



ENGLISH HERITAGE

Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment

PPN 6: Development of Procedural standards and guidelines for the historic environment

Version	Date	Comments
1.0	January 2008	First published version

Preface

MoRPHE Project Planning Notes (PPNs) form an integral part of the Management of Research in the Historic Environment (MoRPHE) Project Management Methodology issued by English Heritage in 2006.

They are intended to be presented together with, and read in conjunction with, the 'MoRPHE Project Managers Guide' which gives generic guidance on project management. The Project Managers Guide can be downloaded from the English Heritage 'Free Publications' list website:

www.english-heritage.org.uk/publications

1.0 Introduction

1.1 This Project Planning Note is for Project Managers involved in the development and dissemination of written guidelines and standards for all aspects of historic environment practice. It will assist with the production of new documents, the revision of existing documents, and their conversion to a new format.

1.2 A significant number of standards and guidelines development projects are undertaken every year by organisations and groups working in the historic environment. Often, for those undertaking this work, it is a new or additional responsibility, separate to their normal duties. This PPN provides advice to those commissioning and managing these projects to make the process as effective and straightforward as possible.

1.3 It is aimed at teams working within English Heritage or commissioned by English Heritage, though other groups are most welcome to apply them. Sections in the text relating to specific English Heritage circumstances are shown in boxes.

1.4 The PPN relates to traditional publications, digital documents and web-pages. The focus in the PPN is on how to develop the content, irrespective of the format used for dissemination.

1.5 This PPN has been based on the experience of advising on the development of standards and guidelines over the last two years. It will be updated to reflect further experience and comment from readers.

1.6 For the purpose of this Project Planning Note:

- ◆ 'Guideline' is any informational document that can be used to guide a piece of work. It covers good practice guides, guidance notes, technical papers on techniques, manuals, recommended approaches to work undertaken etc.
- ◆ 'Standard' means documents that specify measures against which a piece of work or a product can be objectively assessed

and compliance or non-compliance established. Model specifications and codes of conduct are examples.

These two types of document often occur together, but they serve different functions. They are therefore viewed as separate products of a development project. This PPN covers both types of document. Specific requirements for Standards are noted where relevant. To avoid repetition, standards and guidelines documents are referred to simply as 'document(s)', unless a distinction is appropriate.

2.0 Planning

The following sections identify issues to be considered during the planning of the project. These should be addressed in the initial Proposal prepared during Start-up, or they may require more detailed investigation during the project Initiation stage. Refer to the MoRPHE Project Managers Guide for further information on the Start-Up and Initiation of projects.

2.1 Setting Objectives

2.1.1 Standards and guidelines documents have the general objective of communicating a means of improving practice in historic environment work. Agreed clearly stated objectives will assist both in production of appropriate text, and any future review of the effectiveness of the document(s). The 'Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, Timely' (SMART) approach to setting objectives is very relevant, and should be used to test stated objectives.

2.1.2 The objectives for guidelines and standards documents are often a response to change. Relevant changes include:

- ◆ Technological change: for example the introduction of a new survey technique.
- ◆ Policy change: either within an organisation or in government (for example Planning Policy Statements) requiring the introduction of revised guidelines.
- ◆ Standards or regulatory environment change: e.g. through legislation such as the reform of the heritage protection legislation.
- ◆ Organisational change: e.g. recording the knowledge and understanding of a process to introduce an improved service, for example to provide efficiently the answers to frequently asked questions.
- ◆ Operational context change: to respond to changes introduced by publication of other guidelines or standards.

BOX A: ENGLISH HERITAGE STRATEGY

English Heritage has set objectives relevant to standards and guidelines development in its Strategy document 'Making the Past Part of the Future 2005-2010'. These include specifically 4B 'Developing and disseminating policies, principles guidelines standards and exemplars to promote better management of change in the historic environment'. Specific departmental objectives should be consulted to assess the contribution of proposed documents.

