

## Discovering the Archaeologists of Europe

Title:	<b>Final Evaluation Report</b>
Author:	Rachel Edwards
Derivation:	Project design, External evaluation plan
Origination Date:	12 November 2008
Date of last revision:	27 January 2009
Version:	1.02
Status:	Final
Circulation:	Project Manager, Project Partners, others as relevant

### 1. Background

#### Project background

Discovering the Archaeologists of Europe (DISCO) aimed to address one of the three Leonardo objectives: Objective 2 – to improve the quality of, and access to, continuing vocational training and the lifelong acquisition of skills and competences. The priority in the 2005-06 call which DISCO addressed was: Priority 1 – Promoting transparency of qualifications.

It was a transnational project, managed from the UK, with partners in BE, CY, CZ, DE, EL, IE, NL and SI. MT was originally identified as the tenth partner state, but after protracted discussions was unable to join the partnership, and from September 2007 was replaced by SK. The European Association of Archaeologists is also a partner in the project. Two additional associate partners, AT and HU joined the project on a voluntary basis.

The aims and objectives were set out in the project design, as follows

‘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.'

The programme of work for the project was set out in the project design and is summarised in Appendix 1 below.

### **Evaluation background**

The *External Project Evaluation Plan* prepared by the author for the project in January 2007 guided the preparation of this final evaluation report.

The evaluation process aimed to identify what worked well and what did not work so well. The intention was to improve the performance of the project by helping to build on successes and avoid repeating mistakes. Partners were asked to prepare brief written evaluation comments to contribute to this process on three occasions during the programme of work, following headings summarised in Appendix 2 below. Now that the project has been completed, this final evaluation report will highlight achievements and note any areas for improvement in any similar future projects.

This is the second of two written evaluation reports prepared during the course of the project. Other input into the project took the form of verbal feedback during project meetings, and informal discussions with the Project Manager.

## **2. Summary of project achievements**

### **Process**

#### ***Achievements – Partnership and meetings***

The partnership was established in principal before the project began, though there was a change in partner for NL at the start of the project, and MT withdrew before the project was fully under way, later to be replaced by SK. Two additional partners joined the project as honorary associates during the second year: AT and HU.

Partner organisations were varied and included universities, associations, professional institutes, scholarly institutions, ministry departments and a private company.

UK	Institute of Field Archaeologists
BE	K U Leuven (University of Leuven)
CY	Ministry of Communications and Works, Department of Antiquities
CZ	Archeologicky Ustav Praha (Prague institute of archaeology)
DE	Verband der Landesarchaeologen in der BRD (the association of state archaeologists in Germany)
EL	Syllogos Ellinon Archaiologon (association of Greek archaeologists)
IE	Institute of Archaeologists of Ireland
NL	Vestigia b.v. archeologie en cultuurhistorie (Vestigia Ltd Archaeology and Cultural History)
SI	Univerza v Ljubljani (University of Ljubljana)
SK	Archaeological Institute of Slovak Academy of Sciences
–	European Association of Archaeologists
<i>Honorary associate partners</i>	
AT	Internationales Österreichisches Archäologie Forum (IÖAF) and Bangor University (UK)
HU	Magyar Régész Szövetség (Association of Hungarian Archaeologists)

In addition to the representatives of partner organisations, the partnership included the education and training consultant, and the project external evaluator.

Six partner meetings were held, in Reading (UK), Athens (EL), Ljubljana (SI), Leuven (BE), Dublin (IE) and Malta (MT). Meetings were hosted by project partners with the exception of MT, and the timing and locations of the Dublin and Malta meetings were selected to coincide with the Sixth World Archaeological Congress and the annual conference and meeting of the European Association of Archaeologists respectively.

### ***Achievements – Language and understanding***

The language of project meetings and project administration was English. Beyond the basics of ensuring that all could understand the essential elements of the project and administrative requirements, a significant part of the project proved to be the development of a wider mutual understanding between partners. ‘Archaeologist’ does not have the same meaning in all European countries, or in all the partners’ countries. The work of archaeologists and associated professionals is organised very differently in the different partners’ countries.

