

A review of the Portable Antiquities Scheme



Kate Clark

for:

The Museums, Libraries and Archives Council

September 2008



Whitehaven Young Archaeologists Club discover metal detecting



PAS Recording day with the Isle of Wight Metal detecting Club

Cover image: Cambridgeshire Roman horse and rider.

LIST OF CONTENTS

Introduction	5
Recommendations	6
Abbreviations used in the text	8
Chapter One: The Portable Antiquities Scheme	9
Chapter Two: Metal detecting	14
Chapter Three: Impact	18
Chapter Four: Issues	26
Chapter Five: Options for funding and delivery	30
Bibliography	36
Appendix One: PAS Partnerships	37
Organisations who host or manage FLOs	
Breakdown of organisations by type	
Secondary partners	



Finds Adviser Sam Moorhead at work

Abbreviations used in the text

AHRC	Arts and Humanities Research Council
BM	British Museum
Cadw	Name of the historic environment service of the Welsh Assembly Government
CBA	Council for British Archaeology
CSR	Comprehensive Spending Review
DCMS	Department for Culture, Media and Sport
DNH	Department of National Heritage (former name of DCMS)
EH	English Heritage
FA	Finds Adviser
FID	United Kingdom Federation of Independent Detectorists
FLO	Finds Liaison Officer
HER	Historic Environment Record
HLF	Heritage Lottery Fund
MGC	Museums and Galleries Commission (former name for MLA)
MLA	Museums, Libraries and Archives Council
NCMD	National Council for Metal Detecting
NGR	National Grid Reference
PAAG	Portable Antiquities Advisory Group
PAS	Portable Antiquities Scheme
RMTF	Regional Museums Task Force
Resource	Also a former name for MLA
PPG 16	Planning Policy Guidance Note 16: Archaeology and Planning

Introduction

The Portable Antiquities Scheme (PAS) was set up in 1997 to encourage members of the public to report archaeological finds. The scheme comprises of a network of 36 Finds Liaison Officers (FLOs), supported by a central unit at the British Museum and five Finds Advisers (three full-time and two part-time). The FLOs are based locally usually in museums or historic environment records offices and cover England and Wales.

PAS is funded by the Museums Libraries and Archives Council (MLA) who in 2008-9 provided a core grant of £1.3m, and housed by the British Museum which provides support and some additional funding. Around 30 local partners provide a 5% contribution to the costs of PAS staff based in their organisations.

This review has been commissioned by MLA in conjunction with the British Museum and the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS). The purpose is to review:

- the objectives of the scheme in the light of changes in regional museum provision, most particularly the 'Renaissance in the Regions' programme;
- options for levels of activity and funding;
- how the scheme can be delivered in the future in the most cost-efficient manner; and
- how the scheme can be funded and managed in the future in a sustainable way.

The context for the review is the question of future funding. MLA has received a c.25% cut in core funding as part of the 2008-2011 Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR). In 2008/9 the scheme received £1.3million from MLA. In the context of its overall priorities MLA is not able to maintain current funding levels from its core grant.

This report has taken evidence from stakeholders including finders and metal detecting organisations, PAS staff, MLA, the British Museum, DCMS, managers of PAS staff and the Portable Antiquities Advisory Group (PAAG) as well as archaeologists and regional museums. The short timescale means that it has not been possible to undertake a full survey of all organisations.

Note that this is an independent review; the findings are my own and do not necessarily represent the views of MLA, the British Museum or DCMS.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank everyone who kindly took the time to speak to me as well as the many people who wrote in about their experiences of the scheme or their views on its future. I would particularly like to thank Kurt Adams, Roger Bland and his staff, Gail Boyle, Harry Bain, Steve Critchley, Paul Gilman, Suzie Thomas and Pete Twinn. Because of the short timescale, much of this review was done on the basis of information in websites, magazines and other publications, and I am sorry that it was not possible to speak to a wider range of people or to visit more groups.

A steering group from the BM, MLA and DCMS supported the review.

Recommendations

PAS has overcome the scepticism of archaeologists and the mistrust of finders to create a partnership in the understanding of the past. Data from thousands of members of the public has helped create a new cultural map of England and Wales, with insights into rural life in Roman Britain, Anglo-Saxon trade, the Vikings and the links between Britain and the Byzantine world. PAS has filled a gap in museum services, re-established skills in identifying objects and created a virtual collection used by a quarter of a million individuals each year. It also seems to have reduced the amount of illicit detecting on archaeological sites.

Margaret Hodge has outlined plans to strengthen DCMS engagement in regional policy. By bringing together 28 regional organisations, 3 universities, 3 national museums and 70 secondary partners PAS is delivering regional capacity. Over ten years an investment of £6m has leveraged another £4m to deliver a scheme with a demonstrable impact on museums, individuals, communities and archaeology.

Recommendation 1: PAS aims should better reflect its role in museums

There is generally a better fit between PAS and museums than with planning-based archaeology services although there are huge benefits in the two working together. PAS aims do need to reflect what PAS has achieved for museums as well as for archaeology.

Recommendation 2: PAS already delivers Renaissance objectives

Renaissance funding is ring-fenced and separate from MLA's core funding. Although not originally part of Renaissance, PAS is already delivering against Renaissance objectives for inclusion, outreach and ICT, and is also strong in other core areas of its work. Funding PAS under Renaissance would not diminish the achievements of that programme but PAS objectives would need to reflect a stronger museum focus.

Recommendation 3: PAS aims should reflect its nature as a partnership

PAS began as a scheme lead by archaeologists to record items but has now become a partnership between museums, the community (including finders and volunteers) and archaeologists. The four aims of the scheme should better reflect this partnership and PAS should do more to balance the views and interests of finders in its work.

Recommendation 4: PAS needs to develop more recording capacity amongst the community

FLOs are struggling to meet the demand for recording without reducing the quality of records. Many finders have a lot of knowledge but lack formal training. FLOs and Finds Advisers should focus outreach on involving finders and other volunteers in the work of the scheme, including recording, education and promotion. The scheme should consider a training programme to help volunteers become 'certified' recorders.

Recommendation 5: the PAS needs measures of success based on outcomes

PAS should develop more sophisticated measures around the broad outcomes it is trying to achieve. This will require working with the community to discuss and explain the changes.

Recommendation 6: separate the policy and management roles of the advisory group

The policy function of the advisory group should be separated from its management role; historic environment agencies should convene a separate group to deal with metal detecting policy. PAAG membership should reflect PAS management needs, with more regional and museum representation, and a greater voice for finders. PAS regional groups should be set up to bring together local clubs, museums, universities and local societies to generate local initiatives.

Recommendation 7: do more to build skills in community engagement

Skills in community engagement are just as relevant for FLOs as finds expertise. This needs to be taken into account when recruiting and consideration should be given to more formal training and guidance in this field for FLOs.

Recommendation 8: PAS needs a sustainability strategy for its data

PAS needs to ensure the long-term security of the data and deal with the potential risk of loss of IT skills, and may need to engage in discussions with an organisation such as English Heritage and the Archaeological Data Service to do this.

Options for delivery and funding

This review has not identified an alternative option for delivery:

- FLOs are very effective in delivering local and regional services; basing them anywhere other than regional partners would not be effective.
- Finds advisers were brought in to deal with problems in the quality of records. They remain necessary and removing them would put data at risk.
- The central unit is based at the BM where there are economies of scale with the Treasure service; neither English Heritage, Cadw or MLA are viable alternatives.
- The database is managed from the BM; it could be housed with the National Monuments Record or Archaeology Data Service although there are no obvious advantages to either and the synergy with management functions would be lost. An arrangement would need to be made with Cadw.

Despite savings in posts, in travel and equipment budgets, IT and in operational costs, PAS is under-resourced; national coverage is at risk and outreach has been curtailed. The loss of an education post has been regrettable but not disastrous. Delivery options include:

Option 1: Close the scheme

The scheme attracts fierce loyalty from finders and partner organisations; even sceptical archaeologists and finders have been won over. Without PAS, the trust between finders and museum/archaeology services will be broken, knowledge lost, and illicit detecting (and thus loss of sites) may increase.

Option 2: Remove part of the scheme

The PAS stands on a tripartite structure of local FLOs, Finds Advisers who cover the whole country and central support. Dismantling that structure would risk the academic credibility of the scheme, its strong regional basis or its clarity of purpose.

Option 3: Support the scheme at the current level

If the current level of funding is maintained, even with an allowance for inflation, the lack of operating budgets mean that FLOs will struggle. PAS will need to cut posts in

order to provide operating budgets. The diminishing IT budget puts the existing investment at risk.

Option 4: Find additional resources

An estimated increase in resources of £165,000 is needed to restore travel and equipment budgets, invest in IT and maintain regional equity.

Option 4 is favoured by everyone from finders to partners. No consultee has suggested that the scheme is not needed, or that the aims could be delivered in an alternative way.

Funding options include:

- **Renaissance in the Regions** There is no conflict in using Renaissance to fund PAS providing that work is focussed on regional and museum-based delivery of the scheme.
- **English Heritage** Historic Environment Records (HERSs) are one of the beneficiaries of the database; (EH) has always supported HERs but has not previously supported this element of PAS. EH has considerable expertise in this area and should be approached to help upgrade the IT system and deal with data sustainability. Cadw has similar responsibilities in Wales and discussions should take place with them.
- **Partners** Local partners contribute 5% of the cost of employing a FLO (c.£900 to c.£4000 a year) and provide support in kind. Although local budgets are tight, increasing that contribution to 10% would enable budgets for travel, equipment and illustration to be reinstated.
- **One-off grants** PAS has recently had support from AHRC and HLF (for a community archaeology post) and has approached other trusts. It is important to keep applying for such funding to build on the work of PAS, but one-off grants do not provide long-term stability.
- **British Museum** The BM hosts PAS and in 2007/8 contributed £96,729 with additional housing costs of £8,527. PAS is helping the museum to deliver its responsibilities under the Treasure system and is a good fit with the museum's commitment to regional working.
- **Welsh Assembly Government** Coverage in Wales is delivered by one full time post and a small subsidy to the Welsh archaeological trusts which seems inadequate. The Welsh Assembly Government should be approached for additional help.

Level of funding

PAS funding has been frozen for four years. An increase of 12% (£165,000) would reinstate full national coverage, re-establish operating budgets and provide resources to train finders in recording. That increase could be achieved by increasing partnership contributions to 10%, funding from EH for data functions, and a modest increase from Renaissance and MLA.

Chapter One: The Portable Antiquities Scheme

Background to the Scheme

PAS is a solution to a very old problem – and that is what happens to the large number of potentially interesting small objects that are found every day by members of the public. These finds matter because they may be of cultural, artistic or historical interest in their own right, or may cast light on the date, location or function of sites. They also may have a financial value.

Treasure Trove

PAS runs in parallel with the legal system for reporting Treasure. Although the two systems are separate, the history of Treasure Trove is closely linked to the history of PAS. The principle that ownerless items belonged to the Crown was established earlier but the first written account appears in a lawbook of c.1250 AD; withholding reports of treasure was an offence punishable by imprisonment or loss of limbs. Most items were melted down for bullion to augment Royal revenues but from early 19th century onwards, people began to recognise that these finds had antiquarian value and were of interest to museums.

