completed questionnaires will be entered onto a database; analysis will be in Excel and Access.

Approaching organisations for information may not be the best approach for all partner countries. Smaller countries with a limited number of organisations might find a direct approach to individual archaeologists would be more effective. Whatever method is used, it will be important to ensure that all individuals or organisations are asked the same set of questions.

PP asked whether there a model covering letter could be made available. KA responded that the letter used in the UK in 2002-03 is reproduced on page 118 of the report. He and MG agreed to share positive responses and feedback to the questionnaire and report, to provide information which could be used in other countries.

Action: KA, MG

VP noted that Slovenia intended to use a direct approach.

SS noted that previous surveys in Germany had received a very poor response rate, unless the questionnaire is taken in person. He would also anticipate reluctance to reveal salary information.

KA noted that it may not be necessary to know precise details of salaries; ranges may provide sufficient information. It can also help to publicise the survey in advance so respondents are aware of the questions which will be asked.

RE commented that postal surveys in the UK were most successful when the questionnaire was accompanied by a pre-paid reply envelope.

SS asked how previous work could be brought in to the project. KA noted that the 2002-03 UK report included a summary of related and earlier surveys. Something similar could be included in the report on the survey in Germany.

SS hopes to be able to acquire official statistics for employment in archaeology, if possible.

PP asked whether unemployment schemes which provide archaeological work experience should be included. KA said they were relevant.

SS noted that about 80% of archaeological site workers are on employment schemes and would need to be included. KA noted that it might be necessary to be able to separate these different types of employment when presenting statistics on salaries.

KW noted that employment agencies are used in the Netherlands by organisations seeking workers. Should these organisations also be included? KA assumed not, if the survey covered employing organisations, as long as these included all staff howsoever they had

come to be working there. (RE note: as the aim is to know about the work being carried out and the individuals carrying it out, the responding organisation needs to be that which is directing the work being undertaken. An employee on secondment should be counted by the seconding organisation, not the primary employer.)

PP asked about including volunteers and those who are provided with board and lodging in return for their work. KA noted that the 2002-03 UK survey asked about unpaid members of staff, so they could be included. He also noted that this relates to issues of routes into archaeology and barriers to entry. In some countries individuals have to pay to gain the necessary experience, and this would constitute a barrier.

DP noted that students are normally paid for their work in Cyprus.

MG noted that in Ireland employment law could be a barrier to volunteer participation, as only those over 16 may work. Also all those carrying out site work have to have a Health and Safety 'Safe Pass' which is issued after a one-day course costing €150. Students therefore rarely approach commercial companies for work experience.

VP noted that the safety licence required in Slovenia is usually paid for by the company offering the work.

6 Administration and project documentation

The project will produce an overall academic report and a series of administrative reports.

Partners will produce interim and final academic reports which will be incorporated in the project's final academic report, and will provide data for the administrative reports.

6.1 Administrative summary reports

KA will produce administrative summary reports at regular intervals as determined by Leonardo and specified in the 'Financial and administrative handbook'. These are scheduled for April 2007, October 2007 and October 2008. Only the final report is linked to a specific product from the project. Partners do not have to produce these reports or read the handbook, as this is KA's responsibility as Project Manager. It is, however, worth knowing that the handbook is available (and is available in all languages – see local Leonardo websites).

6.2 Proof of project expenditure

It is **essential** that there is proof of any and all expenditure. **All** receipts must be retained and logged.

Copies of receipts should be retained and submitted to KA when requested, in advance of each report. KA will send proforma tables to fill in to record expenditure.

All expenditure on this project since 1 October 2006 is eligible, including time spent.

Action: KA

Time spent on the project will need to be proved by means of payment or salary slips, plus proof of the time spent as recorded on log sheets, or a signed letter from someone in a position of responsibility in the partner organisation.

JC and RE will not have to prove time spent on the project, but will have to record all expenditure, as above.

No proof is required of the national contributions (proof is required that money has been spent, rather than that money has been received).

The Leonardo portion of the project should not make any profit. For example, if a report is produced and sold to produce €10,000, Leonardo will ask for this sum to be repaid.

It is acceptable for there to be a surplus in the national contribution element of the project.

Projected travel costs were calculated according to EC rules. Actual expenditure on travel will be reimbursed on the basis of receipts.

The costs of subsistence and the meeting room for this meeting will be subtracted from the next payment due to partners.

7 Evaluation

RE summarised the evaluation process for the project, outlined in the *External Evaluation Plan* made available on the project website. She emphasised that whilst evaluation is recommended by Leonardo, there is no point in this element of the project unless it can be useful and helpful to those undertaking the project. The aim will therefore be to use the evaluation process to support all those involved. Copies of the *Evaluation Guidance Note for Leonardo Projects* were provided for all partners.

Each partner country is expected to prepare evaluation reports on their own projects, and there will be overall evaluation reports covering the project as a whole.

