HIGHER EDUCATION FUNDING COUNCIL FOR ENGLAND hefce

The University of Reading

ABX

INCLUSIVE, ACCESSIBLE, ARCHAEOLOGY
(HEFCE FDTL5)

Phase 1

DISABILITY AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL FIELDWORK

Summary of a report based on a questionnaire survey of Archaeology Subject Providers, Disability Support Services in HEIs and Archaeological Employers

(November 2005)

Tim Phillips &

Roberta Gilchrist

LAYOUT OF THE REPORT

INTRODUCTION

This report summarises Phase 1 of the 'Inclusive, Accessible, Archaeology' project, funded by the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE FDTL 5) for developments in teaching and learning. The project is directed by Professor Roberta Gilchrist of the Department of Archaeology at the University of Reading in partnership with the School of Conservation Sciences at Bournemouth University and the Council for British Archaeology (CBA), and in collaboration with the Research Group for Inclusive Environments (School of Construction Management) at Reading. The project also has the active support of the Institute of Field Archaeologists (IFA), Oxford Archaeology and English Heritage.

PROJECT SUMMARY

GOALS

The project aims to address the dual issues of disability and transferable skills in the teaching of archaeological fieldwork. It will:

- Increase awareness of disability issues in archaeology;
- Improve the integration of disability in fieldwork teaching; and
- Improve all students' awareness of their development of transferable skills for the transition to employability through participating in archaeological fieldwork.

PROJECT OUTCOMES

The outcomes will be:

- The integration of disabled students into archaeological fieldwork and related activities according to, and consistent with, the mandatory legal requirements of disability legislation.
- A change of emphasis from 'disability' to 'ability': rather than excluding or categorising individuals, all students will be engaged actively in assessing their own skills. This will be achieved by developing a generic self-assessment tool kit suitable for use by all students being taught fieldwork in archaeology and other fieldwork related subjects.
- Dissemination of the results through published guidelines, websites, workshops and conference presentations carried out in association with the project's professional stakeholders (the

Institute of Field Archaeologists, the Council for British Archaeology, English Heritage, and Oxford Archaeology).

PROGRAMME OF WORK

- Phase 1 – Assessment (February – July 2005, 6 months):

  Evaluate through questionnaires the issues surrounding, and current practices relating to, disability and archaeological fieldwork.
- Phase 2 – Characterisation (August – December 2005, 5 months):
  Develop a generic method of assessing physical and psychological abilities of disabled/non-disabled people to participate in archaeological fieldwork training.

- Phase 3 – Controlled Testing (January – June 2006, 6 months):
  Test and refine characterisation of archaeological field activities and environments through real-world tests in controlled laboratory conditions; produce pro-forma of self-assessment tool kit.

- Phase 4 – Field Trials (July – October 2006, 4 months):
  Assess suitability of controlled tests and evaluate generic method of assessment through field trials on archaeological excavations.

- Phase 5a – Evaluation (November 2006 – January 2007, 3 months):
  Refine the project's deliverables.

- Phase 5b – Wider Dissemination (February – April 2007, 3 months):
  Wider dissemination of project results.

- Phase 6 – Continuation After Funding Ends (May 2007 on):
  Integrate awareness of disability into archaeological fieldwork in training, employment, and the development of transferable skills in conjunction with archaeology subject providers and professional bodies.

MODELS OF DISABILITY

Disability has been described and understood through a number of different models which attempt to define the experience of being disabled.

THE MEDICAL MODEL

This considers a disabled person as ‘ill’, a subject for treatment and cure. It does not address the social, economic and environmental experience of a disabled person.

THE CHARITABLE MODEL

This sees a disabled person as a tragic individual. They are an object of pity who need to be cared for and protected from the rigours of everyday life.

THE SOCIAL MODEL

This shifts the emphasis from what is ‘wrong’ with a disabled person, to the ‘barriers’ in society (physical, social, economic and attitudinal) that exclude them from participating in everyday activities.

This project follows the social model of disability in that it is attempting to remove barriers that exclude some members of society from participating in archaeological fieldwork training. In this, it is promoting inclusiveness.

I METHODOLOGY

METHOD USED

The aim of Phase 1 of the project was to conduct an assessment of the Issues surrounding, and current practices relating to, disability and Archaeological fieldwork. To achieve this it was decided to use questionnaires. This method have various advantages and disadvantages.

ADVANTAGES:

- Cost effectiveness, there are no expenses relating to travel
- Time effectiveness, this also relates to travel and arranging interviews with subjects
- In relation to cost and time, there is the potential to reach a large sample of respondents
- Through ‘closed’ questions, the information gathered is in a controlled and structured format which enables it to be analysed efficiently and in a standardised way, especially quantitative data
- ‘Open’ questions included in a questionnaire allow for the collection of a wider range of qualitative data.

DISADVANTAGES:

- A low return rate is often a problem with questionnaire surveys
- The number of questions that can be asked is limited
- There is no ‘control’ over the answers received and these cannot be easily clarified; also it is not possible to ‘probe’ deeper into particular points that may be raised as in a face-to-face interview
- Not all the questions may be answered by a respondent
- The information recovered may be limited to the amount that a respondent feels like providing in written form.

The decision to conduct a questionnaire survey was taken on the basis of the time and resources available for this phase of the project. A number of strategies were adopted to mitigate the disadvantages of a questionnaire survey. These are described in the following section.

QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN AND EVALUATION

DESIGN

Reference was made to the survey conducted by the Geography Discipline Network's Inclusive Curriculum Project (Hall & Healey 2001, Hall et al 2001). This involved a questionnaire survey of subject providers, disability support services in HEIs and undergraduate Geography and Earth Science students. A recent survey of archaeological employment by the IFA was also referred to in designing the questionnaires (Aitchison & Edwards 2003). These provided 'templates' on which the questionnaires for this project could be based. In the original project design it was proposed that the archaeology subject providers, undergraduate archaeology students and archaeological employers would be surveyed. Following on from the experience of the Inclusive Curriculum Project, it was decided to also survey a number of disability support services in HEIs. This was to widen the information recovered on the experience of a varied number of people who have dealt with the issues of disability and archaeological fieldwork. The four questionnaires that were designed were addressed to four different audiences:

- Archaeology subject providers
- Disability support services in the same HEIs as the subject providers
- Archaeological employers
- Disabled undergraduate archaeology students

Copies of the first three of these questionnaires are included as Appendices to this report. The survey of the undergraduate students is continuing and a report on this will be produced at a later date (see below).

The questions were designed to recover a certain amount of quantitative data, such as the numbers of students or employees, and the amount of time spent on archaeological fieldwork training. More 'open' questions were included to recover qualitative data reflecting the experience of disability and archaeological fieldwork.

CHANGES TO THE ORIGINAL METHODOLOGY IN THE PROJECT PROPOSALS

- In addition to the three questionnaire surveys originally proposed, it was decided to also survey the disability support services in

HEIs to maximise the information relating to archaeological fieldwork training and disability that could potentially be gathered.

- There were problems in contacting disabled archaeology students and encouraging them to complete and return questionnaires. This was due to the survey being carried out in the Summer Term when most students are sitting exams. The decision was taken to extend the survey of students until the end of the year so that the feedback from them can be maximised.
- On the advice of the project's study advisor, feedback forms addressing the experience of doing archaeological fieldwork for all students participating in the University of Reading's training excavation at Silchester and Bournemouth University's excavations at Knowlton have been distributed. These will also be fed into the report on the experience of archaeology students. This will address issues related to disabled students, and the issues of transferable skills gained from participating in archaeological fieldwork. This is the other important aspect of archaeological training being addressed by the project.

These two examples of the changes made to the original methodology illustrate how the methods are being adapted in response to the feedback received and the situations encountered. Although these changes have been made, the basic aims of the project are being kept fully in sight.

MITIGATION STRATEGIES

A number of strategies were adopted to mitigate the disadvantages of conducting a questionnaire survey (see above).

- The original project design stated that 20 Archaeology subject providers would be surveyed and also 48 archaeological employers with the assistance of the IFA. These numbers were increased to 35 subject providers and 120 employers so as to obtain a large enough sample of replies. In the event, completed questionnaires were received from 20 subject providers and 53 employers.
- The questionnaires, especially for the employers, were designed to be as short and simple as possible so as to make them easy to complete.
- The recipients' contact details were asked for, as was permission to make follow-up contact.
- To encourage the completion of the questionnaires, all the 35 subject providers and disability support services were contacted by telephone. The nature and purpose of the project was explained to them, and they were informed that they would shortly

be receiving a questionnaire. The employers were all contacted by email with a similar message.
- When the questionnaires were sent out, they were accompanied by a reply paid envelope.
- 'Chase-up' emails were sent to the subject providers and the disability support services about four weeks after the questionnaires were sent out. No chase-up emails were sent to the employers.
- The questionnaires were all put onto the project's website in a downloadable format. The employers' questionnaire was also placed on the IFA website. This gave the recipients the choice of returning a questionnaire in digital format.

EVALUATION

The questionnaires were subjected to two forms of evaluation before their format was finalised:

- The questionnaires were handed out to the delegates who attended the official launch of the project at the British Academy in London on 11th March 2005. The delegates attending the launch comprised interested academic and professional archaeologists.
- The questionnaires were subjected to formative evaluation by the project's internal and external evaluators.

Only after the comments received through evaluation had been incorporated into the questionnaires, were they sent out.

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

- The quantitative data that involved numbers were entered into a series of Excell tables which were used to calculate the totals.
- The data from 'Yes/No/Don't Know' questions were entered into a number of simple ACCESS databases which were used to calculate the totals for the different categories.
- The comments provided by the respondents (qualitative data) were typed into a Word document and then imported into a simple Qualitative Data Analysis software package for analysis – Weft QDA (2005), a free download from the Internet. Given the amount of qualitative data to be analysed, it was deemed unnecessary to purchase a more powerful software package.
- The results of the subject providers and disability support services surveys were compared with data from the Inclusive Curriculum Project (Hall et al 2001), as this was also a survey

investigating disability within a discipline with a strong fieldwork element in its teaching programmes. The results were also compared with information from the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA 2004a) which provides national figures on students in Higher Education. The results of the employers' survey were compared with data derived from a recent survey of archaeological employers carried out by the IFA (Aitchison & Edwards 2003).

II RESULTS OF THE ARCHAEOLOGY SUBJECT PROVIDERS' QUESTIONNAIRE

INTRODUCTION

This report is based on the returns from a questionnaire survey of all the Archaeology Departments in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in England, Scotland and Wales that offer Archaeology undergraduate degrees (35 institutions). A telephone call was made to each of the departments, prior to the questionnaires being sent out, in which the purpose of the project was outlined. 'Chase-up' emails were sent out after a period of four weeks.

The questionnaire was made available in a downloadable format on the project's website. The covering letter accompanying the questionnaire explained the background to the project in the context of new disability legislation affecting both Higher Education and employment. It also highlighted that the project was being funded by the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) and that a number of professional archaeology bodies were major stakeholders. A postage-paid, self-addressed reply envelope was also sent with each questionnaire. A list identifying the scope of disabilities/impairments was provided as a guideline, along with an invitation to identify any additional conditions that the respondents deemed relevant. The list provided composed:

Dyslexia (and similar conditions)
Unseen disabilities/impairments, eg. Allergies, Arthritis, Asthma, Ataxia, Diabetes, Epilepsy, Heart Condition, ME, Phobias. Etc.
Hearing impairment
Wheelchair user/restricted mobility
Asperger's Syndrome/Autism
Mental illness
Visual impairment

The purpose of the survey was not to collect accurate quantitative data, but to gain an overall impression of the experience that subject providers have had in dealing with issues of disability in archaeology.

RESPONSE TO THE SURVEY

The 20 responses comprised 18 paper returns and 2 digital returns. This represents 57.1% of the 35 questionnaires that were sent out. Of these, one was returned anonymously with barely any information and has been discounted from the survey. This gives a total of 19 Departments, 54.3% of those surveyed (Table 1).

Table 1 Response to the survey

Departments surveyed	35
Number of replies	20
Percentage	57.1%
No information given	1
Sample size	19
Percentage	54.3%

Of the 20 Departments who returned questionnaires, 9 are in southern England, 7 in northern England, 3 in Wales and 1 in Scotland. 8 can be classified as ‘small’ (1-99 undergraduate students) and 12 as ‘large’ (>100 undergraduate students).

PART 1: ARCHAEOLOGICAL FIELDWORK IN YOUR DEGREE PROGRAMME

Q1.1 Please indicate the number of students registered for Archaeology undergraduate degrees in the academic year 2004/2005.

In the sample of Archaeology Departments the overwhelming number of students are studying archaeology as a full time undergraduate degree (about 90%). Over 60% of students are studying archaeology as a single/major subject, whilst almost 40% are taking it as a joint/subsidiary subject (Table 2).

Table 2 Number of Archaeology undergraduates 2004/2005
n=18 – one respondent did not supply these figures

Degree	No. FT	%	No. PT	%	Total	%
Single/Major	1352	58.6%	101	4.4%	1453	63.0%
Subsidiary	166	7.2%	15	0.6%	181	7.8%
Joint	568	24.6%	107	4.6%	675	29.2%

Total	2086	90.4%	223	9.6%	2309	100.0%

Q1.2 Please indicate the amount of time spent on practical teaching sessions of archaeological field techniques (as opposed to participation in an actual fieldwork project in vacations) in hours applicable to your degree programme(s).

The format of this question caused a few problems for at least one respondent because the organisation of their degree courses did not fit this layout:

> 'This has proved to be a tricky form to fill in, largely because our pattern of degree programmes does not easily fit into the format of the questionnaire…practical work cuts across a number of units and it is not possible to do a tidy counting job.'

However, the format was suitable for the vast majority of the respondents.

A wide range of total teaching hours is being spent on practical sessions as part of archaeology degree courses for both compulsory and optional units. The greatest range is within the optional training available. The most important factors to note is that all the respondents to the survey include practical teaching within their degree courses and that this is considered an integral part of an education in archaeology (Table 3).

Table 3 Amount of practical teaching

Degree	Compulsory Range (hrs)	Compulsory Average (hrs)	Optional Range (hrs)	Optional Average (hrs)
Single/Major	5 - 340	67 (n=15)	10 - 160	59 (n=6)
Subsidiary	6 - 24	15 (n=5)	5 - 80	27 (n=4)
Joint	5 - 164	34 (n=11)	5 - 300	81 (n=8)

Q1.3 Please indicate the amount of participation on a fieldwork project in vacation time required (in days) applicable to your degree programme(s).

All the departments except one that are represented in the survey expect their undergraduates to participate in fieldwork projects in vacation time. As with the amount of practical teaching, there is a wide variation in the amount of participation expected, as well as the availability of optional fieldwork (Table 4).

Table 4 Participation in field projects

Degree	Compulsory Range (days)	Compulsory Average (days)	Optional Range (days)	Optional Average (days)
Single/Major	5 - 55	27 (n=14)	50 - No Limit	? (n=6)
Subsidiary	10 - 24	15 (n=3)	14 - 50	32 (n=2)
Joint	12 - 160	33 (n=11)	15 - No Limit	? (n=6)

Again this stresses the importance of practical training and experience in archaeology undergraduate teaching. The one department that did not expect their students to participate in fieldwork in vacations explained the reasoning behind their policy:

> 'I think it is worth making clear that the inclusion of any optional or compulsory fieldwork in vacations is not allowed at [this University]. It is considered disadvantageous to the students who work during the holidays. A compulsory training dig is therefore delivered in teaching time as a double assessed module.'

This is a small department and its policy relates to the (increasing) financial pressures on students and tries to balance this with the teaching programme, whilst still retaining practical experience on a fieldwork project as central to the degree programme.

Q1.4 Please indicate the archaeological field techniques taught to undergraduate students participating in practical teaching sessions of archaeological techniques (as opposed to participation in a fieldwork project during vacations) and whether these are assessed as part of your degree programme(s).

The full range of field techniques, as listed in the questionnaire, are taught in nearly all the departments who responded to the survey (Table 5).

This is particularly the case with the processing of artefacts (89.5%), planning, instrument survey, and field survey (84.2% each); and geophysics (73.7%). The technique taught least is environmental sampling (52.6%). Apart from the processing of artefacts (78.9% of the departments in the sample), the techniques are assessed at this stage as part of the degree course in about half the institutions who responded to the survey, except for geophysics and environmental sampling. The other techniques reported as being taught and assessed in practical teaching sessions are aerial photography, standing building

surveys, graveyard surveys and skeletal identification and interpretation. The amount of time spent on practical teaching sessions (see Q1.2 above) is reflected in the range of techniques being taught and the extent to which they are assessed. Again, this indicates the importance of the teaching of archaeological field techniques at undergraduate level.

Table 5 Techniques taught and assessed in practical teaching sessions

Technique	Taught: no. of Depts.	%	Assessed: no. of Depts.	%
Excavation	11	57.9%	8	42.1%
Recording Techniques	12	63.2%	8	42.1%
Planning	16	84.2%	10	52.6%
Instrument Survey (eg Level, EDM)	16	84.2%	10	52.6%
Environmental Sampling	10	52.6%	7	36.8%
Processing of Artefacts	17	89.5%	15	78.9%
Field Survey	16	84.2%	10	52.6%
Geophysics	14	73.7%	7	36.8%
Others	5	26.3%	5	26.3%

Q1.5 Please indicate the archaeological field techniques taught to undergraduate students participating in fieldwork projects during vacations and whether these are assessed as part of your degree programme(s).

Nearly all the departments in the sample are teaching the archaeological field techniques listed in the questionnaire. The only exceptions are field survey (84.2%) and geophysics (63.2%). These techniques are being assessed at well over half the departments sampled, except for geophysics (42.1%). The other techniques reported as being taught and assessed on field projects are standing building surveys and graveyard surveys.

The nature of the assessment was not specifically asked for by the questionnaire but, from the information volunteered by some respondents, this may take different forms:

> ‘Assessment is by project report not by practical exercises.’

> ‘As of 2005/6 students will keep a diary of their excavation experience in the summer vacation of Year 1, which will be assessed as part of a Year 2 Research Methods module. Until now, there has been no assessment of field experience.’

‘Practical assessment through portfolio/field diary.’

‘Optional fieldwork not assessed.’

Again, the responses to the questionnaire demonstrate the central importance of the teaching of archaeological field techniques in undergraduate archaeology courses in both small and large departments. The responses to this particular question also highlight the importance of field projects in the vacations to the teaching of archaeological field techniques. The high level of assessment reflects a change in pedagogical practice, with the principle that the hours of student effort are assessed for credit.