2.1.3 Standards documents have the objective of improving the quality of executed work or services. The British Standards Institute identifies a variety of beneficial social and economic outcomes that derive from the development, promotion and implementation of standards. This serves as a useful checklist

These include:

- ◆ Standards lighten the regulatory burden, reducing the cost of quality monitoring. This may appear contrary to expectation. However the objective of standards is to provide clarity to both those producing work and those assessing it, such that mistakes and bad practices are gradually removed, so that work to check quality can be reduced and targeted.
- ◆ Standards serve as a badge of quality and reliability.
- ◆ Standards reduce the risk in investment, encouraging innovation, and new participants.
- ◆ Standards provide a more stable business environment encouraging the development of new markets (a 'level playing field').
- ◆ Standards improve potential health, safety and environmental conditions.

2.2 Useful techniques for estimating time and budget

2.2.1 Time and cost model

The following Time and Cost model is intended as an approximate indicator of the relative proportions of time required and typical cost headings in different stages in a document development project. It is derived from general models of technical writing, and will be refined with experience to assist future planning.

The model assumes a fairly minimal approach to dissemination. A more complex approach, for example through the development of a training course, would greatly increase the proportion of time and costs for this stage. Dissemination, in particular where training is to be delivered, may well be best treated as a separate project.

The model also assumes that a principle author (the MoRPHE Expert role) will not also be the Project Manager. If this combination can not be

avoided, there is a risk of the Project Manager / Author being overstretched, in particular during the Authoring and Illustration stage.

Table 1. provisional time and cost model for standards and guidelines development projects

Stage	%Project Time	%Authors Time	Cost headings
Start up	3%		Meeting costs
Review Point R1	1%		Meeting costs
Initiation	20%	10%	Authors time / fee Meeting / workshop costs
Review Point R2	2%		Meeting costs
Authoring and illustration	40%	60%	Authors time / fee
Review point R3.2	2%		Meeting costs
Consultation / Peer review	10%	10%	Authors time / fee Circulation costs Reviewers fees
Review Point R3.3	2%		Meeting costs
Production	10%	10%	Authors time / fee Editing, Design, Printing
Review Point R3.4	2%		Meeting costs
Dissemination	5%		Distribution
Review Point R3.5	1%		Meeting costs
Closure	2%	10%	Authors time / fee

BOX B: EXAMPLES OF CONVENTIONAL PRODUCTION COSTS:

The following are the production stage costs (editing, design and printing) for some recent English Heritage guidelines, provided to assist in estimating costs for planning purposes.

“Guidelines on the X-radiography of archaeological metalwork” English Heritage 2006.

8,000 words, 23 figures mainly photographs.

16 pages 3 column ‘standard leaflet’ format, in full colour.

Editing was done in house; about 2 days’ work.

Design cost £890

Print was £1690 for 5000 copies

“Understanding historic buildings” English Heritage 2006

12,000 words, 39 pages in 3 column ‘standard leaflet’ format, full colour with numerous figures, mainly line drawings.

Editing cost £676.30 (charged at £20 per hour)

Design cost £1300

Print was £4953 for 10,000 copies

“Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment Project Managers Guide” English Heritage 2006

13,300 words

58 pages, full colour cover, two-colour inside

One-off design

Proof reading and editing (contracted out) £985

Design £6283 (included work on three project planning notes)

Printing was £5236 for 1000 copies

2.2.2 Consultation and Peer Review approach

Traditional peer review (as used in the academic or publishing world) involves detailed consideration of the draft text by either one or a small group of reviewers or ‘referees’ with relevant expertise. This requires a substantial commitment from the reviewer, for which they might appropriately require payment, either on a scale related to the extent of the text or a fixed fee or a daily rate.

Wide scale consultation involves the costs of reproducing and circulating the document widely, and putting in place support to receive and process comments from a large number of reviewers. The generally accepted trade-off is that payment is not made, but the reviewers get early sight of a forthcoming guideline or standard, and are acknowledged in the final text.

