

This item is the archived peer-reviewed author-version of:

Evaluating participatory practice in archaeology: proposal for a standardized approach

Reference:

Tully Gemma, Delgado Anés Lara, Thomas Suzie, Olivier Adrian, Benetti Francesca, Castillo Mena Alicia, Chavarria Arnau Alexandra, Rizner Mia, Möller Katharina, et al..- Evaluating participatory practice in archaeology: proposal for a standardized approach
Journal of community archaeology & heritage - ISSN 2051-8196 - (2022)
Full text (Publisher's DOI): <https://doi.org/10.1080/20518196.2021.2013067>
To cite this reference: <https://hdl.handle.net/10067/1874880151162165141>

Evaluating Participatory Practice In archaeology: Proposal for a standardized approach

Gemma Tully, Lara Delgado Anés, Suzie Thomas, Adrian Olivier, Francesca Benetti, Alicia Castillo Mena, Alexandra Chavarria Arnau, Mia Rizner, Katharina Möller, Raimund Karl, Akira Matsuda, José María Martín Civantos, Gian Pietro Brogiolo, Nekbet Corpas Cívicos, Francesco Ripanti, Julia Sarabia Bautista & Sonia Schivo To cite this article: Gemma Tully, Lara Delgado Anés, Suzie Thomas, Adrian Olivier, Francesca Benetti, Alicia Castillo Mena, Alexandra Chavarria Arnau, Mia Rizner, Katharina Möller, Raimund Karl, Akira Matsuda, José María Martín Civantos, Gian Pietro Brogiolo, Nekbet Corpas Cívicos, Francesco Ripanti, Julia Sarabia Bautista & Sonia Schivo (2022): Evaluating Participatory Practice In archaeology: Proposal for a standardized approach, *Journal of Community Archaeology & Heritage*, DOI: 10.1080/20518196.2021.2013067

ABSTRACT: In this paper we present a proposal for the creation of a standardized evaluation model for participatory/public/community archaeology and heritage initiatives. The proposal is the result of discussions during a Spring School that the University of Padua and the MAG Museum of Alto Garda, Italy, organized between 9 and 15 April 2018. The Spring School brought together international practitioners to compare experiences and share visions for the sustainable future of archaeology and heritage management. We reflect on the process of bringing together our thoughts and views into one place, and on the theoretical and practitioner contexts that inform our proposed model. The model is intended for researchers and practitioners planning to carry out archaeological and heritage projects with communities. We invite readers to try using some or all of the sections of the model in their own work and to contribute to further refinement of the approach.

KEYWORDS: evaluation; community archaeology; participatory heritage; archaeological heritage management; sustainable archaeology

Introduction

In April 2018, the University of Padua organized a Spring School for doctoral researchers and heritage academics and practitioners in the tiny village of Canale di Tenno, Italy (Figures 1 and 2). Participants came from different institutions across Europe and were set the task of identifying both challenges and good practices connected to participatory research in archaeology. Themes discussed at the workshop included the role of legislation, working with different communities and citizen empowerment, with case studies from places as diverse as Austria, Egypt, Finland, Germany, Spain, and of course Italy.

In addition to these presentations, an in-depth meeting involving all participants was devoted to the discussion of how best to evaluate participatory heritage and archaeology projects. The result of that discussion was an extensive evaluation table which we present in this article. The table itself has only been used in a few projects so far, and the purpose of this article is to present the table as a speculative model for good evaluative practices, and to invite researchers, practitioners and volunteers to use and adapt it in their own work in future. In this way, we hope that a diverse range of aspects of participatory heritage work can be evaluated critically, and that over time it will become easier to analyse even quite diverse projects along comparable parameters. The model may or may not need refining over time, and responses to this article would be welcomed.

Figure 1. Canale di Tenno. Chavarria Arnau (2018)

Consensus of the spring school

Archaeologists have always had an interest in communicating cultural heritage as evidenced, for example, through site interpretation, museums, conferences, TV shows and accessible publications. Since researchers began to review the theory and practice of the social sciences, the discipline of archaeology has been changing; adapting to greater inclusivity through engaging, communicating and promoting the outcomes and social values of cultural heritage (Matsuda 2004, 66). Archaeologists working in this context have increasingly acknowledged the importance of contemporary society as integral to attempts to understand and interpret the past, and to understand its significance in the present time (Holtorf 2007). This has been a key element of ongoing debates.

Figure 2. Participants of the Spring School. Chavarria Arnau (2018)

During the 1986 World Archaeological Congress, delegates stated that archaeology must be a responsible, reflective and self-conscious social science (Shepherd and Haber 2011). Over time, and with experience, approaches have evolved and diversified to include a wide range of participatory and engagement methods. In this way, archaeologists have increasingly adopted methodologies from other sciences to develop more democratic research (e.g. Pyburn 2009). This has led to the development of an open archaeology and the emergence of a wide range of evaluation categories for participatory archaeology (see also Delgado Anés 2017). There is increased demand from civil society for more participatory and transparent systems, exemplified in frameworks such as the Faro Convention in Europe (see Olivier 2017 for discussion). In addition, there is a need for better ways to communicate and share not only knowledge, but also experiences which take a pragmatic approach to the complex dynamics surrounding subjective and objective interpretations of archaeology and heritage in the public sphere (e.g. Kohl 1998; Kristiansen and Rowland 1998). While the ramifications of the current Covid-19 pandemic may have, as of yet, unforeseen implications on this highly interpersonal element of the discipline, the current trajectory of community and participatory archaeology are in part a consequence of a more citizen-driven context.