Table 6 Techniques taught and assessed on field projects

Technique	Taught: no. of Depts.	%	Assessed: no. of Depts.	%
Excavation	19	100.0%	13	68.4%
Recording Techniques	19	100.0%	13	68.4%
Planning	19	100.0%	13	68.4%
Instrument Survey (eg Level, EDM)	19	100.0%	13	68.4%
Environmental Sampling	19	100.0%	11	57.9%
Processing of Artefacts	19	100.0%	12	63.2%
Field Survey	16	84.2%	11	57.9%
Geophysics	12	63.2%	8	42.1%
Others	4	21.1%	2	10.5%

Q1.6 Are the students undertaking an archaeology degree trained ‘in-house’ on fieldwork techniques through practical teaching sessions and/or fieldwork projects?

The vast majority of respondents indicated that their students were trained in-house on fieldwork techniques (Table 7).

Table 7 In-house training

Answer	No. of Depts	%
Yes	17	89.5%
No	2	10.5%

In the cases where training takes place on in-house projects, there are often other opportunities outside the individual institutions:

‘In-house practical of field survey (including instrument survey). Students encouraged to undertake fieldwork in holidays (though this is not compulsory, in respect of single honours archaeology), either on projects run by the department or others.’

‘Option of work placement at SMR and [the local archaeological contracting unit], counts as module.’

‘2 weeks compulsory departmental training excavation, 3 weeks elsewhere, could be an anthropological project as it is a joint degree in Archaeology and Anthropology.’

‘Two weeks on a training dig jointly run by the Department and the University Archaeology Unit’s staff. Four weeks additional fieldwork training on a fieldwork project approved by the Department somewhere in the world.’

‘Professional placement: an optional level 3 module involving c.40 days work experience, which may include fieldwork depending on the placement. ‘

‘Most are now being taught on in-house projects, although some are sent on projects run by other institutions due to pressure of numbers. These include excavations run by other Universities and local organisations. This should change to all in-house next year.’

The picture that emerges is one of variety with a great number of options allowable, and available, to students.

Q1.7 Please describe briefly any other fieldwork experience included in your degree programme(s), including the approximate amount of time in days.

The response to this question revealed the wide variety of options available at different institutions:

‘Students may choose from a range of practical skills modules covering aspects of artefact interpretation and treatment. Each module chosen usually includes 20 hours taught, and up to 50 hours self-directed analysis.’

‘Students may take optional courses in Geoarchaeology. Geoarchaeology courses normally include two days of fieldwork experience.’

‘2 weeks compulsory departmental training excavation, 3 weeks elsewhere, could be an anthropological project as it is a joint degree in Archaeology and Anthropology.’

‘Landscape units and those associated with optional courses taken in second year (practicals) or certain third year options.’

‘Numerous field trips, 3-9 days per year, depending on module.’

‘This will depend upon the programme. All programmes have a requirement for a placement of 20 days (approx 120 hours). However, the nature of the placement will depend upon the choice of the individual and its applicability to the programme of study. Virtually any placement could include archaeological field skills.’

‘Archaeological Practice students undertake in Year 2 a Placement Module (150 hours), which often includes fieldwork or artefact analysis.’

‘Dissertation: some dissertations may involve a fieldwork element.’

As with the responses to the question on in-house training (Q1.6 above), this indicates that across the country there is a wide choice of options allowable and available, within both large and small departments. This suggests that a certain amount of flexibility and adjustments being made to the teaching of archaeological field techniques to suit individual needs/wishes already exists.

PART 2: DISABLED STUDENTS

Q2.1 How many of the students currently registered on your degree programme(s) for 2004/2005 are you aware of being disabled and what are their disabilities/impairments?

No information was provided by one respondent to this question. A second department classified as 'large' explained that it was University policy to keep this information confidential, although a high incidence of dyslexia was noted:

> 'The University does not make this information public on the grounds of confidentiality. However, a tally of graduating single honours students showed 50% of them were registered dyslexic.'

A third department, small in size, was unable to provide figures, as students were not required to disclose any disability. However, in this case a high incidence of dyslexia was also noted:

> 'Students do not have to disclose their disabilities but (as far as we know) most are dyslexic with others having visual impairments, mobility impairments and medical conditions. Information on disabilities only given for first year students but think this is right (but problems of part-time students).'

However, this example does raise the question that, if cases of dyslexia are not disclosed, how is it taken into account when assessing written work?

The sample below (Table 8) represents the disabled students in 16 archaeology departments with a total number of 2060 students.

Table 8 Disabled students
n=16 departments, with a total of 2060 students

Disability/Impairment	No.	% Disabled Students	% All Students
Dyslexia	178	63.1%	8.6%
Unseen Disability	43	15.2%	2.1%
Hearing Impairment	15	5.3%	0.7%
Restricted Mobility	24	8.5%	1.2%
Asperger's	3	1.1%	0.2%
Mental Illness	16	5.7%	0.8%
Visual Impairment	3	1.1%	0.2%
Total	282	100.0%	13.8%

A wide range of disabilities is represented in the sample. The figures also confirm the statements above with dyslexia being overwhelmingly the most common form of disability that has been recognised (over 60%). This is followed by a range of unseen disabilities (around 15%) and, interestingly, restricted mobility (8.5%). The lowest figures are the incidences of visual impairments and Asperger's Syndrome (1.1%). This may reflect the visual nature of archaeology. A variety of disabilities, but with dyslexia being predominant, is recognised at all levels in several departments:

> 'Dyslexia accounts for over 60% of our disabled students in the past few years and we have had experience in the past of mental health conditions including bipolar disorder and clinical depression. The majority of students are in levels 1-2 but many of these are now progressing to Honours Archaeology and we have experience of a number of dyslexic and other disabled students at postgraduate (both taught and research) level.'

The detailed accuracy of these figures can be questioned, as they only represent those individuals whose disability has been declared and recorded. The experience of one department illustrates the existence of much that has gone unrecorded or may be undeclared, especially unseen disabilities:

> 'These are the students who are formally recorded with the University as having disabilities. In addition students have declared health problems of the 'hidden disability' type on their practical work health forms. The problems declared include asthma, epilepsy, diabetes, IBS and ME.'
>
> 'We do not have access to a central database of those students who are disabled/impaired because of [the] Data Protection Act/ confidentiality issues. The numbers are from the next-of-kin forms which I keep for all students going on fieldwork placement.'

The number of recorded disabled archaeology students also appears to be on the increase:

> 'While numbers of students vary there has been an increase in disabled students over the past three years.'

This may be related to several factors:

- A greater awareness of various conditions and their effect on individuals

- The increased screening for particular conditions, especially dyslexia
- Greater access to Higher Education from more diverse groups
- The impact of disability legislation (DDA and SENDA)

DYSLEXIA

Among the 178 dyslexic students, 5 were specifically identified as being dyspraxic. The questionnaire requested numbers for 'Dyslexic (and similar conditions)' and it is probable that the number of dyspraxic students is much higher.

UNSEEN DISABILITIES

A wide range of 'unseen disabilities' were described (Table 9). In many ways these reflect the conditions recognised in contemporary society as a whole.

Table 9 Hidden disabilities

Unseen Disability	No.
'Unseen Disability'	5
Asthma	4
Epilepsy	5
Specific Learning Difficulty	6
ME	3
ADH	2
CFS	3
Diabetes	3
IBS	2
Eating Disorder	1
Heart Condition	1
HIV+	1
Metabolic Disorder	1
OCD	1
Poor Waking Memory	1
RSI	1
Scoliosis	1
Sleeping Disorder	1
Steroid Resistant Syndrome	1

RESTRICTED MOBILITY

Many of the descriptions in this category tended to be general: 'mobility issues', 'mobility problems' or simply 'restricted mobility' (Table 10). Interestingly, one respondent listed 'obesity' in this category as a restriction on mobility when doing archaeological fieldwork.

Table 10 Restricted mobility

Restricted Mobility	No.
'Mobility Issues'	7
'Mobility Problems'	3
'Restricted Mobility'	2
Obesity	5
Back/Knee Problems	1
Back Problems	1
Dislocating Wrist	1
Joint Hyper Mobility Syndrome	1
Muscular Dystrophy	1
Problematic Hand Tendons	1
Wheelchair User	1

MENTAL ILLNESS

As with restricted mobility, mental illness was described in general terms: 'mental health issues', 'mental illness' and 'mental care' (Table 11). This may be due to a general reluctance to divulge the personal details of individual cases, and also that the questionnaire was couched in general terms. Bipolar disorder and anxiety/depression were identified as particular conditions in a few cases.

Table 11 Mental illness

Mental Illness	No.
'Mental Health Issues'	7
'Mental Illness'	3
'Mental Care'	1
Bipolar Syndrome	3
Anxiety/Depression	2

Q2.2 Does your Department, or another body within your Institution, make any special pre-enrolment arrangements for potential archaeology students who are disabled? For example, Open Days, interviews, in the information on courses, on your web site, etc.

Almost three quarters of the respondents are involved in pre-enrolment arrangements for disabled students (Table 12).

Table 12 Pre-enrolment arrangements for disabled students

Answer	No. of Depts	%
Yes	14	73.7%
No	4	21.1%
Don't Know	1	5.2%

Many of the arrangements are organised in collaboration with the Disability Support Services, either at Faculty/School or Institution level:

> 'The admitting College in conjunction with the University's Disability Office.'
>
> 'Colleges and University Disability Services.'
>
> 'This is all done centrally through the Faculty and Student Disability Service who then contact the Department.'
>
> 'Department has to respond to College wishes or who it admits as an undergraduate. So far this has not affected our Department operations, but one day it will, and serious re-considerations may be necessary as to what is required and how we and the University provide it.'
>
> 'Our website contains a statement of our commitment to students with special needs, providing direct contact with our Special Needs Tutor and has a link to the University's page on disabilities and special needs.'

More detailed arrangements were described at some institutions, even the larger departments, revealing the procedures adopted for Open Days and interviews. This indicates that disabled students tend to be treated individually, recognising their particular needs:

> 'Presence of disability officer at interviews and open days if necessary.'
>
> 'We have a College Disability Officer, who makes a presentation to all of the students on their arrival, and a School Disability Officer. Students may make appointments to see either at any time. We have large print versions of all our publicity material.'
>
> 'When invited to Open Days students are asked if they would complete a disability questionnaire and if they need any special arrangements.'

> ‘All student applicants are invited for interview, and the support offered can then be discussed directly. The School’s web pages provide a guide to the main student welfare and advisory service pages, where full details on the University’s support for Disabled Students is provided.’ (A ‘large’ department)
>
> ‘Student Services make arrangements. They produce a Learning Agreement, if the student accepts it, we will have a specific meeting with them on an Open Day or on a separate visit to the University.’
>
> ‘All students who have declared a disability on their UCAS form are invited to have a one-to-one discussion with an appropriate member of staff from the Disability Resource Centre and with the Departmental Admissions Officer. This is normally done in association with an Open Day, but may be at another time by arrangement. Disabled students who accept an offer are followed up as appropriate: eg. provision and implementation of an Individual Learning Plan. General advice on the University’s disability support services is given to all students during Freshers’ Week.’ (A ‘large’ department)
>
> ‘Students are asked about special needs when invited to Open Days, giving them the opportunity to discuss them in an interview.’

However, it should also be noted that almost 20% of the sample (4 respondents) declared that they made no special pre-enrolment arrangements and one was unsure. In this latter case there may be a lack of communication between the department and the institution’s disability services:

> ‘I am not sure – this would be done by our Equal Opportunities Centre, most prospective students talk to them before contacting our department.’

Q2.3 Where your Department has had experience of a disabled student(s) participating in practical teaching sessions and fieldwork projects, please indicate the support you have provided.

This question was answered in detail by 17 of the respondents. Of the two others, one (a large department) provided a general comment as they have, as yet, no experience of dealing with special needs related to fieldwork:

> ‘Considerable support is offered to students with specific learning difficulties for help in class-based teaching and learning generally. Thus far no clear needs have been identified for students with other hidden disabilities/medical conditions in terms of access to fieldwork.’

The other respondent (a small department) described the question as: ‘Not Applicable’. Interestingly, all their declared disabled students are dyslexic. The limited experience of some Departments was also commented on:

> ‘Ours is the first intake of a new degree programme so our experience is limited at present. We would envisage disabled students taking a specially tailored role in our student excavation projects where possible to try and ensure that they are getting as broad a grounding in field archaeology as their peers and they are not removed from the social network of their year.’ (A small department)

Nearly all the respondents regardless of their size are involved in discussions of individual students’ needs. Other important issues are Health and Safety and Risk Assessments followed by aspects of supervision and student peer support (Table 13).

These aspects are described in some of the examples provided:

> ‘Discussion of students’ needs leading to a choice of project appropriate to the individual student’s needs.’

> ‘Fieldwork arrangements for individual disabled students is (sic) handled case-by-case, according to student choice about which fieldwork project they will participate in and the nature of their disability Working arrangements are made such that any student can take part in as much of the work of the project as possible where Health and Safety issues allow.’

There is also evidence of ‘buddies’ or ‘mentors’ working alongside individual disabled students:

> ‘Interviewing (attended by disabled student) buddies for fieldwork for visually impaired students, employees drawn from graduates. One visually impaired student had a buddy employed during the excavation to ensure health and safety of student.’

> ‘In my experience of 10 years running fieldwork the only time we had to provide particular support was for a student with one hand.

This did not require modification. We discussed the matter with the student and a friend of her choosing. The friend then worked alongside the student concerned discretely dealing with any lifting tasks that were required.'

Table 13 Student support provided
n=17 – two respondents did not provide details

Experience	No. of Depts	%
Discussion of students' needs (preparatory session)	15	88.2%
Travel arrangements	5	29.4%
Location and access to sites	8	47.1%
Health and Safety issues	12	70.6%
Risk Assessments	12	70.6%
Integrity of archaeological deposits	1	5.9%
Student peer support	8	47.1%
Supervision	11	64.7%
Method of instruction	6	35.3%
Students' contribution to group work	5	29.4%
Assessment	6	35.3%
Financial support/additional resources	8	47.1%
Follow-up sessions	3	17.6%
Others	2	11.8%

The aspect that is least taken into account is the integrity of archaeological deposits. This may represent a particular view of disabled people being wheelchair users or having a vision impairment and, as such, the only ones who could potentially cause damage when accessing an archaeological site. The responses in this survey suggest that few current archaeological students are wheelchair users or are visually impaired.

The 'Other' support that was mentioned consists of:

'They are referred by me to learning support and student guidance who then work with them to achieve a reasonable path of training.'

'Alternative arrangements.'

Of special concern is the legal liability of the parties involved in fieldwork:

'Insurance issues for staff, disabled helpers and others on fieldwork and fieldtrips.'

Another issue involved the participation of disabled students on fieldwork outside the department:

> ‘Provision on non-departmental projects given the nature of the [Department’s] fieldwork requirement, one student recently turned away from a fieldwork project at another institution apparently because of their impairment.’

One respondent provided a reply which illustrates the far-reaching effect of the SENDA legislation, more than just a simple matter of facilitating fieldwork for disabled students:

> ‘Our key issue for Archaeology at present is to facilitate disabled access to our buildings in which some practical teaching takes place. At a University level, we are about to initiate – this summer – a series of briefings across the University concerning SENDA and its implications; the development of a University-wide policy and issues of access to buildings.’

Although ‘alternative arrangements’ were only mentioned by one respondent as another form of student support, examples of alternative arrangements were provided by other departments. These either involved an alternative location and activity such as work in a museum or an archaeological unit, or an alternative archaeological field technique:

> ‘For those unable to dig, for whatever reason, we have usually individually arranged alternative experience in a museum or at a unit by discussion with the student. Their work is assessed by a written report, whatever the activity.’

> ‘The provision for combined students of an optional module that involved field survey at Level 2 was not available to our students with restricted mobility (in this case an elderly mature student with arthritis).’

> ‘A range of other techniques options were made available and the student chose archaeological illustration instead. That said, an even older participant was happy to take part. We made sure [that] once we arrived at site that her role was to involve minimal walking.’

> ‘Students with conditions which affect their ability to carry out strenuous activities (eg. heart conditions) have been given alternative areas of responsibility (eg. photographic coverage), rather than just a ‘lighter load’.

An example of good practice is illustrated by the following case study:

> ‘Paraplegic student:
> - discussion with student, agreed on-going dialogue.
> - hygiene issues identified, special toilets/washroom ordered
> - student self-evaluation of skills to identify areas of strength/competence, this information used to tailor student’s contribution to the project ie. from strength rather than weakness
> - selected peers trained in personal assistance
> - student wished to participate in all activities wherever possible with no ‘special’ assessment allowance
> - on-going monitoring of situation at instigation of student only
> - student subject to routine supervision and role adjustment
>
> Result – no problems encountered, student performance exemplary.’

Q2.4 Is your Department aware of any disabled student(s) who has decided not to take your degree programme(s), or who has changed degree programme, because of the actual or perceived difficulties of participating in practical teaching sessions or fieldwork projects?

Very few known instances of students changing their degree course because of difficulties with archaeological fieldwork were reported (Table 14).

Table 14 Students changing degree programme (no. of Depts)

Answer	Practical Sessions	%	Field Projects	%
Yes	0	0%	2	10.5%
No	16	84.2%	14	73.7%
Don’t Know	3	15.8%	3	15.8%

In the two examples that were provided of a student changing course, both large departments, the individuals concerned remained within their respective departments and chose alternative options:

> ‘This was in the case of a student with IBS who found a number of site routines troublesome. Also it was impossible to guarantee extended hygiene arrangements during fieldwork and site visits. However, the problem was overcome by student switching to the parallel Heritage Conservation programme which better suited

her requirements, whilst preserving fulfilment of academic preferences.'

'In 2003-4, one student studying Ancient History and Archaeology opted to take a module choice that eliminated the mandatory fieldwork requirement for this degree. This followed an individual meeting with the student in which it was explained that we would be able to support his/her disability in the field.'

In one case where a 'Don't Know' reply was returned, the following example was provided:

'Not to our knowledge at [our Department], in fact one student changed to Archaeology because of the positive environment.'

Q2.5 Is your Department aware of any cases where a practical teaching session, or its assessment, has been waived or modified for a disabled student?

Very few practical teaching requirements are reported to have been waived, although in a greater number of cases the teaching has been modified (Table 15).

Table 15 Practical teaching session waived or modified (no. of Depts)

Answer	Session waived	%	Session modified	%
Yes	2	10.5%	8	42.1%
No	16	84.2%	11	57.9%
Don't Know	1	5.3%	0	0%

Most of the examples of modification provided relate to meeting the individual needs of students:

'Student with problem over group work (an issue of noise and concentration) allowed to work on own – provision of own copy of relevant TLTP programme. Substitution of flat screen computer monitor.'

