

8.4 Summary of the Impact of Workshops 1-3

We issued questionnaires to 79 attendees of Workshops 1-3 and received 18 responses by the requested deadline. Ms Stephanie Garrison, an Environment, Heritage and Policy MSc student at the University of Stirling, organized this exercise and produced the analysis below.

Which workshops did you attend?

Workshop	1, 2, 3	Only 1	Only 2	Only 3	1+3	2+3
# of Attended	2	1	1	4	2	2

What two things worked particularly well about the workshop(s) you attended?

Overview:

1. *Chance to meet others in the heritage professionals/ stakeholders*
2. *Improve interpretation skills*
3. *Overall organisation and organisation of discussion groups*

- The multidisciplinary aspect of the workshops and the chance to meet other heritage professionals with similar concerns
- Networking and interpretation skills
- Exchange of ideas - pooling of experts with different specialisms.
- Wide spectrum of stakeholders, including those who aren't normally involved in such discussions, and the focused questions with feedback after discussion.
- The presentations in Workshop 1 were enlightening, and really helped stimulate later discussion within the afternoon's open forum format. The idea to have all delegates create a poster was a good means of icebreaking and facilitate networking as well as give a micro-overview of peoples' research interests and directions. This helped create a cohesiveness in the wider group, despite their diverse backgrounds and skill sets.
- Organization - there were 'formal' presentations but it became a workshop through the efforts of the hosts to get discussions going and the participants to interact. Post-it notes etc. The 2nd half group discussion. Built on the observations and comments in the first part of the meeting
- Hearing reports from each group at the very end of the conference in a lecture setting.
- I thought both breaking down into focus groups of manageable size and ensuring that there was a designated leader/note-taker definitely contributed to the productivity of the day.
- I felt I was well placed in each discussion group according to my interests.
- The open-ended nature of the workshop allowed fresh ideas to be raised. Preliminary information and introductory talk set objectives out clearly.
- Good mix of people and views leading to a good discussion. The workshop was very well organised and included some great keynote talks. Poster introductions were a novel idea that helped introduce participants. Excellent Scandinavian work.
- Recording: Very well conducted by John Borland. Many problems really usefully expressed from a wide range of expertise.

What one thing do you think might have been done better?

Overview:

1. *Wider publicity/ input from museums*
 2. *Better representation of other time periods*
 3. *Better categorisation/details of the workshop sections*
 4. *Better arrangement of group break-ups for more conversation*
 5. *Establish a network of communication outside the workshop for future researchers*
- Wider publicity
 - Input from museums?
 - The focus was very much upon ecclesiastical and medieval stones and whilst this is very important (and indeed forms the bulk of carved stones) could have represented other periods better. More theory?
 - The difficulty of accessing laser scans, especially in paper copy.
 - Some important details of discussions from each group were lost, as the noteboard system was a bit chaotic (and what was written down was up to the note-taker).
 - Separation of breakouts could have been better - distracting hearing conversations from other breakout group in the main lecture theatre
 - More time to discuss (as always with these things!).
 - The groups, particularly at workshop 3, were very delineated into areas of interest, this meant for instance the morning and afternoon groups for Science and Conservation respectively were almost exactly the same individuals. Because of the overlap of these subjects it felt the group had discussed most areas of interest in the morning and had run out of steam by the afternoon. I feel intentionally mixed groups might spur greater discussion and avoid unchallenged tribal 'group think'. (e.g. some historians may harbor radically different views on conservation than conservators!)
 - More categorisation and details of the workshop sections
 - Ensuring clarity on the location of each group.
 - One of the group discussions I was involved in was not really led well. The person leading such discussions needs to be a person who is good at it. Too much time was spent on the particular leader's own concerns and interests, rather than on a more balanced discussion of the other's concerns and thoughts. The other group discussion was much better.
 - Workshop 2- perhaps representation could be broader (difficult to achieve though).
 - More detailed central reporting at Workshop 3 to trigger a fuller large group discussion
 - Establishing some sort of more permanent network of interested researchers might help strengthen the contacts made at these workshops? I chatted with all sorts of very interesting people doing great things, but as it stands I doubt I'll have much contact with most them in the future, which seems a pity.
 - A bit more clarity as to what it was all for. Was it a University-based agenda for the benefit of individual careers, or a HES inspired concept for future work. Quite a few people I spoke to were not sure where it was going, although they all approved of the overall aims of the Workshop.