### ***Achievements – Project implementation***

The ‘core data’ to be collected for each partner’s country was agreed at the first project meeting. The questionnaire method of data collection was suggested as the best approach but was not insisted upon, however, in practice all partners adopted some form of questionnaire to collect the information required.

Information about the structures and organisations which govern the work of archaeologists in each country was shared at the first meeting, then provided in written form by each partner. Later it was agreed to include a statement which described the qualifications and experience required to work as a professional archaeologist in each partner's country. This information contributed to the summary report about education and training in archaeology in each country, prepared by the project education consultant.

Some partners carried out the project using the staff of the partner organisation; others subcontracted individuals to work within or for the organisation, and others subcontracted the work to external organisations.

The Project Manager, Kenneth Aitchison (KA) and the external Project Evaluator, Rachel Edwards (RE) both had multiple roles in the project as a whole. KA was managing the overall project and also the UK national project, as well as carrying out some of the research for the UK project. In addition to her role as Project Evaluator, RE also worked as researcher for the UK project, and took notes of the project meetings.

#### ***Achievements – Communication***

Communication between partners and with the Project Manager other than at meetings was primarily by email. There were occasional monitoring phone calls from the Project Manager to partners.

#### ***Achievements – Administration***

Project administration initiated by the Project Manager included written and verbal progress reports by all partners at each meeting. Periodic financial reports were also required.

Project administration required by Ecotec consisted of 6-month, 12-month and 24-month formal reports, and meetings with the Project Manager. The formal reports included financial reports from all partners following a standard format.

Evaluation reports from partners were requested by the external evaluator on three occasions during the course of the project.

#### ***Achievements – Timetable***

The overall project timetable was established as part of the project design process (see Appendix 1). Due to the withdrawal of MT as a partner, the overall project started nearly four months late. There was a delay for negotiations with other potential MT partners, but ultimately none could be found. Projects within partners' countries in some cases were further delayed, as formal agreement from other funding partners needed to be sought. As a consequence the 'Work Packages' were neither carried out according to the timetable, nor were all partners working on the same stages of the project at the same time as had been planned.

Despite these difficulties, all partners completed their projects on time. The transnational report was completed later than anticipated, in January 2009.

## **Products**

### ***Achievements – National reports and summaries***

Each of the partners prepared a report on the project as carried out in their country, presented in national languages and in English.

In each case a reliable estimated total number of archaeologists working in each country was made, and actual data were presented on age and gender, disability status, country of origin, full- and part-time employment, data on past numbers employed and estimates of future employment, highest qualifications and where these were obtained, information on training needs and skills shortages, and salaries or wages paid for archaeological work. Other topics were introduced where relevant for each partner.

In ten of the twelve countries the data presented in the reports had never been collected before.

The means of dissemination of the national reports within the partners' countries has varied, but all have been made available in national languages and in English on the project website.

Each partner also produced a summary of the archaeological profession in their country, and a description of the education, training and experience required to practice as an archaeologist. In some cases these were incorporated in the national reports, and in other cases these summaries were simply published on the project website.

### ***Achievements – Consultant report***

The consultant's report on the qualifications required for archaeologists to practice in the partners' countries was prepared towards the end of the project. This summarises the qualifications required to practice and university education and training in each country, and examines issues relating to transnational mobility which arise from the areas discussed.

### ***Achievements – Transnational report***

The transnational report was completed in January 2009. This summarises and tabulates the results of the project in all twelve countries for the comparable core data collected for each country. The report includes brief statements outlining the structure and basis of the profession in each country, and examines issues relating to transnational mobility.

### ***Achievements – Website***

The project website has performed two functions during the life of the project. Project management documentation for internal project use has been made accessible from

the website, and the products of the project have been posted to allow wider dissemination of the results of the work. In due course the former use will cease and project management documents will be archived, leaving only the products of the project for use in perpetuity.

### **Achievements – Evaluation**

Written evaluation reports were requested by the external evaluator from partners three times during the course of the project. These contributed to the external evaluation reports, of which this is the second. Initially two interim reports were proposed, to be followed by a final report, but this was reduced to two reports in response to timetabling issues discussed above.