'We have modified the arrangements for a student with a sight disability in relation to the handling and observation of artefacts.'

> ‘Aspects of landscape units sometimes not demanded, or elements circumvented. Changes to teaching necessary for visually impaired.’

In one case the need for modifications was investigated, but this was found to be unnecessary:

> ‘One student was worried about their disability and the convenor of the module was sympathetic to the problem. In the end, the student joined the activity with no problems.’

As with the teaching of archaeological fieldwork, there is little evidence for the assessments being waived for disabled students. Modifications have been made in a greater number of cases (Table 16).

Table 16 Practical teaching assessment waived or modified (no. of Depts)

Answer	Assessment waived	%	Assessment modified	%
Yes	1	5.3%	7	36.8%
No	16	84.1%	9	47.4%
Don’t Know	1	5.3%	2	10.5%
N/A	1	5.3%	1	5.3%

These modifications were related to individual cases:

> ‘Have changed assessment form to a pictorial record.’

> ‘Some modifications to practical tasks, eg. assistance with field walking.’

> ‘Student with perception problem given alternative assessment in Archaeological Illustration.’

> ‘Replacement of some practical assessment with library or museum work.’

The attitude towards waiving and modification of practical teaching being based on the ability and needs of individual students, rather than on an overall perception of ‘disability’ is summed up in the following statement provided by one respondent:

> ‘Sessions and assessments waived solely on the grounds of mitigating evidence not on the basis of disability per se. Sessions have been modified and alternatives offered for assessment. For

example alternative accessible sites on fieldtrips, practical elements done in lab instead of outside etc. Assessment mode modified.'

Q2.6 Is your Department aware of any cases where a required field project, or its assessment, has been waived or modified for a disabled student?

Attendance on a field project and its assessment has been waived for disabled students on only a few occasions. There has been an appreciable amount of modification of the attendance on field projects, but a lesser degree of its assessment being modified (Tables 17 and 18). Modifications have again, in many examples, been based on the needs of individual students:

'One example would be availability of a scribe for compilation of site notebooks.'

'Have allowed student choice as to nature of project.'

'A student with a temporary mobility disability has had the nature of a period of excavation for him/her [modified], so that they do not have to kneel and excavate, but have been able to concentrate upon site planning, artefact analysis, etc.'

'For a visually impaired student the instructions on section drawing etc. were enlarged, as were recording forms, graph paper and a copy of the assessment criteria.'

Table 17 Field project waived or modified (no. of Depts)

Answer	Project waived	%	Project modified	%
Yes	1	5.3%	7	36.8%
No	16	84.2%	10	52.7%
Don't Know	2	10.5%	2	10.5%

Table 18 Assessment of field project waived or modified (no. of Depts)

Answer	Assessment waived	%	Assessment modified	%
Yes	1	5.3%	5	26.3%
No	16	84.2%	11	57.9%
Don't Know	0	0%	1	5.3%
N/A	2	10.5%	2	10.5%

In one case the student was encouraged to identify and exploit their own personal areas of strength:

> ‘Range and level of activities modified to accommodate on a case by case basis eg. nature and demand of physical work by a paraplegic student. However, in such cases every effort is made to encourage such students to compensate by increasing input/ responsibility in perceived areas of strength.’

This is matched by the flexible attitude towards practical assessment in one department:

> ‘Not all assessable tasks undertaken by disabled students, but there has never been an occasion when a student has been unable to do sufficient tasks to be assessed.’

One trend that was repeated in some institutions in the sample, both large and small, was the replacement of archaeological fieldwork by museum experience:

> ‘In the days when fieldwork was compulsory and assessed, two students with limited mobility undertook work in museum modules.’

> ‘Replacement of some practical work with library or museum work.’

> ‘Museum work may be considered an option instead of fieldwork.’

Indeed, in one case it was argued that such an option was becoming synonymous with archaeological fieldwork:

> ‘A student with severe arthritis was allowed to work in a museum rather than to excavate on medical grounds. However, as places on field projects are becoming increasingly difficult to find, museum experience is becoming more regularly defined as ‘field experience’.

This is an example of a broadening of the definition of fieldwork by some subject providers when faced with the perceived ‘problems’ of dealing with disabled students. There is a wider issue involved in this; does this constitute a ‘reasonable adjustment’ to actual archaeological fieldwork training? This is obviously an issue that would have to be assessed for each individual case with the appropriate learning outcomes being taken into account.

PART 3: POLICY AND STAFF TRAINING

Q3.1 Are you fully aware of your obligations under, and the implications of, the Special Educational Needs and Disability Act (SENDA)?

Around three quarters of the respondents replied that they were aware of their obligations, and the implications of, recent disability legislation (Table 19). This awareness tallies with the replies to the questions relating to the adjustment of, and modifications, to the teaching of archaeological fieldwork.

Table 19 Awareness of disability legislation

Answer	No. of Depts	%
Yes	15	78.9%
No	4	21.1%

There is some uncertainty in some departments of the effect that the legislation will have on the teaching of archaeological fieldwork, although this is under consideration:

> 'I am not sure we are fully aware of the wider implications. It seems more likely that we will modify existing fieldwork provision; for example, potentially making some elements optional.'

Q3.2 Are you aware of organisations that provide external support mechanisms eg National Disability Team, SKILL etc.? If so, have you contacted any of these organisations and which ones?

Despite an overall awareness of the disability legislation, only half the respondents were aware of external organisations that provide support and advice (Table 20).

Table 20 Awareness of external disability organisations
n=18, this question was not answered by one respondent

Answer	No. of Depts	%
Yes	9	50.0%
No	9	50.0%

Of the respondents who were aware of external disability organisations, less than half (4) had contacted any of them (Table 21).

Table 21 Contact with external disability organisations
n=9

Answer	No. of Depts	%
Yes	4	44.4%
No	5	55.6%

The organisations listed as being contacted for support and advice include: NDT, SKILL, RNIB, Dyslexia Association, Epilepsy Society and Teachability.

The respondents who did not know of, or had not contacted, any external organisations explained that their usual procedure was to work with their respective disability services as a first, and often only, contact:

> 'We have a disability officer in the department who liaises with these organisations and sends information out, but they have not spoken specifically to me about archaeology.'

> 'The University Service for Students with Disabilities is the Department in the University that gives more specific advice to students and therefore they are the ones who are aware of all the legislation. In case of doubt, I ask them.'

> 'None consulted, I work through the University's Disability Resource Centre.'

> 'Advice is usually sought via Colleges and University Disability Services.'

Q3.3 Will this legislation change the way in which your department teaches archaeological fieldwork techniques to undergraduate students?

Over half of the respondents felt that the legislation would not change their teaching of archaeological fieldwork (Table 22).

Table 22 Teaching changing due to legislation

Answer	No. of Depts	%
Yes	3	15.8%
No	10	52.6%
Don't Know	6	31.6%

This feeling that change was unnecessary tended to be because the current procedures and situations were seen as adequate:

> 'We hope to maintain our present flexibility and deal with individual student's requirements – numbers are very small, allows us to be flexible.'

> 'No changes currently planned.'

A third of the departments replied 'Don't Know' to this question. In these cases, there is an uncertainty over the extent to which the legislation would affect their teaching programmes, and the identification of potential problems:

> 'Under discussion.'

> 'It would mean re-evaluating how we should deliver compulsory practical training for Single Honours. At the moment it is either optional (with a range of other 'techniques' on offer) or, in the case of Single Honours, a brand new course. It has yet to run, and will first run in Semester II 2006-7.'

> 'Difficult to answer just yes or no to this. We are aware of our obligations and already flexible regarding fieldwork requirements. While acknowledging that we are required to be anticipatory rather than reactive in adapting to special needs students, this is something which is, in practice, extremely difficult to do in the light of a very wide range of disabilities/special needs with which students may present and of the fact that individual students have a lot of choice over where they do their fieldwork.'

The respondents who identified that they would be adjusting their teaching programmes appeared to be aware of the procedures necessary and that these were already being put in place:

> 'Provision for reasonable adjustments currently being implemented and [a] review planned for this year will highlight further areas for improvement.'

‘Reasonable adjustments on a case by case basis, anticipation of potential cases in fieldwork planning, design of written materials, equipment orders eg. toilets, staffing, including EAAs, review of fieldwork components, assessment strategies.’

Q3.4 How many of the academic staff in your department have had disability equality training? Please indicate the approximate number, and the nature of the training.

The majority of the departments in the sample have academic staff who have participated in disability training. On the whole, this is between one and three staff members in each department (Table 23).

Table 23 Numbers of staff attending disability training
n=17, one respondent did not answer this question and one responded ‘All’

No. of Staff	No. of Depts	%
0	6	35.3%
1	7	41.1%
2	1	5.9%
3	2	11.8%
7	1	5.9%

The one department which responded ‘All’ to this question declared:

‘All staff attended a half-day course on the SENDA legislation. Others staff have attended courses on Mental Health, adapting lectures for disabled students, disability awareness, disability and equal opportunities.’

The training is generally provided within the respective institutions and the main topics are DDA 1995 and SENDA 2001, although some staff have attended other courses:

‘In-house programmes via Academic Services.’

‘All staff have been briefed on SENDA by the Access Officer from the DRC, and provided with supporting written information.’

‘Training provided as part of the University’s accreditation process for new lecturers indicating responsibilities and University support services, as well as specialist programmes offered by University Staff Development and Training Division.’

‘Participation in events by our Equal Opportunities Department.’

‘DDA training.’

The nominated Disability Representatives in some departments have attended a wider range of courses:

‘The Department has a Student Disability advisor [who] has attended dedicated workshops in the [University] and beyond.’

‘The Department’s Disability Representative goes on regular training sessions.’

Q3.5 Are the practical training sessions and field projects in your degree programme(s) affected by any Institutional written policy or guidelines relating to disabled students?

Only around a quarter of the replies indicated that their fieldwork was covered by written guidelines for disabled students (Table 24).

Table 24 Respondents possessing institutional written policy/guidelines for disabled students participating in archaeological fieldwork

Answer	No. of Depts	%
Yes	5	26.3%
No	14	73.7%

The written policy/guidelines tend to be produced at institutional level:

‘Our Institutional Policy on ‘Placements, Study Abroad and Field Trips’ is currently in draft form. Our practices are being aligned with this.’

‘Covered by the University’s general guidelines concerning support for disabled students.’

‘University’s Teaching Guide to SENDA.’

A concern with Health and Safety and Risk Assessments was also expressed in reply to this question:

‘Practicals are affected by risk assessments which subsume any disability issues.’

Q3.6 Do you or any of your staff have a disability/impairment? This includes registered disabled as well as physical or mental conditions that could affect working.

About a third of the sample replied with a 'Yes' to this question. Given its personal nature with regards to close colleagues, only 2 respondents gave no reply (Table 25).

Table 25 Departments employing disabled archaeology staff

Answer	No. of Depts	%
Yes	6	31.6%
No	10	52.6%
Don't Know	1	5.3%
No Answer	2	10.5%

Twelve individuals were identified as having a disability (Table 26). Although the sample is small, it closely resembles the overall trend of disability amongst disabled students (Table 8 above). Dyslexia is by far the most common reported condition, followed by restricted mobility, unseen disabilities and mental health problems.

Table 26 Disabled archaeology staff

Disability/Impairment	No.	% Disabled Staff
Dyslexia	5	41.6%
Unseen Disability	2	16.7%
Hearing Impairment	1	8.3%
Restricted Mobility	2	16.7%
Mental Illness	2	16.7%
Total	12	100.0%

As with the sample of disabled students, these figures represent only the disabilities that have been declared. One respondent noted a reluctance to declare disability. The main reason for this being the perceived attitude of the employers and a general insecurity felt by employees in Higher Education Institutions:

> 'At least three members of staff consider they are dyslexic, but none have been formally tested. My investigation of this area indicates that the University would not want to encourage staff to be tested for dyslexia. The track record on medical disability is to 'persuade' them to take ill-health premature retirement.'

PART 4: OTHER INFORMATION

Q4.1 Are you willing to talk to us in more detail about your Department's experiences?

An overwhelming number of the respondents expressed a willingness to talk at greater length with the project team (Table 27).

This willingness may reflect the contemporary topical nature of disability issues and the awareness of the recent legislation. However, in a couple of cases there was an admission that their experience was limited:

> 'Yes – although our experience so far is limited.'
>
> 'I am, but not sure how useful. I'm the only member of the department who runs fieldwork/practical sessions, but only started in January and so have yet to encounter any problems with department assessment procedures. The fact that fieldwork is optional and we have only a 2 hour surveying practical will mean the situation [varies] and will be dealt with on an individual basis in consultation with students.'

Table 27 Further Contact
n=18, one respondent did not answer this question

Answer	No. of Depts	%
Yes	17	94.4%
No	1	5.6%

Q4.2 We are interested in building up a body of case studies based on the profiles of individual disabled students (and staff). If there are any students or staff in your Department who you think would be appropriate, are you willing to approach them on our behalf?

Only about 40% of the respondents expressed a willingness to approach disabled students on behalf of the project team, and a quarter did not reply to this question (Table 28).

Table 28 Contact with students

Answer	No. of Depts	%
Yes	8	42.1%
No	6	31.6%
No Answer	5	26.3%

DISABLED UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

The results of this survey can be compared to the information provided to the project by the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA), although such comparisons cannot be made directly because of differences in the collection of data and its presentation. Table 29 compares the number of all disabled first degree students in Higher Education in 2003/04, as reported by HESA, against the data collected by this survey. There is a marked difference in the figures, with the HESA proportion of disabled students about half that revealed by this survey. However, the HESA data refers to all first degree students in the academic year 2003/04, whilst the data from this survey represents all the undergraduate students from a sample of 17 Archaeology subject providers.

Table 29 Comparison of numbers of first degree disabled students (extracted HESA Student Record 2003/04) and this survey (see notes below)

Survey	Total Students	Disabled Students	%
HESA	1,210,780	78,380	6.5%
This Survey	2,060	282	13.8%

Notes on Table 29:

- As required by HESA, the data supplied by them have been rounded to the nearest '5'
- HESA does not accept responsibility for any inferences or conclusions derived from data by third parties

The accuracy of these figures can be questioned. This has already been noted about the data collected from the Archaeology Departments, as this relies on students declaring a disability. The same problem is recognised in the HESA data: 'the figures reported in [the] analyses are derived from a subset which may not be representative of the total student population' (HESA 2004).

The problem of the nature of the statistics and their presentation also lies behind the data in Table 30. This shows the number of all first degree students with particular disabilities, as provided by HESA, and compares it with the data collected by this survey. There are marked differences in the proportions, for example: dyslexia at 46.9% (HESA) and 63.1% (this survey). Again, this is a result of the nature of the data: all first degree students (HESA) as opposed to the archaeology undergraduates in 17 departments (this survey). The high figures for dyslexia in both surveys probably reflect the regular screening for this condition amongst first year undergraduates in most HEIs. This also

emphasises that students with dyslexia make up the majority of 'disabled' students in Higher Education as a whole; this is not a phenomenon restricted to students choosing to study archaeology. Despite these differences in the nature of the data, there is one noticeable similarity in the two data sets. The trend in the proportions is remarkably similar. This is especially the case for dyslexia, unseen disabilities, hearing impairments and mental illness. This may indicate that the data collected by this survey generally corresponds with what is known of the national picture. The greatest difference is the proportion of students with restricted mobility and, to a lesser extent, a visual impairment. Despite the physical 'image' of archaeology as a field discipline, a substantial number of disabled students with restricted mobility are choosing this as an undergraduate course of study. This remains the picture when the 5 cases of 'obesity' are removed from the figures: 19 students out of 277, or 6.9%. The low number of archaeology students with a visual impairment may represent a perception of archaeology as a very 'visual' subject.

Table 30 Comparison of proportion of particular disabilities amongst first degree students (extracted from HESA Student Record 2003/04) with this survey (see notes below)

Disability/ Impairment	HESA	% Disabled	% Total Students	This Survey	% Disabled	% Total Students
Dyslexia	36,795	46.9%	3.05%	178	63.1%	8.6%
Unseen Disability	14,470	18.5%	1.21%	43	15.2%	2.1%
Mental Illness	3,110	4.0%	0.26%	16	5.7%	0.8%
Hearing Impairment	2,980	3.8%	0.25%	15	5.3%	0.7%
Restricted Mobility	2,390	3.1%	0.20%	24	8.5%	1.2%
Visual Impairment	1,980	2.5%	0.16%	3	1.1%	0.2%
Asperger's	110	0.1%	0.01%	3	1.1%	0.2%
Multiple Disabilities	7,295	9.3%	0.60%			
Other Disabilities	9,250	11.8%	0.77%			
Total	78,380	100.0%	6.51%	282	100.0%	13.8%

Notes on Table 30:

- As required by HESA, the data supplied by them have been rounded to the nearest '5'
- HESA does not accept responsibility for any inferences or conclusions derived from data by third parties

The data from this survey can also be compared with the GDN's Inclusive Curriculum Project survey of disabled Geography and Earth Sciences students within six institutions (Hall & Healey 2001). This is an academic discipline in which fieldwork is an integral component of the teaching programme. Table 31 compares these two sets of figures.

As in the previous comparison (Table 30), there are problems in making direct analogies between the two sets of data because of the categories used. However, there is a similar 'trend' with the highest figures being for dyslexia and unseen disabilities. The greatest differences are for restricted mobility and hearing impairments. Despite the image of archaeology as a physically demanding subject, a substantial number of students with restricted mobility are choosing it as their course of study, although this does not seem to be happening in another discipline in which fieldwork is an important element. This difference might be explained by the fact that Geography is a traditional 6th form subject that is known to involve substantial written work. The current perception of Archaeology has been partially conditioned by popular media exposure, with programmes such as 'Time Team'. These tend to present archaeological fieldwork very much as a participatory activity.

