



## Summary Report

### Future Thinking on Carved Stones in Scotland: Workshop 2

#### At the door of the church? Research and carved stones at ecclesiastical sites

##### **Preamble**

The workshop took place on 1 May at Govan Old Church, Glasgow and was the second of four Royal Society of Edinburgh-funded workshops. Together, these aim to stimulate research into all aspects of carved stones in Scotland and to promote an increased awareness of their interest, significance and value. The workshop was organized by Dr Sally Foster (University of Stirling) and attended by 18 participants (see page 11). This workshop brought together for the first time church organizations, curators and researchers. It sought to understand the historical and curatorial issues for carved stones from each other's perspectives and to identify what research is necessary, desirable and possible. By doing so, it was hoped that this event would contribute to a research agenda for carved stones in Scotland.

##### **Workshop findings**

The matrix below (page 3-11) summarises the issues identified during the workshop under four overarching themes – *understanding*, *protecting*, *valuing* and *systemic*. The predominant themes of discussion were:

- The **absence of information** to enable stakeholders **to move forward on a strategic basis** and implement actions following the fundamental conservation process of understanding, valuing and protecting carved stones.
- The **lack of an overview** supported by more detailed records **curtails our ability to characterise the resource** and as a result effectively **identify and assess the significance of and the risks** to carved stones. It limits our capacity to address the many failings we know of anecdotally, particularly the legislative gaps affecting carved stones, and to protect the highest-risk categories, such as loose and vulnerable sculpture and graveyards.
- Currently, there are several **key gaps in our knowledge** that limit our ability to both understand carved stones ourselves **as managers and researchers** but importantly as **communicators** to create a bridge that can allow their value to be experienced and understood more widely by others.
- The above point is all the more important because of a **widespread lack of even basic knowledge about churches among the public**. Stakeholders have insufficient knowledge about the social and public values placed on carved stones in an ecclesiastical setting and the relationship between the resource and different communities in practice.

- The **key research themes** of **identity** and **authenticity** and a focus upon **carved stone biographies and contexts** can help us to develop a better appreciation of these ‘missing’ values and to understand the effects of ecclesiastical heritage upon communities (and how communities can impact ecclesiastical heritage).
- **Two categories** of carved stones were identified within discussion as being particular **high priorities**:
  - 1. **Loose and Vulnerable carved stones** are at risk because
    - Responsibility for them **falls between stools** (e.g. museums, Historic Scotland, local authorities, the church)
    - They are **not well protected by current legislation**. Listing does not usually cover loose stones and portable stones by definition cannot be scheduled.
    - In many cases **ownership is unclear** and/or **owners are difficult to trace**
    - Their **portability is a risk to their traceability and protection** from theft.
    - Movement increases the chance of stones being **taken out of their historical context**.
    - There may be **issues over the extent and quality of recording** and cataloguing to document their original placement or develop biographies of secondary associations, or to evidence claims if stones have been stolen.
  - 2. **Graveyards** are at risk due to
    - **The divided nature of their ownership**, which brings a lack of clarity over responsibilities and inhibits joined-up action.
    - An assessment of graveyards’ significance and condition is particularly challenging because of the **quantity of sites and the numbers and variety of features they contain**.
    - Anecdotal evidence clearly shows **good practice guidance is not informing their day-to-day care**.
    - The **risks they face from grave and gravestone reuse is unclear**.
    - The limited resources available to care for the large number of gravestones graveyards places an **urgent need to**

**develop more appropriate conservation strategies** than available at present.

### **Workshop format**

The workshop comprised three main sessions; defining the issues, refining the strategy and making things happen. The day began with two brief presentations by Dr Katherine Forsyth on the Govan Old Project and Dr Susan Buckham on the Govan Old Churchyard Conservation Management Plan. Together the talks outlined the strengths of the Govan Old Project as a case study of collaborative, community-led stewardship of carved stones within an ecclesiastical setting, as well as anticipating several of the main themes raised by discussion. Before the workshop’s main discussion commenced, participants (see page 11) were invited to attend the Daily Service or quietly enjoy the Govan Stones.