### **Valorisation**

#### **Achievements**

In the original project design valorisation formed a separate work package which was timetabled to last for the entire duration of the project. However, in practice the nature of this project is such that valorisation gradually increased towards the end of the project as results became available, and is continuing beyond the formal end of the project on 30 September following the publication of national reports in each country. As the national reports become more widely disseminated, and once the transnational report becomes available, valorisation of the results of the project will continue.

An important part of transnational dissemination and valorisation during the project was presentations at conferences. Papers were given at the *European Association of Archaeologists'* (EAA) annual conferences in 2007 and 2008, and at the *World Archaeological Congress* (WAC) in 2008. Thirteen matching posters were prepared for WAC and also presented at the 2008 EAA conference. These had a considerable impact, attracting international interest in the project from countries including Japan and Australia.

## **3. Summary of partners' evaluation responses**

Partners' responses to the final request for evaluation information are summarised in the following sections. The full list of questions asked in September 2008 is reproduced in Appendix 2 below.

### **How had the project contributed to the archaeological profession?**

Partners' responses were generally positive in relation to the contribution of the project to the archaeological profession in their country so far. For some, the project provided an impetus to individuals to think of themselves as a group and to begin to consider themselves as a 'profession'. In several countries the results had demonstrated the need for more posts, and in some, plans to appoint new personnel were already under way. The results were also considered useful to students and those planning to work in the profession. In many cases it was noted that further

consideration of the results would be needed, as this was the first time such a project had taken place. Both countries where the survey was being repeated noted that the results were particularly interesting as, for different reasons, they marked a moment in time when employment was considered to be at a peak.

**Had the project met partners' objectives?**

Generally speaking the project had at least achieved what partners had expected, and in a number of cases it had exceeded expectations. For a few, problems with data collection, particularly slow or inadequate responses to requests for information led to disappointment, and in one case to a level of scepticism about the reliability of the results.

**Did partners have specific aims for the project or did these develop as work progressed?**

In most cases the aims were those of the project as a whole. In a few cases the response rate or the quality of data collected allowed additional aims to be developed and addressed as the work progressed. One respondent noted that an understanding of the significant differences in who is an archaeologist in each of the different countries had not been an initial transnational aim for the project, but the importance of this developed as the work progressed.

**Would partners do the project again in the future, eg in five years' time, and if so what would they do differently?**

All responded that they would be interested in repeating the project in five years' time. One was unsure whether there would have been sufficient change over that timescale to warrant a repetition that soon, however. Most had suggestions for future improvements. These included additional aims of the project for an individual partner's country as well as the overall aims; adaptations to the methods of data collection, for example adopting a more personal approach, or directing questionnaires to individuals rather than organisations in some countries; more time spent on the mailing list; and a number of specific alterations to the questionnaire.

**Did partners have any general comments on the overall transnational project?**

A range of positive comments were received. The overall transnational project was generally regarded as a success. Suggestions for improvement included communication between the partners, and better coordinated timetables so partners are doing the same stages of the work at the same time.

**Were there any aspects of the overall project which partners would identify as particular successes?**

Specific mention was made of the well-chosen range of partners; the partner meetings; the degree of collaboration and cooperation between partners; the enormous amount of detailed and high quality information gathered; the clarification of the significant differences between countries; and additional partners joining the project as honorary associates.

### **What aspects might be improved if the project were to be repeated, eg in five years' time?**

A range of suggestions was made. At a strategic level it was suggested that the European dimension and common interest could be emphasised more, and that wider participation should be sought. Two partners would like to see more standardisation of data entry and analysis, and the creation of a common structure for all to work with. Two commented on the project timetable and work programme, suggesting more time at the start of the project for discussion on the aims and the detail of the questionnaire, and also more time at the end for generating the transnational report, discussing it more widely and translating it into partner languages. The difficulty of understanding the financial aspects of the project was mentioned, and it was suggested that a paper outlining these could be circulated at the start of the project. A number of other specific suggestions was made.