Table 31 Comparison of proportion of particular disabilities in the GDN survey (Hall & Healey 2001, Table 4) and this survey

Disability/Impairment	GDN	%	This Survey	%
Dyslexia	41	54.7%	178	63.1%
Unseen Disability	14	18.7%	43	15.2%
Mental Illness	3	4.0%	16	5.7%
Restricted Mobility	3	4.0%	24	8.5%
Hearing Impairment	1	1.3%	15	5.3%
Visual Impairment	1	1.3%	3	1.1%
Asperger's	0	0.0%	3	1.1%
Multiple Disabilities	10	13.3%		
Other Disabilities	2	2.7%		
Total	75	100.0%	219	100.0%

Tables 32a and 32b represent the data supplied to the project by HESA. The total numbers of disabled students, and their disability, are listed under the 20 subject areas used by HESA. Higher than average numbers of disabled students are found in (in ascending order of numbers) Social Studies, Physical Sciences, Agriculture, History/Philosophy (includes Archaeology), Combined Studies, Technology, and Art and Design. Of the dyslexic students, above average numbers (in ascending order) are found in Physical Sciences, Engineering, Architecture, Agriculture, Art and Design, and Technology. Less than the average number of dyslexic students are studying subjects in the whole History/Philosophy group which includes Archaeology. The greater number of students with a visual impairment tend to study Mathematics/ Computing and Law; whilst those with a hearing impairment tend to be studying Medical subjects, European Languages, and Linguistics/ Classics. Students with restricted mobility are more likely to be found studying History/Philosophy (includes Archaeology), Linguistics/ Classics, and Law. A greater number of students with mental health problems tend to take History/Philosophy (includes Archaeology), Linguistics/Classics, European Languages, and Combined Studies. Students with a hidden disability tend to study Linguistics/Classics, Law, Languages, and Medicine; fewer than average study subjects in the History/Philosophy group.

Notes on Tables 32a and 32b:

- As required by HESA, the data supplied by them have been rounded to the nearest ‘5’, this has two effects:
  - ‘0’ may represent 1 or 2 students in some cases
  - valid percentages cannot be calculated for values of less than ‘52’, these are marked by *
- ‘Other Disabilities’ include ‘Personal Care’, this is marked by ^
- HESA does not accept responsibility for any inferences or conclusions derived from data by third parties

	Clinical Medicine	Allied to Medicine	Biological Sciences	Agriculture/ Veterinary	Physical Sciences	Maths/ Computing	Engineering	Technology	Architecture/ Planning	Social Studies
Total Students	36,085	104,050	111,095	11,095	50,040	107,765	72,025	8,475	27,275	111,480
Dyslexia, No.	510	2,470	3,355	545	1,995	2,530	2,240	480	1,090	3,540
% Disabled	40.5%	45.8%	44.3%	61.2%	54.4%	45.5%	58.3%	66.2%	59.4%	44.7%
% Total Students	1.41%	2.37%	3.02%	4.91%	3.99%	2.35%	3.11%	5.66%	4.00%	3.18%
Vision, No.	30	130	180	20	70	245	80	15	30	195
% Disabled	*	2.4%	2.4%	*	1.9%	4.1%	2.1%	*	*	2.5%
% Total Students	*	0.12%	0.16%	*	0.14%	0.23%	0.11%	*	*	0.17%
Hearing, No.	60	270	270	25	115	250	140	25	70	295
% Disabled	4.8%	5.0%	3.6%	*	3.1%	4.2%	3.6%	*	3.8%	3.7%
% Total Students	0.17%	0.26%	0.24%	*	0.23%	0.23%	0.19%	*	0.26%	0.26%
Mobility, No.	30	135	240	20	70	235	60	15	45	300
% Disabled	*	2.5%	3.2%	*	1.9%	3.9%	1.6%	*	*	3.8%
% Total Students	*	0.13%	0.22%	*	0.14%	0.22%	0.08%	*	*	0.27%
Mental, No.	20	160	380	15	125	215	70	15	40	380
% Disabled	*	3.0%	5.0%	*	3.4%	3.6%	1.8%	*	*	4.8%
% Total Students	*	0.15%	0.34%	*	0.25%	0.20%	0.09%	*	*	0.34%
Unseen, No.	425	1,265	1,355	135	665	1,195	700	100	285	1,330
% Disabled	33.7%	23.5%	17.9%	15.2%	18.1%	20.1%	18.2%	13.8%	15.5%	16.8%
% Total Students	1.18%	1.22%	1.22%	1.22%	1.33%	1.11%	0.97%	1.18%	1.04%	1.19%
Multiple, No.	20	310	835	45	185	480	175	25	120	825
% Disabled	*	5.8%	11.0%	*	5.0%	8.1%	4.6%	*	6.5%	10.4%
% Total Students	*	0.30%	0.75%	*	0.37%	0.45%	0.24%	*	0.70%	0.74%
Asperger's, No.	0	5	5	0	10	30	10	0	0	5
% Disabled	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
% Total Students	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Other^, No.	165	645	955	85	430	770	365	50	155	1,050
% Disabled	13.1%	12.0%	12.6%	9.6%	11.7%	12.9%	9.5%	*	8.4%	13.3%
% Total Students	0.46%	0.62%	0.86%	0.77%	0.86%	0.71%	0.51%	*	0.57%	0.94%
Total Disabled Students, No.	1,260	5,390	7,575	890	3,665	5,950	3,840	725	1,835	7,920
% Total	3.49%	5.18%	6.82%	8.02%	7.32%	5.52%	5.33%	8.55%	6.73%	7.10%

Table 32a Disabled First Degree students by subject area (extracted from HESA Student Record 2003/04, see notes below)

	Law	Business/ Administration	Communications/ Documentation	Linguistics/ Classics	European Languages	Other Languages	History/ Philosophy	Arts/ Design	Education	Combined
Total Students	56,895	151,845	32,185	48,420	24,290	7,240	61,980	106,310	42,500	39,730
Dyslexia, No	755	3,335	1,075	830	310	140	2,045	7,800	1,145	605
% Disabled	27.2%	49.6%	50.9%	29.6%	28.4%	35.9%	40.4%	62.4%	45.3%	18.1%
% Total Students	1.33%	2.20%	3.34%	1.71%	1.28%	1.93%	3.30%	7.34%	2.69%	1.52%
Vision, No.	125	200	60	95	40	10	140	175	55	85
% Disabled	4.5%	3.0%	2.8%	3.4%	*	*	2.8%	1.4%	2.2%	2.5%
% Total Students	0.22%	0.13%	0.19%	0.20%	*	*	0.23%	0.16%	0.13%	0.22%
Hearing, No	110	270	70	145	55	15	195	365	125	110
% Disabled	4.0%	4.0%	3.3%	5.2%	5.0%	*	3.8%	2.9%	4.9%	3.3%
% Total Students	0.19%	0.18%	0.22%	0.30%	0.23%	*	0.31%	0.34%	0.29%	0.28%
Mobility, No.	160	210	70	125	40	15	200	220	85	115
% Disabled	5.8%	3.1%	3.3%	4.5%	*	*	4.0%	1.8%	3.4%	3.4%
% Total Students	0.28%	0.14%	0.22%	0.26%	*	*	0.32%	0.21%	0.20%	0.39%
Mental, No.	115	150	70	215	90	30	280	395	55	290
% Disabled	4.1%	2.2%	3.3%	7.7%	8.3%	*	5.5%	3.2%	2.2%	8.7%
% Total Students	0.20%	0.10%	0.22%	0.44%	0.37%	*	0.45%	0.37%	0.13%	0.73%
Unseen, No.	700	1,395	420	690	320	100	815	1,810	605	160
% Disabled	25.2%	20.8%	19.9%	24.6%	29.4%	25.6%	16.1%	14.5%	23.9%	4.8%
% Total Students	1.23%	0.92%	1.30%	1.43%	1.32%	1.38%	1.31%	1.70%	1.42%	0.40%
Multiple, No.	375	360	110	240	70	20	645	740	180	1,535
% Disabled	13.5%	5.4%	5.2%	8.6%	6.4%	*	12.7%	5.9%	7.1%	45.8%
% Total Students	0.66%	0.24%	0.34%	0.50%	0.29%	*	1.04%	0.70%	0.42%	3.86%
Asperger's, No.	5	5	5	5	5	0	10	10	0	0
% Disabled	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
% Total Students	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Other^, No.	430	795	230	455	160	60	730	990	280	450
% Disabled	15.5%	11.8%	10.9%	16.3%	14.7%	15.4%	14.4%	7.9%	11.1%	13.4%
% Total Students	0.76%	0.52%	0.71%	0.94%	0.66%	0.83%	1.18%	0.93%	0.66%	1.14%
Total Disabled Students	2,775	6,720	2,110	2,800	1,090	390	5,060	12,505	2,530	3,350
% Total	4.88%	4.43%	6.56%	5.78%	4.49%	5.39%	8.16%	11.76%	5.95%	8.43%

Table 32b Disabled First Degree students by subject area (extracted from HESA Student Record 2003/04, see notes below)

In Table 33 the data extracted from the information supplied by HESA presents the number of disabled students in six subjects that contain an appreciable amount of fieldwork in their courses. Where valid percentages can be calculated, a greater than average number of disabled students (>6.5%) have chosen to take these courses. This is especially the case with Agriculture, followed by Archaeology. Above average numbers with dyslexia (>46.9%) are following these courses, whilst a below average number of students with a hidden disability (<18.5%) have made this choice.

Table 33 Proportion of particular disabilities amongst first degree students taking subjects with a substantial fieldwork element (extracted from HESA Student Record 2003/04, see notes below)

	Botany	Agriculture	Forestry	Geology	Geography	Archaeology
Total Students	215	3,490	225	5,360	15,355	6,040
Dyslexia, No.	20	290	15	300	700	305
% Disabled	*	65.9%	*	58.8%	59.8%	51.3%
% Total Students	*	8.31%	*	5.60%	4.56%	5.05%
Vision Impairment, No.	0	5	0	5	25	5
% Disabled	*	*	*	*	*	*
% Total Students	*	*	*	*	*	*
Hearing Impairment, No.	0	10	0	10	40	25
% Disabled	*	*	*	*	*	*
% Total Students	*	*	*	*	*	*
Restricted Mobility, No.	0	10	0	10	20	20
% Disabled	*	*	*	*	*	*
% Total Students	*	*	*	*	*	*
Mental Illness, No.	0	5	0	25	40	25
% Disabled	*	*	*	*	*	*
% Total Students	*	*	*	*	*	*
Unseen Disability, No.	0	50	0	70	185	105
% Disabled	*	*	*	13.7%	15.8%	17.6%
% Total Students	*	*	*	1.31%	1.20%	1.74%
Multiple Disabilities, No.	0	25	5	25	40	30
% Disabled	*	*	*	*	*	*
% Total Students	*	*	*	*	*	*
Asperger's/Autism, No.	0	0	0	0	5	0
% Disabled	*	*	*	*	*	*
% Total Students	*	*	*	*	*	*
Other Disabilities^, No.	0	35	0	65	115	80
% Disabled	*	*	*	12.7%	9.8%	13.4%
% Total Students	*	*	*	1.21%	0.75%	1.32%
Total Disabled Students	20	440	20	510	1,170	595
% Disabled	*	12.61%	*	9.51%	7.62%	9.85%

Notes on Table 33:

- As required by HESA, the data supplied by them have been rounded to the nearest '5', this has two effects:
  - '0' may represent 1 or 2 students in some cases
  - valid percentages cannot be calculated for values of less than '52', these are marked by *

- ‘Other Disabilities’ include ‘Personal Care’, as designated by HESA, this is marked by ^
- ‘Archaeology’ includes students listed as studying ‘Archaeology’ and also ‘Forensic and Archaeological Science’ which is listed in the ‘Physical Sciences’ subject area by HESA
- HESA does not accept responsibility for any inferences or conclusions derived from data by third parties

CONCLUSION

Although there are problems in attempting direct comparisons between the data supplied by HESA and the data collected by this survey, there is a general correlation between the ‘trends’ in the two data sets. The point to emphasise is that there are significant numbers of disabled students studying Archaeology as an undergraduate degree, especially in comparison with other subjects with a fieldwork element included in their courses (Table 33). Of these students, the majority have dyslexia, but an appreciable number have some form of restricted mobility or a hidden disability.

SUMMARY

- The amount of time devoted to archaeological field training indicates the importance that this practical instruction has in undergraduate archaeology courses in both large and small departments throughout England, Wales and Scotland. This is confirmed by the requirement to spend time on an archaeological field project as part of the courses.

- A wide range of archaeological field techniques are taught and assessed through practical teaching sessions and on field projects. This is an integral part of undergraduate archaeology courses in both large and small departments.

- Most students are trained 'in-house', but a wide range of options and opportunities for other fieldwork are available, allowed and even encouraged.

- Approximately 14% of archaeology students have declared a disability/special need. The vast majority of these students are dyslexic, but this may represent the increased screening for this condition. High figures for dyslexic students are also recorded at a national level and in Geography and Earth Sciences, another discipline which includes an important fieldwork element in its teaching. These figures cannot be seen as totally accurate as there are probably many cases that have not been declared or diagnosed. Direct comparisons with national figures (supplied by HESA) are also difficult; however, the data collected by this survey does appear to match the national trends of numbers and types of disabilities. This is also the case for comparisons with the GDN data. The exceptions are restricted mobility where a surprisingly high number of students in this category are choosing to take archaeology as an undergraduate degree. The lower number of students with a visual impairment doing archaeology may reflect a perception that this condition is incompatible with doing archaeological fieldwork.

- The archaeology departments are closely involved in pre-enrolment arrangements for disabled students. These tend to be organised in conjunction with the Disability Support Services within the respective institutions.

- Few disabled students, if any, change their degree programme because of problems associated with archaeological fieldwork.

- The support provided for disabled students participating in archaeological fieldwork revolves around meeting any special need through discussion with the individual concerned. Health and Safety and risk assessments are also considered important factors. Interestingly, the integrity of archaeological deposits is not considered a major concern when making arrangements for disabled students.
- Only on very few occasions are archaeological fieldwork and its assessment waived for a disabled student. There is a greater likelihood of the fieldwork element being modified. This survey has revealed that, to a great extent, reasonable adjustments have been incorporated into existing practices in many of the Archaeology Departments who returned questionnaires. However, there is a question over whether this modification always leads to the same learning outcome as in the case of the substitution of museum work for actual archaeological fieldwork.

- Academic staff appear to be aware of the recent disability legislation and its implications. However, few of them expect this to change the way in which they teach archaeological fieldwork.

- An appreciable number of staff have attended disability training courses, but in many cases attendance has been delegated to one member of staff as a designated Disability Representative who may not actually be involved in delivering fieldwork training in every case.

- The written policy/guidelines used for disabled students participating in archaeological fieldwork tend to be produced at institutional level.

- Disabled staff are being employed in academic archaeology. The range of disabilities is similar to the trends identified amongst disabled students. However, it is uncertain whether these figures represent the full picture as many disabilities may remain undeclared.

- Most departments express a willingness to talk further with the project staff about their experiences, but fewer are willing to approach individual disabled students on the project's behalf.

III RESULTS OF THE DISABILITY SUPPORT SERVICES IN HEIs QUESTIONNAIRE

INTRODUCTION

This report is based on the returns from a questionnaire survey of Disability Support Units at all the Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in England, Scotland and Wales that offer full time Archaeology undergraduate degrees (35 institutions). A telephone call was made to each of the Disability Support Services, prior to the questionnaires being sent out, in which the purpose of the project was outlined. 'Chase-up' emails were sent out after a period of four weeks.

The questionnaire was made available in a downloadable format on the project's website. The covering letter accompanying the questionnaire explained the background to the project in the context of new disability legislation affecting both Higher Education and employment. It also highlighted that the project was being funded by the Higher Education Funding Council for England and that a number of professional archaeology bodies were major stakeholders. A reply paid envelope was also sent with each questionnaire. A list identifying the scope of disabilities/impairments was provided as a guideline, along with an invitation to identify any additional conditions that the respondents had experience of. The list provided consisted of:

Dyslexia (and similar conditions)
Unseen disabilities/impairments, eg. Allergies, Arthritis, Asthma, Ataxia, Diabetes, Epilepsy, Heart Condition, ME, Phobias. Etc.
Hearing impairment
Wheelchair user/restricted mobility
Asperger's Syndrome/Autism
Mental illness
Visual impairment

The purpose of the survey was not to collect accurate quantitative data, but to gain an overall impression of the experience Disability Support Services in HEIs have had in dealing with issues of disability in archaeology.

RESPONSE TO THE SURVEY

The 16 responses were all paper returns, a sample of 45.7% of the 35 Disability Support Units contacted. This can be compared to the Geography Discipline Network's 'Inclusive Curriculum Project' where 19 replies were received from 95 Offices surveyed, or 20% (Hall et al 2001, Table 1).

Table 1 Response to the survey

Disability Offices surveyed	35
Number of replies	16
Percentage	45.7%

Of the 16 Disability Support Services in HEIs who returned questionnaires, 11 are in southern England, 3 in northern England, 1 in Wales and 1 in Scotland. 10 questionnaires were returned from the same Institutions as the subject providers' questionnaire. Comparisons between these show a consistency of approach to disabled students within individual Institutions.

PART 1: YOUR EXPERIENCE OF DEALING WITH DISABLED STUDENTS UNDERTAKING ARCHAEOLOGICAL FIELDWORK AND PRACTICAL TEACHING SESSIONS AS PART OF AN ARCHAEOLOGY DEGREE

Q1.1 Have you, or your staff, had experience of advising or dealing with disabled students at the pre-enrolment stage who were considering taking an Archaeology degree?

From a sample of 16 respondents, 11 (68.8%) had experience of dealing with disabled Archaeology students at the pre-enrolment stage. This indicates that, to an appreciable extent, the advice of Disability Support Units within HEIs is being sought by prospective archaeology students who have a disability.

Table 2 Disability Support Services dealing with disabled Archaeology students at the pre-enrolment stage

Answer	No. of DSSs	%
Yes	11	68.8%
No	5	31.2%

General issues were being advised on and the probability of adaptations having to be made were recognised:

> ‘Not at this stage, very general query.’

> ‘Discussions at an early stage recognising that adaptations in the broadest sense would have to be made.’

More specific issues were mentioned which related to foreseeing problems and the support that would be needed for participating in fieldwork:

> ‘It was agreed that support would be provided if necessary ie. with mobility/note-taking etc.’

> ‘Issues raised was (sic) the need to provide support worker assistance.’

> ‘Students may need to record/tape/use laptop on fieldwork and may require advance information regarding site/content of work covered etc.’

> ‘Mobility impairments and accessing fieldwork.’

> ‘Transport to and from fieldwork; accommodation during fieldwork; mentoring arrangements’

> ‘Accommodation, provision of personal assistant on field trip.’

On a couple of occasions, individual cases were alluded to:

> ‘Concerns regarding not being able to fully participate in fieldwork trips due to physical disability affecting their hands.’