In 1858 Lord Malahide introduced a Bill into the Lords to give the full antiquarian value to honest finders who reported their finds, but it took more than 70 years for that to be fully achieved. In 1886 a Treasury circular set out the formal principle of the system for reporting items of gold or silver that had been hidden and for which the owner could not be found. Despite later improvements, the system was cumbersome and did not cover the other metal items that were found every day. Various attempts were made to reform the system during the early twentieth century and the need for reform was one of the founding principles of the Council for British Archaeology.

Rival campaigns

Things came to a head with the introduction of cheap metal detectors in the 1970s making it easier for individuals to participate in the hobby and the number of finds increased greatly. Relationships between archaeologists and finders worsened after several cases where archaeological sites were damaged by illicit detecting. Perhaps the best-known example was Wanborough, where thieves using metal detectors damaged a Romano-British temple site in order to steal a hoard of Iron Age coins. There were two options – to ban metal detecting all together, as happened in other countries – or the two sides could work together. In the end there was no wholesale ban, although a license is needed to detect on a scheduled site.

In 1995, a report on the illicit use of metal detectors found that 188 scheduled ancient monuments (SAMs) had been attacked in the past five years and that 37 out of 50 archaeological units reported raids on excavation sites. Several places acted as honeypots including a Roman site near Corbridge which had been raided 23 times in 4 years (Dobinson & Denison 1994). In the same year, Lord Perth introduced a new Treasure Bill (earlier bills had been blocked) designed to clarify and extend the definition of Treasure Trove, but although the new Act solved some of the problems with the definition and reporting of Treasure, it did not deal with the larger problems of unreported finds and the damage to archaeological sites.

Mistrust was inflamed by two rival campaigns. Concerned about damage to sites, organisations including the CBA signed up to the Stop Taking Our Past (STOP) campaign launched in 1980 which sought to ban metal detecting (Thomas 2006:253). At the same time they were pressurising the Home Office to prohibit metal detecting.

In response, detectorists and manufacturers organised their own campaign called DIG in support of detecting, claiming that there were at least half a million tax-paying detectorists. The campaign held regular rallies and marched on Downing Street to present a petition to the Prime Minister in favour of metal detecting. There was political support for the cause, and Harold Wilson became patron of the National Council for Metal Detecting (NCMD). Although much has been achieved by PAS, traces of the mutual suspicion engendered by these rival campaigns continues today; older detectorists who remember those days tend to be more suspicious than younger colleagues who have worked more closely with museums and archaeologists during their detecting career, and several archaeologists remain deeply sceptical.

Despite this hostility, there were pioneering attempts on both sides to work together. Detectorists such as Dave Haldenby, Chris Marshall, Irene McGrath and Jim Halliday and archaeologists such as Tony Gregory and Kevin Leahy began recording metal detector finds which, in heavily ploughed areas, allowed some information to be salvaged from sites that were being destroyed by cultivation. As Tony Gregory said, 'we have got to do something; our archaeology is now in the plough-soil' (pers. com. to Kevin Leahy)¹.

The PAS pilot schemes

In 1996 the Department for National Heritage (now DCMS) published *Portable Antiquities: a Discussion Document* which proposed a scheme to report finds that fell outside the scope of the Treasure Act (Bland 2005:267). A two-year pilot scheme was put in place from September 1997, co-ordinated by DCMS with funding channelled through MLA (then known as the Museums and Galleries Commission). Six posts were created (five funded by DCMS and one by the BM) in Kent County Council, Norfolk Museums and Archaeology Service, North Lincolnshire Museums, Liverpool Museum, Birmingham City Museum and Art Gallery and Yorkshire Museum. These posts established the idea of the Finds Liaison Officer (FLO) whose job was to work with local finders. Detectorists saw the scheme as,

'... a very refreshing and important change. The Scheme presented a common and easily recognisable interface between archaeology and metal detecting, free from the local archaeological politics and the animosity which had bedevilled contacts in the past....many who previously had bad experience with local museums found that they were being made more welcome by the Finds Liaison Officers and responded accordingly.' Bob Whalley, *The Searcher* April 2008.

The HLF-funded scheme

In 1998 HLF was asked to support the scheme; five regional museums and local authorities submitted bids for FLOs and MLA bid for an outreach officer. The bids were successful and by March 1999 there were 11 FLOs and an outreach officer coordinated by DCMS (Bland 2005:273).

¹ Some detectorists referred to Norfolk as 'Camelot' as relationships there were so much better than in other parts of the country (letter to *The Searcher*)

HLF was asked to fund an expanded national scheme covering England and Wales in 2000 but the bid was deferred pending an evaluation of the pilot schemes by Gill Chitty (Chitty 2001). She found that the scheme had achieved a huge amount in terms of liaison with finders but that there were problems with the quality of the data so the scheme was revised to include Finds Advisers and ICT capacity. In April 2002 HLF agreed to support the national scheme, which established the structure that remains today. DCMS provided a partnership contribution as part of their grant-in-aid to MLA, ring-fenced in SR02 (the 2002 Spending Review).

After HLF

After HLF funding ended, management of PAS was transferred to the British Museum, and in July 2006, three members of staff became British Museum employees. DCMS provided MLA with £800,000 additional grant in 2006/7 and £840,000 additional grant in 2007/8. The sums were not formally ring-fenced as there was no longer a need for match funding against the HLF grant, although the inference was that the increase was to sustain the Portable Antiquities Scheme. James Purnell noted that 'any decisions on its funding was a matter for MLA' (Parliamentary Question 14th January 2008).

Under the final year of lottery funding, total PAS funding had been £1.43m but in 2006/7 the budget was £1.308m. These reductions were eased by the fact that HLF allowed some unspent money to be carried over. In 2007/8 PAS received £1.3m from MLA.

In 2008/9 MLA received a cut of c 25% in core funding in their 2008-2011 Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) settlement. PAS has been funded using £1 million from an underspend in funding for Renaissance in the Regions (which received an inflationary settlement) and £300,000 from MLA. PAS had hoped for £1.49m in order to keep going at the same level as in 2007/8, and argued that £1.3m represented a cut of £190,000.

	Year	DCMS	HLF	BM	MLA	Partners	Total
2 year pilot	1997-98	55,000		12,500			67,500
	1998-99	100,000		14,500			114,500
HLF-funded pilots	1999-2000	100,000	171,000	15,000		8,500	294,500
	2000-01	250,000	85,000			4,250	339,250
	2001-02	252,000	190,000			9,500	451,500
	2002-03	426,000					426,000
HLF-funded National Scheme	2003-04	330,000	793,000	7,000	10,000	46,330	1,186,330
	2004-05	395,000	855,000	7,245	10,500	56,000	1,323,745
	2005-06	460,000	845,000	7,500	10,800	59,000	1,382,300
MLA funding	2006-07			7,500	1,260,000	51,255	1,318,755
	2007-08			96,729	1,300,000	54,120	1,450,849
	2008-09			68,364	1,300,000	57,176	1,425,540
Total		2,368,000	2,939,000	236,338	3,891,300	346,131	£9,780,769

The Portable Antiquities Scheme today

Today the scheme has four aims:

- To advance knowledge of the history and archaeology of England and Wales by systematically recording archaeological objects found by the public;

- To raise awareness among the public of the educational value of archaeological finds in their context and facilitate research in them;
- To increase opportunities for active public involvement in archaeology and strengthen links between metal-detector users and archaeologists; and
- To encourage all those who find archaeological objects to make them available for recording and to promote best practice by finders.

These aims are delivered through a database of recorded finds; a network of Finds Liaison Officers hosted by local partner organisations, specialist Finds Advisers and a small central unit who provide leadership and administration.

The PAS Database

The core work of the scheme is creating the PAS database –a virtual museum collection of small finds from England and Wales. The database holds records for over 350,000 objects including 183,000 images that can be used freely. Several hundred objects are entered every day. Each record contains an image of the object and a detailed description of it. Some information is not publicly available – for example details of the grid reference (although this is available to *bonafide* researchers). Records can be created by FLOs, Finds Advisers or finders. The data generated by PAS is also made available to Historic Environment Records (HERs) under a protocol for use.

The website www.finds.org.uk also includes information about the scheme and its background, and contact details for staff and FLOs. There is also information about Roman and medieval coins, an education section, information about conserving small finds and about the way the Treasure Act operates.

Finds Liaison Officers

A network of 36 Finds Liaison Officers (FLOs) are based in ‘host’ or partner organisations, who are usually in local museums or Historic Environment Records (HERs). Some posts have shared arrangements, such as Bristol City Museums and Gloucestershire County Council. In Wales because of large distances (it can take 5 hours to reach a club), the main post is based in the National Museum Cardiff, and each of the four Welsh Archaeological Trusts has a service agreement whereby the co-ordinator for each trust supports a network of reporting centres in regional and local museums.

The core duty of a FLO is to record archaeological finds made by members of the public on the PAS database. In order to do this they need to make contact with finders, spending time visiting organisations such as metal detecting clubs, attending rallies, giving talks and presentations, and organising events such as finds days or roadshows. Recording an item involves researching, photographing and describing it, and entering it into the database, then returning it.

FLOs provide educational activities such as training for finders in finds identification or conservation. They organise exhibitions and displays and provide information for annual reports and publish articles relating to the work of the scheme. Many FLOs are assisted by volunteers, so their job description may also involve supporting volunteers.

Finds advisers

FLOs are supported by six Finds Advisers – who ensure the quality and integrity of the PAS database as a research tool. They check records for consistency, set standards for

recording and work with institutions using the data. They train FLOs and volunteers, research and publish data relating to the scheme, contribute to annual reports and identify material which local FLOs cannot identify. They regularly give lectures to clubs and other groups, in effect acting as a link between the academic world, and community archaeologists.

The central unit

There is a small core central unit based at the British Museum consisting of a Head and Deputy Head of the scheme, a Resources Manager who deals with payments to and liaison with the many partner organisations, and an ICT adviser who manages the website and database. The Education Adviser has been made redundant. The team is based in the separate Department of Portable Antiquities and Treasure where 5 PAS funded staff work alongside 5 staff who administer the Treasure Act. The Head of the PAS is also the head of this department, and manages the separate team who deal with Treasure (see below). Managing Treasure functions takes up about 10% of his time.

Governance

A Project Board was set up in 1998 to oversee the running of the HLF project which still meets as the Portable Antiquities Advisory Group (PAAG) chaired jointly by MLA and the BM, with representatives from National Council for Metal Detecting (NCMD), the UK Federation of Independent Detectorists (UKFID), British Museum, National Museums and Galleries of Wales, English Heritage (EH), the Royal Commission on Ancient and Historical Monuments of Wales (RCAHMW), the Council for British Archaeology (CBA), the Association of Local Government Archaeologists (ALGAO), the Society for Museum Archaeologists (SMA), the Institute of Archaeology and the Country Land and Business Association. This group has close links to the All Party Parliamentary Archaeology Group and to the Treasure Valuation Committee.