Both approaches are valid, but the selected approach should be made clear in the Project Design. Reviewers should be informed whether or not any payment is offered at the time they are invited to review a document.

2.3 Risks and their management

2.3.1. Delay in authoring: a key risk is difficulty in estimating the time required to author text, and consequent delay beyond the expected timetable. The Project Manager should manage this at the Initiation stage by development and agreement of a thorough document specification. This will simplify the task for the author, who will then not have to determine issues such as audience and style during authoring stage. Uncertainty is the main cause of ‘writers block’.

2.3.2. Over commitment of project team: If the Project Manager role is also the principle author there is a tendency to focus on delivering the text, rather than managing the project. This is particularly apparent during the Authoring and Illustration stage, which also includes planning work to design the peer review stage. If this can not be avoided by separating the Author and Project Manager roles, then temporary project support to assist with the design and implementation of the peer review should be arranged and budgeted for, or additional time allowed in the timetable.

2.3.3. Multiple authors leading to timetabling difficulty: The Project Manager should seek to work with a single principle expert author rather than using a panel or group of authors. It is preferable for peers and experts to be involved in the project in the Assurance role, or as Stakeholders. If multiple

authors are essential, then time should be allowed for additional meetings and chasing up of missing contributions. Authors should be made aware that if deadlines are missed, then an alternate plan for the production of the text may need to be made.

BOX C: FORWARD JOB PLANS

For English Heritage projects the Project Manager and principle author should always have this work included in their Forward Job Plan.

2.3.4. Lack of feedback to reviews: The Project Manager should identify and agree the participation of key reviewers as early as possible. During authoring make contact with key reviewers to ascertain their availability. A well structured reviewer's pack is essential, including a covering letter setting out what sort of comment is required, when it is required by and how comments should be submitted. Make it as easy as possible for reviewers to comment to maximise participation.

2.3.5. Contradictory and negative feedback: Review of standards and guidelines is often controversial, and should be expected to generate criticism. Criticism may be conflicting (e.g. 'this section is too detailed' versus 'this section is not detailed enough'). The Project Manager must ensure clear decision making to resolve these potential log-jams. This should be documented in the peer review plan. Decisions to resolve or in some cases ignore feedback must reflect the objectives of the document.

2.3.6. Production delay: The Project Manager should not underestimate how long it can take to get images suitable for use as illustrations prepared for use. This includes line drawings, photographs, logos of supporting organisations etc. This work should be started as soon as possible during the Authoring stage. Seek assistance from those with experience.

2.4 Likely list of products or outcomes

2.4.1 The list of products for a standards and guidelines development project is given in Table 2.

2.4.2 A key product will be the document specification, included in the project design (P2). This should include the following

- ◆ the audience: size, level of experience and background
- ◆ the purpose: learning and training, reference, or, for a standard, process management or assessment of an item of work
- ◆ organisation: one document or a suite of several documents; what section headings and format
- ◆ relation to existing documents: replacing, amending explaining

2.5 Likely project stages

The key stages are as follows. The work in each stage will be tailored to the needs of the particular project, reflecting, in particular, the intended audience. However all the stages will be relevant, even if they are very short.

2.5.1 Start Up – the priority here is to establish and document what the problem is that the guidelines or standards are seeking to address.

2.5.2 Initiation – The main planning stage. This should include work to validate the need for, scope, audience etc of the proposed document. Workshops, structured email discussion or e-conference, presentations to likely users of the document should be considered, and the results documented in the project design, to guide the author. Copyright in the text should be agreed and dissemination plans outlined.

2.5.3 Authoring and Illustration – the main stage of drafting of the text, and sourcing of appropriate illustrations where needed. Project Manager undertakes planning work focused on the design of the peer review.

2.5.4 Consultation / Peer review – collecting and collating comment on the draft text from peer reviewers or representative users. Project Managers planning work focuses on production costs and timetable.