> ‘Timings, problems because of the student’s family commitments.‘

Issues of Health and Safety and risk were considered important, and on only one occasion was the considering of adjustments reported:

> ‘Mainly health and safety issues eg. someone with an unstable spinal fusion who had difficulty walking on uneven ground.’

> ‘Health and Safety issues, risk assessments and insurance.’

> ‘Compulsory nature of fieldwork and the possibility of it being replaced by something else etc.’

At the pre-enrolment stage the general problems of participation in fieldwork are being considered. The main concern seems to be in identifying what problems, including Health and Safety and risk factors, may occur and what support would be needed. The probable necessity of making adjustments to the teaching programme are also recognised at this stage.

Q1.2 Have you, or your staff, had experience of advising or dealing with the issue of disabled students undertaking archaeological fieldwork and practical teaching sessions as part of an Archaeology degree?

Around two thirds (68.8%) of the sample of Disability Support Services reported that they had been approached concerning issues of disabled students undertaking archaeological fieldwork. This was more often an approach by a student than a member of staff.

Table 3 Advice regarding disabled students and archaeological fieldwork.

Answer	No. of DSSs	%
Yes	11	68.8%
No	5	31.2%

If yes, have you advised or dealt with staff or students?

Table 4 Advice sought by staff and/or students

Staff/Students	No. of DSSs
Staff	7
Students	11

The relationship between the Disability Support Services and the staff and students seeking advice can best be summed up in these quotes:

> ‘Staff seek advice on how to support students. Students seek advice on the support needed.’
>
> ‘Generally both the student and the staff member would be involved in the discussions.’
>
> ‘Academic/Disability staff need to keep working together to address the issues of supporting disabled students out on placements/fieldtrips.’

Advice over the problems experienced by individual cases was being sought:

> ‘Problems with the wind blowing across a mike/transmitter for a hard of hearing student, she could hear the wind and not much else. Kneeling down for a long time, using a trowel.’

> ‘Concerns regarding handling pieces of equipment and artefacts.’

> ‘We have had experience of a student who had mobility difficulties due to a paralysed spine and was a wheelchair user for most of the time. Partially sighted students have also attended the course.’

> ‘Issues such as funding for adapted transport to site. The problem of the uneven site and whether ramps should be erected. Also, the installation of a disabled toilet.’

Concerns related not just to participating in fieldwork itself, but also revolved around the recording of learning and some aspects of assessment:

> ‘Difficulty recording information afterwards due to short term memory problems or processing difficulties.’

> ‘Problems for dyslexic students writing and submitting fieldwork notes by the end of each session.’

Some respondents revealed that their experience had been mainly concerned with dyslexic students:

> ‘Dyslexia – no fieldwork issues.’

> ‘I should point out that Academic Support has primarily had experience of supporting students of archaeology who have dyslexia. Obviously if any student has any disability or long-term medical condition, the support that is provided is appropriate to their specific requirements.’

Disability Support Services have also been approached for advice over financial support and had not been involved in advising on fieldwork and adaptations:

> ‘Disability Office support around disabled students’ allowance, not fieldwork.’

> ‘Support has involved assisting to apply for Disabled Students’ Allowance and also University Hardship funds. Liaising with RNIB and feeding information into Academic staff re. adapting sessions. Investigating sources of funding for students attending the course and assisting the Department with fairly substantial contributions in order to make physical adaptations on the archaeological sites.’
>
> ‘In my experience we have always supported students and encouraged them to apply and it seems they always fully participate and gain invaluable insight from the field trips. We recommend courses should be adapted without question for students and appropriate funding should be made available if necessary.’

In only one instance were the details of the need to make adjustments reported:

> ‘Limited arm/wrist mobility: museum work recommended.’

Both staff and students are approaching the Disability Support Services for advice. Support is being sought for participating in actual fieldwork, but there are also issues surrounding post-fieldwork activities such as the writing up of notes and written assessments, especially in the case of dyslexic students. The need to make adjustments where necessary is recognised and advice on financial support is also being sought.

Q1.3 Have you, or your staff, advised on the writing of risk assessments for disabled students undertaking archaeological fieldwork or practical training sessions?

From the sample of 16 Disability Support Services, only one had advised with the writing of risk assessments for disabled students participating in fieldwork. This indicates that the Disability Services are not usually involved in this aspect of Health and Safety.

Table 5 Disability Support Services advising on risk assessments

Answer	No. of DSSs	%
Yes	1	6.3%
No	15	93.7%

This should not be seen as Disability Support Services being unconcerned about Health and Safety and the risks involved in archaeological fieldwork:

> ‘Spinal injury – awaiting medical evidence and will then perform risk assessment, complicated legal situation as paralysis could occur at any time.’
>
> ‘There would be a discussion between my service and the School.’
>
> ‘Currently we would ‘outsource’ this to our Health and Safety team or to University Health Service Occupational Health.’

There was also a suggestion at one HEI that the Disability Support Services expected to be called in to advise on this aspect:

> ‘No, but I’m probably about to!’

Q1.4 Where you, or your staff, have had experience of dealing with a disabled student(s), who was participating in practical teaching sessions or archaeological fieldwork projects, please give brief details of their disability/impairment and the support/advice you have provided for them.

Q1.5 Where you, or your staff, have had experience of a member of staff approach you seeking advice or guidance concerning a disabled student(s), who was participating in practical teaching sessions or archaeological fieldwork projects, please give brief details of their disability/impairment and the support/advice you have provided for them.

The indication that staff and students were, on the whole, approaching Disability Support Services jointly for advice is born out in the way these two questions were answered. The comments provided often related to both questions.

Disability Support Services have a wide experience of being involved in providing support for staff and disabled students undertaking archaeological fieldwork. This support has consisted of the provision of note-takers and other support workers, the supplying of learning material in different medium or at different times (before and after fieldwork), and also assistance in accessing sites. Another important aspect has been effective consultation and communication with the relevant Archaeology Department:

> ‘We have experience of supporting a wide range of students eg dyslexia/deafness. Support provided has been access to support workers to assist with note-taking.‘

‘Usually students with a specific learning difficulty mainly dyslexia/ dyspraxia: students may need to record/tape/use laptop on fieldwork; or may require advance information regarding site/content of work covered etc.’

‘Student requiring a PA went on the same trip as they did, as one (PA) was also an archaeologist.’

‘Student with hearing impairment – difficult to solve [wind blowing over] mike problem other than staff providing written comments/instruction, or speaking at the hotel, rather than [in] the field.’

‘Dupuytren’s Disease and Trigger Finger. Support focused on providing their department with the relevant information. The disability contact in the department worked with the student and their colleagues to arrange any specific support for these sessions.’

‘Student with cerebral palsy had a note-taker/assistance on fieldwork trips.’

‘Student in wheelchair [had] assistance providing transport on fieldtrips and accommodation whilst away.’

‘Student with a visual impairment provided with support with a personal reader, mentor support, advocacy work and help with accessing.’

‘Students with chronic medical conditions supported with accommodation and dietary issues, taxis to and from placements, portable IT support and mentoring support.’

‘Staff approached to seek advice on a number of students eg Asperger’s Syndrome, Menieres Disease, Dyslexia, Mental Health issues etc. Support worker assistance provided etc.’

‘We have a student with Asperger’s who may need closer supervision on placement because of reduced levels of responsibility.’

Adjustments appear to have been tailored to meet the needs of individual cases:

‘Wheelchair user – where rare samples were not in an accessible location, advice given on photographic evidence as alternative, or videos etc.’

‘Dyslexia – generally these students would be given extra time to complete their notes/recordings.’

‘Flexibility over the fieldtrip location.’

‘Students with rheumatoid arthritis – one field trip by one student completed at great physical cost, second replaced by lab work.’

‘Appropriate transport found and provided, ramps installed, disabled toilet, visual aides amended to become more tactile for partially sighted students.’

Although there was evidence of the Disability Support Services working closely with the Departments concerned, there was also a suggestion of friction in one case:

‘Seeking extensions for fieldwork reports from a Department that doesn’t give extensions.’

The overall impression gained from the answers to these two questions is that the Disability Support Services within HEIs have a wide experience of providing advice to staff and disabled students participating in archaeological fieldwork.

Q1.6 Are you, or your staff, aware of any disabled student(s) who has changed degree programmes out of Archaeology because of the actual or perceived difficulties of undertaking practical teaching sessions and archaeological fieldwork?

None of the Disability Support Services surveyed were aware of any incidence where a disabled student had changed degree programme because of the difficulties of doing archaeological fieldwork. Two thirds responded with a categorical ‘No’.

Table 6 Disabled students changing degree programme

Answer	No. of DSSs	%
Yes	0	0%
No	11	68.8%
Don’t Know	5	31.2%

One respondent noted that a couple of disabled students had withdrawn for health reasons, but this was from the whole degree programme.

> ‘Most complete, two withdrew I recall because their health deteriorated.’

Q1.7a Are you, or your staff, aware of any cases where, following staff or student consultation with you, a practical teaching session has been waived?

None of the respondents gave a ‘yes’ answer to this question. Over 60% of the sample replied ‘no’, whilst the rest were uncertain.

Table 7 Practical teaching session waived for a disabled student

Answer	No. of DSSs	%
Yes	0	0%
No	10	62.5%
Don’t Know	6	37.5%

Although no incidences of practical teaching being waived in Archaeology were reported, the experience from another department was reported:

> ‘Too few archaeological students to make useful comment here, but field trips for other courses have been ‘waived’ in the past. In principle, I consider this to be a bad idea. Universities should accommodate the students’ needs.’

Q1.7b Are you, or your staff, aware of any cases where, following staff or student consultation with you, a practical teaching session has been modified?

Four respondents gave a ‘yes’ answer to this question, but the majority of replies were split between ‘no’ and ‘don’t know’.

Table 8 Practical teaching session waived for a disabled student

Answer	No. of DSSs	%
Yes	4	25.0%
No	6	37.5%
Don’t Know	6	37.5%

This question revealed a number of comments detailing the adjustments that had been made for the special needs of individual students:

> ‘If I remember correctly, extra time.’
>
> ‘Student suffering from anxiety was able to submit written work instead of a presentation.’
>
> ‘Student was offered laboratory or experimental fieldwork as opposed to practical fieldwork.’
>
> ‘A dyspraxic student had severe difficulties telling left from right and had to have skeletal parts colour coded rather than referring to left/right. This helped her enormously but involved a lot of work from the Department, although they were extremely helpful.’

Q1.8a Are you, or your staff, aware of any cases where, following staff or student consultation with you, a fieldwork project has been waived for a disabled student?

As with practical teaching sessions, none of the Disability Support Services that were surveyed were aware of a fieldwork project requirement being waived for a disabled student.

Table 9 Field project waived for a disabled student

Answer	No. of DSSs	%
Yes	0	0%
No	11	68.8%
Don’t Know	5	31.2%

Q1.8b Are you, or your staff, aware of any cases where, following staff or student consultation with you, a fieldwork project has been modified for a disabled student?

Four respondents replied that a field project had been modified for a disabled student, but the majority were unaware of any incidence of this.

Table 10 Field project modified for a disabled student

Answer	No. of DSSs	%
Yes	4	25.0%
No	8	50.0%
Don’t Know	4	25.0%

Adjustments consisted of accommodation arrangements and aspects of assessment:

> ‘A student was offered reduced attendance/non-residential option to compensate for fatigue caused by dietary and medical condition.’

> ‘Dyslexic students – extra time away from the field to complete write-ups.’

PART 2: STAFF TRAINING AND POLICY

Q2.1 Have you, or your staff, been involved in disability equality training for staff from Archaeology?

Over half (56.2%) of the Disability Support Services surveyed reported that they had been involved in disability equality training for Archaeology staff. This indicates that a fair proportion of Archaeology staff in HEIs are aware of disability issues.

Table 11 Training Archaeology staff in disability equality

Answer	No. of DSSs	%
Yes	9	56.2%
No	5	31.3%
Don’t Know	2	12.5%

This training can be for staff across a Department:

> ‘Staff training offered as part of the University Staff Development Programme.’

> ‘Dyslexia awareness training session as part of a series of lunchtime diversity programme training.’

> ‘We offered training on ‘Disability Awareness’ but I don’t know if staff from Archaeology attended.’

> ‘Some training is delivered generically and I would not always be aware of participants’ backgrounds. However, nothing specifically has been delivered to the Archaeology Department.’

> ‘Only in the generic sense – within the Disability Office training and University disability training. Not specifically tailored for the Department as yet.’

Alternatively, an individual member of staff is being nominated to deal with disability issues:

> ‘Archaeology staff have an Accessibility Tutor, so a contact for disabled students in the Department who attends meetings/training on occasion.’

> ‘Disability Liaison Officer meetings.’

> ‘We are aware that Departmental Disability Co-ordinator has attended training and awareness sessions, but we are not aware of any other staff members from the Department being involved.’

The training has involved mainly the DDA 1995, SENDA 2001 and general disability awareness:

> ‘DDA Part 4 awareness training.’

> ‘SENDA, DDA, Disability Awareness.’

Q2.2 Does your unit produce any written policy or guidelines relating to disabled students undertaking practical teaching sessions and archaeological fieldwork?

Very few of the Disability Support Services in the survey (20.0%) produce their own guidelines relating to disabled students and archaeological fieldwork.

Table 12 Guidelines for disabled students and archaeological fieldwork

Answer	No. of DSSs	%
Yes	3	18.8%
No	12	75.0%
No Answer	1	6.2%

Most rely on generic guidelines produced by the individual institutions and similar material:

‘Not specifically, but is referred to in general inclusive teaching advice.’

‘More generic information regarding how the University supports students with disabilities.’

‘Practical work, yes; explicitly Archaeology, no.’

‘Included in overall guidelines.’

Although the Disability Services have institutional policies and guidelines to follow, in one case it was felt that this could be improved upon:

‘I would like an audit done in the Department of the core competency requirements for the course (including fieldwork). I would also like clearer info/guidelines and policy on risk assessments – who/when/where/cost?’

PART 3: OTHER INFORMATION

Q3.1 Are you willing to talk to us in more detail about your experiences?

Half of the sample indicated a willingness to speak further with the project team. One respondent suggested:

‘Even better, talk to Archaeology staff and students.’

Table 13 Further contact

Answer	No. of DSSs	%
Yes	8	50.0%
No	7	43.7%
No Answer	1	6.3%

SUMMARY

- The majority of the sample of Disability Support Services had experience of dealing with students seeking advice about archaeological fieldwork, including the pre-enrolment stage. Archaeology staff had also been seeking advice, but to a lesser extent.

- The advice being given was mainly about general issues at the pre-enrolment stage and more specific issues later. The advice being offered was about foreseeing potential problems, providing support and making adjustments to participate in fieldwork, and problems relating to assessment (especially in the case of dyslexic students) and financial issues.

- Only one of the Disability Support Services had been involved in writing risk assessments relating to archaeological fieldwork, but Health and Safety issues were seen to be of the utmost importance. Very few produce their own specific guidelines for archaeological fieldwork, generic guidelines within the HEIs are used.

- There were no known instances of disabled students changing course because of problems with archaeological fieldwork or of fieldwork being waived.

- About 25% of the respondents reported that fieldwork had been modified for a disabled student.

- Archaeology staff at about half the HEIs in the sample had attended disability equality training. This training tended to be on general disability awareness and legislation.

- Just under half of the sample expressed a willingness to talk to the project team in greater depth.

IV RESULTS OF THE EMPLOYERS' QUESTIONNAIRE

INTRODUCTION

This report is based on the returns from a questionnaire survey of archaeological employers. These were chosen from the lists provided in the Institute of Field Archaeologists Yearbook and Directory (IFA 2005) and in the Handbook section of the Current Archaeology (2005) website. The sample was composed of commercial archaeological field units and commercial companies offering geophysical survey services in England, Scotland and Wales, a sample total of 120. An email was sent to each of the commercial companies prior to the questionnaires being sent out briefing them on the survey. No 'chase-up' letters or emails were sent.

The questionnaire was designed with advice from the IFA's Outreach Officer and was limited to two sides, as well as being made available in a downloadable format on the project's website and on the IFA's website. The covering letter accompanying the questionnaire explained the background to the project in the context of new disability legislation affecting both Higher Education and employment. A reply paid envelope was also sent with each questionnaire. A list identifying the scope of disabilities/impairments was provided as a guideline, along with an invitation to identify any additional conditions of which the respondents had experience. The list provided consisted of:

Dyslexia (and similar conditions)
Unseen disabilities/impairments, eg. Allergies, Arthritis, Asthma, Ataxia, Diabetes, Epilepsy, Heart Condition, ME, Phobias, etc.
Hearing impairment
Wheelchair user/restricted mobility
Asperger's Syndrome/Autism
Mental illness
Visual impairment

The purpose of the survey was not to collect accurate quantitative data, but to gain an overall impression of the situation in the commercial section of the profession. Given the nature of archaeological employment, with a mobile workforce and short-term contracts, it would require a more detailed and complex questionnaire than the one used in this survey to collect detailed quantitative information. The analysis of quantitative data in this report must be considered within these parameters.

RESPONSE TO THE SURVEY

The 53 responses comprised 49 paper returns, 2 digital returns and 2 email replies. This represents 44.2% of the 120 questionnaires that were sent out. Of these, no figures were given in 1 of the responses, 4 were sole traders and 1 kept no records of disabled employees. This gives a viable sample of 47 employers, 39.2% of those surveyed.

A return rate of around 40% is relatively high for a questionnaire survey. This may be related to a number of factors:

- The sending of emails prior to the survey
- The short and simple layout of the questionnaire
- The provision of a postage-paid reply envelope
- The topical nature of disability and employment
- The Support and involvement of the Institute of Field Archaeologists (IFA), the Council for British Archaeology (CBA) and English Heritage (EH)

Table 1 Response to the survey

Employers surveyed	120
Number of replies	53
Percentage	44.2%
Sole traders	4
No records of disabled employees kept	1
No figures given	1
Sample size	47
Percentage	39.2%

Of the sample of 53 employers 29 are in southern England, 7 in northern England, 7 in Wales and 7 in Scotland; whilst 3 questionnaires were returned anonymously. 29 of the employers can be described as ‘small’ (1-19 employees) and 20 as ‘large (>20 employees). 4 were sole traders.

EMPLOYEES

Q1 Please indicate your approximate number of employees in a year, including voluntary workers and trainees.

Q2 Please indicate the approximate number of disabled employees working for you over the last five years, including voluntary workers and trainees. This includes registered disabled and physical or mental disabilities that could impair working.