Reporting

The scheme publishes an Annual Report; for 2007 this was being combined with the annual Treasure report to save money. In the past it has produced regular regional newsletters but these again have been discontinued. Information is also disseminated through regular updates in academic journals, websites and magazines. The scheme has a very strong record of data collection on all aspects of its operation, and there have been three independent evaluations (see next section).

Partners

The organisations that host FLOs contribute 5% (£54,000 or £57,176 including partnership contribution to Finds Advisers) towards the cost of the posts (although they often contribute more in kind such as accommodation, and help with other expenses).

The principal partners include three national museums – the British Museum, the National Museums of Wales and National Museums Liverpool, as well as ten hub museums, eight other museums, ten County Council Archaeological Services and three universities (see Appendix Two). Partners also contribute help in kind such as accommodation, venues for events, publicity and assistance with conservation and education. About 70 secondary partners contribute to, support or are involved PAS including museums, local authorities and archaeological services. They host finds days, provide venues, publicity and financial support, give conservation advice or help identify finds.

Treasure

PAS operates in parallel to the legal system for reporting Treasure whereby all items of potential Treasure belong to the crown and must be reported to the coroner. If an item is declared to be Treasure, it is valued and the finder (and landowner) is eligible for a reward if a museum decides to acquire it. Non-declaration of Treasure is an offence.

The Act is administered by a team in the British Museum in the same department as PAS, comprising a Treasure Registrar and four staff who have about 1000 live cases at anyone time. The BM has just taken on new responsibilities for Treasure from DCMS, acting as a central point of enquiry for finders, receiving deliveries, reporting on finds and passing information to the coroner. In 2008/09 the BM will receive £103,688 for additional functions in dealing with Treasure which it took on from DCMS in March 2007; £57,370 for staff costs and £46,318 for other costs. Two further posts in the Treasure team are funded by the Museum through its core grant at a cost of £56,041 in 2008/09.

Chapter Two – Metal detecting

Introduction

Around two thirds of the finds reported to the PAS are found by metal detectorists. Although PAS records finds made by any member of the public, liaison with detectorists is a significant part of the work of PAS, so it is important to understand the hobby and its concerns.

Metal detecting as a hobby

Responsible metal detecting is one way in which people of all ages engage with the past. As the editor of 'The Searcher' notes,

'it is not the personal glory (that motivates detectorists) but sharing information about the history and archaeology of their finds....detecting is about searching for our past'

Detectorists are very proud of our history and understand the importance of recording:

Most weekends we are out together Metal Detecting.....we find it an absorbing and fascinating hobby. There's something about finding things which have been lost for centuries, being the first to hold and touch the artifacts, still brings big smiles to our faces. It may only be a button or a Musket ball, but it enables us to acquire hands-on experience of history. The finds we make today may help out our kids' homework tomorrow. www.geocities.com/garys_hoard

Detecting also has health and social benefits – it is a good way of keeping fit (wielding a detector is surprisingly hard work) and meeting people. But it is also a skill; it takes time to learn to use a detector effectively. The chance of finding valuable treasure is also a motivation, although most websites counsel that this is unlikely.

Metal detectors use electromagnetic induction to detect metals; they can be sensitive at different depths and to different-sized objects and some discriminate between metals. Over time detectors have become lighter, deeper-seeking, use less battery power and discriminate better. Most successfully detect metal to a foot or two below the surface (depending on the size of the coil). A growing number of detectorists use GPS to plot findspots.

It is difficult to estimate the number involved in England and Wales, as many people who have bought detectors don't use them regularly, but both the clubs and the PAS estimate that there are between 8,000 and 10,000 people who actively take part in the hobby.

Metal detecting clubs

People either belong to metal detecting clubs or detect independently. FLOs are aware of 186 metal detecting clubs. Some are organised over the internet, others have more regular local meetings. Most clubs organise weekend digs, have regular talks and share information about finds. For example one Gloucestershire club limits its membership to 45 people; there is a waiting list to join so if members do not attend meetings regularly they are asked to leave. The club organises detecting events which are closely managed to ensure best practice. Other clubs such as Weekend Wanderers meet rarely, but exist mainly to organise digs for members. Many clubs organise talks and displays for community groups and will have their own programme of specialist talks on local history or finds topics such as identifying munitions.

Most clubs promote responsible metal detecting; they are very aware of their responsibilities to landowners and the need to maintain their trust (indeed, one of the benefits of being in a club is that it makes relationships with landowners easier to manage). They condemn the use of metal detectors to steal items (see below). A small number (17) don't allow FLOs to attend meetings.

Representative organisations

The two main organisations who formally represent metal detector users in the UK are the National Council for Metal Detecting (NCMD) and the UK Federation of Independent Detectorists (FID). Both publish codes of conduct for metal detecting and have been involved in developing the national code. The National Council for Metal Detecting is a representative body of elected volunteers formed in 1981 to give responsible metal detector users a democratic forum to discuss the hobby and to provide an authoritative voice to counter criticism of the hobby. It does not represent the trade or archaeological interests. Members are provided with public liability insurance; there is a newsletter and a regular bulletin. The Federation of Independent is described as the world's largest metal detecting organisation and is open to responsible detectorists. The group provides quarterly postal bulletins, help and information on metal detecting, and public liability insurance. Both sit on PAAG.

Websites and magazines

As well as individual club websites there are also sites that relate to specific models of metal detectors (eg Minelab Owners) and sites set up by individual detectorists (eg Paul Shields). A number of sites provide an overview of the hobby including UK Detectornet <http://www.ukdetectornet.co.uk> which has been in existence since 1994, described as 'the premier metal detecting site in the UK'. It has information about metal detecting, a forum for detectorists, information about magazines, products, rallies and events.

There is also a separate voluntary initiative set up by detectorists to record their own finds called the **UKDetector Finds Database**. It is described as 'an easy-to-use, friendly and supportive online facility for detectorists to record their finds and ensure that the information is preserved for future generations'. This aims to promote a recording ethos and encourage detectorists who would not otherwise record their finds to do so. It

also allows members to record post c.1650 finds, which are less of a priority for the PAS database

Two monthly magazines cater for the hobby in the UK - 'Treasure hunting' and 'The Searcher'. Both cover metal detecting as well as general information about collections, archaeology and history. A good deal of space is devoted to identifying and discussing finds.

Rallies

Metal detecting rallies are organised by clubs or by individual entrepreneurs. A rally will take place on land which is not scheduled, but is advertised at least as being of potential archaeological interest. It will normally have been ploughed. The organiser will charge a fee for entry although profits from the day will often go to charity such as the RNLI or local Rotary Clubs. Some are day events and others are held over weekends. Some events are relatively small attracting 20-30 people whilst larger ones will attract hundreds of detectorists. Usually there will be arrangements with the landowner with regard to the future of finds. It is difficult to estimate the number of rallies that take place, but there are currently 14 rallies in 2008 advertised on the website of *Treasure Hunting* magazine (although more may take place).

For detectorists, rallies provide an opportunity for less experienced to detect alongside more experienced people, and provide a place to detect if there are problems in obtaining permits. They are also enjoyable social events.

FLOs will usually try to attend rallies in their area. If the rally is likely to be particularly large, FLOs from neighbouring areas may also help out as will a Finds Adviser. The FLO will usually be there to record items but also to meet people, and chat through issues such as conservation, finds identification and to promote the benefits of recording. A single rally may produce hundreds of finds, which in itself is a source of workload pressure for FLOs.

For example, in August 2006 the King Alfred the Great rally in Oxfordshire was attended by over 2000 detectorists. The rally produced finds from a Mesolithic mace head to a Medieval dropped purse hoard; as well as 58 Roman brooches suggesting a ritual or perhaps military use of the site, and Bronze age finds that suggested that the site was earlier than thought. It was attended by five FLOs who, with help from volunteers, recorded around 550 objects.

Metal detecting vacations

A small number of organisations bring metal detecting tours to the UK such as Metal Detecting Tours who organise around ten tours a year from the USA (<http://metaldetectingtours.com/>); Jimmy Sierra who organises two tours a year; Lost Treasure and England Detecting tours whose website advertises three or four tours a year (www.englanddetectingtours.com). Metal Detecting Tours employs archaeologists to record finds to high standards, but others can place burdens on FLOs by producing large groups of finds at short notice.

Expertise

Many detectorists also have considerable expertise in small finds. Brian Read, Gordon Bailey, Mike Cuddeford have all published academically-respected books and articles on

small finds whilst Ross Whitehead researched buckles as a part of his archaeology degree and published *Buckles 1250-1800* with an easy to follow identification system. Dave Haldenby has published academic articles on Anglo-Saxon strap ends whilst Peter Spencer is a numismatist.

Attitudes to recording

A core issue is reporting findspots; detectorists argue that this is a matter for agreement between the finder and the landowner, and often landowners stipulate that the information should not be shared. Detectorists cite instances where detailed reporting has led to them being no longer allowed to detect on land. For archaeologists, the detailed find spot casts light on the nature of the archaeology in that place. A find spot that is accurate to parish level is of relatively little value in terms of understanding the archaeological context. Against that, detectorists point out that most metal-detecting takes place on arable land which has already been ploughed. This means that the archaeological context of finds has often been lost and that detecting is the only source of information about the past. They also point out that topsoil is often machined off during archaeological investigations and that without metal detecting archaeologists themselves are losing information about the past.

Controls over metal detecting

Metal detecting on a Scheduled Ancient Monument requires a license under the 1979 Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act. In Scotland similar provisions apply (but *all* finds are potentially the property of the Crown and should be reported). In comparison, many European countries require a license for any form of archaeological excavation (and include metal detecting in that definition) and require all archaeological finds to be reported. In Ireland it is also illegal to promote the sale or use of detection devices for searching for archaeological objects.

Anyone detecting on land without consent could be charged with a criminal offence or sued for damages. Detectorists are very concerned that some larger landowners are moving away from allowing detecting on their land. For example the Forestry Commission England has restricted permits for metal detecting on Forestry Commission land in East Anglia.

Under the Countryside Stewardship Scheme (if the land is not scheduled) metal detecting is allowed providing there is written consent from DEFRA, and detectorists must comply with the codes of conduct of NCMD or FID. Under the new Entry Level scheme, metal detecting will be allowed providing it is undertaken in accordance with the Code of Practice. Events and rallies will require written permission from Natural England. There are also controls over detecting on Higher Level Schemes.

The UK has ratified the Council of Europe Valletta Convention² which requires signatories to authorise all archaeological excavation as well as the use of metal detectors (article 3) and also to prevent the illicit circulation of elements of the archaeological heritage (article 10).

Finds

Finds (which are not Treasure) made during detecting are usually subject to an agreement with the landowner, and may be kept by the finder, returned to the

² Downloaded 8th August 2008 from <http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/en/Treaties/Html/143.htm>

landowner, given to a museum or sold. Detectorists recognise ethical dilemmas in amassing large personal collections of objects. Most detect for their own enjoyment and because of their interest in history and archaeology, but significant numbers of artefacts are bought and sold; the magazines and websites carry advertisements for organisations who specialise in the sale of artefacts and rallies are often attended by dealers. The landowner may also insist on the sale of valuable finds.