Many researchers, practitioners and even participants recognize that the integration of public, participatory practice into archaeology and heritage management is vital if these connected disciplines want to retain value and relevance within contemporary society (Moshenska 2017; Delgado Anés and María Martín Civantos 2019; Brogiolo and Arnau 2020). There are different degrees of participation, from formal learning initiatives to processes of archaeological interpretation, site governance, management and conservation (stewardship). Through these processes, participation can cultivate a deeper connection to archaeological heritage, which in turn can motivate wider society to protect the historic environment and its interconnected features, i.e. cultural landscapes, farming, ecology, ecosystem services, town planning and so on (Moore and Tully 2018).

Participatory approaches span top-down engagement activities to more horizontal interactions between archaeologists and the public, or co-responsibility for heritage assets, and are adopted with different degrees of public participation depending on national legislations, administrative traditions and political factors (see e.g. European Journal of Postclassical Archaeologies 9: 2019; Benetti 2020; Brogiolo and Arnau 2020). Yet, collaboration still appears to remain 'optional' within current archaeological and heritage methodologies. In fact, although there is consensus among a growing number of researchers that work should not be carried out from an elitist and non-social perspective (Richardson and Almansa-Sánchez 2015), it does not mean that the theoretical proposals regarding the participation of local communities are actually being met, as most projects are still conceived from the top down (Schmidt 2014, 40). In addition to the innate value of collaborative approaches in terms of methodology, preservation, social impact and benefits, new terms of engagement also represent a change in the archaeological discipline in the face of more romantic or financially-driven perceptions (e.g. Dawdy 2009). These can generate a negative view of professional archaeology and create social conflict between the preservation of 'cultural heritage' and 'progress' (consider for example the recent loss of Liverpool's World Heritage status, e.g. Halliday 2021).

Part of the challenge is to convince archaeologists and heritage professionals who are resistant to the idea of working beyond the discipline's 'traditional borders' that participatory approaches are methodologically robust (scientific) and aim to enhance rather than erode their role (i.e. employment opportunities and traditional authority as 'experts'). There is the perception that these practices are simply 'add-ons', are not central to research and that they require no training or specific professional skills for their development, thus devaluing their importance. No doubt linked to this perception is the issue that, with some notable exceptions, current university courses lack adequate curricular or training opportunities in participatory approaches, thus promulgating the problem (e.g. Sutcliffe 2014, 110). Other difficulties arise from archaeological working conditions such as job precariousness, lack of time and limited budgets. One way to address these issues is through developing more detailed and standardized evaluation processes, which enable practitioners effectively to capture the impact of collaboration and demonstrate 'real' change in perceptions, policies and behaviours. This could provide a template for funding assessors, academic panels and others, both in order to measure and to understand better the actual impact(s) of community engagements.

At present, multiple academic papers, websites, reports and other outputs exist, acting as testimony to the successes and challenges of participatory approaches (e.g. Atalay 2010; Bollwerk, Connolly, and McDavid 2015; Delgado Anés 2017; Jones 2017; Chavarría Arnau 2019 to name a few). Among these, also sit various toolkits, models and recommendations intended to disseminate best practices (e.g. Jones 2004; Simpson and Williams 2008; Burtenshaw 2014; Sayer 2014; Guildoyle and Hogg 2015; Castillo Mena et al. 2015; De Leijen and Arthure 2016; Halperin 2017). While these reflect the spectrum of collaborative, inter-cultural and interdisciplinary exchanges in which

archaeology and archaeological heritage plays a part, the lack of a standardized evaluation framework nonetheless prevents case studies from forming the strong, unified voice (and body of evidence) needed to convert sceptics and enable practitioners to realize the full potential of participatory archaeology.

In this paper, we wish to suggest a robust model, which has the capacity to adapt and to mould to different forms of community-oriented archaeology and heritage, and to be a valuable tool for future participatory heritage projects and their evaluation. We also aim in the near future to test this model further in the research of many of this paper's co-authors.

The problem of evaluation within participatory archaeology and heritage

There is no shortage of material surrounding case studies of participatory practice within archaeology and heritage (e.g. Atalay 2010; Kiddey 2020). However, project facilitators – from academics to practitioners and stakeholder communities – are often poor at evaluating collaborations beyond surface-level data and at sharing 'difficult' information such as areas of conflict or explanations of failures to meet project objectives. This is notwithstanding the efforts of journals such as this one, which encourage authors to reflect also upon failures and challenges within community archaeology and heritage projects. As Ellenberger and Richardson (2019, 81) state:

... often, evaluation reports ignore any areas where impact has not been felt. Are we afraid of sharing failure and projects that did not turn out as we expected? Do neoliberal agendas drive these fears because of a pressured financial environment?

In addition, evaluation rarely assesses impact beyond the (funded) course of an initiative (i.e. it does not return for example two, five or ten years later to assess sustainability or lasting impact - see also Isherwood 2009). Where evaluation does take place, it tends to be piecemeal and is difficult to compare across projects due to lack of standardization in approach (Wilkins 2019), and much of the data (particularly challenges or longer-term outputs) remain private or unpublished. It would therefore be highly advisable to build longer-term and more critical (i.e. reflexive and challenge-, as opposed to achievement-, focused) evaluation into project proposals (Ellenberger and Richardson 2019).