From a sample of 47 respondents, 28 (59.6%) had experience with disabled employees as defined in the survey. A total of 119 disabled workers were recorded as being employed in the last five years. Within the sample, this is 9.6% of the staff employed in any one year. Over a five year period, the average would be about 24 employees a year, or almost 2% of the workforce.

From these figures, the number of disabled staff employed in commercial archaeology at any one time may be estimated between 2% and 10% of the workforce. However, because of the nature of archaeological employment and the format of the questionnaire, this can only be considered as a rough estimate of the incidence of disability in the commercial sector of the profession.

These figures can be compared with a national average of 19% of all working people in employment (Disability Rights Commission 2002). The results of a recent IFA survey of the profession (Aitchison & Edwards 2003) recorded a proportion of 0.34% of disabled archaeologists across the whole profession. However, this figure may not be accurate as it 'may not include all disabled people covered by the survey, as some respondents chose not to answer this question' (ibid, 25). It should also be noted that the current survey was addressing directly the question of disability within the profession, whilst the IFA study was a detailed analysis of a wide range of aspects of archaeological employment. Nevertheless, the results of both surveys do suggest that the numbers of disabled people employed in commercial archaeology is very low when compared to the national average, but higher than previous estimates.

Table 2 Numbers of archaeological employees

Sample size	47
Employers declaring disabled employees	28
Percentage	59.6%
Total number of employees	1245
Total number of disabled employees over 5 years	119
Percentage of disabled employees (total)	9.6%
Average number of disabled employees per year	24
Percentage of disabled employees per year	1.9%

DISABLED EMPLOYEES

Q3 If you have employed disabled workers over the last five years, how would you best describe their disability/impairment?

Unseen disabilities account for over half the reported impairments, 69 incidences, or 53.5%, of the sample. This is followed by 20 reports of dyslexia (15.5%), 11 each of Restricted Mobility and Mental Illness (8.5%) and 9 of visual impairment (7.0%).

Table 3 Disabled employees (*some have more than one disability)

Disability/Impairment	**No.**	**%**
Dyslexia	20	15.5%
Unseen Disability	69	53.5%
Hearing Impairment	5	3.9%
Restricted Mobility	11	8.5%
Asperger's	4	3.1%
Mental Illness	11	8.5%
Visual Impairment	9	7.0%
Total	129*	100.0%

The category 'unseen disability' provoked a wide range of detailed responses. These are listed in Table 4 as described in the returned questionnaires. Diabetes accounts for the highest number of hidden disabilities with 18 returns (26.0%), followed by 12 examples of arthritis (17.3%), 10 of asthma (14.4%) and 6 of epilepsy (8.7%). Other unseen disabilities account for 33.6% of the sample.

Table 4 Unseen disabilities (*Some employees have more than one disability)

Disability/Impairment	Nos.	%
Agoraphobia	1	1.5 %
Allergy	1	1.5%
Arthritis	12	17.3%
Asthma	10	14.4%
Bronchial Condition	1	1.5%
Diabetes	18	26.0%
Epilepsy	6	8.7%
Fibromyalcia	1	1.5%
Heart Condition	4	5.8%
ME	3	4.3%
MS	2	2.9%
Phobia	2	2.9%
Reynaud's Syndrome	1	1.5%
RSI	4	5.8%
Terminal Illness	2	2.9%
'Unseen' Impairment	1	1.5%
Total	69*	100.0%

These figures appear to contradict the picture revealed amongst undergraduate archaeology students where the highest 'disability' recorded is dyslexia followed by unseen disabilities. However, the unseen disabilities amongst employees tend to be conditions like diabetes, arthritis and asthma. These are late-onset conditions appearing in mature workers, some of which (eg arthritis) may be related to their employment.

Only 11 incidences of 'mental illness' were reported. These are detailed in Table 5. The most common condition reported was depression (8 incidences), followed by the generic term 'mental illness' (3 incidences). However, the sample is too small to come to any meaningful quantitative conclusions.

Table 5 Mental Illness

Disability/Impairment	Nos.	%
Depression	8	72.7%
Mental Illness	3	27.3%
Total	11	100.0%

Only 11 incidences of restricted mobility were reported comprising a variety of conditions. However, as with mental illness, the sample is very small. Chronic back complaints make up over half the sample with 6 reported incidences (54.5%), but from the results of the survey as a

whole, the number is very low. Interestingly, obesity was not mentioned by any of the respondents.

Table 6 Restricted mobility

Disability/Impairment	Nos.	%
Amputated leg	2	18.2%
Cerebral Palsy	1	9.1%
Chronic back complaint	6	54.5%
Restricted mobility	1	9.1%
Wheelchair user	1	9.1%
Total	11	100.0%

EMPLOYMENT

Q4 If you have employed disabled workers over the last five years, in which roles have they been involved?

FIELD INVESTIGATION

The greatest number of disabled employees are employed in field investigation activities, regardless of their impairment. Interestingly, this includes all the employees classified as having restricted mobility.

Table 7 Field investigation (*sample size x 129)
Note – individuals may be involved in more than one activity

Total - 101
Percentage of disabled employees* - 78.3%

Disability/ Impairment	No.	% of disability	% all disabled employees*	% in work category
Dyslexia	20	100.0%	15.5%	19.8%
Unseen Disability	48	69.6%	37.2%	47.5%
Hearing Impairment	5	100.0%	3.9%	5.0%
Restricted Mobility	8	72.7%	6.2%	7.9%
Asperger's	4	100.0%	3.1%	4.0%
Mental Illness	9	81.8%	7.0%	8.9%
Visual Impairment	7	77.8%	5.4%	6.9%

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT ADVICE

Only 13 disabled employees are involved in providing Historic Environment Advice, 10.1% of the sample, and only staff with dyslexia, an unseen disability or a visual impairment.

Table 8 Historic environment advice (*sample size x 129)
Note – individuals may be involved in more than one activity

Total - 13
Percentage of disabled employees* - 10.1%

Disability/ Impairment	No.	% of disability	% all disabled employees*	% in work category
Dyslexia	2	10.0%	1.6%	15.4%
Unseen Disability	9	13.0%	7.0%	69.2%
Hearing Impairment	0			
Restricted Mobility	0			
Asperger's	0			
Mental Illness	0			
Visual Impairment	2	22.2%	1.6%	15.4%

EDUCATION

A total of 29 disabled employees, 22.5% of the sample, are involved in educational activities.

Table 9 Education (*sample size x 129)
Note – individuals may be involved in more than one activity

Total - 29
Percentage of disabled employees* - 22.5%

Disability/ Impairment	No.	% of disability	% all disabled employees*	% in work category
Dyslexia	1	5.0%	0.8%	3.4%
Unseen Disability	16	23.9%	12.4%	55.2%
Hearing Impairment	2	41.0%	1.6%	6.8%
Restricted Mobility	3	27.3	2.3%	10.3%
Asperger's	1	25.0%	0.8%	3.4%
Mental Illness	2	18.2%	1.6%	6.8%
Visual Impairment	4	44.4%	3.1%	13.8%

SUPPORT STAFF

A total of 28 disabled employees are employed in support roles, 21.7% of the sample. No staff with Asperger's Syndrome or a visual impairment are represented.

Table 10 Support Staff (*sample size x 129)
Note – individuals may be involved in more than one activity

Total - 28
Percentage of disabled employees* - 21.7%

Disability/ Impairment	No.	% of disability	% all disabled employees*	% in work category
Dyslexia	2	10.0%	1.6%	7.1%
Unseen Disability	19	27.5%	14.7%	67.8%
Hearing Impairment	2	40%	1.6%	7.1%
Restricted Mobility	1	9.1%	0.8%	3.6%
Asperger's	0			
Mental Illness	4	36.4%	3.1%	14.4%
Visual Impairment	0			

UNSEEN DISABILITY

Disabled staff with hidden disabilities are widely involved in field investigation, including employees with arthritis and a heart condition.

Table 11 Employment of staff with unseen disabilities
Note – individuals may be involved in more than one activity

Disability? Impairment	Field Investigation	HE Advice	Education/ Research	Support Staff
Agoraphobia	1		1	1
Allergy	1	1	1	1
Arthritis	10	1	2	3
Asthma	9	1	4	1
Bronchial Condition				1
Diabetes	14	1	2	5
Epilepsy	6			
Fibromyalcia	1			
Heart Condition	3	1	1	3
ME	1		1	2
MS	2			
Phobia	2			
Reynard's Syndrome	1		1	
RSI	1		3	
Terminal Illness			2	
'Unseen' Impairment	1	1	1	

MENTAL ILLNESS

Nearly all the staff described as having a mental illness are employed in field investigations.

Table 12 Employment of staff with a mental illness
Note – individuals may be involved in more than one activity

Disability/ Impairment	Field Investigation	HE Advice	Education/ Research	Support Staff
Depression	7		1	
Mental Illness	3			1

RESTRICTED MOBILITY

The majority of staff with restricted mobility are employed in field investigations. This includes employees with amputated legs, chronic back complaints, restricted mobility and a wheelchair user.

Table 13 Employment of staff with restricted mobility
Note – individuals may be involved in more than one activity

Disability/ Impairment	Field Investigation	HE Advice	Education/ Research	Support Staff
Amputated leg	2			
Cerebral Palsy				1
Chronic back complaint	3		3	
Restricted mobility	1			1
Wheelchair user	1			

LEGISLATION

Q5. Will the new Disability legislation affect your recruitment and working practices?

The vast majority of the employers feel that the new disability legislation will not affect their recruitment and working practices. Only 2 respondents (3.9% of the sample) answered 'Yes' to this question and 5 'Don't Know' (9.8%).

Table 14 Legislation and recruitment/working practices

Total sample number	-	53
Question unanswered	-	2
Sample	-	51

Answer	No. of Employers	%
Yes	2	3.9%
No	44	86.3%
Don't Know	5	9.8%

The two respondents who answered 'Yes' to this question are both small employers, as are four of the five who replied 'Don't Know'.

The perception that the legislation will have little effect on current working practices is also reflected in the comments on the questionnaires by both large and small employers:

> '[The new legislation will not affect us] because our recruitment and working practices have changed to meet them.' (A large employer)
>
> 'Our employment practices will not change as they already ensure that applicants with disabilities are not discriminated against.' (A small employer)
>
> 'All managerial staff undergo training in Health and Safety, cultural diversity, recruitment and interviews and equal opportunities policies.' (A large employer)
>
> 'I am assuming I can find details of the legislation on the government website.' (A small employer)
>
> 'I'll ensure we comply with the legislation.' (A small employer)

This suggests that the employers are, on the whole, aware of the implications of the new legislation and either have altered, or consider that they do not need to alter, their procedures.

FURTHER CONTACT

Q6. Would you be willing to talk to us in more detail on the telephone?

Over half the sample (56.9%) indicated a willingness to have further contact with the project staff. This indicates a high level of concern and interest in disability and archaeological employment.

Table 15 Further contact

Total sample number	-	53
Question unanswered	-	2
Sample	-	51

Answer	No. of Employers	%
Yes	29	56.9%
No	22	43.1%

DISABILITY AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL EMPLOYMENT

This survey can be compared to that carried out by the IFA (Aitchison & Edwards 2003), but only indirectly as there are several basic differences between the two surveys and there are several inconsistencies between the figures. The IFA survey comprised a detailed questionnaire about a wide range of aspects of archaeological employment. The four categories of archaeological roles were accurately defined. Multiple activities by the same individual in the different categories were not recorded, they were classified under one role only. In comparison, our survey was asking specific questions about disability and archaeological employment. The four categories of archaeological roles differ slightly from those used in the IFA survey and were not precisely defined. Our survey also revealed that individuals are being employed in multiple roles. Within these limits, the main point to observe is that the percentage of disabled employees working in 'Field Investigation' activities is less than the percentage in commercial organisations as a whole, but the difference is not great (Tables 16 and 17).

Table 16 Employment of disabled staff (this survey)

Employment	No.	%
Field Investigation	101	78.3%
HE Advice	13	10.1%
Education	29	22.5%
Support Staff	28	21.7%

Table 17 Employment of archaeological staff in commercial organisations (from Aitchison & Edwards 2003, Table 15)

Employment	Known No.	%	Estimated No.	%
Field Investigation	1052	95.1%	1932	81.9%
HE Advice	48	4.3%	390	16.6%
Museum Services	4	0.4%	24	1.0%
Education/Research	2	0.2%	12	0.5%

DISABLED EMPLOYEES AND DISABLED STUDENTS

There is an apparent inversion of the predominant condition reported in the Archaeology Subject Providers and the Employers' questionnaires (Table 18). Amongst the students, dyslexia is the highest disability reported, followed by unseen disabilities. The opposite is true amongst archaeological employees: unseen disabilities followed by dyslexia. This may be explained by the particular range of unseen disabilities being reported amongst the employees: diabetes, arthritis and asthma especially. The first two of these can be seen as 'late onset' conditions perhaps reflecting the age differences between most students and employees. In some cases arthritis may also occur as a result of working in archaeology. Visual impairments are proportionally higher amongst employees, perhaps representing degenerative conditions. However, hearing impairments, which are potentially degenerative conditions, are higher amongst the sample of students. Interestingly, similar percentages were revealed for both employees and students with restricted mobility.

Table 18 Disabled archaeological employees and archaeology students

Disability	Disabled Employee Nos.	Disabled Employee %	Disabled Student Nos.	Disabled Student %
Unseen Disability	69	53.5%	43	15.2%
Dyslexia	20	15.5%	178	63.1%
Mental Illness	11	8.5%	16	5.7%
Restricted Mobility	11	8.5%	24	8.5%
Visual Impairment	9	7.0%	3	1.1%
Hearing Impairment	5	3.9%	15	5.3%
Asperger's	4	3.1%	3	1.1%
Total	129*	100.0%	244	100.0%

DEFINITION OF DISABILITY

There was some confusion among employers in the exact definition of ‘disability’. This was the case amongst smaller employers and mainly concerned hidden disabilities:

> ‘It really depends how you define disabled. According to the list in your letter, about half our staff are disabled, including myself. Four have some degree of visual impairment, for which they wear glasses or contact lenses. Additionally, two of these also suffer from mild dyslexia. I do not consider myself disabled, and I’m sure they do not either. In any case, some of the conditions you list (eg. Arthritis, diabetes, ME) should surely be classified as ailments or diseases, not disabilities. This all sounds a bit too politically correct in my view.’

> ‘I don’t actually consider these (diabetes, asthma) disabilities.’

> ‘From past experience I have employed staff under your ‘unseen disabilities’ which I would consider relatively minor medical complaints (where the individual can manage and provide guidance on the consequences, if any, to working practice) and not significant enough to be dealt with the much more critical issues of disability in archaeology.’

The nature of hidden disabilities meant that some of the employers suspected that a number of their employees had these conditions, but they were not known about because they had either not been declared, or they had not actually caused any problems in the performance of expected duties:

> ‘Although this aspect of our recruitment has never been tracked, from ‘living memory’ of several key staff members it would appear that we have only employed a very small number of people with any disability that you list in your categories. These would include: one lady who had arthritis, one young man with epilepsy (there’s probably a few more undisclosed), two to three with diabetes (that we know about), one man with a heart condition, one young woman with suspected ME, one man with severe depression and three to four with dyslexia (that we know about).’

> ‘It may be that some of our staff are dyslexic, but this is not declared or diagnosed.’

> ‘Dyslexia/associated impairments are a problem probably quite widespread in a mild form.’

> ‘Please note that the numbers of employees with disabilities is an underestimate as we do not keep records of anything other than registered disability and the one example of dyslexia relies on my recollection of what was declared on an application form.’

This highlights the problems of the exact meaning of the words ‘disability’ and ‘impairment’ and the problems that may arise in effective communication. The reference to wearing glasses and contact lenses is an extreme example of a misunderstanding of ‘visual impairment’. A statement in the covering letter accompanying the questionnaire defining disabilities/impairments, for the purpose of this survey, as ‘a physical or mental impairment which has a substantial and long term adverse effect on their ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities’ (DDA 1995) would probably have eliminated this problem.

EMPLOYERS’ CONCERNS

The major concern amongst the employers was the ability of disabled staff to carry out their duties. Their comments ranged from specific points to the outline rejection of the employment of disabled staff, although the latter was a minority view mostly expressed by the smaller employers:

> ‘As an employer my prime concern when engaging staff is, can they undertake the tasks detailed in the description of the post for which they are applying? In this respect I have to consider their skill level, and whether they are physically (and mentally) capable of doing the work.’ (A small employer)

> ‘Whilst not officially disabled, one of our archaeologists has a visual impairment which may get worse over time. This could have an impact on the work that the individual can undertake.’ (A large employer)

> ‘We have our own set of problems relating to geophysics and disability that need addressing and in some cases these would prevent an individual being employed. This wouldn’t be through choice but for technical reasons that geophysical survey cannot avoid. One simple example would be an individual with stainless steel implants – there are some forms of survey, principally electromagnetic, that they would be unable to become involved with due to chronic interference with the instrumentation. Tough but a reality and with the best will in the world there is no way round this.’ (A small employer)

> ‘The only person we had real problems with was an Asperger’s spectrum employee who was on a short contract which was not renewed. As might be assumed, it was the disruption to the team which caused the problems, as well as his inability to cope with changes in routine. Dyslexia/associated impairments are a problem probably quite widespread in a mild form. We provided support for an employee in the form of an assessment, but at the end of the day he was incapable of writing reports or organising anything, just a brilliant ideas person.’ (A large employer)
>
> ‘As we are contracting field archaeologists, almost by definition we do not employ disabled people on a regular basis. However, if there was an area where they could be employed, they would not be turned away.’ (A small employer)
>
> ‘We will still continue to consider able-bodied and disabled applicants on their merits.’ (A small employer)
>
> ‘Physical impairment, vision impairment – difficult to employ in archaeological fieldwork.’ (A small employer)
>
> ‘The concept of anyone who is physically or mentally impaired being involved with field archaeology, particularly excavation, is absurd.’ (A small employer)

Interestingly, none of the respondents provided examples of ‘reasonable adjustments’ and only one mentioned providing support. However, these aspects were not directly mentioned in the questionnaire.