Some archaeologists are worried that detecting is feeding an illicit trade in antiquities. Paul Barford, vocal critic feels strongly that PAS encourages the trade in portable antiquities³. This trade undoubtedly exists: although it is an offence to acquire, dispose, import or export 'tainted cultural objects' there are around 400 'British' antiquities advertised daily on eBay. At the request of PAS, Ebay has developed guidance on *Buying and Selling Antiquities Safely on eBay*, and have agreed to remove tainted cultural objects from sale.

Detectorists do build up their own personal collections of material and one of the issues that has begun to emerge for PAS is what happens to those collections as people get older.

Illicit detecting

So-called 'nighthawks' use metal detectors on sites without the permission of the landowner. Not only can such activities damage archaeology, they damage the reputation of responsible metal detectorists by association. As one letter to The Searcher noted,

"if a thermic lance or high speed drill is used in safebreaking episode, the police do not, as a matter of course, round up every engineer in the district...or expect Engineering Today to criticise its readers. Nor do they carry out dawn raids on builders' merchants every time a brick is used in a smash and grab raid" (The Searcher July 2007).

As another writer notes, nighthawking is simply theft, using a metal detector. Because such activities are perceived to be contentious, English Heritage, Historic Scotland and others have commissioned a survey to find out the extent of illicit detecting. Detectorists are worried that the project will reinforce the negative views of detecting, but the team stress that it is aimed at finding out how often the law is being broken and not aiming to ban metal detecting. Initial results suggest that the problem has decreased significantly since the last survey in 1995 – the amount of damage to monuments has been reduced by a half and 27% of units report problems. It is possible that a strong, local 'responsible' metal detecting community might act as a 'watch dog' and deterrent to illicit detecting.

³ <http://paul-barford.blogspot.com/2008/08/new-aim-for-portable-antiquities-scheme.html>

Chapter Three – Impact

The following section looks at the impact of PAS; the starting point is the PAS aims although this exercise has shown that the aims do not really capture the full range of what the scheme is doing or the difference it is making. The second part of this chapter looks at impact against Renaissance objectives.

Advancing knowledge

The first objective of PAS is, '*to advance knowledge of the history and archaeology of England and Wales by systematically recording archaeological objects found by the public*' and the second aim includes a need to '*facilitate research*' (in finds). PAS has done that in through creating a virtual collection used by researchers.

A virtual collection

The scheme has created a virtual collection of c. 350,000 objects; just over a third of those are Roman, a quarter medieval and about 13% Palaeolithic. Recent objects are only recorded if they are of particular interest, but 13% of finds were post-medieval. The 70,000 Roman coins on the database, for example, are the largest publicly accessible Roman site find database in the world.

About 250,000 people use the site each year and that is increasing steadily – there were 720,369 visits by 247,103 unique visitors in 2007, up from nearly 85,000 unique visitors in 2004. People mainly visit the website to find out about finds in their local area or to find information about a particular type of object; a third want to learn about archaeology (PAS 2006:131). There have been problems with the usability of the database but the scheme is working hard to address that and improvements will be in place by the end of 2008; the Celtic Coin Index has just been incorporated into the database and it is proposed to introduce maps and Google Earth layers.

Many of the finds recorded with the scheme could have been lost – 90% are from cultivated land, where they are especially vulnerable to agricultural damage or natural and artificial corrosion processes; the remaining 10% came from woodland, coastal areas and other parts of the country.

A new cultural map of England and Wales

There is no doubt that PAS data has advanced knowledge. One expert sees it as creating 'a new cultural map of England and Wales' through new insights into the material culture of ordinary people and ordinary places. It has also shown the far-reaching contacts and cosmopolitan nature of Britain from prehistory onwards and helped put finds in a wider landscape context.

Our knowledge of the material culture of Roman Britain comes from excavations of forts and villas, or redevelopment sites, mainly in towns. PAS data is very different. As a result, it is breaking down simplistic distinctions between town and country, military and civilian sites to show a mass of regional differences. New temple sites, votive offerings and imagery are providing a different view of worship in the Roman period that might represent popular rather than elite religion, and we have learnt a huge amount about personal dress and ornament.

For overall spatial and chronological study of Roman coin loss in Britain, this is a massive leap forward...give us five years, and the map of rural Roman Britain will be very different... it is just possible that comparison of the PAS data with post-43 data will finally prove that they (the Romans) did arrive in Britain prior to AD 43. This argument has been running for years. Sam Moorhead

PAS data is challenging our picture of early medieval trade and economy. For example experts thought that Byzantine coins in Britain were brought back by tourists, but the discovery of many ordinary copper Byzantine coins suggests that parts of the south-west were trading with the Eastern Mediterranean in the 6th and even 7th centuries (Sam Moorhead pers com.).

A burst of local coin-making around AD 700 suggests a sudden increase in trade; for example, a 'hot-spot' of late 7th century Early Saxon coins in the upper Thames Valley puts the wool trade much earlier than documents suggest. There is some debate over 'productive' sites where detectorists find lots of material but there is little buried archaeology. They could be market places, part of an integrated trading system united by ships and the sea, and by the network of good roads left behind by the Romans (Pryor 2006:42).

Detecting is also changing our view of the Vikings; Leahy argues that we thought that the Danelaw was just a change of management, but large numbers of small cheap dress fittings show the arrival of significant numbers of Danish peasant women. Finds of 9th century Irish metalwork suggest that there were Irish soldiers in England as part of the Great Army of the Vikings.

For the medieval period, PAS finds are giving us new insight into individual lives. Finds of medieval toys such as pewter dolls and miniature tableware, contradict assumptions by social historians that childhood was not enjoyed in the middle ages in the same way as it is today. Most of the pilgrim badges have been found through detecting; it was assumed that there was nothing more to learn from these, but the finds have given new impetus to the study of medieval pilgrimage as a social phenomenon. New finds also show that fashions were very similar across England with no obvious difference between urban and rural areas, or even regions. One of the few regionally distinct items (a form of early C16th strap-end) was first identified by detectorist Brian Read in Devon. Detectorists have found anti-witch items hidden in buildings; evidence for prisoners of war and soldiers from their badges and buttons; Russian seals from imported flax and even metallic pornography (Geoff Egan pers comm.).

The study of medieval seals used to concentrate on kings or nobles, but the seals of less important people are giving us new insight into the iconography of ordinary people. Equally our knowledge of single finds types such as coin weights, token coinage, window leading and Russian seals for traded flax have all been revolutionised by detectorists (Egan in Chitty 2001).

Data from detectorists is revealing more about places. Brian Waterhouse's work on a single field in Romney Marsh has challenged the received wisdom on of the Cinque Ports, suggesting that there was no late medieval waning of the area. Detectorists working near the River Trent have found the site of the winter camp of the Great Viking Army in 872 whilst in Gloucestershire Pete Twinn has found a hitherto unknown Roman temple through meticulous plotting of coins. In 1978, the Scunthorpe museum had only

two late Saxon items representing 450 years of history; the additional finds have enabled Kevin Leahy to publish a new study on the kingdom of Lindsey.

The PAS database is now large enough to begin to explore big questions. The distribution of metal work is a critical element in the VASLE project (Viking and Anglo-Saxon Landscape and Economy) - a 3 year study of England and Wales from the early 8th to mid-11th centuries. PAS data can now be compared with other sources in order to identify biases in the archaeological record, and PAS has applied to AHRC for a £221,500 research project to do this in collaboration with Southampton and Belfast. The data has already inspired four major research projects, 19 PhDs and over 30 other academic dissertations.

PAS data is also identifying new sites. PAS finds have identified 160 new sites in Lincolnshire, and comparative work by Tom Brindle suggests that PAS finds may have revealed some 2,500 new archaeological sites in England and Wales.

Public awareness

PAS also aims to **raise public awareness of the educational value of finds**. PAS staff have organised regular events for members of the public. In 2007 they were involved in 1749 events which reached nearly 45,000 people ranging from formal talks to archaeologists and to metal detecting clubs about the work of the PAS, metal detecting rallies and finds days. There were over 400 drop-in sessions at museums to record finds attended by more than 18,000 people.

For young people, PAS has organised object-based learning events contributing to history, ICT, science and maths. Over a thousand children from inner city schools in West Yorkshire have also been involved in a project to engage children in history and heritage through activities such as archaeological excavation, using finds and role play. PAS has developed online resources for teachers (www.pastexplorers.org.uk).

PAS staff and finders have also been involved in formal learning; a six-week course on the recovery, analysis, identification and conservation of artefacts, entitled Fabulous Finds, was held in Leominster with the Workers Education Association (WEA) and Hereford Museum and Art Gallery. PAS has also helped fill a gap in formal university learning where few students learn to identify objects:

First what encouraged us to take on the postwas the recognition that there was, and is, an increasing dearth of individuals working in museums who are trained to look at and identify archaeological objects. Professor Steve Shennan, University College London.

The results of PAS have been presented at several conferences, including Buried Treasure: Building Bridges in Newcastle aimed at creating a forum of debate between archaeologists and finders.

There have also been a number of exhibitions. Material from PAS was on display as part of the British Museums touring exhibition Buried Treasure, which was exhibited in Cardiff, Manchester, Newcastle and Norwich. PAS has also helped to organise exhibitions displaying material found by metal detectorists. The Lune Valley Metal Detecting Club displayed material at Lancaster City Museum, whilst individual

detectorists such as Trevor Brown contribute displays to local museums. The British Museum is planning a major touring exhibition on the work of PAS.

Public involvement in archaeology

PAS aims to *increase opportunities for active public involvement in archaeology* and *to strengthen links between archaeologists and detectorists*.

PAS staff named 126 detectorists working on archaeological projects as well as eight clubs that were involved in fieldwork projects (each with up to 40 members). In just one recent example, a local metal detectorist has been on hand throughout the Bristol University excavations at Berkeley. In regions such as Kent, local authority archaeologists use conditions requiring metal detecting surveys as part of the operation of Planning Policy 16 (PPG 16) (under which developers may have to pay for the evaluation of sites prior to development).

For example, the Edgehill metal detecting team are volunteers mainly from Warwickshire who are working each Sunday to systematically survey the site of the Battle of Edgehill (1642). They are collaborating with Bob Kings who has extensive detecting experience, as well as the Battlefields Trust, the local FLO and the County Council with support from Minelab detectors⁴.

PAS know of 48 detectorists who have completed or are undertaking archaeological or museums courses at the universities of Kent, Central Lancashire, Hull, East Anglia, UCL, Sheffield, Bristol, Sussex, Exeter and Birkbeck as well as several colleges. At least three now work in archaeology or museums.

As a measure of the success of the reach of the scheme, 93% of respondents to a survey of detectorists said that FLOs attended meetings of their club and that they could contact their FLO at any time. 92% said FLOs were friendly and over a third said their club had been involved in joint projects or events with the FLO.

Encouraging recording and best practice

PAS also aims '*to encourage all those who find archaeological objects to make them available for recording and to promote best practice by finders*'.

The number of individuals recording items with the scheme is rising steadily. In 2007 6830 individuals offered finds to the scheme – two thirds were detectorists. In 2007 over 77,600 artefacts were reported to the PAS (an increase of c.20,000 objects on the 58,290 recorded in 2006). Three quarters of finds are reported by detectorists, but finds also come from field walking, or during activities such as gardening or building work.