The external project evaluation will include quantitative and qualitative review, and will consider process as well as output. The earlier evaluation stages are likely to focus more on process, and the later stages on output. The evaluation process will be reflexive, and will include the effectiveness of the evaluation as well as other aspects of the project and its management. Survey projects can go wrong, for example, when the level of response is so low as to be unusable. Leonardo accepts that this can happen, and one aim of evaluation is to allow lessons to be learnt during the project, rather than only being revealed too late for the project to adapt appropriately.

KA commented that the inclusion of external evaluation was one of the aspects of the project which led to its success in obtaining funding.

RE will provide partners with an outline for their interim evaluation reports.

Action: RE

8 Cost and staffing review

8.1 Partner contributions

Partner contributions can consist entirely of staff time – ‘contributions in kind’ – or they can be partly financial and partly in kind. Calculation of the financial equivalent of contributions in kind should be at the local daily or hourly rate for that member of staff, rather than at the official Leonardo rates for project roles.

Details of overheads included as part of the partner contribution do not have to be itemised.

KA will provide proforma accounts for the recording of these expenses.

Action: KA

8.2 Outline programme

KA asked whether partners were reasonably content with the outline programme of days allocated.

Most were content and considered that the partner contributions, both financial and in kind, would permit sufficient flexibility.

PP is concerned that it will be more difficult in Greece, as he feels that it will be necessary to conduct interviews in person, and travel around the country and to the islands will be time-consuming.

KA summarised how the budgets had been estimated, using standard EC rates for different project roles, and to make best use of the maximum level of grant possible for a Transnational project. Although the estimates were based on standard daily rates, it is acceptable for the actual daily rates to be different. Accounts will need to demonstrate that the full amount of grant has been spent, even if daily rates and numbers of days are different.

9 Change requests

This will be a standing item on the agenda for each meeting, and includes both small and more significant changes.

The effect of the delay in formally starting the project was discussed. KA considers that this will not affect the overall result, although the earlier stages will be more compressed. Although we may not have achieved all that was initially anticipated by the second meeting, in Athens, it will be important for all partners to meet, in order to maintain communication, and to share progress reports.

PP asked about the allocation of time between data collection and data analysis.

RE commented that in her experience this was often an area of project programming which allowed some flexibility in practice, depending on the survey and analysis methods to be used. Data analysis can be very quick in some instances, and it can also be

possible to set up database queries in advance of having collected all the data. Once all data has been collected and entered onto the database the queries can be run again to establish the final results.

10 Team and meeting management (including date of next meeting)

10.1 Meeting dates

It was agreed that it will be best to allow two full days for each meeting in order to allow sufficient time for presentation of results and discussion as required.

Work Package 2 meeting:

Athens, 2 days, May 24 and 25 2007 (to be confirmed)

Work Package 3 meeting:

Ljubljana, Slovenia, 2 days, *circa* 13 and 14 September, before start of the EAA conference in Zadar, Croatia (18–23 September 2007). Leonardo will not pay for travel outside EU, so the meeting cannot be held in Croatia.

Work Package 4 meeting

Dublin, Ireland, 2 days, before start of World Archaeological Congress (29 June – 4 July 2008).

Work Package 5 meeting

Malta, 2 days, before start of EAA conference in Valletta, September 2008.

10.2 Travel and meeting expenditure

Expenditure should be recorded in the local currency (eg GB £ sterling for this meeting). Expenditure will be reimbursed in € in accordance with the official EC exchange rate at the time. KA will provide a link to the exchange rate calendar, or provide relevant exchange rate information as required.

Action: KA

SS asked what documentation is required when travel expenditure is being provided as part of the partner funding.

KA responded that all expenditure should be fully documented, regardless of the source of funding.

11 Any other business (AOB)

11.1 Contact details

A list of contact details including telephone numbers, postal addresses and the recent changes of email address for ML and PP will be compiled and circulated by email.

Action: KA

11.2 Northern Ireland

Northern Ireland is part of the UK, but was covered in 2002-03 by both the UK survey and the CHL survey of the island of Ireland. It was agreed that MG would make initial approaches to colleagues in Northern Ireland for them to carry out their own survey (with support both practically and financially from IFA and IAI) which will include all

IAI and IFA questions to allow comparability both with the UK and with the island of Ireland.
KA will contact Brian Williams (at the Department of Environment, Northern Ireland) with regard to a contribution to the funding for this.

Action: KA

The meeting closed at 12:50 on 25 January 2007.