2.5.5 Production – the creation of copies or formats suitable for distribution to the intended audience, including traditional printing, digital files for download and web-pages. Project Managers planning work focuses on dissemination of the completed guidelines.

2.5.6 Dissemination and adoption – the circulation or release of the finished document to its intended audience. Where appropriate, adoption of the document by relevant professional bodies, fora or groups. Integration into training materials where relevant. Development of a maintenance and review plan.

2.5.7 Closure – learning and recording in the project archive the lessons learned from this project to assist future projects.

Table 2. Project stages and products in a standards and guidelines development project

Stage	Document production products	Archive products	Dissemination products
Start up	P1.Objectives documented in Project Proposal		
Review Point R1	Has the case for this guideline or standard been made? Are we the right organisation to produce this? Are the objectives specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and timely?		
Initiation	P2.Document specified in Project Design	Project Archive file created	Communication with potential stakeholders (e.g. a meeting or workshop).
Review Point R2	Is the plan for the project realistic? Are all appropriate stakeholders aware of the project?		
Authoring and illustration	P3.Committee draft(s) written P4.Consultation Draft P5. Dissemination plan drafted. P6. Peer review plan added to Updated Project Design	HEEP project agreement Draft versions added to project archive file	Working Knowledge entry created Publication proposal drafted.
Review point R3.1	Is the Consultation draft ready for peer review?		
Consultation / Peer review	P7. Review pack P8. Review report	Review pack, peer reviewers list, peer review comments added to file	Working Knowledge entry updated News item in relevant periodicals Email to appropriate discussion lists
Review Point R3.2	What changes are needed following review?		
Production	P.9 Final Draft P. 10 Editing complete P. 11 Design complete P. 12 Electronic publication version delivered P13. Printed publication version delivered P14. Dissemination plan added to Updated Project Design.	Final as published version archived Image credits and permissions added to file	

Table 2 cont.

Review Point R3.3	Are the Publication Versions OK to distribute? Is the Dissemination Plan appropriate?		
Dissemination and adoption	P X - one or more products as agreed in the Dissemination Plan, e.g. publication, publication online, training courses, distance learning, launch, and adoption by relevant organisations.	Circulation list filed Launch arrangements filed Complimentary copies circulated	Working Knowledge entry updated News item in relevant publications Email to appropriate discussion lists Review in relevant publications
Review Point R3.4	OK to close the project?		
Closure	PI5. Maintenance and review plan PI6. This Project Planning Note updated with lessons learned	Registry file closed	

BOX D: CASE STUDY: HERITAGE 3D PROJECT

This project was funded in 2004-6 by the English Heritage Historic Environment Enabling Programme (HEEP ref 3789) as “Developing professional guidance – laser scanning in archaeology and architecture”. The project funding source provided a structured approach to management of the project, which was identified as a key factor in its success.

Guidelines were developed covering the use of a new survey technology and its application to archaeological, architectural and museum object survey and recording.

The guidelines were published online only via a specially created website www.heritage3d.org. The main guideline document was presented as a downloadable .pdf document of 57 pages with 36 figures, a total of around 11,000 words. This was supported by 17 2-page case studies written by project partners. Together with the main guidelines the project published some 30,000 words of advice and guidance.

Overall project cost was £35,585. The approximate breakdown of costs for key items was:

Project management costs (including Project Manager and steering group costs) 32%,

Authoring 45%

Technical support including web-site set-up 11%

Workshops to communicate with professional peers and partners 4%

Lessons for future projects include careful project management, and good communication with the intended audience, through the website, workshops and case studies.

3.0 Project Execution

Expertise in the subject area is the principle requirement for undertaking standards and guidelines development. Other relevant skills that the project team should have or acquire include the following.