Best practice by finders is also improving. More and more finders record detailed findspots. Over 90% of finders in 2007 recorded their finds to at least a six-figure National Grid Reference (NGR) and almost half were recorded to at least eight figures (PAS forthcoming). Most users can only access findspots to four figures although 355 registered users have full rights to interrogate the data for research purposes

There is now a very strong culture of recording amongst clubs and websites as a result of interaction with PAS. For example:

⁴ <http://www.battlefieldstrust.com/resource-centre/civil-war/battlepageview.asp?pageid=807&parentid=500>

The reason for these web pages is to encourage metal detectorists of the importance of voluntarily recording and reporting finds with the Portable Antiquities Scheme while at the same time suggesting what constitutes good practice together with the reasons why certain other practices are not desirable... This site also includes information on the responsibility of the finder for the artefacts that they have in their care. This is simply to encourage detectorists to record and to help stem the drain on 'lost' artefacts not being recorded. www.ourpasthistory.com

PAS have encouraged best practice by agreeing a *Code of Practice for Responsible Metal Detecting in England and Wales*. The document outlines what is meant by being responsible, with an emphasis on the recording finds and avoiding damage to archaeological sites. However the PAAG have not yet reached agreement on a code relating to metal detecting rallies.

Impact on Renaissance Objectives

PAS has delivered other benefits that are not necessarily reflected in the aims of the scheme. One of the key questions for this review is whether it would be appropriate to continue to fund PAS from funding ring-fenced in MLA's budget for Renaissance in the Regions. Using the seven core objectives for Renaissance, it is useful to look at what PAS has achieved.

- **To be an important resource and champion for learning and education;**
The PAS database is an important resource for learning; it has reinvigorated research into material culture in the landscape; increased the knowledge base of finders, and created a new generation of young archaeologists with skills in identifying small finds; many finders have gone on to formal studies in archaeology or history.
- **To promote access and inclusion;**
PAS has promoted access to objects through its virtual collection of 350,000 objects, and has contributed to inclusion by rebuilding trust between museums and finders. Both finders and archaeologists report that the scheme has attracted non-traditional audiences to museums. By going out to detecting clubs and spending time at rallies, FLOs have effectively brought museums out to communities. Postcode data from 2006 shows that 47% of people recording with the Scheme (since 1997) were from social groups C2, D and E, which compares favourably to museums (31%). Nearly half of the people who attended a Fabulous Finds Day in 2005 had never been to that museum before, and went as a result of PAS.
- **Use collections to encourage inspiration and creativity;**
PAS has many examples of events and activities inspired by objects that have been found under the scheme. For example, students from Aberdare Girls School near Llyn Fawr (site of a hoard of late bronze age cauldrons tools and weapons) worked with a local artist, a musician and a poet to produce an animated film inspired by the finds.
- **Ensure excellence and quality in the delivery of core services;**
By bringing together academics, museums and volunteers, the PAS has created an academically rigorous knowledge base that is having a demonstrable impact on our understanding of the landscape and material culture of England and Wales.

- **To implement modernisation and rationalization;**
Under this heading, Renaissance was looking for a clear sense of mission and direction, relatively flat management structures and team working. PAS has had good central leadership; the FLOs represent a very flat management structure, and the partnership with regional museums and other organisations demonstrates team working.
- **To measure outputs, outcomes and benefits.**
Throughout its existence PAS has had a strong culture of measuring outputs and benefits. There have also been several reviews which have looked at outputs but also outcomes, such as changing attitudes but more could be done to capture outcomes.
- **To contribute to economic regeneration in the regions**
It would be difficult to argue that PAS has contributed to economic regeneration in terms of creating jobs, or direct or indirect expenditure. Nevertheless, 70% of the funding is directed at regional partners and the remainder is spent in national museums.

The current review of Renaissance has identified some areas of potential concern, including vision, leadership, mapping of achievements, additionality, quantity rather than quality of work and lack of commitment to partnership. These are not weaknesses for PAS:

- PAS has always had a very clear vision – to encourage the voluntary reporting of finds. This has remained the driver for the scheme, and underpins everything it does. One of the reasons why the scheme has been successful is that it is tightly focussed on that vision.
- The scheme has been closely managed and well-lead. The central unit have provided day to day management of funding for partners and leadership. There are improvements that can be made, but these do not affect the overall achievement in this area. The strong central unit has ensured that there is good mapping of what is being achieved in the regions and by whom. Because the scheme is relatively narrow in its focus it has remained coherent.
- PAS seems to have been additional to local provision - this risk has been managed through the job description for FLOs which states that they should not be drawn into general museum or archaeology service activities; indeed it is more likely that PAS has gained from support in kind provided by hosts.
- PAS did face the issue of quantity rather than quality of work, but dealt with it by employing Finds Advisers.
- Partnerships is a particular strength of PAS with over 30 principal partners and 70 secondary partners including universities, national museums, local authorities and smaller non hub museums.

We have had a fantastic response to what Kurt has been doing. Previous curators had a negative relationship with detectorists and that reputation has stayed with the museums for a long time. (Kurt) has been able to develop relationships that we would not have been able to do as curators. He also deals with other finders..and responds to requests from museum development officers for help with identifying collections or help with archaeology days....PAS ventures in to places that Renaissance does not...he has more contact with regional museums in his area than I do as a curator and sees them more regularly than I do... even as part of Renaissance..he has relationships with Thornbury, the Forest of Dean, Tewkesbury, Gloucester, Corinium. In terms of outreach he has out-Renaissanced Renaissance Gail Boyle, Bristol City Museum.

General impact on museums

PAS is more about creating a virtual collection than necessarily adding objects to collections (although museums such as Hereford report several donations as a result of the FLO acting as a medium between museum and finders). About 3-5% of recorded finds are acquired by museums and the Headly Trust has agreed to extend its support for acquisition to non-Treasure finds. However, acquisition is not a primary PAS purpose, and collections have benefited more from new skills in finds identification – as a result of PAS curators report new insights into existing collections and have been able to go back and identify or better understand objects in their care,

PAS is also bringing archaeological expertise back into museums. Twenty years ago, many museums were centres of expertise for the archaeology their area. When separate archaeology services were set up in local authorities the two grew apart. PAS has begun to rebuild that connection between museums and archaeology and is also creating new links between local authority archaeology services and museums.

We also fill the gap in providing archaeological advice on public finds which used to be a core role of museums. Most museums in this area do not have a specialist archaeological curator, and those that do have many other roles to fulfil. The PAS has filled this gap very successfully and become an essential part of the museum system. This is especially true of community lead museums and small independent museums. My work with the Renaissance led Museum Development Officers has lead to close ties with the two independent museum forums in Herefordshire and Shropshire along with giving advice to users of Much Wenlock, Clun, Bridgnorth, Whitchurch and Market Drayton, Shropshire and Leominster, Ross-on-Wye, Kington and Weobly Museums Herefordshire. PAS led events at these museums adds to the limited activity of these sites and always brings in very interesting results Peter Reavill, FLO Shropshire and Herefordshire.

FLOs also value their ability to work across more than one museum:

The FLOs need to be free from ties to a certain museum or museum service because we are meant to work with all museums and galleries in our counties and all those finders who require our services. This does certainly not mean that we do not work for the benefit of the museums in our area and just for the Scheme alone – our host partners and other local museums give us desk space and a place in the gallery for finds days, rooms for educational activities and furthermore, advice and support. We work FOR the museums, trying to get people into the museums to enjoy the collections on display, invite children, families and school parties for finds handling days and archaeology activities and

much, much more, especially now during the upcoming archaeology week. Dot Boughton, FLO Lancashire and Cumbria.

Volunteers

PAS has also encouraged volunteering. At one level each of the 6-7000 individuals who record finds with PAS each year could be considered a volunteer who is contributing to our knowledge of the past. However, many people play an even more active role in helping to deliver the PAS. In 2007 some 145 volunteers helped the scheme including:

- finders with expertise in areas such as lithics who help with recording finds;
- finders who have been helping to photograph and identify finds;
- amateurs with specialist knowledge of finds;
- detectorists who are helping to record finds; and
- university students who have volunteered to help identify finds.

FLOs often struggle to keep up with the amount of recording needed, particularly as a result of rallies and volunteers make a vital contribution in dealing with this.

Nevertheless, some finders would like to do more recording themselves, and there is clearly an opportunity to encourage this through formal training.

Evaluation of PAS

The observations made here are reflected in earlier, more systematic reviews of PAS. In 2001 Gill Chitty asked finders, museums, archaeology services and academics what the HLF pilot project had achieved. She concluded that it was filling an important gap in the provision of public services by providing information about archaeological finds for the public and also by encouraging participation in archaeology as part of the outreach of local museums and archaeology services.

'Users value this aspect consistently highly, together with the strengthened links it has created between the public, especially detectorists, and archaeologists and museums.'

She also asked academic researchers about the quality of the data; they were clear about the academic potential but raised concerns about some of the records. This was one of the reasons for adding Finds Advisers to the national scheme (Chitty 2001).

In 2004 she evaluated the HLF-funded national scheme. Nearly half of the respondents were finders, a third (30%) were involved in archaeology and 13% came from museums. PAS had increased outreach and participation and raised awareness of the importance of finds, but the scheme could do more to increase opportunities for public involvement in archaeology. Website visitors had increased, but there were still problems with the usability of the database. Seventy percent of respondents thought that the scheme was changing attitudes to reporting archaeological finds and their importance. Those who were involved in the scheme were twice as likely to agree that it had changed attitudes than people who had not.

The review recommended (amongst other things) that PAS should focus on training FLOs, increase the capacity of recording for finders, maintain the liaison with clubs and

NCMD strengthen partnerships and find a more secure long-term future for the scheme (Chitty 2004).

The user survey was updated in 2006; again the majority of people surveyed were detectorists, finders or members of the public; 87% thought PAS had advanced archaeological knowledge and the approval rating of the scheme was between 6 and 16% higher than in 2004 (Edwards 2006)..

The independent detectorist survey of PAS found good support for PAS; 78% of detectorists felt that PAS was doing a good job for them, but there were concerns about issues such as the knowledge of some FLOs (Steve Critchley pers. com.).

Leverage

Over ten years, total government investment (directly or via MLA) has been £6.228m, which has leveraged about another £4 million of investment (excluding recent partnership contributions in kind). Additional funding has included:

- **HLF** funding for the pilots and the national roll-out for three years, with a contribution of £2.939,000 between 1999 and 2006. They have also funded a two-year community archaeology post in north Wales.
- **English Heritage** grant-aid of £330,896 since 2002/3 for the archaeological investigation of findspots identified by detectorists. With Historic Scotland, Cadw, Environment and Heritage Services in Northern Ireland and heritage organisations in the Isle of Man, Guernsey and Jersey, they are also contributing £100,000 to the study of illicit detecting.
- **Arts & Humanities Research Council (AHRC)** have supported five collaborative doctoral research projects using PAS data worth £47,500. PAS have applied for £221,500 to research PAS data.
- **British Museum** The BM awarded PAS £10,000 to upgrade the database and £3000 to incorporate the Celtic Coin Index into the database in 2007.
- **Partners** their 5% contribution to employing an FLO amounts to about £54,000 per annum (£57,000 including the contribution to Finds Advisers). Partners also make contributions in kind; over the three years of HLF funding the total contribution of partners was £548,321 – roughly £130,000 per annum worth of in kind contribution. The British Museum has also made a considerable contribution to PAS over time.