Assessing the social impacts of community projects should be conceived of as a process of analysis and assessment of transformations throughout the course of their development, taking into account the assessment of the positive and negative effects caused by it, which may appear as expected or unplanned results. How to do this, though? Gould (2016) suggests that studying varied case studies of public and community archaeology projects through statistical data alone can be problematic in terms of offering useful comparisons. In addition, practitioners/participants need to capture the data in the first place in order to study and revisit it later. We could take into account different communities, types of heritage and project conditions with a flexible approach alongside the adoption of a standardized evaluation method, which considers how to demonstrate project objectives, via mixed methods, whether qualitatively or quantitatively (Bryman 2015), while allowing for the necessary flexibility that is inherent in all collaborative work.

Certain national funders, such as the National Lottery Heritage Fund (formerly Heritage Lottery Fund) in the UK, offer guidance to grant beneficiaries on how to evaluate their projects (e.g. Heritage Fund 2021). These guidelines are, naturally, open to adaptation depending on the project, which allows for flexibility for example in deciding how to collect data from the project. On the other hand, their connection to specific types of projects, funding, or national frameworks mean that they are unlikely to be used at the international scale. The European Research Council, which funds primarily academic research, employs a self-assessment evaluation model for projects, which is submitted by the principal investigator at the end of the funding period (European Commission 2017). The evaluation includes a flexible approach to defining project achievements, including elements such as ethics, data management, open access and dissemination. There is, however, no area dedicated to critical reflection and neither the data nor evaluation format is made widely available for adaption or reuse in other contexts.

Proposition

We propose a table (Table 1) with key evaluation measures and timescale indicators. This, we feel after extensive discussion and sharing of experiences through our workshop and through the collaborative process of writing this article, offers a best practice model and creates a standardized means of evaluation across participatory archaeology and archaeological heritage projects. The template is not designed for prescriptive use – that is to say, not every project will consider every form of evidence or approach. Rather, the table aims to act as a framework and ‘shopping list’ through which individual evaluation models can be tailored by linking them to specific project outcomes and objectives. The table explicitly advocates a mixed method approach, suggesting different data collection strategies to be used at different stages before, during and after the project. Importantly, different elements of methods can be used and even combined depending on the project’s needs (see also Axinn and Pearce 2006 and Bryman 2015 for detailed overviews and examples of using mixed method approaches in social sciences). Thus, users can select the most relevant aspects for evaluation from the admittedly extensive list in the table, and also consider which evaluative methods from the suggestions given are most appropriate for their project. This will be both facilitated and simplified once the table is transferred online (see discussions in ‘Next Steps’ below) by providing drop down lists and opt-in/out options to tailor and streamline data input and cross-referencing. Naturally new methods are also likely to be innovated over time. The proposed table and approach also facilitates robust comparisons across the sector. Effectively, we hope that projects can select the sections and measures most relevant to their situation, and that the table thus provides both relative standardization and flexibility.

We have named it the Tully Table after co-author Gemma Tully, who sketched out the first version and its components during a roundtable discussion of public archaeology evaluation during the Spring School in Canale di Tenno in April 2018. After some initial debate, the table took shape relatively quickly during the discussion (Figure 3). It reflects the collective experiences of the authors as practitioners and scholars in this field. We have all tried previously to evaluate the impact and utility of our methodologies, activities and the strategies that we follow and apply in our work. Therefore, the Tully Table is a synthesis, in fact a prototype awaiting further testing in its current form, but nonetheless it has a strong base thanks to our previous experiences and results from working with different kinds of archaeological heritage in different national and regional settings. (For more papers stemming from the workshop and highlighting different examples of our work, see *European Journal of Postclassical Archaeologies*, vol.9 2019).

To ensure clarity, we outline our understanding of the table’s column headings and key terms below:

Table column headings:

- 1. Evaluation category, aims and methods** concern the different components and methods that **may be** relevant to a project’s evaluation, depending on the specificities of each project.
- 2. Potential risks and obstacles** concern elements that may arise during the project (e.g. potential social/cultural conflicts, economic concerns, heritage management issues). These elements are normally considered during project planning and are usually ‘flagged’ during formative evaluation (see below). It is important to include these elements here so that projects can easily share this data and enhance awareness of the wide range of challenges faced across project types and locations.
- 3. Quantitative evidence** concerns numerical data linked to each evaluation category that is acquired through counting or measuring (e.g. number of participants, visitors to a museum, total sales by value, views of a website, points on a Likert scale etc.)
- 4. Qualitative evidence** (including anecdotal evidence) concerns descriptive rather than numerical data (e.g. feelings, perceptions, ideas, personal narratives, visual outputs, beliefs, experiences etc.)
- 5. Outcomes** are the results of the project in relation to the project objectives. This may include quantitative goals in terms of involving a certain number of participants, through to more qualitative results such as changes in attitudes or expressions of enjoyment. As such it relates to both 3. and 4. on the Tully Table, and is a means of assessing the extent to which espoused outcomes were met in practice.

6. **Challenges** acknowledge the perceived difficulties encountered during the project, which may be seen as less successful or even outright failure, such as missing particular goals or encountering unexpected problems.