In relation to the preparation of a future application for funding from any source, it was emphasised that this should follow discussion of how the work might be approached differently, rather than assuming that the same methods would be used.

## **4. Summary of Project Manager's evaluation response**

This summary is based on a meeting with the Project Manager Kenneth Aitchison (KA) on 18 November 2008 and on written evaluation information provided following the general request to all partners in September 2008.

KA considered that overall the project had worked very well, and noted that it was the largest partnership project ever managed by IfA. He was delighted by what the project has achieved, and considered it to be the most successful transnational collaborative project he individually and IfA corporately have ever participated in.

He made particular mention of the strength of the partnership, the diversity of partner organisations, and the participative nature of individual partner representatives. He noted that partners generally had a good idea of what was expected of them, and that there had been good engagement from individuals which strengthened the partnership through contact between partners. Overall there had been very strong commitment from the project researchers in each partner's country.

Despite these strengths of the project, KA did experience communication and / or administrative difficulties with some individuals. Some partners had difficulties understanding the financial side of the project. Some of the partner organisations had difficulties implementing financial administration of the project, in some cases these may have been due to communication difficulties, in other cases they were probably a result of particular employment practices which were not a good match to a project-based financial system.

KA considered that valorisation and dissemination had gone well, noting that all partners had engaged in this part of the project. The EAA conferences and WAC had provided opportunities for useful pan-European and international valorisation. He anticipated that valorisation of the project would continue after the formal end of the project.

On a transnational scale he considered that the project had achieved more than was originally anticipated, with more countries participating, and gathering higher-quality data than anticipated.

In relation to any future repetitions of the project, KA made the following suggestions for what he would do differently:

- Allow more preparation time pre-application and during preparation of application
- Allow more preparation time during the project
- Work on keeping all partners' timetables more synchronised
- Avoid the burden of multiple roles, which in this project included transnational Project Manager, UK national Project manager, UK project research, transnational research/report writing, and financial management of the transnational and UK projects.

## **5. Evaluator's comments on process, products and valorisation**

Success is easier to measure and assess in relation to products of a project than in relation to process. However, especially in a project such as this, both tangible products and intangible elements contribute to overall success.

### **Process**

#### ***Comments – Partnership and meetings***

The partnership and partner meetings have been a very successful aspect of the project. It is a testament to the success of the project and of the group as a whole that two voluntary associate partners' countries subsequently opted to join the project.

The variety of organisation types has been commented upon positively by those involved in the project, and by the majority of those external to the project, with one exception. A comment was made at an EAA board meeting that the project should have been undertaken by state services in all participating countries. From a practical point of view this would not have been possible in all cases, as several partners' countries do not have an appropriate single state service to undertake the work, for example where archaeology is organised along federal or regional bases – one of the significant outcomes of the project has been to note the significant differences between countries in the organisation of the archaeological profession. Furthermore it was vital that those chosen as project partners were those who were able to deliver the results in that country. To date, all partners have delivered the required results. In terms of future valorisation, time will tell. It is to be hoped that the integrity of

participating organisations is trusted within the partners' countries and that the results come to be used by all professional and aspiring archaeologists.

The success of the partner meetings was clear to all participants, and is further emphasised by the request of all partners to hold an additional meeting in Leuven which had not been proposed in the original programme.

It worked very well for meetings to be hosted by partner organisations, with the whole group staying at the same hotel and eating meals together. This allowed unscheduled time for contact and informal discussion which undoubtedly contributed to the success of the partnership as a whole. The final meeting in MT was not hosted by a partner's country, and as a consequence partner representatives had less opportunity for informal contact time as their accommodation was widely dispersed.

There is clearly some practical benefit in scheduling meetings in association with conferences (EAA in Zadar (Croatia), WAC in Dublin (IE), EAA in MT). However, as a number of the partner representatives were conference organisers or board members, these responsibilities made attendance for the whole of the relevant project meetings difficult.

#### ***Comments – Language and understanding***

All partner representatives for whom English was not their first language proved to have impressive linguistic abilities in both written and spoken English, and showed admirable focus and concentration during meetings. It was very rare for language to be a difficulty.