The workshop noted that carved stones within an ecclesiastical contexted included a wide range of carved stone types from different periods including early medieval monuments, post-Reformation gravestones and medieval and later architectural carved stones.

Table 1

<b>UNDERSTANDING</b>	
<i>Where are we?</i>	<i>Where do we want to go?</i>
<p><b>STRENGTHS</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Long history of recording</b> ecclesiastical carved stones, in variety of formats</li> <li>2. <b>Tested recording methods</b> e.g. CSAP, PKHT, Aberdeenshire Historic Kirkyard, CAVLP</li> <li>3. <b>Existing datasets</b> e.g. SAFHS Graveyard Inventory, SCHR Places of Worship in Scotland</li> <li>4. <b>Existing research</b> e.g. HEACS reports outlining the social and economic context for ecclesiastical heritage (access reports online <a href="#">here</a>, <a href="#">here</a>, and <a href="#">here</a>)</li> <li>5. <b>Knowledge is continually developing</b> with researchers still coming across new things</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>15. <b>Put current records in order</b></li> <li>16. <b>Action:</b> Collate (by whom?) existing information (incorporating local authority ownership lists and records compiled by other stakeholders, including workshop participants) to reassess what it can tell us and to identify gaps in knowledge</li> <li>17. <b>Get more information to fill in the gaps in our current knowledge</b> so we can begin to investigate the resource at a more strategic level</li> <li>18. <b>Action:</b> Carry out an audit to grasp the scale and basic nature of the carved stones resource. The audit process should include field investigation. Audit should also capture information on management (e.g. ownership, maintenance regimes, repairs, stone condition) and to identify lost or misplaced stones. Volunteers may be able to assist with recording programmes</li> <li>19. <b>Enhance recording practices to standardize and formalize data</b> recording and management and to identify and share good practice</li> <li>20. <b>Action:</b> Develop a recording strategy for use by a range of groups (including the public) to document different types of carved stones. This should lead to action on the ground and must reflect current understanding of ecclesiastical carved stones but also enable new appreciations to be developed. Methods should take into account any lack of subject knowledge (cf 97).</li> <li>21. SAFHS intend to record the inscription on every tombstone by 2020</li> <li>22. <b>Increase access and contextualisation of information</b> by linking</li> </ol>
<p><b>WEAKNESSES</b></p> <p><b>No overview of the carved stone resource means that we cannot get a handle on what we have</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. The <b>lack of detail within heritage management records</b> (e.g. CANMORE, HERs, Historic Scotland lists of scheduled monuments and listed buildings) makes it impossible to answer preliminary questions such as ‘how many’, ‘where located’, ‘what condition?’</li> <li>7. If we do not have any overview, <b>how can we know what is important</b> to record, identify new discoveries or identify gaps in current knowledge and begin to fill these in strategically?</li> <li>8. There has been <b>no national audit</b> (and only limited regional examples) to measure and characterise what exists, or has been lost, on the ground in practice</li> <li>9. Without an audit we know anecdotally that ecclesiastical carved stones are a resource under threat but we <b>cannot understand</b> the nature of their vulnerability or <b>the relationship between significance and the rate of loss</b>.</li> </ol> <p><b>Barriers to using existing records and research</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10. Difficult to access data without a central portal that covers all types of</li> </ol>	