What specific benefits/ outputs has the workshop(s) you attended brought you?

Overview:

1. *Contact with leading scholars/ established researchers/ meet people with similar interests/ networking*
2. *Broad knowledge of some of the research themes*
3. *Inspiration for research/ identify new research taking place*
4. *Helpful introduction of new techniques*

- Matt Ritchie (A+OC) "Ballochmyle" cup and ring markings- brought his publication to my attention (and later sent me a copy.)
- The biggest benefit was the chance - as someone at the beginning of a major project - to speak to people who had already completed analogous projects and benefit from their practical experience of this sort of work (the opportunity to have a long conversation with Nancy Edwards about the ways one might go about recording corpora was particularly useful). More generally, though, as someone coming from a text-based historical background rather than anything more archaeological, the workshop was a very useful point of orientation, giving me a much clearer sense of priorities, challenges, and opportunities within the field than I had before.
- It was helpful to re-establish contacts and meet new people with similar interests. One new contact in particular has led to renewed research into a previous project, which had been shelved through lack of time and expertise. Also the introduction to new concepts or techniques is rewarding in broadening ones' professional viewpoint and approach.
- Networking with a wide range of individuals with an interest in tombstones and burial grounds
- Identified an opportunity to add links from Canmore to the Burial ground database maintained by the The Scottish Association of Family History Societies. This possibility is being actively explored. Raised the need to consider how we classify and search on carved stones within online database.
- The person from the Isle of Man and the person who is involved with the research work on the supposed tomb of Robert the Bruce gave me ideas to think about up which I hadn't considered before. Others I spoke with also gave interesting ideas, but it was these two men who had the greatest impact on me for what I am doing.
- Collaboration with C Muir of HS Conservation - follow up session with him over laser scans of tomb at Rodel
- Highlighted some specific issues which we need to address within the planning process, and provided useful background on issues that need to be addressed within management plans for those sites within local authority ownership.
- The contacts I have made will be of a great help to my future research. I have been given specific advice of digital recording, for example.
- Remade contact with a few individuals interested in the geological aspects of Carved Stones.
- Opened my eyes to the potential for more advanced scientific / quantitative analysis of the 3D data being captured. Had been focused on accessible models for dissemination but contribution from Scandinavia showed potential value of the 3D data for detailed understanding of the carvings - eg carving process / deterioration / conservation
- At workshop 3 it was beneficial to identify new / current research taking place
- Broad knowledge of some of the research themes - this is new to me.

Is there anything that you are now going to do which you would not have done had you not attended the workshop(s)?

Overview:

1. *Contact researchers/ Follow leads*
2. *More confidence in drafting proposals*
3. *Try new methods*

- Follow up a few leads. They may or may not prove to be fruitful, but they are certainly things that need to be looked into.
- I will contact researchers I share interest with that I didn't know about to continue exchange of knowledge I will tailor my research projects briefs and funding applications in light of the themes and priorities identified at the workshops
- Follow up with other meetings including the Death conference. Build some of this into the Pilgrimage lifelong learning activity with Soc Ant.
- Overall the workshop gave a grounding that means I'll be more confident in drafting proposals in the field.
- "Ballochmyle" seems to me to justify the continuation of our process of drawing alongside photography and laser scanning.
- In approaching my own work I'm now likely to pay much more attention to methodologies and approaches used by early medievalists and classicists than I had been before. The workshop made me think across period and generic boundaries in ways I hadn't anticipated.
- Address the issue of non-fixed and vulnerable carved stone elements of such sites not covered by designation.
- Look to add scientific analysis to the data sets
- Draw on local examples of cultural heritage management in relation to stones in Scotland in my teaching.
- I am collaborating on investigations of the Alisdair Crotach tomb on Rodel, further utilising close range scan data from a digital survey I carried out in 2012
- Try out photogrammetry.

Any other comments about the workshops?