Developing understanding was an un-stated but crucial part of the project. Many partners assumed that they knew what 'archaeologist' means across Europe, and were somewhat surprised to find that their understanding did not reflect reality. Many partners had not considered how archaeology was structured in other countries, and initially assumed that it was the same everywhere. Assuming that this reflects a general understanding within the profession across the EU, the transnational report has great potential to increase the potential for transnational mobility via increased transnational understanding.

It was essential to the future success of the project that the differences in meaning of the term 'Archaeologist' and the different ways in which the profession is organised were discussed and understood from the first partner meeting and throughout the project.

#### ***Comments – Project implementation***

The means by which partner organisations achieved the work varied, but it is not surprising that subcontracted individuals or organisations were used in several cases. The nature of the project as a stand-alone occasional piece of work, carried out at intervals of perhaps five years, means that it may be difficult to find core staff

time for it. The level of commitment of partner organisations was not related to their use of core staff or subcontractors.

The multiple roles held by KA appear to have made it difficult for him to devote sufficient time to certain aspects of the project. It would seem that he was overcommitted, and that this may have contributed to the delay in starting the project when the proposed MT partner dropped out, and to the delay in issuing the transnational report. This may also have contributed to communication issues and to some partners' difficulties with understanding the financial side of the project.

At times it was difficult to combine the three roles which I held in the project as Project Evaluator, as UK project Researcher, and taking minutes of partner meetings. With some effort I believe it was possible for me to separate these roles, but it may have led to confusion amongst some of the project partner representatives.

The contribution of the project's education consultant to the project as a whole could perhaps have been managed more smoothly. Work towards the very useful final report summarising archaeological education and training in the partners' countries began relatively late in the project process. The data required for this report overlapped to an extent with data collected for other project products (the summary of experience and qualifications required to become an archaeologist in each country). It would seem that communication difficulties may have led to an initial misunderstanding of what was expected and the nature of the contribution required.

#### ***Comments – Communication***

Communication via email was essential to the smooth and timely running of the project, and in most cases was successful. On a few occasions, however, partner representatives resorted to contacting the project evaluator when unable to raise a response from the Project Manager.

#### ***Comments – Administration***

In general administration worked well, and all administrative reports required were completed, generally on time. A number of partners found the financial arrangements and requirements difficult to understand, and for some these difficulties persisted throughout the project. It is not clear to the external evaluator to what extent this was a communication issue within the project, and to what extent persistent misunderstanding might have been due to national or organisational cultures.

#### ***Comments – Timetable***

Although the project was mostly completed on time, the delay to the start of the project had a serious effect on the time available to partners to finalise arrangements for initiating national projects, and this in turn meant that the different stages of national projects were being carried out at different times. For example, data analysis was being carried out by one partner before another had completed data collection. As the project was new to most partners and to most researchers it would have been

helpful if the timetable had been more synchronised, as planned, and in particular if the UK project had been able to lead the way.

## **Products**

### ***Comments – National reports and summaries***

In all but UK and IE the project was completely new, so the national reports present data previously not collected. The broader impact of this beyond the project cannot be assessed for some time, therefore, but partners reported widespread interest in the results in their evaluation comments. All the reports have a common cover design, but the structure of the contents varies, although in every case the core project data have been presented.

### ***Comments – Consultant report***

The consultant report *An overview of the definition of archaeologists and requirements to practice* is a very useful document summarising the differences in definition, university education and professional practice for archaeologists in the partners' countries. As mentioned above, one of the important outcomes of the project has been an understanding of the significant differences between the countries. This report summarises how some of these differences in education and practice can affect transnational mobility.

### ***Comments – Transnational report***

The transnational report produced in January 2009 provides a useful and succinct summary of the results of the project in each country, and focuses on the issues relating to transnational mobility which have been revealed by the project as a whole. The appendix provides an indispensable summary of the different ways in which the profession is structured and archaeological investigation is undertaken in each country. It is to be hoped that this report will be widely read by archaeologists across the EU as a whole. In relation to future data-gathering exercises the results will be of great interest, as in most countries they reflect archaeological employment before the global financial crisis began to take hold. (Archaeological employment in the UK has already reduced from that reported to the survey, as a result of the recession.)