<p>information, including contextual</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>11. The absence of standard terminology and compatible approaches to recording / data management makes it hard to pull existing information together or even interrogate individual databases</li> <li>12. It is unclear how existing information might contribute to new research areas e.g. carved stone biographies and context, the social and public values of carved stones, identity and authenticity</li> <li>13. If nested within wider research on ecclesiastical heritage a consideration of values and issues as they might apply specifically to carved stones can be overlooked (e.g. HEACS reports)</li> <li>14. Questions over the quality of information given the lack of ecclesiastical knowledge among academics and recorders (cf 97)</li> </ol>	<p>carved stones records to other types of data (architectural, place names, landscape, local history etc.)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>23. <b>Action:</b> Assess the potential to enhance CANMORE by improving how it can be interrogated and its capacity to act as an umbrella site to link with other datasets. There should be dual development with HERs and issues should be flagged to the Scotland’s Historic Environment Data (SHED) forum to incorporate in their strategy</li> <li>24. <b>Carry out research</b> informed by gaps in knowledge and to cover core themes of: identity; carved stone biographies; early historic sites; memorialisation over time, including patterns of reuse; and death beliefs, attitudes and practices</li> <li>25. <b>Action:</b> Compile and promote thematic case studies. Undertake a programme of on-the-ground investigation of early historic sites through unobtrusive means to help clarify their origin with the aim of improving their management (especially in advance of grave reuse).</li> </ol>
---	--

Table 2

PROTECTING	
Where are we?	Where do we want to go?
<p><b>STRENGTHS</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>26. <b>Statutory designations</b> of scheduled monument and listed building can apply to protect ecclesiastical carved stones and new discoveries may be covered by Treasure Trove</li> <li>27. <b>Good practice guidance</b> includes Scottish Executive <i>Policy and Guidance for Carved Stones</i>, Historic Scotland’s <i>Practitioners’ Guide to the Conservation of Historic Graveyards</i></li> <li>28. <b>Case studies</b> include CSAP, PKHT, Aberdeenshire Council’s historic kirkyards project and audit</li> </ol> <p><b>WEAKNESSS</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>29. Loose and vulnerable carved stones are at risk because responsibility for them falls between stools (e.g. museums, Historic Scotland, local authorities, the local churches).</li> </ol> <p><b>Legislation</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>30. It is <b>not clear what is and what is not protected within the current legislation</b> for scheduled monuments, listed buildings and Treasure Trove. This is the result of grey areas in how laws are</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>43. <b>Change policy to better protect stones</b></li> <li>44. <b>Action:</b> Build up an evidence base to demonstrate through mapping scenarios and case studies what the results will be for carved stones, particularly loose and vulnerable stones, if regulatory gaps are not resolved. Evidence should be quantified for policy-making. Research to review approaches in other countries to advocate for best practice</li> <li>45. <b>Improve management of church disposals</b></li> <li>46. <b>Actions:</b> Establish a mechanism for a multi-</li> </ol>

interpreted and applied in relation to issues of portability and ownership, but also because of a lack of clarity in the documentation of individual sites and monuments.

31. **Church disposal loophole:** Ecclesiastical Exemption means there is no legal protection for carved stones inside a church in use. While listed building status applies when the church is no longer in use, stones are vulnerable to disposal if a church is cleared prior to closure as there is no Scottish equivalent of the Pastoral Measures Act 1983
32. **Changing policy requires a strong evidence base, which we do not have.** Although many issues are known anecdotally, policy-makers cannot make recommendations to close legislative gaps without more detailed evidence to quantify the risks posed to carved stones in practice. Historic Scotland lacks the resources to undertake such research to a level sufficient to develop new policies
33. The **impact of proposals to enable grave and gravestone reuse is unclear** from how Scottish Government consultations are framed. New practices could have a considerable effect and we currently lack a baseline to assess potential risks and measure any future impact
34. Legislation is failing to protect carved stones in practice because **owners and managers are often unaware of their statutory responsibilities**, and such protection may anyway only be passive

#### **Barriers to developing, sharing and implementing good conservation management**

##### **Ownership**

35. **We do not know the impact of changes in ownership and use**, particularly from increasing church and manse redundancies, upon access, stone condition or public opinion. How can we create better physical access to sites and monuments after a change in use? Is an increase in tourism a risk to carved stones?
36. **Fragmented responsibilities impede a joined-up approach to protection** - for example, most people are unaware of their responsibility to maintain family gravestones. Relocating stones from a local authority graveyard into a church is complicated by the different ownerships
37. We need a better understanding of **what are the issues linked to different types of ownership / stewardship** (cf 102). What is the diversity of management, particularly within current local authorities? Do carved stones present a management burden for churches (e.g. need to keep open for visitors, security issues, increased insurance)? Does moving a carved stone into a church increase protection at the expense of visitor access? What resources do 'friends of' groups bring and what support is needed to ensure the sustainability of their actions, information, experience and skills? How does graveyard conservation management conflict with burial provision?

agency committee (e.g. church, Historic Scotland, Local Authority) to coordinate, in advance and at a local level, procedures to inform church disposals.