3.1 Technical authoring

Principally this is writing to suit the user. This includes understanding the circumstances in which the document will be used, and presenting the material appropriately. Some tips include:

- ◆ Emphasise the nature of what should be achieved by a piece of work, rather than specifying how it should be achieved. The aim should be to support innovation within a set framework.
- ◆ Try to anticipate why your reader might not want to adopt the recommended approach, and address this.
- ◆ Think of your document being used to train staff – what is it that you want them to learn?
- ◆ Describe clearly areas of flexibility in the guidance given. What recommended work can be adapted for small-scale or less complex circumstances?
- ◆ Where appropriate include examples and case studies to illustrate application in practice. This will broaden the appeal of the document.
- ◆ The style should aim to be informative, authoritative and explanatory. A guideline or standard is not the place to write an academic paper.

Standards documents will need to use a precise and unambiguous form of words to avoid conflict over interpretation and meaning. It is advisable to define the intended meaning of words such as 'should', 'must', 'may' etc at the start of any standard. Examples of their use by the British Standards Institute are given in their document 'BS0' (see Further Information).

3.2 Acquiring images and graphics

This involves understanding what the purpose of each image is within the document, identifying suitable images, understanding access and copyright issues, understanding the effect of digital image file sizes on options for digital circulation and costing bespoke photography / drawing / artwork where relevant. Caption text to describe images used will be needed for digital publication to make them accessible to visually impaired readers using screen reader software.

BOX E: IMAGES FROM ENGLISH HERITAGE

Readily available sources of images at English Heritage include:

ViewFinder <http://viewfinder.english-heritage.org.uk/>

EH Photo Library <http://ehphoto01/catalogue/index.asp>

Digital Image Collection

Recent publications – recently used images will generally be available in formats suitable for printing: contact Creative Services or Publications team.

EH photographic teams

3.3 Word-processing

The Project Manager should select the most appropriate word processing package and formats for distribution of draft texts, and ensure that the principle author either has sufficient word-processing experience to present draft text, or, if not, has access to suitable assistance. For example in MS-Word this includes familiarity with setting style and formatting for headings, page and paragraph numbering, and using the Protect Document, Comment and Track changes options to assist in compiling comments from multiple reviewers. NB it is rarely necessary to replicate the final designed appearance of a text in draft versions. This formatting will generally be finalised during document production.

Note: peer review or consultation versions of documents should be circulated in a format that is likely to be readable by as wide an audience as possible. Consider converting word-processor documents to a widely accessible format such as Adobe .pdf

3.4 Editing

This includes familiarity with in-house style guides for text, conventions for bibliography etc. Wherever possible, text should not be edited by the principle author. This will give a 'second pair of eyes' on the text.

3.5 Communication skills

Communication and consensus building are at the heart of the development of standards and guidelines documents. Familiarity with the following will be advantageous:

- ◆ Conference / workshop organisation
- ◆ Presentation skills
- ◆ Structured interview techniques
- ◆ Working with external contractors
- ◆ Use of email based discussion lists
- ◆ Peer review management

3.6 Design style

It is useful to be familiar with existing templates and design styles relevant to the particular document. Be aware of branding issues for documents produced under a particular series or format. Design work for 'one-off' documents should be undertaken by professionals. Within the team there should be awareness of the value of a design style and agreement on the

intended 'message' and image for the document, sufficient to brief designers.

4.0 Review

4.1 Relevant standards and guidelines

The British Standards Institute publishes details of its approach to development of BS standards documents on its website (see Further Information).

House style manuals. For English Heritage documents English Heritage house style guides are available on the intranet, or from the Publications team.

Guidelines on accessibility issues for digital publication (e.g. downloadable .pdf files) are forthcoming from English Heritage.

The Plain English Campaign produces useful guides on writing clearly and concisely. See Further Information for contact details.

BOX F: ENGLISH HERITAGE FORMATS

Templates for English Heritage issued guidelines are available, and should be used wherever possible for English Heritage authored documents. These are:

EH standard leaflet format, for example "Understanding Historic Buildings", 2006. Appropriate for technical guidance principally aimed at the historic environment profession. Generally, these are made available both in printed form (with a limited print run) and online as free publications.