Overview:

1. *Well organised*
2. *Could be more interdisciplinary*
3. *Could be tightened up*

- My particular interest 'the drawn record' especially of Early Medieval Sculpture was echoed by a call (again) for an enhanced Allen E.C.M.S.
- I felt the day was well organised and thought through by the leaders. It was a very good idea to have each person make a poster about what he/ she does or about the organisation with which that person is involved in. The balance to different backgrounds and areas of research was good.
- Overall I have really enjoyed the workshops and found them beneficial to my professional direction. It has been helpful to see the issues and concerns of other disciplines, and how these may impact on my own work practice. It is also good to see a degree of clarity emerge from many disparate voices as to what are our shared priorities, and what needs to happen to address issues identified.
- Could be tightened up in general

- It felt like a "tick box" PC exercise that would be beneficial to Academia or HES. Whether there would be any long term scientific changes to research into carved stones was still unclear.
- The focus was (understandably) very heavily on archaeology / art history - but it would have been good to have had more representation from anthropology, geology, sculpture and conservation, to learn from other disciplines and perhaps enliven the discussions. Perhaps more hands-on working with stone and thinking about materiality - for me the most important aspect of carved stones - would have been good too?
- Perhaps future ones could have more participants presenting to the whole group

Part 2: Developing a research agenda

At Workshop 3, in particular, we learnt that there is anecdotal and hard evidence for the significance of carved stones for many communities across Scotland. Please supply details of any examples we can follow up and consider citing in the research agenda.

- A handlist with pictures needs to be produced for the stones of Scotland--as many are neglected in scholarship (particularly those in southern Scotland, as they are neither Pictish nor fit in the modern borders of England (and thus the Anglo-Saxon corpus) or are half-lost in back rooms of churches and not properly catalogued, and thus at risk of disappearing.
- It's difficult to pin these things down, but I do think the inhabitants of the East Neuk villages in Fife have a certain awareness and pride in the many carved stones around there (especially door lintels, which are often pointed out to visitors, etc.).
- Most complete consideration: Antiquaries Monograph "Fragmented Masterpiece"
- Kilmartin Stones near Oban.
- Lismore Heritage Society - enabled and encouraged by HS to raise, clean and re-display medieval slabs at the cathedral
- I'm working in Ireland. Recently been working on Ogham in 3D project where in nearly all cases the communities appear to have (or want) ownership of the stones. Landowners are very protective of the stones, and often concerned that they will be moved or taken into care. An example of this could be the Ogham stone at Carns, Co Roscommon, which will inevitably end up in the National Museum store but is currently in the custody of the local landowner who passionately wants to retain it in the community.
- Detailed carvings, names and figures on major buildings in many towns - eg Princes Street, Edinburgh. Citations on public monuments,
- The Family History Community take great interest in Burial Ground and Monumental Inscriptions.
- I think the situation with the deteriorating Shandwick Stone would lend itself to further research. Both in the care of monuments by the community, the transitory enthusiasm for such altruistic stewardship and the efficacy (or not) of other larger bodies to be able to intervene where appropriate care or funding is no longer available.
- Inverurie Kirkyard, Inverurie, Aberdeenshire - carved Pictish stones. Community are very concerned over the current state and vulnerability of these stones and are actively seeking to undertake a project in partnership with Aberdeenshire Council to safeguard them for the future. The community view the stones as a key part of their heritage and an important visitor draw to the town.
- EWH (2011) and Carved Stones Adviser Project (2006) public consultations on attitudes towards and priorities for graveyards may provide helpful baseline data.

- In my experience, there are many local church groups and societies enamoured by their early medieval stones. We, as researchers, need to embrace this and use it to our mutual benefit.
- One thing that came out of the discussions was that there needs to be a means by which the various organisations can easily know what is happening with the others. By having various organisation sites cited in various places, this would allow a better cross-over of findings, which are often relevant to other groups. The lack of awareness of what other groups are doing means that important findings are not easily accessible at present.
- The carved stone assemblage from the Ness of Brodgar, Orkney - now over 700 decorated and dressed stones from the site. These are really capturing the community's imagination and inspiring many local artists too.