47. Create guidance for local churches to set out procedures for formalised de-accession, outlining steps for the parish to take  
Research on practice in other countries to develop a strategy for how to best deploy guidance
48. Create guidance for new owners and subsequent purchasers of deaccessioned churches and manses with carved stones
49. **Develop appropriate preservation strategies for both *in situ* and relocated stones**
50. **Action:** Use baseline (cf 18) to identify priorities issues where further guidance is needed to protect and display (present and interpret) stones.
51. Identify and promote case studies for good and bad practice
52. Develop new or revise existing policies and guidance for implementing these on the ground (e.g. for maintenance, repairs, shelters, relocating stones, fixings, monitoring, creation of casts and other replicas etc.). The development of best practice guidance should include a skills audit to implement
53. Create guidance to cover the conservation process (e.g. recording, conservation management plans, conservation statements)
54. Assess potential for good practice in maintenance and repairs to be enforced

<p><b>Limited knowledge base</b></p> <p>38. The <b>lack of knowledge about carved stones</b> (cf 97) and about <b>conservation principles</b> (i.e. need to understand stones before doing anything to them) among owners and managers increases the risks to carved stones. Undesignated carved stones are particularly vulnerable in this respect</p> <p>39. The knowledge gap means <b>new discoveries may also be overlooked</b> and therefore not given appropriate care</p> <p>40. A lack of an overview (cf 8) to give a sense of <b>what the correlation is between risk and significance</b>, particularly for graveyards. This <b>limits the ability to target finite resources</b> available for maintenance and repairs effectively (cf 9)</p> <p><b>Variable standards of care</b></p> <p>41. Across Scotland there is a <b>lack of consistency for the protection of stones <i>in situ</i></b> both in terms of using appropriate techniques and materials and for decision-making when dealing with competing values (e.g. the relative importance of a carved stone as a piece of art and as a part of a building)</p> <p>42. <b>Anecdotal evidence indicates current best practice guidance is not being widely followed</b>, particularly for graveyards. More information is needed to understand why and the contribution of factors such as a lack of (craft)skills and knowledge, public attitudes, available resources and local authority service delivery mechanisms. Protection is not just about designation and strategies also need to be developed on the basis of a good understanding current practice. For example, what is the most appropriate means to deal with grass cutting or memorial stability in graveyards with the likely resources available?</p>	<p>through legislation</p>
---	----------------------------

Table 3

VALUING	
Where are we?	Where do we want to go?
<p><b>STRENGTHS</b></p> <p>55. <b>Gathering of momentum in both scholarly and general interest</b> in carved stones e.g. SAFHS online graveyards inventory has received over 8,000 ‘hits’, SCT Pilgrim journeys network, Dig It! research on lifelong learning provision involving archaeology found that carved stones and medieval were in the top ten search topics</p> <p>56. <b>Church heritage affects every community in Scotland</b> with sites offering good local access, biographies of communities and potentially international stories</p> <p>57. <b>Ecclesiastical heritage has significant educational value</b> and offers multidisciplinary, place-based</p>	<p>76. <b>Quantify current engagement and evaluate its impact</b> to inform future engagement and evaluation. Evidence of social and public values can be used to support funding and to advocate more broadly for carved stones</p> <p>77. <b>Action:</b> Create a baseline of current engagement and good practice by</p>

learning for both formal and informal education that fits well with cross-sector priorities e.g. health and well-being, place-making etc.