### ***Comments – Website***

All found the project website very useful during the lifetime of the project as a communication tool and for posting project management documents. Although the facility for using the website for discussion of data analysis issues was made available, no project researchers took advantage of this option. Improvements were made to the website as the project progressed, which made it easier to use.

The website has yet to be finalised for future dissemination (27 January 2009), so no further comments can be made.

### ***Comments – Evaluation***

The evaluation process aimed to be constructive and helpful to participants in the project, and as such it seemed better to adapt to the timetable in practice rather than

to adhere rigidly to the timetable and produce interim reports when significant progress was still to be made.

## **Valorisation**

### **Comments**

In the majority of partners' countries which had not previously undertaken projects of this type before, the results are likely to have a significant impact, as the project has produced data which was not available before. It will take time, however, for this to take place, and valorisation of the project in each country and across and beyond the EU will therefore continue for some years to come. The effects of the project are difficult to predict with any precision, but will undoubtedly be wide-ranging and significant. As we have discovered in the UK with the previous two versions of this project, it is only when data such as this becomes available that people realise how useful it could be for a wide variety of previously-unexpected purposes.

The dissemination of initial results with the poster sessions at WAC and EAA 2008 had a considerable impact, and the international interest generated is evidence of valorisation of the project as a whole. It is hoped to hold a whole session focussing on the project at the EAA conference in 2009.

## **6. Conclusions and implications for future work**

All those involved considered that the project had been a success, and would be pleased to contribute to any future repetition of the project, eg in five years' time.

All agreed that the partnership between organisations and individuals had been particularly fruitful, and all hoped that this could be maintained beyond the lifetime of the project.

Initial comments from partners about the effect of the project on the profession in their countries were very positive, indicating a significant impact in some cases.

The project collected a significant body of data which has huge potential for analysis and research in the future, both for each individual country and comparing the twelve EU countries represented.

Suggestions for improvements to any future project included allowing more time in the project design, initial stages and final stage of the project; ensuring that partners are working to the same overall timetable; improving communication; better explanation of financial matters; and allowing more time/personnel for project and financial management.

## **Appendix 1 Summary of work programme**

### ***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

Expected outcomes/results:

- Project meeting in Reading
- Methodologies for data collection agreed
- Awareness raising exercise undertaken in all partner countries

Start Date: 1st October 2006. Finish Date: 30th November 2006

Overall Duration: 2 months

### ***Work Package II – Data Collection***

Aims: II/1 collect information relating to necessity and transparency of qualifications  
II/2 collect labour market information

Expected outcomes/results:

- Draft reports on qualifications produced in all partner countries.
- Consistent datasets collected in all partner countries.
- Project meeting in Athens
- Interim evaluation report.

Start Date: 1st December 2006. Finish Date: 31st August 2007

Overall Duration: 9 months

### ***Work Package III – Review***

Aims: III/1 review data collection process  
III/2 present interim results to European Association of Archaeologists

Expected outcomes/results:

- Project meeting in Ljubljana
- Agreed methodologies for data analysis.
- Agreed responsibilities for the production of final products.

Start Date: 1st September 2007. Finish Date: 30th September 2007

Overall Duration: 1 month

### ***Work Package IV – Data Analysis***

Aims: IV/1 quantified analysis of data  
IV/2 preparation of final reports for each partner country  
IV/3 preparation of overall, transnational report  
IV/4 preparation of recommendations for future work  
IV/5 preparation of project proposal for future work, involving a widened network

Expected outcomes/results:

- Consistent datasets from each partner country.
- Draft final products.
- Project meeting in Dublin

- Second interim evaluation reports.

Start Date: 1st October 2007. Finish Date: 31st August 2008

Overall Duration: 11 months

### **Work Package V – Results Presentation**

Aims: V/1 preparation of final reports for each partner country

V/2 preparation of overall, transnational report

V/3 preparation of recommendations for future work

V/4 preparation of project proposal for future work, involving a widened network

Expected outcomes/results:

- Project meeting in Malta
- Final national reports produced.
- Final transnational project report produced.
- Recommendations for future work produced.
- Proposal for follow-on project with wider partnership produced and submitted to relevant funding bodies (if funding body timetables permit).