Please provide details of any model case studies you are aware of (brief description, why it is significant, bibliographic reference, web or other resources).

- My impression is that there is not yet a model site, but that if the various organisations were to take on some of the suggestions given at Workshop 3, there would be several very good sites.
- From the point of view of Family History studies, each burial ground becomes a separate case study, with the individual tombstones providing detail to the study
- "Cradle of Scotland" exhibition in the Hunterian- S.E.R.F's research leading to local involvement and reconstruction of carved stone crosses.
- The style of research carried out into the social and cultural importance of local heritage in neighbouring Hilton, would lend itself to research relating to concepts of ownership, responsibility and significance of the Shandwick Stone, both to locals and related professionals. Why these factors vary from community to community, and how best to create sustainable support either locally or nationally. See - Jones, S. Early Medieval Sculpture and the Production of Meaning, Value and Place. Historic Scotland, 2004.
- Thomas Yarrow and Sian Jones' work with Glasgow cathedral masons (JRAI 2014) Interesting work being done at Exeter University (Geography dept) about stoneworking and materiality that would feed into the theoretical framework by e.g. David Paton, Rose Ferraby
- My particular interest is in enabling consistent discovery of information through cross-searching of databases. Existing approaches categorising carved stones (and other monument types) by monument terminologies limit the level of searchability and restrict the potential of exploring the resource fully. Good examples of new approaches moving beyond monumentality are England's Rock Art
<http://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/era/section/access.jsf> the Masons' mark project:
<http://www.masonsmarkproject.org.uk/DisplayMarks.aspx>
- In regards to the point made above, I have spoken with another student who has struggled with research of particular stones in that he travels to where the stone is supposedly being held currently only to find it has disappeared and that there is no local knowledge as to its whereabouts anymore.
- Already provided for NCCSS website
- Kilmartin Glen case study
http://www.archaeologyscotland.org.uk/sites/default/files/RLUCaseStudy4_KilmartinGlen_03072015.pdf
- I suggest you contact Dr.David Caldwell on his team's work on the West Highland Carved stones.

Summaries of all the workshops are accessible online at <http://www.stir.ac.uk/cehp/projects/futurethinkingoncarvedstonesinScotland/>. If any points have occurred to you since the workshop(s) which you would like to feed into the research agenda, please add them here.

- I would like to see a geological database set up where thin sections and other results from non destructive geological/geochemical data is available for all researchers.
- I have reviewed the past and regret the lack of action following previous reviews extolling the value of enhancing Allen's corpus. I would emphasize the immediate need for the training of graphics technicians.
- As with situations such as Shandwick, I would like to see 'carved stones at risk' highlighted in a similar vein to the 'Buildings at Risk Register'. This should be somewhere publicly accessible online, so that people can monitor where the system is failing and how long it has been since severe deterioration was noted, also if there are official plans pending to address the situation, and contact details for the bodies responsible. I note that Historic England now maintain regional 'Heritage at Risk' registers, which is something Scotland could do with. Carved stones could then be a searchable sub-set of the gathered data.

Any other comments?

Overview:

1. *Very productive workshop*
 2. *Create an electronic newsletter*
 3. *Hold another workshop or create a conference*
- It's a great project and the conversations that were had in August awakened a number of people to issues they weren't aware of previously.
 - I hope the research agenda will identify a central focus for the reporting of dissemination of current work.
 - A very useful set of workshops (and hopefully outcomes) which have highlighted the issues around this particular topic, and the very real danger of responsibility for doing something about them falling between organisational and community cracks.
 - I look forward to seeing what the next directions might be. A conference - which some people spoke about during the workshop - would be good! Perhaps even more niche and specific ones.
 - I would like to see some kind of electronic "Newsletter". For example to keep researchers in touch with each other.. "The Welsh Stone Forum" is an excellent publication. What happens after April when the funding for this project ends?
 - It would be good to see some continuation of these workshops/seminars, maybe on an annual basis, to further consolidate the interdisciplinary 'community' of interested parties, and to maintain a momentum for research in the directions identified.

Optional: Would you like to become a 'Critical Friend', which means have the opportunity to comment on the draft agenda before its finalised?