58. **Case studies for creative interpretation** include St Andrews University's 3D digital reconstructions of ruined buildings, McManus Art Gallery and Museum's later medieval grave-slabs 3D scanning project, Faith in Cowal Pilgrim Landscape
59. **Case studies for positive community engagement** leading to decreased antisocial behaviour in graveyards (Loudon Kirk, East Ayrshire; Stonehouse, South Lanarkshire; Greyfriars, Edinburgh)

## WEAKNESSES

### We are lacking an appreciation of the social and public values of carved stones

60. **Social and public values can offer a more inclusive means for communities to engage** with carved stones. They are strands of cultural value we know less about and find more difficult to quantify than more 'traditional', intrinsic cultural values
61. By understanding the factors that underpin social value we can tease out **why some people are not currently interested** in carved stones and develop strategies to improve engagement. We will also be better placed to include and promote social and public values within policy-making, management and research
62. We are missing knowledge about the local values of carved stones, 'the stories behind inscriptions', and how these links to social and public values as **heritage management records focus on indicators of national and regional importance**
63. **Identity is as a key area where ecclesiastical heritage can play a social role.** Churches and churchyards are no longer places where everyone regularly visits (or indeed feel comfortable in or understands). Accordingly, the important question to answer now is what is their value to entire community?
64. A **biographical approach** to studying carved stones draws in the range of values that can make it easier for people to appreciate them and **lays down a continuum of social value.** This can enhance our own sense of stewardship by virtue of appreciating peoples' previous relationship with the material. However, more research is needed to unpack associations and values that might follow, such as authenticity. For example, the level of visibility and the continuation of links to place might mean a replica stone in front of church has higher public value placed upon it than an original carving in an overgrown churchyard or in a museum

### At present evaluating significance is hard to carry out in a holistic and consistent way

65. The **lack of evidence for comparative analysis** is a major difficulty (especially for graveyards). This is due to the absence of
- Chronological and regional frameworks to give a context to appreciate, for example, rarity

working with others (churches, heritage organisations and voluntary groups etc.) to record activities. Collate and quantify information centrally (by whom?) and feed back to stakeholders.

78. A focus on formal/informal learning might form a useful pilot study
79. Basic information to capture includes number and type of; participants, school visits, other activities (formal or informal), web 'hits', volunteering hours etc.
80. Measures of impact might include instances of antisocial behaviour, number and level of grants secured. Indicators to fit where appropriate with SHEA, and BEFS Measuring Success
81. Create a series of rich case studies to evidence social and cultural impact and specific issues and themes e.g:
- What happens when you create new spaces and new activities for carved stones?*
  - How we know people appreciate things?*
  - How can biographical approach make stories grip?*
  - What enables different modes of engagement?*
  - How does presentation influence how people experience the heritage?*
  - How does harnessing community values affect stewardship?*
  - What are the connections between awareness, value, protection and policy and how can we capitalise*