HELM (Historic Environment Local Management) guidance notes, for example the "Farming the Historic Landscape" series 2004. Appropriate where the target audience is related professions, for example land or property managers, planners etc. Generally these are made available both in printed and electronic form, though the main method of access is online via the HELM website.

MoRPHE Project Planning Notes, for example this note. Appropriate where the content covers management of historic environment research projects, rather than application of specific techniques. These are made available in digital format only via the English Heritage Free Publications website.

Internally issued documents currently do not follow standard templates, but may be required to fit into team or departmental styles.

4.2 Approaches to assessment of quality

4.2.1 The BSI produces a useful list of the necessary qualities of good standards and guidelines documents, given at Annex 2.

4.2.2 Consultation with the likely audience for the standard or guideline is the principle means of review of quality of documents. It not only validates the content of the document, but also raises awareness of the document in advance of its dissemination and builds a sense of ownership. Consultation must be aimed at developing consensus around the proposed standard or guideline, and so must genuinely recognise that changes to the text arising from comments are likely, and should be welcomed. The Project Manager should be aware that they are asking reviewers to provide free advice to their project, and ensure that the review process is as straightforward as possible.

4.2.3 Separate guidelines on peer review planning, and on the use of email based discussion lists for structured e-conferences are available from the English Heritage Heritage Data Management team (hadminfo@english-heritage.org.uk).

BOX G: POSTAL PEER REVIEW

For postal responses to peer reviews organised by English Heritage a freepost address is available. Reviewers can be provided with a pre-paid return envelope for their responses marked as follows:

Freepost RRBS-CYET-ZJYE
English Heritage
Your Name, Department
1 Waterhouse Square
138-142 Holborn
London
EC1N 2ST

An arrangement with London-based staff will be necessary to forward reviews received.

Details are available from Mark Watson, Purchasing Manager.

4.2.4 Peer review can usefully be supported by workshops or seminars convened specifically to gather opinions from Stakeholders. These provide an opportunity for discussion, and promote a sense of participation in the process. They are, however, expensive and time consuming to organise. They can also inadvertently exclude Stakeholder communities who are not available on a particular date or are unable to travel. Combining opinion gathering seminars with existing professional events such as conferences should be considered.

5.0 Archive and Dissemination

5.1 Standards and guidelines development projects will principally produce a document archive. This should be retained as it will prove useful when the standard or guideline is reviewed, or a revision proposed. The archive should be established when a project is authorised at Review point R2, and relevant documents added to it during the progress of the project, as set out in Table 2. In addition the key project management documents listed in the MoRPHE Project Managers guide (Project Design, Issues Log etc) should also be included in the archive.

BOX H: ENGLISH HERITAGE REGISTRY

For English Heritage internally managed projects, a Registry file should be set up for each project. The Records Management Service (part of the NMR) should be consulted for advice on creation of a registry file.

For English Heritage funded projects managed externally, the Project Officer should ensure that the project design details how the project will be archived.

5.2 Legal and Copyright Deposit: publishers are under a duty to deposit one copy of every work published in print in the UK with the British Library within one month of publication. British Library deposit is a responsibility of individual teams and sections developing standards and guidelines. Internal guidance and standards are excluded. Where available these may be deposited in .pdf format by email to LDO-Electronic@bl.uk. A check on whether guidelines have previously been deposited can be made via the British Library Integrated Catalogue <http://catalogue.bl.uk>.

The UK and Ireland Copyright libraries should also be supplied free of charge with copies of printed guidelines.