Start Date: 1st September 2008. Finish Date: 30th September 2008

Overall Duration: 1 month

### **Work Package VI – Valorisation**

Aims, Objectives and Outcomes:

Typical valorisation trajectories involve 2 phases of activities

1. transferring: the use of project results by discussing results with potential users and by organising debates with key players

2. disseminating: ensuring promotion of developed products, tools, and methods. The latter will involve the designing of a clear dissemination strategy which:

- i. identifies the particular target groups;
- ii. adapts dissemination support and messages to these groups;
- iii. envisages a specific timetable of dissemination activities;

Start Date: 1st October 2006. Finish Date: 30th September 2008

Overall Duration: 24 months

### **Work Package VII – Quality Management Plan**

- An initial risk assessment exercise, undertaken by the project manager in consultation with key team members, will identify all potential risks to the project. This will be recorded in a project risk log, identifying the likelihood of any potential risk and its potential impact on the project. Action to be taken and a containment plan will be prepared. This will be a dynamic document, updated whenever action is taken to contain risks or when new risks are identified.
- The project will then be managed under a programme of staged change control. This will ensure that at the end of each working package of the project, a decision can be made as to whether the project is still meeting the overall requirements (in terms of products, budget and timetable). Brief progress reports will be prepared

at each review point, which will include details of schedule variance (identifying how project progress is relating to the planned progress at any given point).

- This system will allow progress to be monitored against the project design, controlling any deviations from the project plan. Change from the project plan will only be allowed formally, via a formal request to the Leonardo national agency.
- An external evaluator (Rachel Edwards, archaeological consultant of Arboretum Archaeology) will work (as a subcontractor) on ensuring and advising on continuous quality review for the project. This person is a recognised expert in archaeological skills and labour market intelligence. She will attend project partner meetings and liaise with the project manager and consultant throughout the lifetime of the project.
- Internal evaluation will be undertaken by all project participants, feeding through their team leaders.
- The European Association of Archaeologists' Education and Training Committee will be informed and updated of the project's progress. This committee has offered advice in the development of the project bid, and will continue to do so throughout the period of the project.
- The resources for the enactment of the quality management plan have been distributed throughout the allocated budgets for the six working packages of the project.

## Appendix 2

### Evaluation questions asked of partner in May and September 2007

- 1 Evaluation of progress within each partner country:
  - 1.1 Has the project got as far as you expected it to by this time; what worked as expected; what did not work as well; what worked better than expected?
  - 1.2 What problems were encountered, if any; why did they occur; what impact will problems have; will this affect what you hope to achieve by the next meeting in September; is there anything you can do to make sure problems do not recur?
  - 1.3 Have you progressed further than you expected to by this time, with the project as a whole, or with part of the project; what impact will this have?
- 2 Evaluation of the overall transnational project; any comments on management and communication and how these have worked since the last meeting; any suggestions for how these might be improved.
- 3 Any comments on the evaluation process so far.
- 4 Any other relevant information.

### Evaluation questions asked of partners in September 2008

- 1 ***Evaluation of the project within each partner country***
  - 1.1 How has the project contributed to the archaeological profession in your country so far; do you see it as making a contribution in the future?  
Has the project done what you wanted it to; has the project done more than you anticipated?  
Did you have specific aims for the project in your country from the start; did you develop specific aims as the project progressed; can you now identify specific aims which were not apparent at the start of the project?
  - 1.2 Would you do the project again (eg if it is repeated in five years' time); if so, what would you do differently?
- 2 ***Evaluation of the overall transnational project***
  - 2.1 Do you have any general comments on the overall transnational project?
  - 2.2 Are there any aspects of the overall project which you would identify as particular successes?
  - 2.3 Are there any aspects which might be improved, if the project were to be repeated in the future (eg in five years' time)?
- 3 ***Any other comments.***