<p>or representativeness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. Specific guidance to apply designation policy to individual and groups of carved stones</li> <li>c. Designation documentation does not usually fully articulate the basis on which a particular site or monument has been determined as holding national or regional importance</li> </ul> <p>66. <b>Designation is not strong in its current legislation, policy and practice to deal with aspects beyond the intrinsic</b> values of carved stones (cf Tinkers' Heart, Argyll and Bute)</p> <p>67. We <b>lack an evaluation process</b> that recognises that not everything can or necessarily should be graded, yet can acknowledge multiple values and deal with a number of significances and still determine priorities. There is no means to recognise the public create their own values and significance for carved stones</p> <p><b>We need to improve how we communicate value creatively, to create joined-up 'messaging' as well, and enable visitors to create their own significance</b></p> <p>68. The <b>priority audiences are formal / informal education and lifelong learning</b> and to reach these groups we need to answer the kinds of questions likely to captivate a schools audience. This differs from the academic information built up for carved stones</p> <p>69. Another target audience is <b>congregations and ministers, to help churches to theologise their own material heritage</b> and value the stones as part of the history of their church and part of the resources they have to carry out their work</p> <p>70. <b>Media</b> for interpretation includes computers (more appealing to children), digital technologies (to help locate and improve access) and touring displays (to increase dynamism of church spaces), which can be <b>linked to themed events</b></p> <p>71. We <b>communicate the importance of carved stones through their presentation</b>. Accessible displays using high quality designs and materials and within well-maintained settings all subliminally convey the value of stones. Such presentation (e.g. the Nigg cross-slab) helps challenge any public perception that a museum is the only place to find important stones rather than within the local church and churchyard. Such displays do, however, need good promotion to encourage visitors.</p> <p>72. Good physical access to the material allows people to experience materiality of stones within a particular place and <b>draw their own values without the specific need for 'knowledge'</b>. It invites people to feel that this is their space and it is OK for them to enjoy it on their own terms, overcoming potential cultural barriers among non-Christian audiences, as well as sensitivities connected to the subject of death</p> <p>73. While we are <b>not clear yet on what the stories are we want to tell</b> (and so if we have the necessary information and other building blocks in place), there is <b>consensus for appropriate 'messaging'</b>, from across the sector using a common language to address the educational gap on ecclesiastical heritage (cf 97)</p>	<p><i>upon these to developing interest?</i></p> <p>82. <b>Improve messaging</b> to take the increasing momentum of interest in carved stones to target educational audiences and the wider public</p> <p>83. <b>Action:</b> Use baseline information (cf 77) to promote existing and new opportunities for themed events coordinate nationally in advance but delivered locally e.g. anniversaries of WW1, Doors Open Day, Year of Homecoming, Day of the Dead etc.</p> <p>84. Promote existing and new opportunities to link sites and landscapes so they can become part of a journey (both physically and virtually and from a local to international levels) and increase understanding and access e.g. Govan Old as a portal for early medieval stones in Scotland</p> <p>85. Undertake collaborative working to develop an interpretation strategy based on messaging that assumes little or no knowledge about ecclesiastical heritage</p> <p>86. Begin to build links with schools to understand and then deliver the educational resources for carved stones that schools need e.g. links to the curriculum, teachers' toolkits, CPD for teachers etc.</p> <p>87. Begin to build links with churches and their stewards to deliver resources that can complement yet in some instances also strengthen their current religious objectives</p>
--	---



<p>74. It is important that stories are communicated creatively (e.g. imaging the material in terms of the ideas which were current at the time of its creation) but also that <b>interpretation be linked and layered to offer opportunities for deeper engagement</b>. For example, interpretation of stones within their landscape and biographical context optimises access and historical and social linkages. This can help viewers understand less 'obvious' significance: for example, a fragment of early medieval carving may have little artistic merit but be the only evidence for an early Christian community in a particular area</p> <p><b>Evaluating outcomes and impact of carved stones for communities</b></p> <p>75. Lots of engagement seems to be taking place but we need to draw evidence for this together to understand the audiences, in particular their experiences and learning outcomes, as well as the implications for future practice and research</p>	<p>88. <b>Enhance our methods to assess cultural significance</b> to more effectively bring together different elements of value and improve our ability to prioritise</p> <p>89. <b>Action:</b> Carry out research to create contextual frameworks to support comparative analysis (particularly for graveyards, architectural carved stones). Identify aspects to consider when evaluating significance for categories of carved stones</p> <p>90. Develop policy, supported by specific guidance on how to bring different elements together to evaluate significance, including national importance</p> <p>91. Establish protocols to accommodate that our knowledge is continually developing and so assessment needs to similarly be on-going</p>
--	---

Table 4

SYSTEMIC ISSUES	
<i>Where are we?</i>	<i>Where do we want to go?</i>
<p><b>STRENGTHS</b></p> <p>92. The <b>National Committee on Carved Stones in Scotland (NCCSS)</b> exists to draw attention to the opportunities and issues for Scottish carved stones of all periods and to promote their understanding, appreciation and care. The Committee is an independent body mainly composed of representatives from Scottish national bodies (including Historic Scotland, RCAHMS, ALGAO, PMSA, SAFHS, SMF and Treasure Trove Unit)</p> <p>93. The majority of carved stones in Scotland are found at ecclesiastical sites, and most of these sites are owned or managed by local authorities or the Church of Scotland</p>	<p><b>Establish closer cross-sector working</b> by finding ways for</p> <p>118. Researchers to work with and through church bodies to get a better handle on what is happening on the ground and help with processes</p> <p>119. Closer working between church</p>