Chapter Four: Issues

The objectives of the scheme

This review has suggested that the current objectives of PAS do not entirely reflect its impact or achievements. At present they are:

- To advance knowledge of the history and archaeology of England and Wales by systematically recording archaeological objects found by the public;
- To raise awareness among the public of the educational value of archaeological finds in their context and facilitate research in them;
- To increase opportunities for active public involvement in archaeology and strengthen links between metal-detector users and archaeologists; and
- To encourage all those who find archaeological objects to make them available for recording and to promote best practice by finders.

Instead they should reflect the fact that PAS is

- creating a virtual collection that is influencing our understanding of the past;
- bringing finders and museums/archaeologists together in a partnership contributing to that understanding;
- improving knowledge and skills in object identification and conservation in curators, finders and archaeologists;
- enabling more people and a wider range of people to engage with museums and archaeology by creating a positive role for detectorists and other finders; and
- promoting best practice by finders, curators and archaeologists.

Workload

The single biggest issue that came back to this review was the workload of FLOs. Demand for the work of PAS is growing and finders and managers report high levels of stress amongst FLOs. That workload comes from finders, from rallies, from the rising standard of records and the out of hours work needed to reach clubs and attend events. High workloads are leading to delays in returning finds, high turnover of post-holders and the need for a greater investment in training.

An obvious question is whether the right balance has been struck between creating records and outreach. This is not simple; on the one hand the trust and engagement of finders depends upon FLOs having the capacity to record and return their finds quickly, and this should remain a priority. On the other hand, the demand for recording will always grow, and the outreach done by FLOs is equally important. It has also been argued that recording should remain a priority for the scheme as outreach can be done by others. Possible solutions might be:

- **Prioritising what to record** FLOs already prioritise recent collections; specialists argue that it is often the apparently less interesting finds (eg Roman 'grot') that have the potential to most change our understanding of the past.
- **Building capacity** FLOS could prioritise outreach that will build up the capacity of volunteers to contribute to the scheme, such as creating recording capacity amongst finders (eg through a programme of 'accredited' recorders); developing research capacity amongst finders and other community groups by creating links between

them and research bodies; encouraging more volunteers to help with the scheme and working with finders to put in place the skills and networks to undertake outreach (eg with schools). Improving the capacity of finders and other volunteers will have important benefits for the scheme and finders, but is unlikely to significantly reduce pressure on FLOs in the short term.

Resources

Over and over again people who responded to this review stressed that the scheme was excellent but there were significant concerns about resources.

It would be a great loss to Herefordshire's museums and the county if the service provided by the PAS was jeopardised. The service could in fact be improved with the allocation of greater human resources. It could grow into a major conduit to attract new users and visitors to museums and encourage awareness of cultural histories and values. Judith Stevenson, Hereford Museum.

The current level of staffing of PAS is only just (and possibly not quite) enough to provide the level of service necessary to meet its stated aims.

There were two principal areas of concern in terms of resources – staffing levels (and therefore regional coverage) and operating budgets. With regard to staffing, many people stressed that these were inadequate; some positions were only part-time and large distances make it difficult to provide adequate coverage. There were arguments for additional resources in Wales, Berkshire, Cornwall and the North East. In Wales the four Welsh archaeological trusts have just over £3000 each to administer the scheme and there is only one full time post in Cardiff.

(In) NE Wales.... lack of coverage did cause problems (it).. took a lot of organising to settle the confusion of the clubs and sharing the workload...I feel part coverage can often be almost as bad as no coverage as there are so many demands on that post that nothing can ever be done properly/regularly etc and then we can end up getting a bad reputation for not doing things.

In terms of operating budgets, PAS has made savings by freezing unfilled posts, reducing budgets for travel, equipment and IT, and not producing an annual report. Those savings are now biting into national coverage and the ability of FLOs to undertake outreach. If the scheme receives a similar award in 2009/10 it will need to cut posts in order to maintain operations.

.. travel for a year in my area is £3000 to get to all 9 clubs and museums regularly and come to some meetings. I've only got half of... If we get larger areas then we just will not be able to be available anywhere near as regularly as we do at this level (this is already a struggle). It is not just time it is money. Most FLO's are happy to put in unpaid hours to get work done but we are not really paid enough to be paying for our own petrol to get to places. If travel expenses remain low or the areas given to each FLO increases then much less will be reported as the FLO cannot get out there to report finds. Frances McIntosh, FLO Cheshire, Greater Manchester & Merseyside.

Management

PAS is generally well managed with a clear sense of direction, efficient administration and excellent reporting on outputs. However, there are some issues relating to the advisory group.

The advisory group (PAAG) has two distinct roles – policy on metal detecting (such as agreeing codes of conduct or liaising with Natural England over issues such as stewardship) and providing strategic oversight for the work of PAS. PAAG have struggled to agree a code of conduct for rallies and there is a continuing concern that there is a 'hidden agenda' for archaeologists who want to ban metal detecting. The close links with the All Party Parliamentary Archaeology Group (APPAG) (long-term champions of PAS) inadvertently contribute to the impression that it is dominated by archaeological interests.

One option would be to set up a separate working group on metal detecting policy, lead by the statutory agencies such as English Heritage and Cadw (and perhaps Historic Scotland and EHS) working closely with finders, landowners and agencies such as Natural England. PAAG could then focus on the management of the scheme. In doing so, it would be useful to rethink membership of PAG increase the representation of finders and better reflect the role of regional partners. A regional museum voice is particularly important. It would also be useful to bring in expertise in areas such as community engagement. The group must be seen to balance the interests of museums, finders and archaeologists, as well as regions and the centre. It is also important to remember that some people who attend the group are volunteers, and unlike others, do not receive remuneration. Given sensitivities, an independent chair may be needed.

Relationship to Treasure

PAS has played a vital role in the implementation of the Treasure Act. FLOs raise awareness of the Act, identify finds that might be Treasure and advise finders of their obligations; they bring items to London and provide initial reports. In practice most reports to the coroner are done by FLOs on behalf of the finder. Treasure finds increased from 595 (2005) to 749 (2007) and since PAS was extended to the whole of England and Wales Treasure reporting has increased by 175%. 97% of Treasure finds are initially reported to the PAS and about 5-10% of the time of FLOs is devoted to dealing with Treasure.

The Head and Deputy Head of PAS also manage the Treasure Registrar and her team. They estimate that about 10% of their time is spent on Treasure work although it is sometimes difficult to separate policy issues relating to the two areas of work. For example, the Deputy Head is a special constable affiliated with the police Art and Antiques Unit and spends time raising awareness of heritage crime amongst police forces. Given that illicit trading in cultural objects is a risk to the heritage and also represents a reputational risk for PAS (if it is seen to be associated with or to encourage it) then it is vital that the scheme retains this capacity.

The Treasure team have about 1000 live cases at any time; the database is outdated and needs improvement and there are potential economies in a closer link with the PAS database.

Museums or archaeology?

Roughly two thirds of FLOs are based in museums services and just under a third are in local authorities (sometimes with shared arrangements). Where an FLO is based seems to make little difference to the quality of service. Museums value the ability of FLOs to deliver outreach and see them as enhancing institutional expertise and reaching new audiences. Archaeology services see the value of PAS as lying more in archaeological knowledge and planning data. There is still some scepticism about the scheme from archaeologists (although surveys show that this is less apparent amongst those who have close contact with the scheme). Detectorists simply want FLOs to be 'independent' – in other words to not be antagonistic towards the hobby. However, it is clear that the impact of PAS on museums seems to have been underplayed, and its role in museums is not reflected in its aims.

Capturing outcomes

PAS has an excellent record in identifying outputs such as the number of records created and the number of people recording, but is less good at capturing the difference that the scheme is making in a systematic way (although evaluations have begun to do this). This could be linked to a clearer set of aims. Of course it would be vital to work closely with finders in developing this in order to avoid a sense that the scheme has somehow stopped delivering. As an example, using the public value framework one might measure the different kinds of value that the scheme is creating:

Intrinsic values

- creation of a virtual collection that is used by the public and academics;
- the scheme has a demonstrable influence on our understanding of the past;
- curators, archaeologists and finders gain new skills in finds identification.

Instrumental benefits

- individuals gain new confidence and networks;
- individuals demonstrate new skills and knowledge;
- more people, and a wider range of people, engage with museums.

Institutional values

- the scheme is trusted by finders;
- the scheme demonstrates a genuine commitment to partnership;
- archaeologists and curators demonstrate a better understanding of the potential benefits of metal detecting.

Chapter Five: Options for Funding and Delivery

Introduction

One of the key questions for the review was whether there are options for funding and delivery other than the current system. It is apparent that the scheme is under considerable financial pressure and will need to cut posts unless additional funding is found.

Does the scheme provide value for money?

In looking at resources and delivery, the first question is whether or not the scheme currently represents value for money. At its most basic, PAS has created a website which each year is used by nearly 250,000 individuals (who make 700,000 visits) each year; enables 7000 members of the public to report finds, and delivers 1700 events where 44,000 people have been able to find out about conservation, museums, archaeology. This seems to represent good value for a core investment of £1.3 million per annum.

Respondents were universally supportive of the scheme, its aims and effectiveness.

It would be difficult to envisage a more cost effective way to deliver this programme, and likewise difficult to imagine how the level of service provision could be maintained with fewer FLOs in the field, and fewer 'experts' at the centre. Steve Hartgroves, Cornwall Archaeology Service.

There are few obvious comparators: as part of *Images of England*, volunteers helped English Heritage put 300,000 images of listed buildings on line; the Victoria County History has a HLF £3.4m grant to deliver 15 projects in 10 counties over five years using volunteers to deliver local history research and publications (c 275 volunteers have been involved to date). Over seven years, 600 volunteers helped the *Defence of Britain* project record 20,000 twentieth century military sites, and through the Local Heritage Initiative and now Your Heritage Grants, HLF have funded many community-based projects that engage with the past, although few of them have operated at the same scale and with the same degree of continuity as PAS.

Are there other options for delivering PAS?

Close the scheme

Whilst the most obvious **output** from the scheme is recording thousands of objects, one of the most significant **outcomes** has been to rebuild trust between detectorists, archaeologists and museums. Although there are still sceptics on both sides, PAS has done much to rebuild that trust. Both groups point to the fragile nature of that trust, and stress that the uncertainty over the future of the scheme is putting some of that trust at risk. As one finder notes,

It has taken many years to build up to the levels of trust and expectation of good practice currently enjoyed and this can be damaged irredeemably in a very short space of time. NCMD.

If the scheme were to close a community with a passionate interest in the past could stop engaging with museums.

If (the FLO) disappeared tomorrow – I would not be able to deal with the people he deals with. The archaeological record would fail - I could never match rate he is recording ..I have far less time to devote to people identifying objects. There would be black hole and it would impact on the museum's role. He is bringing people into museum who have never been in a museum before. Gail Boyle, Bristol City Museum.