7. **Timescale** concerns the time period in which each element of evaluation took place, ideally reflected by date e.g. 01 January 2020–01 February 2020 or just by month when exact dates are not relevant.

8. **Recommendations and new proposals** concern suggestions both for individual projects and the wider sector where relevant, which have arisen from the full experience of evaluating this category.

Table 1 (SEE APPENDIX IN THIS VERSION)

Terms:

Formative evaluation represents work that takes place before the core activities of a project begin – i.e. literature review, discussion with potential partners about the nature of the project, its aims and Figure 3. discussion on the evaluation table during the Spring. Chavarría Arnau (2018) 12 G. TULLY ET AL. methodologies in order to shape these elements and the activities, collaborative structures, desired outputs and so on that will follow. This could take the form of focus groups, surveys, interviews or similar. Formative evaluation therefore shapes the design/planning stage of the project.

Durative evaluation represents the work that takes place during the core phase of the project, i.e. during a community excavation, participatory museum project, oral history documentation, official consultation etc. This could take the form of elements such as focus groups, participant interviews, surveys, data collection from event/online engagement or similar. Durative evaluation therefore records outcomes/feedback on the primary activities/outputs of the project during its ‘active’ phase.

Summative evaluation represents work that takes place after the core activities of a project are over (e.g. an excavation campaign ends). This could take the form of focus groups, surveys, interviews, ongoing evaluation of engagement with project outputs such as online resources, sales of related products/books etc. Summative evaluation has no strict ‘end-date’ and can take place weeks, months and even years after the core activities of a project have been completed in order to assess the long-term impacts of a project.

Next steps

To follow-up, several of the co-authors of this paper aim to apply the proposed table to their own participatory projects, and to report on the table’s effectiveness. It may be that these researchers and practitioners propose yet more modifications to the table, but we see this as a fluid and expected part of the process. Likewise, we invite others to test the table in their own work and to offer feedback. One of the co-authors, Alexandria Chavarria, has already piloted the Tully Table during the participatory research Summer Schools that took place from 2014 to 2019 across a number of small villages in the province of Trento, Italy. The goals of the project were to:

1. gain better knowledge of the historical landscapes and architectures of the case study villages in order to develop future projects based on sustainable economic development (mainly through tourism but also through specific agricultural methods and rural products),
2. enhance the role of archaeological heritage in social cohesion and as part of more attractive activities for schools.

The project started before the discussions of the 2018 Spring School, and Chavarria and her team had already been developing a means of evaluating the work which incorporated some of the elements included in the final table. However, being able to use the Tully Table systematically meant that the results became more clear and could be better organized by output and theme. Chavarria and her team did not experience any challenges or problems in using the table to organize their evaluation, and even built an explicatory scheme (Figure 4a&b) to explain the results to the participating communities.

Although the current Covid-19 pandemic has put many participatory projects on hold for the time being, it is expected that more of the co-authors will use and report upon the Tully Table in the coming years, as the world slowly reopens and it becomes more possible to work together and in person with communities and with each other.

If the new evaluation format is to be available freely, we also need to address investigation into data storage and methods for disseminating results. Creating an accessible and centralized resource through an online hub that enables consistent archiving and comparison between project evaluations and includes a library/archive of results is also under discussion. Any data storage also has to consider ethical requirements such as the protection of privacy of participants, ensuring that consent is given for any data stored. Institutional ethical guidelines (for example Institutional Review Boards in American universities), and local legal requirements such as the EU’s General Data Protection Regulation naturally have to be observed and followed. While projects need to build longer-term evaluation into workflows from the start, such a resource may

help in terms of the challenges that funding and staff change pose, as project facilitators alongside other contributors (including stakeholders) could continue to update/assess projects remotely over time. Grantgivers to community archaeology initiatives may even adopt (and perhaps adapt) it as a more standardized and fit-for-purpose way to measure the effectiveness of the projects that they fund.

Figure 4. a&b Alexandra Chavarria's explicatory scheme to help evaluate community heritage projects. Figure 4a shows the original Italian, and 4b the English translation

This paper is only the first step in developing a systematic evaluation process, and the authors expect to see the table evolve and refine over time, especially following attempts to test the evaluation measures in a wider range of projects. Together, alongside the wider community archaeology and heritage network of practitioners, scholars, volunteers, traditional owners, grant-givers and decision-makers, we hope to refine the Tully Table. This will allow us (as a community) to address issues surrounding the lack of comparable evidence and clear evaluation methodology which continue to hinder the universal acceptance and adoption of participatory practice in all archaeology and archaeological heritage management work.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Alexandra Chavarria for organizing the Spring School in Canale di Tenno and Riva del Garda in April 2018, and for publishing its outcomes. We would also like to thank the University of Padua (WinterSummerschool call 2017) and the PRIN Project 'Archeologia al futuro' (prot. 2015ZKTL5) for funding the Spring School.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Notes on contributors

Gemma Tully teaches Museum Studies at the University of Bergamo (Italy). She works to enhance mutual understandings of heritage between diverse stakeholders in Europe and North Africa.

Lara Delgado Anés is a Geography and History Teacher in the Department of Education in the Regional Government of Andalusia (Granada, Spain), specializing in Public and Community Archaeology.