- 94. Scottish local authority **cemetery managers are part of a benchmarking group**, which provides a collective point of contact
- 95. There is an internal procedure to trigger the **Church of Scotland's Art and Architecture Committee** to approach Historic Scotland for advice on significant heritage items prior to a church's closure.
- 96. An increased involvement by non-ordained church members provides an opportunity to develop articulating connections between liturgy and carved stones and landscape (e.g. the recent publication by Pray Now Group, *Living Stones. Pray Now Weekly Devotions & Monthly Prayer Activities*)

**WEAKNESSES**

**Religious / secular divide, which operates at both community and institutional levels resulting in knowledge gap**

- 97. Changing society over the last century means churches and churchyards are no longer somewhere where everyone regularly visits or has formal links with. As a result there is a widespread lack of general knowledge about churches and carved stones among the public (including academics)
- 98. Associations with death and religion might mean that some people are unsure about how to visit or are uncomfortable with the idea of visiting churches and churchyards
- 99. There is a lack of general knowledge about carved stones as a facet of ecclesiastical heritage among church congregations and ministers linked to a rise in evangelicalism
- 100. The built environment generally, and ecclesiastical heritage specifically, is not part of the schools syllabus. In the long-term the educational gap needs to be addressed through a cultural shift in the sector

**Graveyard ownership**

- 101. Clarifying ownership for graveyards is complex because original paperwork rarely exists. Site owners are not responsible for gravestones or some buildings, which are heritable property, but in many cases the families cannot be traced. Currently, there is no clear legal procedure to deal with 'ownerless' gravestones or graveyards
- 102. When carved stone or graveyard ownership and management reside in different local authority departments or ecclesiastical structures, responsibility for their protection can fall through the gaps

**Fragmentation of work**

- 103. There is no co-ordination of research leading to silo working and the potential for reinventing the wheel and duplication of effort
- 104. There is significant memory loss regarding existing resources (e.g. CSAP), meaning that information which could help is not being utilised
- 105. Specialist knowledge for particular types of carved stone may rest in individuals rather than in publically available resources e.g. dateable records or publications

authorities and heritage bodies to feed heritage assessment into the decision-making process over church closures

- 120. Closer working between different local authority departments with a remit for carved stones at the broadest level (e.g. regeneration and place-making, education, health and well-being, cemetery management, planning and development)
- 121. Heritage bodies and cemetery managers to identify common priorities and develop together strategies to address these
- 122. NCCSS to continue and develop its strategic contribution
- 123. Create networks for all stakeholders to keep in touch, balancing requirement for carved stones to be considered in their own right and as part of associated heritage

**Improve accessibility to information and sharing knowledge**

- 124. Use SCARF as a holding place for links
- 125. Free use of RCAHMS and other tax-payer funded body's images and documents for academic, educational and outreach purposes, notably publication
- 126. Develop a better understanding of how the internet can improve