Another important concern was the nature of ‘risk’ and aspects of Health and Safety, especially amongst the smaller employers:

> ‘We have employed people with various levels of disability, mainly mental, within what was feasible within a local authority. One person had to be terminated on the instructions of Human Resources because of the possible dangers to other staff. Others I have refused on Health and Safety grounds – registered blind are not appropriate members of staff on what may be compared with construction sites, and good eyesight is important when doing fieldwork; staff on crutches have been banned from site until physically able to cope with site conditions.’ (A small employer)
>
> ‘Surely archaeology is no different from other construction-related professions and trades with regards to DDA.’ (A small employer)

> ‘Serious physical disability not allowed on building sites.’ (A small employer)

In these examples there is clearly a view that archaeological excavation has similarities with the construction industry. At present, the main concerns on inclusiveness in the construction industry relate to gender, race and social background (Change Construction 2005). Other concerns relate to health and safety with industrial accidents and work related illnesses or conditions (CIC 2005). However, for a disabled applicant to be refused employment on health and safety grounds would require an individual risk assessment to be carried out in each case (DDA 1995). On the research side, the Building Equality in Construction Project has produced a set of good practice guidelines to improve equal opportunities (Rhys Jones 1998). This is mainly targeted at improving the inclusiveness of women in employed in the industry, but disabled employees are also mentioned (ibid, 25).

Honesty when being recruited was also highlighted:

> ‘I trust that applicants will respect their limitations when applying for work.’ (A small employer)

> ‘Identification of disability at time of appointment and transparency in dealing with implications.’ (A large employer)

> ‘The diabetic person did not tell me they were diabetic at the time (although I do ask if there are any medical conditions at the time of employment) and I was cross to find this out later, as if they had had an incident I would not have known why/what was going on. They told me later they did not tell employers in case they would not get the job. My response was more likely not to get the job for withholding vital medical information! In my opinion a stupid thing to do and by not being honest when asked about any medical conditions that might affect their work I would not employ them again as they were not trustworthy, not because they were diabetic.’ (A small employer)

POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE REACTIONS

A mixed reaction to the employment of disabled people and the usefulness of this survey was revealed with both positive and negative responses. Some of these reactions were based on actual experience, and others on perceptions of disability:

‘Very positive experience with work experience placement who made a very good contribution in his two weeks with us.’ (A large employer)

‘I have no problem employing disabled people and have had disabled colleagues in previous archaeological employment.’ (A small employer)

‘…this survey is probably unnecessary.’ (A sole trader)

‘We are owned by a charity that actively seeks to make archaeology more accessible and have an exhibition explaining ways to do this. We have worked with Scope and used MS sufferers.’ (A small employer)

‘I’m supportive of employing disabled people but feel that the needs of a small employer need to be fully recognised in this.’ (A small employer)

‘I am absolutely in favour of initiatives that are inclusive and designed to facilitate accessibility. Bodies such as [two stakeholders] are great on talk, poor on action. I would be concerned that lip service would be paid to the legislation and that little would change. I expect that they will draft all the appropriate policies, whilst simultaneously sitting on their hands and piously flagging up problems with implementation. Please forgive my criticism, I wish you well with your survey.’ (A sole trader)

‘There are too few positions for able-bodied archaeologists without making a stance on behalf of less fortunate ones. Is this yet another survey (of which there seem to be numerous) designed to keep the likes of you in work?’ (A small employer)

SUMMARY

The main aspects highlighted by this survey can be summarised as:

- The number of disabled workers employed in commercial archaeology is probably less than the national average, but greater than previously estimated.

- The greatest reported incidence comprises hidden disabilities (especially diabetes and arthritis which tend to be late onset conditions), followed by dyslexia. This is a reverse of the trend reported amongst archaeology undergraduates.

- Disabled employees are mostly employed in field investigation activities whatever their impairment, including restricted mobility. This compares well with the results of the IFA survey of all archaeological employment (Aitchison & Edwards 2003).

- The majority of employers are aware of the implications of the disability legislation and consider that they have either satisfactorily altered, or do not need to alter, their procedures. The few respondents that expressed a lack of knowledge tended to be smaller employers.

- Just over half of the employers in the sample expressed a willingness to talk further with the project team suggesting a high level of concern and interest in disability and archaeological employment.

- There is some confusion over exactly what constitutes ‘disability’. This was mainly expressed by smaller employers and may be a result of the wording of the covering letter accompanying the questionnaire. For the purposes of this survey it would be ‘a physical or mental impairment which has a substantial and long term adverse effect on their ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities’ (DDA 1995). This would probably have eliminated any misunderstanding.

- The major concerns of the employers are, especially the smaller employers:
    - the ability of employees to do the job,
    - risk factors and Health and Safety,
    - honesty when being recruited.

- No mention was reported of making ‘reasonable adjustments’ and only one example of providing support was given. However, these aspects were not specifically mentioned in the questionnaire.

- There was a mixed reaction to the employment of disabled staff in Archaeology and to the survey itself. On the whole, the positive comments tend to outweigh the negative ones which tended to be expressed by smaller employers.

V DISCUSSION – DISABILITY AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL FIELDWORK

ARCHAEOLOGICAL FIELDWORK – TEACHING AND EMPLOYMENT

The teaching of archaeological field techniques is an important and integral part of an undergraduate degree in Archaeology. This is revealed by the detailed responses provided by the archaeology subject providers. Practical skills are being taught and assessed in training sessions during term time as a compulsory part of the courses. Attendance on a field project, usually outside term time, is also required where skills are also taught and assessed. This work on field excavations is, in the main, provided by in-house projects. However a wide range of 'outside' opportunities are also available, allowed and, in some cases, encouraged.

Experience in a wide range of field techniques is offered by most of the subject providers. The most important of these are on site activities such as excavation techniques, recording techniques, planning, instrument survey, environmental sampling and the processing of artefacts. Off site, or pre-excavation, activities such as field survey and geophysics are taught to a lesser extent, but still remain important aspects.

At the other end of the spectrum amongst the employers, the majority of staff are employed in field activities. This emphasises the importance of being trained in field skills at University level in preparation for the archaeology workplace.

THE INCIDENCE OF DISABILITY IN ARCHAEOLOGY

There are problems in trying to assess the full extent of disability amongst both students and employees. Many disabilities may go undeclared, or even undiagnosed, especially unseen disabilities. On the basis of the surveys in this report, as many as 14% of undergraduate archaeology students and between 2% and 10% of archaeologists in the workplace may have some form of disability. Amongst the students the condition with the highest incidence is dyslexia. This may be the result of a greater awareness of the condition, more screening at all levels of education and the opening up of access to Higher Education to more diverse groups in society. This probably accounts for the perceived increase in disabled students attending going into Higher Education.

In addition to disabled students, a number of disabled staff in Archaeology Departments were reported in the replies to the questionnaires. These figures may not represent an accurate picture, possibly because some disabilities may not be declared. However, the range and numbers of disability by type resemble the data collected about disabled students.

Amongst the employees, unseen disabilities have the greatest reported incidence, especially diabetes and arthritis. In the latter case this may be partly due to the nature of the job or a case of age-difference with late onset conditions. Interestingly, individuals described as having restricted mobility are represented at a relatively high proportion in both groups.

As there are difficulties in assessing the full extent of disability in archaeology, so there are difficulties with comparing the data in this report with nationally available data, as supplied by HESA. However, there are similarities in the observed trends. In the case of undergraduate students these are the proportion of individuals with specific conditions. Amongst the employees, these are the roles in which disabled staff are employed. The perception of archaeological fieldwork as activity requiring full physical ability may also be challenged by the relatively high numbers of students and employees described as having ‘restricted mobility’ who are involved in field activities.

ATTITUDES TO DISABILITY IN ARCHAEOLOGY

Amongst the archaeology subject providers there appears to be a desire to fully include disabled students in fieldwork. This is balanced by a recognition that there may be practical problems involved in achieving this in every single case, and that there may be limits to what can be done. This emphasises the necessity of dealing with disabled students on an individual case-by-case basis. The Disability Support Services, where they have experience of dealing with archaeology students, are very supportive of inclusion.

A more mixed reaction is in evidence among the employers. This ranges from positive enthusiasm to outright opposition, the latter view being expressed by a few smaller employers. The more extreme views on both sides are very much in the minority, the majority expressing a cautious sympathy. This cautiousness appears to revolve around the practicalities and, especially for commercial businesses, the possible costs involved.

RESPONSES TO DISABILITY IN ARCHAEOLOGY

Amongst the archaeology subject providers there seems to be a high level of awareness of disability and the issues surrounding it in relation to fieldwork. This is reflected in the numbers of staff undergoing disability training and the opinion in most departments that the new disability legislation would not affect their practical teaching programmes. Disability is being dealt with from the first contact with a student at the pre-enrolment stage often in collaboration with relevant Disability Support Services. At this stage, it is more likely that general issues and the foreseeing of potential problems are being dealt with. In relation to actual fieldwork, nearly all the departments in the sample place an emphasis on discussions with their students about individual needs. Health and safety and risk assessments are also seen as important, although archaeological factors such as the integrity of the deposits on a site are seen as less important. The employers' main concern was also health and safety, there was no mention of the potential damage to archaeological deposits. The Disability Support Services also stress the importance of health and safety and risk assessments. They also tend to be the ones, rather than the departments, dealing with matters of financial assistance for students. The overall picture is one of disabled archaeology students being very much treated as individual cases. The guidelines being used to advise disabled archaeology students (and staff) tend to be part of a general overall policy for fieldwork and field trips produced at Institutional level.

Very few, if any, instances are known of disabled students changing their degree course out of archaeology because of difficulties with field work. The waiving of compulsory practical teaching, and its assessment, and attendance on a field project is also an uncommon occurrence. It is more likely that the practical teaching and assessments are modified to suit the needs of individual students. One of these 'modifications' involves the substitution of fieldwork with museum work. In this case, it can be argued that the same teaching outcome may not be achieved.

Overall, the replies provided by the Archaeology Departments are confirmed by the responses from the Disability Support Services. The similarities between these two independent data sets would suggest that the general trends identified in this report are fairly accurate.

The response to disability amongst the employers was more mixed with negative, positive and sympathetic opinions being expressed. Most employers do not think that the new disability legislation will affect them to any great extent. Although some respondents expressed sympathy to the employment of disabled staff, the main concern is the extent to which employees could carry out their expected duties. Other concerns

relate to health and safety issues, and the honesty of staff, when being employed, about any conditions that they may have.

CONCLUSION

Overall, the responses to the surveys indicate an awareness of, and an interest in, the issue of disability and archaeology. This probably represents the heightened awareness, of disability issues as a result of the recent legislation. The exact numbers of disabled students and employees may be difficult to estimate, but the data collected by this survey suggests that they could well represent a sizeable minority, and that this number may be rising. This is in a discipline in which both the training in, and the practice of, field skills is of the utmost importance. The inclusion of students with special needs in archaeological fieldwork training is being addressed by the archaeology subject providers, usually on an individual basis. This is being done with the active help of the relevant Disability Support Services and using general Institutional guidelines. At present, there are no guidelines which specifically cover the teaching of archaeological field techniques to special needs students nor is there an overall understanding of the experience of disabled people doing archaeology as students or as a career.

VI IMPLICATIONS OF THE SURVEYS

PROJECT METHODOLOGY

The surveys will affect the methodology in two major ways:

- The development of case studies
- Informing Phase 2 of the project

In the first case this is possible because of the flexibility in the project design allows for the addition of something new. The second is not only possible, but also the intention of the project design with each phase feeding into and driving the next.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF CASE STUDIES

As already reported (Section I, Methodology), it was decided to extend the questionnaire survey of undergraduate students until December 2005 to maximise the number of responses. However, the project team soon became aware from the contact they had with disabled students that many were very keen to tell their own stories and, as an essential aspect of research, information on their own practical experience could be gained from this. It was therefore decided to develop individual case studies alongside the student questionnaires. These consist of telephone interviews with students who have expressed a willingness to participate in the project. The interviews are being carried out within the terms of the project's Ethical Clearance for Research granted by the University of Reading's Research and Ethics Committee. Disabled students are not contacted directly, but through their respective departments, and all interviewees are guaranteed full anonymity.

Similar case studies are also being collected through interviews with disabled professional archaeologists. Again, this was in response to the desire of subjects to tell their stories. In this case, several individuals independently contacted the project team after the publication of an article in the IFA's magazine, *The Archaeologist* (Phillips 2005).

The use of case studies will enhance the information gathered by the project in a number of ways:

- More detailed information about individual experiences can be obtained than is possible through the short responses to questionnaires.

- Information on the responses in archaeology to particular disabilities will be available, rather than the general policies of departments and employers.
- Disabled students/employees will be able to advise on the practicality and suitability of any proposed guidelines for good practice in archaeological fieldwork training.
- Disabled students/employees will become actively involved in a project that directly addresses their situation.

INFORMING PHASE 2 OF THE PROJECT

The aim of the second phase of the project is the characterisation of archaeological field activities:

> 'To develop a generic method of assessing physical and psychological abilities of disabled/non-disabled people to participate in archaeological fieldwork training.'

The surveys inform this characterisation in a number of ways:

- They clearly demonstrate the importance of archaeological fieldwork training and its integral nature in undertaking an undergraduate degree in archaeology.
- They provide a comprehensive list of the archaeological field techniques being taught by the subject providers and the relative importance of these in relation to teaching and assessment.
- They illustrate where problems have occurred and the adjustments/ modifications to teaching and assessment that have been made.
- They highlight the particular areas of concern for both the subject providers and the employers.

GOOD PRACTICE GUIDELINES

From the aspect of the wider goals of the project, the surveys will be invaluable in compiling 'Good Practice Guidelines' for disability and archaeological fieldwork training. The guidelines can draw on existing practices that have been used successfully by several subject providers in consultation with their respective Disability Support Services. This will ensure the input of the people on the ground, drawing on their practical experience in formulating any guidelines. The existing practices can be listed under a number of sub-headings (examples of these can be found in Appendix 1):

- Pre-enrolment arrangements:
  - There is a body of experience that can be drawn on for advising on good practices when dealing with students at this stage.

- Tried and tested examples of ‘reasonable adjustments’ which allow for full participation in archaeological fieldwork training:
  - A number examples of good practices have been supplied by the respondents to the questionnaires.

- Disability training:
  - The answers to the questionnaires point to the need for disability training to be provided specifically for fieldwork co-ordinators, as well as disability awareness training for students as part of their professional skills training.

- Institutional guidelines:
  - The lack of specific guidelines covering disability and archaeological fieldwork being available in most of the institutions in the sample highlights the need for a national set of ‘Good Practice Guidelines’.

- Disability in archaeology:
  - The responses to the survey clearly demonstrate a substantial number of archaeology students and archaeological employees have some form of disability. This can be used to change attitudes towards archaeology and disability.

REFERENCES

Aitchison, K & Edwards, R 2003, *Archaeology Labour Market Intelligence: Profiling the Profession 2002/03*, Reading: Institute of Field Archaeologists.

Change Construction 2005, Available at: http://www.change-construction.org.uk

CIC (Construction Industry Council) 2005, Available at: http://www.cic.org.uk

Current Archaeology 2005, *Archaeology Handbook*, Available at: http://www.archaeology.co.uk/directory/index.asp

DDA 1995, *Disability Discrimination Act*, London: HMSO.

Disability Rights Commission 2002, *Disability Briefing May 2002*, Available at: http://www.drc-gb.org/drc/informationand legislation/Page358.asp

Hall, T & Healey, M 2001, *The Experience of Learning at University by Disabled Students in Geography, Earth and Environmental Sciences and Related Disciplines*, Available at: http://www2.glos.ac.uk/gdn /icp/ student%20survey.doc

Hall, T, Harrison, M & Healey, M 2001, *The Experience of Academic Departments and Disability Support Units in Providing Learning Support for Students Undertaking Fieldwork and Related Activities: Report on Surveys*, Available at: http://www2.glos.ac.uk/gdn/disabil/ report

HESA (Higher Education Statistics Agency) 2004, *Student Definitions 2003/04*, Available at: http://www.hesa.a.uk/holisdocs/pubinfo/ sudefs0304.

IFA (Institute of Field Archaeologists) 2005, *Yearbook and Directory 2005*, Reading: Institute of Field Archaeologists.

Phillips, T 2005, 'Inclusive, Accessible, Archaeology', *The Archaeologist* 56 (Spring 2005), 9.

Rhys Jones, S (ed) 1998, *Building Equality in Construction: Good Practice Guidelines for Building Contractors and Housing Associations*, Available at: http://www.change-construction.org/ building_equality/ good_practice_guidelines.pdf

SENDA 2001, *The Special Educational Needs and Disability Act*, London: HMSO.

Weft QDA 2005, Available at: http://www.pressure.to/qda

APPENDIX I EXAMPLES TO INFORM GOOD PRACTICE GUIDELINES

PRE-ENROLMENT ARRANGEMENTS

‘Presence of disability officer at interviews and open days if necessary.’

‘We have a College Disability Officer, who makes a presentation to all of the students on their arrival, and a School Disability Officer. Students may make appointments to see either at any time. We have large print versions of all our publicity material.’

‘When invited to Open Days students are asked if they would complete a disability questionnaire and if they need any special arrangements.’

‘All student applicants are invited for interview, and the support offered can then be discussed directly. The School’s web pages provide a guide to the main student welfare and advisory service pages, where full details on the University’s support for disabled students is provided.’

‘Student Services make arrangements. They produce a Learning Agreement, if the student accepts it, we will have a specific meeting with them on an Open Day or on a separate visit to the University.’

‘All students who have declared a disability on their UCAS form are invited to have a one-to-one discussion with an appropriate member of staff from the Disability Resource Centre and with the Departmental Admissions Officer. This is normally done in association with an Open Day, but may be at another time by arrangement. Disabled students who accept an offer are followed up as appropriate: eg. provision and implementation of an Individual Learning Plan. General advice on the University’s disability support services is given to all students during Freshers’ Week.’

‘Our website contains a statement of our commitment to students with special needs, providing direct contact with our Special Needs Tutor and has a link to the University’s page on disabilities and special needs.’

‘Students are asked about special needs when invited to Open Days, giving them the opportunity to discuss them in an interview.’

REASONABLE ADJUSTMENTS

‘Discussion of students’ needs leading to a choice of project appropriate to the individual student’s needs.’

‘Fieldwork arrangements for individual disabled students is (sic) handled case-by-case, according to student choice about which fieldwork project they will participate in and the nature of their disability Working arrangements are made such that any student can take part in as much of the work of the project as possible where Health and Safety issues allow.’

‘Interviewing (attended by disabled student) buddies for fieldwork for visually impaired students, employees drawn from graduates. One visually impaired student had a buddy employed during the excavation to ensure health and safety of student.’

‘In my experience of 10 years running fieldwork the only time we had to provide particular support was for a student with one hand. This did not require modification. We discussed the matter with the student and a friend of her choosing. The friend then worked alongside the student concerned discretely dealing with any lifting tasks that were required.’

‘They are referred by me to learning support and student guidance who then work with them to achieve a reasonable path of training.’