Suzie Thomas is a Professor of Heritage Studies at the University of Antwerp, Belgium, and a Docent in Museum Studies at the University of Helsinki, Finland.

Adrian Olivier has worked as a lead expert for the Council of Europe and he continues to work closely with international organizations on the protection and promotion of the historic environment.

Francesca Benetti is a Historic Environment Forum Manager with a PhD from the University of Padova (Italy). She cochairs the Public Archaeology Community of the European Association of Archaeologists.

Alicia Castillo Mena is Professor at Complutense University and Polytechnic University of Madrid (Spain) She specializes in Cultural Heritage Management and is Director of the Cultural Heritage Management Research Group.

Alexandra Chavarria Arnau is Professor of medieval Archaeology at the University of Padova. She is the Italian coordinator of ICAHM and leads a series of projects on community archaeology in northern Italy.

Mia Rizner works as senior advisor at Conservation department in Rijeka, Croatia and holds an MA from the University of Zagreb (Croatia) and a PhD from the University of Padova (Italy).

Katharina Möller is a PhD student at Bangor University (Wales, UK). Her research focuses on public participation in archaeology in Germany and the UK.

Raimund Karl teaches archaeology and heritage at the University of Vienna (Austria) and is Emeritus Professor of Archaeology and Heritage at Bangor University (Wales, UK).

Dr Akira Matsuda is an Associate Professor at the University of Tokyo. He investigates the meaning, representation and use of the past in the contemporary world.

José María Martín Civantos is Associated professor in Medieval History and Archaeology at the University of Granada (Spain) and coordinator of the MEMOLab, Biocultural Archaeology Laboratory.

Gian Pietro Brogiolo is professor of Medieval Archaeology at the University of Padova. His research focuses on urban, landscape and community archaeology.

Nekbet Corpas Cívicos has recently completed her PhD in conflict analysis and resolution in archaeological heritage management at the Complutense University Madrid (Spain).

Francesco Ripanti holds a PhD from the University of Pisa, Italy, with a project focusing on the study of public participation in Italian archaeology.

Julia Sarabia-Bautista is Professor of Archaeology at the University of Alicante (Spain) and researcher at the UA Institute for Archaeology and Heritage Research (INAPH).

Sonia Schivo recently completed her PhD at the University of Padova on the value and perception of cultural heritage for local communities.

ORCID

Suzie Thomas <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-3365-0136>

Francesca Benetti <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8919-8444>

Alicia Castillo Mena <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9168-1803>

Katharina Möller <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3048-087X>

Raimund Karl <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5832-8656>

Francesco Ripanti <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8196-7720>

References

Atalay, Sonja. 2010. “‘We Don’t Talk About Çatalhöyük, we Live it’: Sustainable Archaeological Practice Through Community-Based Participatory Research.” *World Archaeology* 42 (3): 418–429.

Axinn, William G., and Lisa D. Pearce. 2006. *Mixed Method Data Collection Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Benetti, Francesca. 2020. *Il diritto di partecipare. Aspetti giuridici del rapporto tra pubblico e archeologia*. Mantua: SAP Società Archeologica.

Bollwerk, Elizabeth, Robert Connolly, and Carol McDavid. 2015. “Co-Creation and Public Archaeology.” *Advances in Archaeological Practice* 3 (3): 178–187.

- Brogiolo, Gian Pietro, and Alexandra Chavarría Arnau. 2020. "Archeologia e Sostenibilità Nell'era Post (?) Covid-19." *European Journal of Post-Classical Archaeologies* 10: 7–20.
- Bryman, Alan. 2015. *Social Research Methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Burtenshaw, Paul. 2014. "Mind the Gap: Cultural and Economic Values in Archaeology." *Journal of Public Archaeology* 13 (1-3): 48–58.
- Castillo Mena, Alicia, Ana Yañez Vega, Marta Domínguez, Isabel Isabel Saltó-Weiss, and Marta Dominguez. 2015. "Citizenship and Heritage Commitment: Looking for Participatory Methodologies Adapted to the Urban Cultural Heritage Context". In *Proceedings of the 8th ICOMOS General Assembly and Symposium: Heritage and Landscape as Human Values*, Florence, Italy, 415–422. Florence: ICOMOS.
- Chavarría Arnau, Alexandra. 2019. "La Ricerca Partecipata Nell'archeologia del Futuro." *Il Capitale Culturale* 9: 369–387.
- Dawdy, Shannon Lee. 2009. "Millennial Archaeology. Locating the Discipline in the age of Insecurity." *Archaeological Dialogues* 16 (2): 131–142.
- De Leiu, Cherrie, and Susan Arthure. 2016. "Collaboration on Whose Terms? Using the IAP2 Community Engagement Model for Archaeology in Kapunda, South Australia." *Journal of Community Archaeology & Heritage* 3 (2): 81–98.
- Delgado Anés, Lara. 2017. *Gestión, Comunicación y Participación Social en los Paisajes Culturales de Andalucía: El Caso del Proyecto MEMOLA*. Granada: Universidad de Granada.
- Delgado Anés, Lara, and José María Martín Civantos. 2019. "A Comparative Analysis of Community Archaeology Based on two Excavations in the South-East of the Iberian Peninsula: Local Community Involvement and Social Context." *Il Capitale Culturale. Studies on the Value of Cultural Heritage* 9: 389–414.
- Ellenberger, Kate, and Lorna-Jane Richardson. 2019. "Reflecting on Evaluation in Public Archaeology." *AP: Online Journal in Public Archaeology* 8 (1): 65–94. European Commission. 2017. "European Research Council (ERC) Periodic Scientific Report Template". Accessed 18 October 2021. https://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/h2020/gm/reporting/h2020-tpl-periodic-rep-scierc_en.pdf.
- European Journal of Post-Classical Archaeologies. 2019. "Participatory Research in Archaeology. Legal Issues and Good Practices." *European Journal of Post-Classical Archaeologies* 9, http://www.postclassical.it/PCA_Vol.9.html.
- Gould, Peter G. 2016. "On the Case: Method in Public and Community Archaeology." *Public Archaeology* 15 (1): 5–22.
- Guildoyle, David, and Erin Hogg. 2015. "Towards and Evaluation-Based Framework of Collaborative Archaeology." *Advantages in Archaeological Practice* 3 (2): 107–123.
- Halliday, Josh. 2021. "Unesco Strips Liverpool of its World Heritage Status". *The Guardian*, July 21. <https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2021/jul/21/unesco-strips-liverpool-waterfront-world-heritage-status>.
- Halperin, Christina T. 2017. "Anthropological Archaeology in 2016: Cooperation and Collaborations in Archaeological Research and Practice." *American Anthropologist* 119 (2): 284–297.
- Heritage Fund. 2021. "Evaluation Guidance". Heritage Fund. Accessed 18 October 2021. <https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/funding/good-practice-guidance/evaluation-guidance>.