<p>106. There are questions over the life-spans of work carried out by community groups without institutional transfer knowledge and expertise</p> <p>107. There is no central information hub to draw information together, including contextual</p> <p><b>Barriers to developing and sharing good practice</b></p> <p>108. Who is the lead body(s) to advocate, coordinate messaging, collate information for carved stones?</p> <p>109. Previous cross-sector networks (e.g. Graveyard and Cemetery Liaison Group) have folded with nothing taking their place</p> <p>110. Devolved nature of church management poses challenges for strategic links and communication</p> <p>111. Lack of shared forums and networks works against the urgent need to build momentum given the condition of the resource and limits the identification of shared priorities and partnership working</p> <p>112. Each of us understands fragments of significance – how do we communicate our own perspectives to others in the absence of regular networking events?</p> <p>113. There may be a background or mutual mistrust between heritage authorities and the church arising from previous practices in managing carved stones</p> <p>114. HEACS disbanded and their report recommendations were never acted upon</p> <p><b>Resourcing</b></p> <p>115. Graveyard ownership expensive to resolve; for example one local authority has spent £30K on this issue</p> <p>116. Graveyard repairs: how to prioritize? Example: one LA has 326 graveyards and estimates these require £40M repairs – available budget is only £200,000 !</p> <p>117. With proposals for grave reuse who will pay for the costs involved with archaeological recovery of new material, and also rehousing of material within the historic kirkyard?</p>	<p>enhance access</p> <p>127. Draw together, review and promote grey literature</p> <p>128. Locate and promote the existing information, methodologies and good practice - as the ‘unknown knowns’</p> <p><b>Plug the educational gap</b></p> <p>129. Facilitate access amongst the broader public by devising strategies to embed built heritage in informal education</p> <p>130. Find a way to get built environment, including carved stones, into the education system from an early age</p> <p>131. Develop and promote a research framework for carved stones</p> <p>132. Universities to create funded PhDs</p> <p><b>Policy</b></p> <p>133. Re-examine, augment or edit HEACS report’s graveyard recommendations respond to and progress</p>
--	---

### Workshop Participants

- Dr Sally Foster, Centre for Environment, Heritage and Policy, History and Politics, University of Stirling (NCCSS) [Project PI]
- Dr Katherine Forsyth, Centre for Scottish and Celtic Studies, University of Glasgow (NCCSS) [Project CI]
- Dr Susan Buckham - Kirkyard Consulting (NCCSS) [note-taker]
- Dr Jeff Sanders – Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, Scottish Archaeological Research Framework project
- Christian Clarkson, Student, University of St Andrews
- Bruce Bishop, SAFHS (NCCSS)

- Robin Evetts, Scottish Redundant Churches Trust
- Professor Richard Fawcett, University of St Andrews
- Graham Fender-Allison, Resourcing Worship Team Leader and Secretary of Church Art and Architecture Committee, Church of Scotland
- Fiona Fisher, Conservation Officer, Fife Council; former Historic Churchyards Officer, Perth and Kinross Heritage Trust
- Nick Haynes, Historic Buildings Consultant
- Bruce Mann, ALGAO (Aberdeenshire Council)
- Dr Gilbert Márkus, Cowal Pilgrimage Officer
- Mary McHugh, Roman Catholic Church, Columba House, Edinburgh
- Edwina Proudfoot, Scottish Church Heritage Research, Member of the Buildings Committee of the Scottish Episcopal Church
- Dr John Raven, Heritage Management Team Leader (Monuments) West, Historic Scotland (NCCSS)
- Judith Roebuck, Heritage Management Officer, Historic Buildings West, Historic Scotland
- Dr Christa Roodt, Art Law and Business, School of Culture and Creative Arts, University of Glasgow

### **Abbreviations**

ALGAO - Association of Local Government Archaeological Officers

BEFS – Built Environment Forum Scotland

CAVLP - Clyde and Avon Valley Landscape Partnership

CSAP - Carved Stones Adviser Project

HEACS - Historic Environment Advisory Council for Scotland

LA – Local authority

NCCSS - National Committee on Carved Stones in Scotland

PKHT - Perth and Kinross Heritage Trust

PMSA - Public Monuments and Sculpture Association

RCAHMS - Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland

SAFHS - Scottish Association of Family History Societies

SCHR - Scottish Church Heritage Research

SMF - Scottish Museums Federation

SCT – Scotland’s Churches Trust

SHEA – Scottish Historic Environment Audit

Research workshops organised by Dr Sally Foster (University of Stirling) and Dr Katherine Forsyth (University of Glasgow), supported by the Royal Society of Edinburgh, Historic Scotland, the National Committee on Carved Stones in Scotland and Glasgow School of Art.

Further details: <http://www.stir.ac.uk/cehp/projects/futurethinkingoncarvedstonesinscotland/>