PAS is also seen internationally as a pioneering way of dealing with the problem of illicit detecting. Banning detecting seems only to drive it 'underground' and to turn responsible detectorists with an interest in the past into criminals.

Close elements of the scheme

The four elements of the scheme are interdependent. The database depends on co-operation between finders and FLOs; the quality of records in the database depends upon the training and quality control provided by Finds Advisers; the internal consistency of the scheme and administration depends upon the small central unit. Losing one element would destabilise PAS.

Abandon national coverage

Given that most finds come from cultivated land, and some parts of the country have more cultivated land than others, is national coverage essential? At least 20% of finds come from other areas (50% in Wales) and FLOs often help each other out with big events such as rallies. The number of finds recorded is also not the only measure of the success – building links between museums and finders is just as useful. Withdrawing coverage from parts of the country implies that the voluntary sector and finders in those areas are 'less important'; and it is precisely those areas from which relatively little is known that may have most to contribute academically. Without national coverage PAS could not honour the Code of Practice for Responsible Metal Detecting or the new guidance from English Nature on entry level schemes which asks people to record finds with their local FLO.

Host the scheme in another organisation

MLA could fund an organisation other than the BM to manage the scheme.

University

If a university bid to deliver PAS under the Full Economic Costing (FEC) model used by AHRC £1.3m would support c£520,000 in salaries (after oncosts) – roughly 10 researchers and 5 senior staff. Over time, this could undoubtedly deliver an equivalent research output, although the specific nature of PAS data which is free of the biases created by archaeological research and often comes from places that have not been studied, means that the results would be very different. There would be no outreach as universities have no remit to do this. If the current level of staffing were university-based it would cost about three times as much as it does now.

English Heritage and Cadw

Moving it to EH could strengthen data aspects of the scheme because of links with the National Monuments Record. However, because data functions are integral to the work of FLOs there would be little benefit in separating the management of FLOs from data issues. Some of the policy functions of PAAG do fit with EH. There could be risks to

partnership working, as majority of hosts are museums, who would also have little in common with English Heritage. Similar issues would arise for Cadw.

MLA

MLA could manage PAS directly but with current reorganisation and staff moves it is not a good time to take on new areas. PAS is a specialist scheme with specialist management needs, whilst MLA takes a wider and more strategic role. There might be a small cost saving on grant payment through using MLA's existing financial systems, although the financial administration of PAS involves regular contact with regional partners, and recent improvements in that system have had the knock-on effect of improving the regional relationships with the scheme overall (an area that requires careful nurturing). Again this would be lost were financial systems to be based with MLA.

British Museum

The scheme adds value to the work of the British Museum, including its role in implementing the Treasure Act and related policy issues – in particular the control of the illicit trade in antiquities. Separating the management of PAS from Treasure could jeopardise effective Treasure reporting - without the input of FLOs it is likely that the level of reporting would drop, awareness of the Act (and what is and is not Treasure) would diminish, finds would not get to London and BM curatorial staff would struggle to fulfil their responsibilities. At the same time BM curators also provide advice to FLOs on non-Treasure finds. As well as a financial contribution, the BM contributes to the scheme in kinds by providing facilities such as conference and meeting rooms. The BM's analogue status with AHRC makes it possible for PAS to apply for AHRC funding.

PAS also meshes with the three priorities in the current British Museum review – 'in the city', 'across the country' and 'throughout the world' – by creating partnerships across the country and revealing the cosmopolitan nature of English society through time. That review notes that partnerships are essential to the BM's purpose and highlights the importance of joint working with regional museums, describing PAS as, '*an effective way of welcoming the public into the BM*' (British Museum 2008:43).

Options for sources of funding

English Heritage

EH has funded work relating to PAS under the Historic Environment Enabling Programme (HEEP). That whole programme is worth £4.6million in 2008/9. Priorities for HEEP include broadening access to the historic environment, community involvement in the historic environment, creating online access to data, publications and support for displays of artefacts (English Heritage 2008). Given that there is a close match between the aims of PAS and the areas supported by EH, there would seem to be no reason why finders, host organisations and others could not apply to EH to fund work relating to PAS.

EH also has a lead role for HERs with considerable expertise in developing best practice, providing advice and maintaining data standards. Whilst it does not fund HERs it does fund development control posts. Given that HERs are beneficiaries of PAS data, EH could be approached to help support the database.

British Museum

The BM contributed £97,000 directly to PAS in 2007/8 – with contributions in kind of around £9000 – this was a higher than usual contribution because of the redundancy payments that arose from savings in the PAS budget.

DCMS

It has been argued that DCMS should fund the British Museum directly to manage PAS in this Spending Review period. This is likely to mean reducing MLA's core support which has already been reduced by 25%, or top-slicing Renaissance in the Regions (see below).

Partners

One option would be to increase the requirement for a financial contribution from 5% to 10%. This would have the benefit of increasing the regional 'stake' in the scheme, although given local funding pressures it would be controversial. Many partners will also argue that they already provide additional support in kind.

Users

Could funding be raised through users of the scheme such as the archaeologists who use the data or finders who benefit from a finds identification service? It is hard to make a case for one voluntary sector community with a particular interest in the past paying for museums or archaeology services which are not charged to others. And in fact many finders see themselves as providing a service to museums and archaeologists, rather than the museum/archaeology sector providing a service to them. On the other hand, finders could help the scheme by becoming more involved in its work, and ideally, by being willing to become trained recorders. This might help overcome the particular problem of metal detecting rallies which contribute significantly to the recording backlog.

MLA

MLA has supported PAS for many years; in 2008/9 it provided £300,000 in addition to funding from Renaissance. Most FLOs are based in museums and the scheme has closer affinities with museums than with archaeology services (which have historically been part of land use planning). It fits well with museum focus on material culture, education and learning, and outreach.

Renaissance in the Regions

In 2008/9 £1m of funding for PAS came from an underspend in Renaissance in the Regions. PAS was never historically part of this programme but as Chapter Three shows, it is possible to demonstrate that PAS is delivering against Renaissance objectives.

Nevertheless, some respondents were worried about funding PAS from Renaissance – in part due to a perceived lack of delivery from Renaissance:

The Somerset County Museum Service has seen little direct benefit from the Renaissance project so far, whereas it daily sees considerable benefits from PAS in terms of visitor numbers, publicity, acquisitions and events. Stephen Minnitt, Somerset County Museums Service.

Another drawback is that Renaissance funding is also only available to accredited museums. Ten FLO posts are in County Councils in services that often combine

museums and archaeology (one is actually a Renaissance hub). One FLO is based at the Surrey History Centre (an archive). Several are in organisations that include accredited museums such as the archaeological departments at UCL and Cambridge; whilst the Sussex Archaeological Society has seven properties and is applying for MLA accreditation. The co-ordinating post for Wales is in a National museum but the four Welsh Archaeological Trusts which each receive a small sum for the scheme are not accredited. If Renaissance funding were to be used, MLA would have to look at a precise split between Renaissance funding and MLA funding on the basis of which posts are actually eligible for Renaissance.

On this basis, it is recommended that the scheme is funded as follows:

- Renaissance in the Regions – funding for regional delivery and FLOs that are based in or delivering primarily to accredited museums
- MLA – core funding for the central unit and finds advisers
- English Heritage – contribution to the data and policy functions of the scheme
- Regional partners – enhanced contribution to the cost of FLOs

PAS (and indeed finders, community archaeology groups, museums and archaeologists) should also continue to be encouraged to apply for one-off grants from other bodies for work relating to PAS.

Level of funding

As noted, recent cuts are affecting delivery and retaining the scheme at its current level will mean deciding which regional posts to cut. The scheme has been funded at the same level (c. £1.3m) since 2003/4, but inflation and rising employment costs have increased costs overall.

	Central Unit	Finds Advisers	FLOs	
Salaries	210,935	175,666	876,967	1,263,568
Travel and Subsistence	6120	2,713	55,215	64,048
Other costs	12,373	595	15,780	28,748
	229,428	178,974	947,962	1,356,364

Breakdown of spend 2008-9 (excluding British Museum contributions)

Posts

The two greatest priorities to enable regional coverage to be maintained are Durham and Teeside – where a single FLO covers the North East, including 16 clubs with very high demand; in practice there is no effective coverage of Durham and the Tees area. A part-time post in Durham could be created for £11,500; and Berkshire where the demand for the scheme has been so great that a single post covering Oxfordshire and Berkshire proved inadequate; coverage from Reading/East Berks has been withdrawn and a part-time post in Reading is much needed (£11,000). Coverage of Wales also appears to be inadequate.

Information Technology

ICT provision is a huge risk for PAS. Since the failure of an external IT supplier much of the work on the database has been done by a member of the Central Unit, Dan Pett. He has done a good (and cost effective) job of maintaining and improving the site, and there have been real efficiency improvements – the cost of recording each find has fallen from

£3.62 to 64p. Nevertheless the knowledge of a central component of the scheme – the database – remains with one individual. More worrying for this review is the long-term sustainability of the data itself. The 350,000 records represent nearly £10m of investment over a decade. The data is held on an independent server at the British Museum which must be replaced this year for which there is no funding. Replacing the server would cost £10,000. Some allowance also needs to be made for a long-term strategy to safeguard the data (£20,000) – although this has not been scoped or costed.

Travel

FLOs need to be able to travel to perform their role. Finders, managers and FLOs say that the recent savings in travel budgets combined with rising fuel costs has had a significant impact on the effectiveness of the scheme. Reinstating travel budgets would cost £10,000.

Inflation

With inflation at 2.7% an increase of £35,100 is needed to maintain an award of £1.3m at the same level.

Other budgets

The whole scheme has less than £30,000 for items such as equipment, an annual conference and the small amounts that FLOs need to pack finds, attend events and buy stationery. These budgets have been cut back to retain posts. Just over £22,450 would reinstate these budgets. Small finds are often very difficult to see and photograph, and high quality illustrations can add greatly to our understanding of them; £14,300 per annum would enable this to be done.

Help with recording backlog

In the past, part-time assistants have been brought in to reduce the recording backlog, particularly after rallies which can produce hundreds of finds. Without this capacity, a single FLO covering more than one county and many clubs, could be tied up for months with the finds from just one rally. HLF funded this resource but it has now been withdrawn.

PAS have argued for additional temporary help. This would be useful but would only be a short term solution. An alternative approach would be to create an accredited training system to enable more finders to record finds, perhaps with some help for volunteers with costs. This may be a more long-term, sustainable way of keeping the backlog down.

	£
Part time post for Berkshire	11,000
Part time post for Durham/Tees	11,500
Replace server	10,000
Data sustainability	20,000
Reinstate FLO travel budget	10,000
Illustrations	14,300
Equipment, stationery, finds packing for FLOs	20,000
Training	1000
Annual conference	1450
Inflation	35,100
Backlog help/Finder training scheme	30,000

	£164,350
--	-----------------

Additional funding requirements for 2009/10

Recommended funding model

PAS appears to be well-liked, delivering genuine partnership and good value for money. Having reviewed budgets and operations, it is clear that with no increase in resources, posts must be cut and the scheme will not deliver regional equity.