- Holtorf, Cornelius. 2007. *Archaeology is a Brand!: The Meaning of Archaeology in Contemporary Popular Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Isherwood, Rob. 2009. "Community Archaeology. A Study of the Conceptual, Political and Practical Issues Surrounding Community Archaeology in the United Kingdom Today." (PhD diss.). University of Manchester.
- Jones, Siân. 2004. *Research Report: Early Medieval Sculpture and The Productions of Meaning, Values and Place: The Case of Hilton of Cadboll*. Edinburgh: Historic Scotland.
- Jones, Siân. 2017. "Wrestling with the Social Value of Heritage: Problems, Dilemmas and Opportunities." *Journal of Community Archaeology and Heritage* 4 (1): 21–37.
- Kiddey, Rachael. 2020. "I'll Tell you What i Want, What i Really, Really Want! Open Archaeology That is Collaborative, Participatory, Public, and Feminist." *Norwegian Archaeological Review* 53 (1): 23–40.
- Kohl, Phillip. 1998. "Relativism, Objectivity and the Politics of the Past: Beyond Caricature and Polemics and Towards a Healthy Archaeology." *Archaeological Dialogues* 5 (1): 30–34.
- Kristiansen, Kristian, and Michael Rowland. 1998. *Social Transformations in Archaeology*. London: Routledge.
- Matsuda, Akira. 2004. "The Concept of 'the Public' and the Aims of Public Archaeology." *Papers from the Institute of Archaeology* 15 (2004): 90–97.
- Moore, Tom, and Gemma Tully. 2018. "Connecting Landscapes: Examining and Enhancing the Relationship Between Stakeholder Values and Cultural Landscape Management in England." *Landscape Research* 43 (6): 769–783.
- Moshenska, Gabriel. 2017. *Key Concepts in Public Archaeology*. London: UCL Press.
- Olivier, Adrian. 2017. "Communities of Interest: Challenging Approaches." *Journal of Community Archaeology & Heritage* 4 (1): 7–20.
- Pyburn, K. Anne. 2009. "Practising Archaeology—As if it Really Matters." *Public Archaeology* 8 (2-3): 161–175.
- Richardson, Lorna-Jane, and Jaime Almansa-Sánchez. 2015. "Do you Even Know What Public Archaeology is? Trends, Theory, Practice, Ethics." *World Archaeology* 47 (3): 194–211.
- Sayer, Faye. 2014. "Politics and the Development of Community Archaeology in UK." *The Historic Environment* 5 (1): 55– 73.
- Schmidt, Peter R. 2014. "Rediscovering Community Archaeology in Africa and Reframing its Practice." *Journal of Community Archaeology and Heritage* 1 (1): 37–55.
- Shepherd, Nick, and Alejandro Haber. 2011. "What's up with WAC? Archaeology and 'Engagement' in a Globalized World." *Public Archaeology* 10 (2): 96–115.
- Simpson, Faye, and Howard Williams. 2008. "Evaluating Community Archaeology in the UK." *Public Archaeology* 7 (2): 69–90.
- Sutcliffe, Tara-Jane. 2014. "Skills for the Future: An Introduction to the Community Archaeology Bursaries Project." *Journal of Community Archaeology and Heritage* 1 (2): 107–117.
- Wilkins, Brendon. 2019. "A Theory of Change and Evaluative Framework for Measuring the Social Impact of Public Participation in Archaeology." *European Journal of Post-Classical Archaeologies* 9: 77–100.