Country	Population (millions)	Surface area (1000 km ²)	People per km ²
	2005 data	2001 data	
Belgium (BE)	10.4	30.5	341.0
Czech Republic (CZ)	10.2	78.9	129.3
Denmark (DK)	5.4	43.1	125.3
Germany (DE)	82.5	357.0	231.1
Estonia (EE)	1.3	45.2	28.8
Greece (EL)	11.1	131.6	84.3
Spain (ES)	38.2	504.8	75.7
France (FR)	60.6	544.0	111.4
Ireland (IE)	4.0	70.3	56.9
Italy (IT)	58.5	301.3	194.2
Cyprus (CY)	0.7	9.3	75.3
Latvia (LV)	2.3	64.6	35.6
Lithuania (LT)	3.4	65.3	52.1
Luxembourg (LU)	0.5	2.6	192.3
Hungary (HU)	10.1	93.0	108.6
Malta (MT)	0.4	0.3	1333.3
Netherlands (NL)	16.3	33.9	480.8
Austria (AT)	8.2	83.9	97.7
Poland (PL)	38.2	312.7	122.2
Portugal (PT)	10.5	91.9	114.3
Slovenia (SI)	2.0	20.3	98.5
Slovakia (SK)	5.4	49.0	110.2
Finland (FI)	5.2	304.5	17.1
Sweden (SE)	9.0	410.9	21.9
United Kingdom (UK)	60.0	243.8	246.1

Source: official EU website, accessed 07 February 2007:
http://europa.eu/abc/keyfigures/sizeandpopulation/howbig/index_en.htm
http://europa.eu/abc/keyfigures/sizeandpopulation/howmany/index_en.htm

Annex d: Copies of dissemination/evaluation materials

No dissemination materials produced to date of report except website (www.discovering-archaeologists.eu).

Discovering the Archaeologists of Europe: External Project Evaluation Plan

Title:	Discovering the Archaeologists of Europe: External Project Evaluation Plan
Author:	Rachel Edwards (Arboretum Archaeological Consultancy)
Derivation:	Full project proposal (27/01/06) & verbal instruction December 2006
Origination date:	17 January 2007
Reviser:	Rachel Edwards
Checked by:	Kenneth Aitchison
Date of last revision:	17 January 2007
Version number:	1.0
Status:	Agreed
Summary of changes:	Comments discussed and agreed with KA.
Circulation:	Project partners
Required action:	Implementation by RE
Approval:	

Scope of the external project evaluation

This is an innovative project, with substantial parallel and equivalent work packages to be carried out by each of the nine (potentially ten) European project partners. It is therefore appropriate for the external evaluation to cover all stages of the project, but also for it to develop alongside the project. A significant aspect of the external evaluation will be a reflexive element, considering the success and effectiveness of the evaluation itself.

The external evaluator has substantial experience of relevant projects carried out in the UK, and also has experience of working in archaeology in Italy alongside Italian archaeologists. This experience will enable her to develop and adapt the most effective methods of evaluation as the project progresses.

Having considered the nature of the project, and in the light of her own experience, the external project evaluator and project manager have collaborated in producing the present scoping document, in place of the 'brief' suggested by the *Evaluation Guidance Note* produced by Leonardo UK National Agency³.

³ <http://www.leonardo.org.uk/docs/EvaluationGuidance.doc>

The external project evaluation will include quantitative and qualitative review, and will consider process as well as output. The earlier evaluation stages are likely to focus more on process, and the later stages on output.

This evaluation will be part of the project Quality Management Plan (Work Package 7), and will be a reflexive process to allow continuous improvement and adaptive response to any problems which may arise.

External evaluation outputs

Outputs from the external evaluation process will comprise three elements:

1 *Presentation, written summary and discussion forming standing agenda item at each of the five project meetings, in Reading, Athens, Ljubljana, Dublin and Malta.*

Output 1.1 This will take the form of a presentation to the project partners and project consultant, explaining the concept of evaluation, based on the Leonardo *Evaluation Guidance Note*. Partners will be provided with a copy of this document.

Output 1.2 Presentation of first interim external evaluation report; discussion of project teams' evaluation reports; discussion of how processes have worked and any areas for potential improvement as the project continues. Review of the effectiveness of the external evaluation.

Output 1.3 Summary and discussion of continuing external and internal evaluation of processes and outputs; discussion of how processes have worked and any areas for potential improvement as the project continues. Review of the effectiveness of the external evaluation.

Output 1.4 Presentation of second interim external evaluation report; discussion of project teams' evaluation reports; discussion of processes and outcomes and any lessons learnt which would be relevant for future similar projects in other European countries. Review of the effectiveness of the external evaluation.

Output 1.5 Presentation of final external evaluation report; summary of processes and outcomes and any lessons learnt which would be relevant for future similar projects in other European countries. Review of the effectiveness of the external evaluation.

2 *Two interim evaluation reports, WP2 Athens, WP4 Dublin*

Output 2.1 First interim external evaluation report, to include consideration and evaluation of: monitoring reports; project teams' internal evaluation reports; direct consultation with the project teams, the project consultant and the project manager; the external evaluation process itself. Process may be more significant than output at this stage in the overall project.

Output 2.2 Second interim external evaluation report, to include consideration and evaluation of: monitoring reports; project teams' internal evaluation reports; direct consultation with the project teams, the project consultant and the project manager; the external evaluation

process itself. Output may be more significant than process at this stage in the overall project.

3 *Final external evaluation report*

Output 3 The final report will be compiled from the two interim reports and will include consideration of the final project results. A summary external evaluation report will be prepared for inclusion in the final transnational report.

Annex e: Copies of timesheets for the contracting organisation

Timesheets for Kenneth Aitchison submitted as separate documents; see column O (P53 DISCO) for details of hours worked on project.