6.0 Further information

British Standards Institute: BSi publish a standard to guide development of standards documents. This is available online at

http://www.bsi-global.com/British_Standards/About/bs0.xalter

British Library: for Legal deposit enquiries
The Legal Deposit Office
The British Library
Boston Spa
Wetherby
West Yorkshire
LS23 7BY

<http://www.bl.uk/about/policies/legaldeposit.html>

Agency for the Legal Deposit with Copyright Libraries
100 Euston Street
LONDON
NW1 2HQ

<http://www.llgc.org.uk/ald/>

Plain English Campaign
Plain English Campaign
PO Box 3
New Mills
High Peak
SK22 4QP

<http://www.plainenglish.co.uk/guides.htm>

BOX I: ENGLISH HERITAGE CONTACTS

For English Heritage projects the following contacts within the organisation can assist in preparation of documents, archiving the project, and disseminating standards and guidelines documents to their intended audience.

They should be considered as Stakeholders in any project to develop standards and guidelines, or contacted to invite participation as members of the project team where appropriate. For externally commissioned projects, for example through the Historic Environment Enabling Programme (HEEP), the Project Officer should offer to make contact with the following sections for advice on behalf of the project.

IT Service Desk / Request form: For internal projects the IT team can advise on setting up shared document folders on EH servers or SharePoint workspaces accessible to all EH staff involved in a project.

HELM: Jenny Frew, for web publication of standards and guidelines aimed at related professions such as engineers or local authority planners via www.helm.org.uk

Publications: Robin Taylor for advice on preparation of documents for publication, including assessing costs, and finding contract editors and proof-readers. Where projects are agreed for inclusion in the publications programme Publications team will undertake production and distribution, including legal and copyright deposit.

Photography: Steve Cole. The regional photographic teams produce photographs to support a wide range of EH activities. The teams can assist in taking photographs to illustrate standards and guidelines documents where these are not available from existing sources.

Archaeological Graphics team: Trevor Pearson, for all aspects of preparation of archaeological graphics for use in technical publication or outreach materials (e.g. displays). The teams' role includes setting standards in archaeological graphics, by producing and promoting exemplars, methodologies and guidelines.

Creative Services: Kirstie Holmes for advice on branding of English Heritage publications and procuring design and printing work.

Training and Standards: Bob Hook for advice on integration of standards and guidelines with professional training initiatives.

Data Standards and Heritage Information Partnerships: Lisa Mullen for standards and guidelines that include collection of structured information e.g. databases or forms, in particular where this is intended to integrate with local or national historic environment records.

Web team: Fiona Ryan for advice on accessibility of web-documents and inclusion of standards and guidelines documents on the English Heritage website Free Publications list (<http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/publications>) or on appropriate web pages.

Intranet authors (details from Lewis Edwards-Winsor) for uploading copies to the intranet

Finance team (as appropriate for sections / teams) for arrangement of purchasing of design, images, printing, and publicity material as necessary.

7.0 Acknowledgements

The author is grateful for comments received on early drafts of this Project Planning Note, in particular from the English Heritage Standards Group and the Institute of Field Archaeologists Committee on Working Practices in Archaeology (CWPA).

8.0 Contact details

This Project Planning Note was written by Edmund Lee, Standards and Guidelines Manager at English Heritage. Comments and suggestions for further improvement are welcome: Edmund.lee@english-heritage.org.uk

9.0 Summary check list

- ◆ Is what is proposed a guideline or a standard or both?
- ◆ Who will read it? What is their level of existing knowledge?
- ◆ Do we know enough about how it will be used?
- ◆ How will it be published, disseminated and used?
- ◆ Does that have implications for the format and style of text?

Annexe I Working Knowledge

Working Knowledge is being developed by English Heritage as a definitive resource to assist in location and assessment of the range of standards and guidelines documents (plus policy and research agenda documents) in use or under development within the UK historic environment sector. To assist in dissemination of standards and guidelines the following information should be submitted to the Standards and Guidelines Manager, English Heritage (contact details below) for any new standards and guidelines documents. Information submitted to Working Knowledge will be made available via the Internet.