Table 1. Evaluating Participatory Practice in Archaeology: Proposal for a Standardised Approach - Evaluation ‘Tully’ Table

1. Evaluation category, aims and methods	2. Potential risks and obstacles	3. Quantitative evidence	4. Qualitative evidence	5. Outcomes	6. Challenges	7. Timescale	8. Recommendations and new proposals
<p>Socio-economic, cultural and political context</p> <p>Aim: to evaluate the background/ capacity of the archaeological team and the geopolitical, socioeconomic and cultural context of the project</p> <p>Method: analysis of socioeconomic, political and cultural metrics from local to international scales with special reference to the role of culture and heritage in public policies</p>	List potential risks and challenges considered before work begins	<p>Formative</p> <p>Durative</p>	<p>Formative</p> <p>Durative</p>	Overview of key positive findings linked to information presented in columns 2, 3 and 4, plus additional personal reflection where relevant	Overview of key challenges/ conflicts linked to information presented in columns 2, 3 and 4, plus additional personal reflection where relevant	<p>Formative (insert dates)</p> <p>Durative (insert dates)</p>	
<p>Stakeholder mapping/ stakeholder network analysis</p> <p>Aim: To provide essential baseline data connected to project objectives – must be repeatable over the course of the project to assess change</p> <p>Methods: e.g. interviews, questionnaires, focus groups, mind maps, drawing tasks (in person and online)</p>	List potential risks and challenges considered before consultation/data collection begins	<p>Formative</p> <p>Durative 1</p> <p>Durative 2 and so on (this may be carried out multiple times)</p> <p>Summative 1</p> <p>Summative 2 and so on (this may be carried out multiple times, ideally immediately at the end of the project and at least 6 months and 1 year later. 2, 5, 10 year reviews desirable.</p>	<p>Formative</p> <p>Durative 1</p> <p>Durative 2 and so on (this may be carried out multiple times)</p> <p>Summative 1</p> <p>Summative 2 and so on (this may be carried out multiple times, ideally immediately at the end of the project and at least 6 months and 1 year later. 2, 5, 10 year reviews desirable.</p>	Overview of key positive findings linked to information presented in columns 2, 3 and 4, plus additional personal reflection where relevant	Overview of key challenges conflicts linked to information presented in columns 2, 3 and 4, plus additional personal reflection where relevant	<p>Formative (insert dates)</p> <p>Durative 1 (insert dates)</p> <p>Durative 2 and so on (insert dates)</p> <p>Summative 1</p> <p>Summative 2 and so on (insert dates)</p>	

<p>Perceptions studies</p> <p>Aim: As above</p> <p>Methods: As above - adaptable to include elements such as perceptions relating to project theme/ site visits/ museum visits/visitor experience/textual analysis/ ethnographic interviews or observations/visual analysis etc.</p>	<p>List potential risks and challenges considered before consultation/data collection begins</p>	<p>Formative</p> <p>Durative 1</p> <p>Durative 2 and so on (this may be carried out multiple times)</p> <p>Summative 1</p> <p>Summative 2 and so on (this may be carried out multiple times, ideally immediately at the end of the project and at least 6 months and 1 year later. 2, 5, 10 year reviews desirable.</p>	<p>Formative, Durative, Summative</p>	<p>Overview of key positive findings linked to information presented in columns 2, 3 and 4, plus additional personal reflection where relevant</p>	<p>Overview of key challenges/ conflicts linked to information presented in columns 2, 3 and 4, plus additional personal reflection where relevant</p>	<p>Dates perception work took place</p>	
<p>Metrics: events, online and media</p> <p>Aim: To demonstrate participant numbers/event outcomes/ project's online/ social media presence and chart the development of independent/spin-off websites/online initiatives/ press narratives (including imagery) over time</p> <p>Methods: Statistical, textual, comparative, observational analysis (including responses to surveys, focus groups, comments, readership data etc.)</p>	<p>List potential risks and challenges considered before consultation/data collection begins</p>	<p>Durative and Summative only</p>	<p>Durative and Summative only</p>	<p>Overview of key positive findings linked to information presented in columns 2, 3 and 4, plus additional personal reflection where relevant</p>	<p>Overview of key challenges/ conflicts linked to information presented in columns 2, 3 and 4, plus additional personal reflection where relevant</p>	<p>Dates activities took place and data collection period</p>	

Formation of associations/ groups Aim: Document formation of new social and personal networks as well as new inter-/multi-disciplinary partnerships Methods: Statistical, textual, comparative and observational analysis	List potential risks and challenges considered before consultation/data collection begins	Durative and Summative only	Durative and Summative only	Overview of key positive findings linked to information presented in columns 2, 3 and 4, plus additional personal reflection where relevant	Overview of key challenges/ conflicts linked to information presented in columns 2, 3 and 4, plus additional personal reflection where relevant	Dates of key meetings and decisions	
Training Aims: Document number and type of training carried out (for volunteers as well as ‘professionals’) Methods: Statistical, textual, comparative and observational analysis	List potential risks and challenges considered before consultation/data collection begins	Durative and Summative only	Durative and Summative only	Overview of key positive findings linked to information presented in columns 2, 3 and 4, plus additional personal reflection where relevant	Overview of key challenges/ conflicts linked to information presented in columns 2, 3 and 4, plus additional personal reflection where relevant	Dates training took place	
Funding and economic impact Aim: Document indicators of changing public and private support (i.e. donations/crowd sourcing, new finances -local to international level- for project area/sector and demonstrate economic change (e.g. tourism growth, new industry, agricultural innovation, job creation) Method: Statistical, textual, comparative and observational analysis	List potential risks and challenges considered before consultation/data collection begins	Durative and Summative only	Durative and Summative only	Overview of key positive findings linked to information presented in columns 2, 3 and 4, plus additional personal reflection where relevant	Overview of key challenges/ conflicts linked to information presented in columns 2, 3 and 4, plus additional personal reflection where relevant	Dates of key funding decisions/ supporting/ completion of campaigns etc.	