An increase of £160,000 (c 12%) would enable PAS is to maintain regional equity and put in place a long term solution to the ever increasing demand for recording, as well as to safeguard the existing investment in data and allow for modest travel and operating budgets.

	2008/9	2009/10	2010/11	
MLA core funding	300,000	340,000	349,180	Finds Advisers/Central Unit
Renaissance in the Regions	1,000,000	1,040,000	1,068,080	FLOs
Partners' financial contribution to FLOs	57,176	109,000	111,943	FLOs
English Heritage		25,000	25,675	Database costs
British Museum	68,364	70,900	72,814	Central unit
Welsh Assembly Government		5,000	5,135	Support for core functions in Wales
TOTAL	£1,425,540	£1,589,900	£1,632,827	

Potential funding model 2009/10 (excluding partners' contributions in kind as a result of hosting PAS). The model assumes an inflation rate of 2.7%.

Bibliography

Bland, R. 2005. 'Rescuing our neglected heritage: the evolution of the government's policy on Portable antiquities in England and Wales'. *Cultural Trends* vol 14(4) 56:257-296.

Bland, R. 2005. 'A pragmatic approach to the problem of portable antiquities: the experience of England and Wales'. *Antiquity* 79: 440-447.

British Museum 2007. *British Museum Review 2006/7*. London: British Museum

Chitty, G.. 2001. *Review of Portable Antiquities Pilot Scheme*. Hawkshead Archaeology and Conservation.

Chitty G, & Edwards, R. 2004. *Review of Portable Antiquities Scheme 2004*. Hawkshead Archaeology and Conservation.

DCMS 2002 *The Treasure Act 1996 Code of Practice* (revised). HMSO

Dobinson, C. & Denison, S. 1995. *Metal detecting and archaeology in England*. Report for English Heritage and the Council for British Archaeology.

Edwards, R. 2006. *Portable Antiquities Scheme: user survey 2006*. Aboretum archaeological consultancy.

English Heritage. 2006. *Our portable past*. London: English Heritage

English Heritage, 2008. *Shape (Strategic framework for historic environment activities and programmes)*. Downloaded 13th August 2008 from: <http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/server/show/nav.1303>.

NCMD et al. *Code of practice for responsible metal detecting in England and Wales*.

PAS, 2007. *Portable Antiquities Scheme annual report 2006*. London: Portable Antiquities Scheme.

PAS (forthcoming). *Portable Antiquities Scheme annual report 2007*. London: Portable Antiquities Scheme.

Pryor, F. 2007. *Britain in the middle ages*. London: Harpercollins.

Thomas, S. (2006) 'Building Bridges on Tyneside', in *Public Archaeology* 2006 Vol 5: 253-256.

APPENDIX: PAS Partnerships

Organisations who host or manage FLOs

Post	Primary manager	Other managers/partners
Finds adviser, prehistoric and Roman artefacts	University College London	
Finds adviser, medieval and post medieval artefacts	Dept Archaeology, University of Cambridge	
Finds adviser, medieval and post medieval artefacts	British Museum /Museum of London	
Finds adviser, Iron Age and Roman Coins	British Museum	
Finds adviser: medieval and post medieval coins	Ashmolean Museum	
Finds adviser: medieval and post medieval artefacts (p/t)	North Lincolnshire Museum	
Berkshire & Oxfordshire	Oxfordshire County Museums Service	Reading Museums West Berkshire Archaeology Service
Buckinghamshire	Buckinghamshire County Museum	Culture Milton Keynes
Cambridgeshire	Cambridgeshire County Council	Peterborough Museum
Cornwall	Royal Cornwall Museum	Cornwall County Council Historic Environment Service
Derbyshire & Nottinghamshire	Derby Museums & Art Gallery	Brewhouse Yard Museum of Nottingham Life,
Devon	Royal Albert Memorial Museum, Exeter	
Essex	Colchester & Ipswich Museum Service	Waste Recycling and Environment, Essex County Council
Gloucestershire & Avon	Bristol City Museum	Archaeology Service, Gloucester County Council
Hampshire	Winchester Museums Service	
Hereford & Shropshire	Birmingham Museum and Art Gallery Ludlow library and museum resource centre	Hereford Museum and Art Gallery Rowleys House Museum
Hertfordshire and Bedfordshire	Verulamium Museum	Hertford County Council Bedfordshire County Council
Isle of Wight	Isle of Wight Archaeology Centre	Isle of Wight County Council
Kent	Kent County Council (Leisure and Heritage)	
Lancashire and Cumbria	Museum of Lancashire	Tullie House Museum, Carlisle
Leicestershire and Rutland	Leicestershire County Council (History and Heritage Services)	
Lincolnshire	Lincolnshire County Council	
London	Museum of London	
Norfolk	Norfolk County Council	

	Museums and Archaeology Service	
Northamptonshire	Northamptonshire County Council	
North East	Durham County Council	
North West	National Museums, Liverpool	
North Lincolnshire	North Lincolnshire Museum	
Somerset and Dorset	Somerset County Museums Service	Historic Environment Service, Somerset
Staffordshire and West Midlands	Birmingham City Museum and Art Gallery	Potteries Museum Stoke on Trent
Suffolk	Suffolk County Council	
Surrey	Surrey History Centre, Woking	
Sussex	Sussex Archaeological Society	
Warwickshire and Worcestershire	Birmingham City Museum	Worcester City Museum Service Warwickshire Museum
Wiltshire	Salisbury and South Wiltshire Museum	Swindon Museum and Art Gallery Wiltshire Heritage Museum
Yorkshire (North and East)	The Yorkshire Museum	
Yorkshire (South and West)	West Yorkshire Archaeology Advisory Service	Doncaster Museum and Art Gallery
Wales	National Museum Wales	Welsh Archaeological Trusts (who work with many local museums)

Breakdown of host organisations by type of institution

National Museums (3)

British Museum (5 posts)

National Museums & Galleries of Wales (1 post, plus grants to 4 Welsh Archaeological Trusts)

National Museums Liverpool (1 post)

Hub Museums (10)

Ashmolean Museum (1 post)

Birmingham Museum & Art Gallery (3 posts)

Bristol City Museum & Art Gallery (1 post)

Colchester & Ipswich Museums Service (1 post)

Derby Museum & Art Gallery (2 half-time posts)

Museum of London and Museum of London Archaeology Service (1 half-time post plus a contract for 0.4 post)

Norfolk County Council Museums Service (1 full-time and 2 part-time posts)

Royal Albert Memorial Museum, Exeter (1 post)

Royal Cornwall Museum (0.6 post)

York Museums Trust (1.5 posts, to become 1 post)

Other Museums (8)

Buckinghamshire County Museums Service (1 post)

Lancashire County Museums Service (1 post)

North Lincolnshire Museum (1 post plus contract for 0.4 post)
Salisbury & South Wiltshire Museum (1 post)
Somerset County Museums Service (1.8 posts)
St. Albans Museums Service (1 post)
Sussex Archaeological Society (1 post)
Winchester City Museums Service (1 post)

County Councils (10)

Cambridgeshire County Council (1 post)
Isle of Wight County Archaeology Service (contract for 0.6 post)
Kent County Council (1 post)
Leicestershire County Council (1 post)
Lincolnshire County Council (1 post)
Northamptonshire County Council (1 post)
Suffolk County Council (1.6 posts)
Surrey County Council (0.5 post)
West Berkshire Council (likely to change to Oxfordshire County Museums Service) (1 post)
West Yorkshire Joint Services (1 post)

Universities (3)

University College London Institute of Archaeology (1 post)
University of Cambridge (0.6 post)
University of Newcastle upon Tyne (likely to change to Durham County Council) (1 post)

Secondary Partners

As well as the principal partners who host FLOs, the PAS works with around 70 further local partners that support the scheme or contribute to posts in their area:

Association of Local Government Archaeological Officers
Bath and North Somerset Council
Bedfordshire County Council
Bedford Museum
Berkshire Archaeology
Beverley Museum
Birmingham City Council
Booth Museum, Brighton
Borough Council of Wellingborough
Braintree Museum
Bradford Museums Galleries and Heritage
Bridgwater Brick and Tile Museum
Bruton Museum, Somerset
Calderdale Museum and Gallery Service
Cambria Archaeology
Cater Museum Billericay
Chelmsford Museum
Chard Museum, Somerset
Cheshire Museums Service
Chichester District Museum

City of Plymouth Museums & Art Gallery
Clywd Powys Archaeological Trust
Corby Borough Council
Cornwall Historic Environment Service
Council for British Archaeology
Country Business & Landowners Association
Dartmoor National Park Authority
Daventry District Council
Derbyshire County Council
Devon County Council
Doncaster Museum & Art Gallery
Dorset County Council
Durham County Council
Durham University
East Northamptonshire Council
East Sussex County Council
East Sussex Record Office
English Heritage
Epping Forest District Council
Essex County Council
Exmoor National Park Authority
Fitzwilliam Museum (Cambridge)
Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust
Glastonbury Rural Life Museum
Gloucester City Museum
Gwynedd Archaeological Trust
Hampshire County Museums Service
Hampshire County Planning Department
Harlow Museum
Hastings Museum
Hereford Museum & Art Gallery (Hereford Heritage Services)
Herefordshire Archaeology
Horsham Museum
Hull City Council Museums Service
Kirklees Community History Service
Kettering Borough Council
Leeds Museum Service
Leicester Museums Service
Littlehampton Museum
Manchester Museum
Milton Keynes Council
Museums, Libraries and Archives Council (MLA)
Museum of Barnstaple & North Devon
Museum of Reading
National Council for Metal Detecting
National Farmers Union
New Forest National Park Authority
North Somerset Council
Northampton Borough Council
Northumberland Archaeology
Nottinghamshire County Council

Oxfordshire County Council
Oxfordshire County Museums Service
Peterborough Museum
Portland Museum, Dorset
Potteries Museum & Art Gallery, Stoke-on-Trent
Priest's House Museum
Reading Borough Council
Ripon Museum
Rotherham Museums Service
Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Wales
Rugby Council
Saffron Walden Museum
Sheffield Galleries and Museums Trust
Sherbourne Museum
Shrewsbury Museum Service
Shropshire County Museum Service
Skipton Museum
Society of Museum Archaeologists
South Gloucestershire Council
South Northamptonshire Council
South Yorkshire Archaeology Service
Southampton City Museums
Southend-on-Sea Museum
Sturminster Newton Museum
Surrey Archaeological Society
Swindon Museum & Art Gallery
Tees Archaeology
The Collection, Lincoln
Torbay Council
Tyne and Wear Archaeology
Wakefield Museums Service
Warwickshire County Council
Warwickshire Museum
Waterfront Museum, Poole
Wells Museum, Somerset
West Midlands Archaeological Collections Research Unit
West Midlands Museums, Libraries and Archives Council
West Sussex County Council
Wiltshire Archaeological & Natural History Society
Wiltshire County Council
Wimborne Minster Museum, Dorset
Worcester City Museums
Worcestershire County Museum
Yeovil Community Heritage Access Centre
York Archaeological Trust