At Review Point 2, once initiation has been approved, the following information should be supplied:

- ◆ Working Title
- ◆ Brief description of the content of the document: assume a general audience and use non-technical language.
- ◆ Contact details for the principle author or Project Manager
- ◆ Principle Intended audience
- ◆ Subject area keywords e.g. archaeology, architecture. These should be taken from the UK Archival Thesaurus (www.ukat.org.uk) and should be as specific as possible
- ◆ Area of Competence (see list below)

At the Peer Review Stage the following additional information, should be supplied, along with any updates to the above information.

- ◆ Availability online, giving the web address or other download instructions
- ◆ Availability by post / email (i.e. contact details to request a copy)
- ◆ Deadline for comments

At the Publication stage the following additional information should be supplied, along with any necessary updates to the information above.

- ◆ Final published title
- ◆ Publication date
- ◆ Additional identifiers (e.g. EH product code, ISBN number)
- ◆ Planned date for review (5 years from publication unless otherwise stated)

Information for Working Knowledge should be sent to:

Edmund Lee
Standards and Guidelines Manager
English Heritage
NMRC
Kemble Drive
Swindon
SN2 2GZ
Email: Edmund.lee@english-heritage.org.uk

Area of Competence list (derived from National Occupational Standards for Archaeology). Standards and guidelines documents recorded in Working Knowledge should be indexed with one or more of the following. Note that currently this approach only relates to documents with an archaeological focus, pending further development of NOS for architectural survey professionals.

- ◆ G2 Strategic planning
- ◆ G3 Managing projects
- ◆ G4 Managing finances
- ◆ G5 Allocating and checking peoples' work
- ◆ G6 Providing leadership)
- ◆ G7 Continuing professional development
- ◆ G8 Developing a communications strategy
- ◆ G9 Managing public relations
- ◆ G10 Working safely
- ◆ J1 Managing disasters
- ◆ J2 Managing a collection
- ◆ J3 Planning projects
- ◆ J4 Representing an organisation
- ◆ J5 Planning and carrying out research
- ◆ J6 Accommodating items
- ◆ J7 Handling items
- ◆ J8 Conserving items
- ◆ J9 Interpreting collections and items
- ◆ J10 Providing learning opportunities
- ◆ J11 Identifying and describing items
- ◆ A1 Developing historic environment polices and guidance
- ◆ A2 Managing archaeological services
- ◆ A3 Carrying out archaeological field work
- ◆ A4 Managing historic environment records
- ◆ A5 Conserving historic environments

Annexe 2: British Standards Institute approach

A standard or guideline must be 'fit for purpose'. The British Standards Institute (BSI) set out the following quality criteria for its work: these apply equally to the specific standards and guidelines for the historic environment sector.

- ◆ They must be needed. This means that development of any proposed standard must start with a business case – a justification for the imposition of a standard.
- ◆ They must be wanted. That is, there must be support for them from relevant interests in the sector.
- ◆ They must be used. The development process must identify how they will be used in practice, and any likely blocks on their adoption, and address these.
- ◆ They must be agreed at the widest level appropriate to their audience. There must be adequate communication with and involvement of relevant interests.
- ◆ They must be impartial. This is particularly significant for a sector which has strong support from the voluntary sector. Standards which aim at a greater level of professionalism, but which have the effect of reducing the involvement of the voluntary sector in work on the historic environment will not win widespread support. Standards must also not simply codify existing practices in English Heritage.
- ◆ They must be maintained. This is particularly significant when the original staff involved in the development move on to other projects, roles or organisations. Recommendations should be made during development for their review, either after a number of years has elapsed, or when some other set of circumstances occurs (e.g. 'This document should be reviewed in 5 years'. 'This should be reviewed if and when HERs achieve statutory status').
- ◆ As with any technical document, standards and guidelines must be clear, consistent, accurate and complete within their scope. They must be comprehensible to their target audience.

In addition, as noted above, standards documents must adopt a suitably precise and unambiguous style to be legally robust. They will also need to include specific sections relevant to their measurement function. These include:

- ◆ how compliance with the standard will be assessed;
- ◆ who will arbitrate in cases of disagreement on compliance.