<p>Policy change</p> <p>Aim: Demonstrate impact on policy from organisational to international level</p> <p>Methods: Statistical, textual, comparative and observational analysis</p>	List potential risks and challenges considered before active consultation/data collection begins	Durative and Summative only	Durative and Summative only	Overview of key positive findings linked to information presented in columns 2, 3 and 4, plus additional personal reflection where relevant	Overview of key challenges/ conflicts linked to information presented in columns 2, 3 and 4, plus additional personal reflection where relevant	Dates of key meetings/ decisions and the publication of new policy documents	
<p>Reputational impact</p> <p>Aim: Demonstrate wider project influence (e.g. adoption of methods by others/evidence of replicability, invitations to speak at public/academic events etc.)</p> <p>Method: Statistical, textual, comparative and observational analysis</p>	List potential risks and challenges considered before consultation/data collection begins	Durative and Summative only	Durative and Summative only	Overview of key positive findings linked to information presented in columns 2, 3 and 4, plus additional personal reflection where relevant	Overview of key challenges/ conflicts linked to information presented in columns 2, 3 and 4, plus additional personal reflection where relevant	Dates of talks, announcements, development of new initiatives etc.	
<p>Conflict resolution</p> <p>Aim: demonstrate role in resolving conflicts/finding trade-offs/solutions</p> <p>Method: Assess conflicts between stakeholders as emerging from mapping/ perceptions studies, monitor project's role in ameliorating conflict through all relevant means (e.g. formation of associations, new initiatives/resources, relevant statistical, textual, visual, observation analysis)</p>	List potential risks and challenges considered before consultation/data collection begins	Formative, durative, summative	Formative, durative, summative	Overview of key positive findings linked to information presented in columns 2, 3 and 4, plus additional personal reflection where relevant	Overview of key challenges/ conflicts linked to information presented in columns 2, 3 and 4, plus additional personal reflection where relevant	Dates of key meetings, decisions and new documentation/ actions/policies (citing sources where relevant)	

Environmental indicators Aims: Document improvements to wildlife, landscape, ecosystems services, management practice in agriculture etc. Method: Statistical, textual, comparative and observational analysis (e.g. ecological surveys, well-being indicators, vandalism, water use etc.)	List potential risks and challenges considered before consultation/data collection begins	Durative and Summative only	Durative and Summative only	Overview of key positive findings linked to information presented in columns 2, 3 and 4, plus additional personal reflection where relevant	Overview of key challenges/ conflicts linked to information presented in columns 2, 3 and 4, plus additional personal reflection where relevant	Dates and sources of relevant data	
Knowledge exchange Aim: Document new information gained by different participants and its impact (this may overlap with other categories, e.g. development of associations, changing behaviour etc.) Method: Statistical, textual, comparative and observational analysis	List potential risks and challenges considered before consultation/data collection begins	Durative and Summative only	Durative and Summative only	Overview of key positive findings linked to information presented in columns 2, 3 and 4, plus additional personal reflection where relevant	Overview of key challenges/ conflicts linked to information presented in columns 2, 3 and 4, plus additional personal reflection where relevant	Dates and sources of data collection initiatives and subsequent outcomes	

Disciplinary change Aim: Demonstrate adoption of new/shifting methods (within archaeological teams, including new professionals with expert profiles on participation and across stakeholder interests) Methods: Statistical, textual and comparative	List potential risks and challenges considered before consultation/data collection begins	Durative and Summative only	Durative and Summative only	Overview of key positive findings linked to information presented in columns 2, 3 and 4, plus additional personal reflection where relevant	Overview of key challenges/ conflicts linked to information presented in columns 2, 3 and 4, plus additional personal reflection where relevant	Dates of key meetings, decisions and new documentation/ actions/policies (citing sources where relevant)	
Outputs (this may overlap with other categories) Aims: Document project outputs, type and number (e.g. books, digital tools, gamification) Methods: Statistical, textual, comparative and observational analysis and feedback on outputs	List potential risks and challenges considered before consultation/data collection begins	Durative – to show collaboration in development of outputs Summative	Durative – to show collaboration in development of outputs Summative	Overview of key positive findings linked to information presented in columns 2, 3 and 4, plus additional personal reflection where relevant	Overview of key challenges/ conflicts linked to information presented in columns 2, 3 and 4, plus additional personal reflection where relevant	Dates and sources of data	
Sustainability Summary Aim: After each key project evaluation phase (as decided by the project team) assess sustainability indicators and lessons for the future Methods: Statistical, textual, comparative, visual, observational	List potential risks and challenges considered before consultation/data collection begins	Phase 1 Phase 2 etc.	Phase 1 Phase 2 etc.	Overview of key positive findings linked to information presented in columns 2, 3 and 4, plus additional personal reflection where relevant	Overview of key challenges/ conflicts linked to information presented in columns 2, 3 and 4, plus additional personal reflection where relevant	Dates and sources of data	

Additional information, thoughts and comments							
----------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--