‘A range of other techniques options were made available and the student chose archaeological illustration instead. That said, an even older participant was happy to take part. We made sure [that] once we arrived at site that her role was to involve minimal walking.’

‘Students with conditions which affect their ability to carry out strenuous activities (eg. heart conditions) have been given alternative areas of responsibility (eg. photographic coverage), rather than just a ‘lighter load.’

‘Student with problem over group work (an issue of noise and concentration) allowed to work on own – provision of own copy of

relevant TLTP programme. Substitution of flat screen computer monitor.'

'We have modified the arrangements for a student with a sight disability in relation to the handling and observation of artefacts.'

'Aspects of landscape units sometimes not demanded, or elements circumvented. Changes to teaching necessary for visually impaired.'

'Have changed assessment form to a pictorial record.'

'Some modifications to practical tasks, eg. assistance with field walking.'

'Student with perception problem given alternative assessment in Archaeological Illustration.'

'One example would be availability of a scribe for compilation of site notebooks.'

'Have allowed student choice as to nature of project.'

'A student with a temporary mobility disability has had the nature of a period of excavation for him/her [modified], so that they do not have to kneel and excavate, but have been able to concentrate upon site planning, artefact analysis, etc.'

'For a visually impaired student the instructions on section drawing etc. were enlarged, as were recording forms, graph paper and a copy of the assessment criteria.'

'Reasonable adjustments on a case by case basis, anticipation of potential cases in fieldwork planning, design of written materials, equipment orders eg. toilets, staffing, including EAAs, review of fieldwork components, assessment strategies.'

'It was agreed that support would be provided if necessary ie. with mobility/note-taking etc.'

'Issues raised was (sic) the need to provide support worker assistance.'

'Students may need to record/tape/use laptop on fieldwork and may require advance information regarding site/content of work covered etc.'

‘Transport to and from fieldwork; accommodation during fieldwork; mentoring arrangements.’

‘Accommodation, provision of personal assistant on field trip.’

‘In my experience we have always supported students and encouraged them to apply and it seems they always fully participate and gain invaluable insight from the field trips. We recommend courses should be adapted without question for students and appropriate funding should be made available if necessary.’

‘We have experience of supporting a wide range of students eg dyslexia/deafness. Support provided has been access to support workers to assist with note-taking.‘

‘Usually students with a specific learning difficulty mainly dyslexia/ dyspraxia: students may need to record/tape/use laptop on fieldwork; or may require advance information regarding site/content of work covered etc.’

‘Student requiring a PA went on the same trip as they did, as one (PA) was also an archaeologist.’

‘Student with hearing impairment – difficult to solve [wind blowing over] mike problem other than staff providing written comments/instruction, or speaking at the hotel, rather than [in] the field.’

‘Dupuytren’s Disease and Trigger Finger. Support focused on providing their department with the relevant information. The disability contact in the department worked with the student and their colleagues to arrange any specific support for these sessions.’

‘Student with cerebral palsy had a note-taker/assistance on fieldwork trips.’

‘Student in wheelchair [had] assistance providing transport on fieldtrips and accommodation whilst away.’

‘Student with a visual impairment provided with support with a personal reader, mentor support, advocacy work and help with accessing.’

‘Students with chronic medical conditions supported with accommodation and dietary issues, taxis to and from placements, portable IT support and mentoring support.’

‘Staff approached to seek advice on a number of students eg Asperger’s Syndrome, Menieres Disease, Dyslexia, Mental Health issues etc. Support worker assistance provided etc.’

‘We have a student with Asperger’s who may need closer supervision on placement because of reduced levels of responsibility.’

‘Wheelchair user – where rare samples were not in an accessible location, advice given on photographic evidence as alternative, or videos etc.’

‘Dyslexia – generally these students would be given extra time to complete their notes/recordings.’

‘Flexibility over the fieldtrip location.’

‘Students with rheumatoid arthritis – one field trip by one student completed at great physical cost, second replaced by lab work.’

‘Appropriate transport found and provided, ramps installed, disabled toilet, visual aides amended to become more tactile for partially sighted students.’

‘Student suffering from anxiety was able to submit written work instead of a presentation.’

‘Student was offered laboratory or experimental fieldwork as opposed to practical fieldwork.’

‘A dyspraxic student had severe difficulties telling left from right and had to have skeletal parts colour coded rather than referring to left/right. This helped her enormously but involved a lot of work from the Department, although they were extremely helpful.’

‘Paraplegic student:
- discussion with student, agreed on-going dialogue.
- hygiene issues identified, special toilets/washroom ordered
- student self-evaluation of skills to identify areas of strength/competence, this information used to tailor student’s contribution to the project ie. from strength rather than weakness

- selected peers trained in personal assistance
- student wished to participate in all activities wherever possible with no 'special' assessment allowance
- on-going monitoring of situation at instigation of student only
- student subject to routine supervision and role adjustment

Result – no problems encountered, student performance exemplary.'

DISABILITY TRAINING

'In-house programmes via Academic Services.'

'All staff have been briefed on SENDA by the Access Officer from the DRC, and provided with supporting written information.'

'All staff attended a half-day course on the SENDA legislation. Other staff have attended courses on Mental Health, adapting lectures for disabled students, disability awareness, disability and equal opportunities.'

'Training provided as part of the University's accreditation process for new lecturers indicating responsibilities and University support services, as well as specialist programmes offered by University Staff Development and Training Division.'

'Participation in events by our Equal Opportunities Department.'

'The Department has a Student Disability advisor [who] has attended dedicated workshops in the [University] and beyond.'

'The Department's Disability Representative goes on regular training sessions.'

'Staff training offered as part of the University Staff Development Programme.'

'Dyslexia awareness training session as part of a series of lunchtime diversity programme training.'

'We offered training on 'Disability Awareness' but I don't know if staff from Archaeology attended.'

'Some training is delivered generically and I would not always be aware of participants' backgrounds. However, nothing specifically has been delivered to the Archaeology Department.'

‘Only in the generic sense – within the Disability Office training and University disability training. Not specifically tailored for the Department as yet.’

‘Archaeology staff have an Accessibility Tutor, so a contact for disabled students in the Department who attends meetings/training on occasion.’

‘Disability Liaison Officer meetings.’

‘We are aware that Departmental Disability Co-ordinator has attended training and awareness sessions, but we are not aware of any other staff members from the Department being involved.’

INSTITUTIONAL GUIDELINES

‘Our Institutional Policy on ‘Placements, study abroad and field trips’ is currently in draft form. Our practices are being aligned with this.’

‘Covered by the University’s general guidelines concerning support for disabled students.’

‘Practicals are affected by risk assessments which subsume any disability issues.’

‘Not specifically, but is referred to in general inclusive teaching advice.’

‘More generic information regarding how the University supports students with disabilities.’

‘Practical work, yes; explicitly Archaeology, no.’

‘Included in overall guidelines.’

‘University’s Teaching Guide to SENDA.’

APPENDIX II

SUBJECT PROVIDERS' QUESTIONNAIRE

Tel. 0118 378 8293

Email:
inclusivearchaeology@reading.ac.uk

Dept. of Archaeology,
University of Reading,
PO Box 227,
Whiteknights,
Reading,
RG6 6AB.

To: Heads of Departments in Higher Education Institutions teaching Archaeology

Re: Inclusive, Accessible, Archaeology (HEFCE FDTL5)

Dear Colleague,

The passing of recent legislation relating to the education and employment of disabled people (DDA 1995, SENDA 2002) presents archaeologists with a new set of challenges. By law, we must not discriminate against any individual on the grounds of their actual, or perceived, disability in relation to their employment or education. In response to this, the Archaeology Departments at Reading and Bournemouth Universities are researching the issues surrounding disability and archaeological fieldwork.

We are being funded by HEFCE, and we also have the support of the Institute of Field Archaeologists, the Council for British Archaeology, Oxford Archaeology, the HE Academy and English Heritage.

Through questionnaire and telephone survey, assessment and practical field trials, the project aims to achieve the following objectives:

- increase the awareness of disability issues in Archaeology and improve its integration into fieldwork teaching
- maximise the opportunity for all students to participate in fieldwork
- increase all students' awareness of the transferable skills learned through archaeological fieldwork by developing a self-assessment tool kit that can be easily integrated into existing programmes of fieldwork training and/or careers management
- produce guidelines in the management of field activities for accessibility by highlighting examples of good practice (all other information will be used anonymously).

The project will also benefit Archaeology subject providers in that it will:

- help us to comply with the SENDA legislation by putting in place 'anticipatory' measures to integrate disabled students into fieldwork training
- aid in estimating fieldwork costs for disabled students and assist in making early cases to cover costs as part of their support grants
- potentially influence the discussion of the banding of archaeological degrees, by highlighting the appropriate measures and cost implications for disabled students to participate in fieldwork training.

The first part of the project is to survey existing practices in archaeological education and employment in relation to disability. I have enclosed a questionnaire, and would be most grateful if a member of your Department could complete this. If there is a specific member of staff in your Department who you would consider as a relevant contact for us, Special Needs Officer or Fieldwork Co-ordinator, we will be most happy to work through them. We are also interested in individual case studies of disabled students, as well as staff. If there are potentially such individuals in your Department, would you be willing to approach them for us? This questionnaire will be followed by one directed to disabled students, and we would be very grateful if you could distribute these to the appropriate individuals.

I have appended a few notes to assist you in completing the questionnaire. If you would prefer, we can contact you by telephone. Electronic copies of the questionnaire are also available from the email address on the header of this letter and at:
'www.hca.heacademy.ac.uk/access-archaeology/inclusive_accessible'.

I enclose an SAE.

Yours faithfully,

Professor Roberta Gilchrist

INCLUSIVE, ACCESSIBLE, ARCHAEOLOGY

The data you supply in the questionnaire will be used by the “Inclusive, Accessible, Archaeology” project team in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998. The data will be used for research purposes only as part of the project outlined above and for no other purpose. The final report and any other documents that will be produced will be written in such a way that it will not be possible to identify individual persons, institutions or other organisations as participants. We will use the fact that you return a completed questionnaire to us as evidence of your consent to use your data in the manner outlined above.

This survey has been designed to collect a certain amount of quantitative data, but we are especially interested in your personal experiences of disability in archaeological education, both positive and negative aspects.

The following identifies the scope of disabilities/impairments you may like to consider when responding to the questions. However, please feel free to identify any additional disabilities/impairments you have experience of:

Dyslexia (and similar conditions)
Unseen disabilities/impairments, eg. Allergies, Arthritis, Asthma, Ataxia, Diabetes, Epilepsy, Heart Condition, ME, Phobias, etc.
Hearing impairment
Wheelchair user/restricted mobility
Asperger’s Syndrome/Autism
Mental illness
Visual impairment

INCLUSIVE, ACCESSIBLE, ARCHAEOLOGY QUESTIONNAIRE

To: Heads of Departments and Fieldwork Co-Coordinators in English HEI Archaeology Departments

(electronic versions are available from the email address at the end and www.hca.heacademy.ac.uk/access-archaeology/inclusive_accessible)
Please continue any answers on a separate sheet if necessary.

Part 1: Archaeological fieldwork in your degree programme(s)

1.1 Please indicate the number of students registered for Archaeology undergraduate degrees in the academic year 2004/2005:

Degree	No of FT Students (all years)	No of PT Students (all years)
Single/Major		
Subsidiary		
Joint		

1.2 Please indicate the amount of time spent on practical teaching sessions of archaeological field techniques (as opposed to participation in an actual fieldwork project in vacations) in hours applicable to your degree programme(s):

Degree	Compulsory – No of Hours	Optional – No of Hours
Single/Major		
Subsidiary		
Joint		

1.3 Please indicate the amount of participation on a fieldwork project in vacation time required (in days) applicable to your degree programme(s):

Degree	Compulsory – No of Days	Optional – No of Days
Single/Major		
Subsidiary		
Joint		

1.4 Please indicate the archaeological field techniques taught to undergraduate students participating in practical teaching sessions of archaeological techniques (as opposed to participation in a fieldwork project during vacations) and whether these are assessed as part of your degree programme(s) (please tick). Please use the empty boxes to describe activities not included in the list:

Technique	Taught?	Assessed?
Excavation		
Recording Techniques		
Planning		
Instrument Survey (eg Level, EDM)		
Environmental Sampling		
Processing of Artefacts		
Field Survey		
Geophysics		

1.5 Please indicate the archaeological field techniques taught to undergraduate students participating in fieldwork projects during vacations and whether these are assessed as part of your degree programme(s) (please tick). Please use the empty boxes to describe activities not included in the list:

Technique	Taught?	Assessed?
Excavation		
Recording Techniques		
Planning		
Instrument Survey (eg Level, EDM)		
Environmental Sampling		
Processing of Artefacts		
Field Survey		
Geophysics		

1.6 Are the students undertaking an archaeology degree trained 'in-house' on fieldwork techniques through practical teaching sessions and/or fieldwork projects? (please tick):

Yes	
No	

If no, please give brief details of how they acquire their experience and how this is assessed:

1.7 Please describe briefly any other fieldwork experience included in your degree programme(s), including the approximate amount of time in days:

Part 2: Disabled students

2.1 How many of the students currently registered on your degree programme(s) for 2004/2005 are you aware of being disabled and what are their disabilities/impairments? (see covering letter for examples of disabilities/impairments):

Disability/Impairment	Number of Students

2.2 Does your Department, or another body within your Institution, make any special pre-enrolment arrangements for potential archaeology students who are disabled? For example, Open Days, interviews, in the information on courses, on your web site, etc. (please tick):

Yes	
No	

If yes, please give brief details and the body making the arrangements:

2.3 Where your Department has had experience of a disabled student(s) participating in practical teaching sessions and fieldwork projects, please indicate the support you have provided (please tick):

Discussion of students' needs (preparatory session)	
Travel arrangements	
Location and access to sites	
Health and Safety issues	
Risk Assessments	
Integrity of archaeological deposits	
Student peer support	
Supervision	
Method of instruction	
Students' contribution to group work	
Assessment	
Financial support/additional resources	
Follow-up sessions	
Others (please specify below)	

Others:

If you have any further details (examples/case studies) about your experiences in providing support for disabled students, we would very much appreciate your comments (please continue on a separate sheet if necessary):

2.4 Is your Department aware of any disabled student(s) who has decided not to take your degree programme(s), or who has changed degree programme, because of the actual or perceived difficulties of participating in practical teaching sessions or fieldwork projects? (please tick):

	Practical Sessions	Field Projects
Yes		
No		
Don't Know		

If yes to any of the above, please give brief details:

2.5 Is your Department aware of any cases where a practical teaching session, or its assessment, has been waived or modified for a disabled student? (please tick):

	Session waived	Session modified	Assessment waived	Assessment modified
Yes				
No				
Don’t Know				

If yes to any of the above, please give brief details:

2.6 Is your Department aware of any cases where a required field project, or its assessment, has been waived or modified for a disabled student? (please tick):

	Project waived	Project modified	Assessment waived	Assessment modified
Yes				
No				
Don’t Know				

If yes to any of the above, please give brief details:

Part 3: Policy and staff training

3.1 Are you fully aware of your obligations under, and the implications of, the Special Educational Needs and Disability Act (SENDA)? (please tick):

Yes	
No	

3.2 Are you aware of organisations that provide external support mechanisms eg National Disability Team, SKILL etc (please tick):

Yes	
No	

If yes, have you consulted any of these organisations and which ones?

3.3 Will this legislation change the way in which your department teaches archaeological fieldwork techniques to undergraduate students? (please tick):

Yes	
No	

If yes, please give brief details:

3.4 How many of the academic staff in your department have had disability equality training? Please indicate the approximate number, and the nature of the training:

3.5 Are the practical training sessions and field projects in your degree programme(s) affected by any Institutional written policy or guidelines relating to disabled students? (please tick):

Yes	
No	

If yes, we would be very grateful if you could send us a copy of the section(s) relating to disabled students participating in practical training sessions and field projects.

3.6 Do you or any of your staff have a disability/impairment? This includes registered disabled as well as physical or mental conditions that could affect working (please tick):

Yes	
No	

If yes, please provide numbers and details of the disability (see covering letter for list of examples):

Part 4: Other Information

4.1 Are you willing to talk to us in more detail about your Department's experiences? (please tick):

Yes	
No	

4.2 We are interested in building up a body of case studies based on the profiles of individual disabled students (and staff). These will be used on our website and in publications, but the anonymity of individual students, staff and institutions is guaranteed. If there are any students or staff in your Department who you think would be appropriate, are you willing to approach them on our behalf? (please tick):

Yes	
No	

4.3 Contact details:

Name ……

Position ……

Address ……

……

Telephone No ……

Email ……

4.4 Are there any other issues affecting the provision of support for disabled students participating in practical training sessions and archaeological field projects that your Department has experience of, or are a concern to you, your colleagues or your students? We would also be very interested in any suggestions that you can make that are based on your experiences. If so, please provide brief details (continue on a separate sheet if necessary):

Dr. Tim Phillips, Dept. of Archaeology, University of Reading, RG6 6AB.
inclusivearchaeology@reading.ac.uk 0118 378 8293

APPENDIX III

DISABILITY SUPPORT SERVICES' QUESTIONNAIRE

Tel:
0118 378 8293

Email:
inclusivearchaeology@reading.ac.uk

Dept. of Archaeology,
University of Reading,
PO Box 227,
Whiteknights,
Reading,
RG6 6AB.

To Heads of Disability Offices in Higher Education Institutions,

Re: Inclusive, Accessible, Archaeology (HEFCE FDTL5)

Dear Colleague,

The passing of recent legislation relating to the education and employment of disabled people (DDA 1995, SENDA 2002) presents archaeologists with a new set of challenges. In response to this, the Archaeology Departments at Reading and Bournemouth Universities are researching the issues surrounding disability and archaeological fieldwork. We are being funded in this by the Higher Education Funding Council of England (HEFCE), and we also have the support of the Institute of Field Archaeologists (IFA), the Council for British Archaeology (CBA), Oxford Archaeology, the Higher Education Academy and English Heritage. Our aim is to investigate how individuals with disabilities can be integrated into archaeological field training and employment. This will be of benefit to not only archaeological students and employees, but also to the employers of archaeology graduates.

The first part of the project is to establish what the existing practices in archaeological education are in relation to disability. I have enclosed a short questionnaire which we would be most grateful if you could complete. Also appended are a few notes to help you in this. If you would prefer, we can contact you by telephone, and electronic copies of the questionnaire are also available from the email address on the header of this letter and at: 'www.hca.heacademy.ac.uk/access-archaeology/inclusive_accessible'.

I enclose an SAE.

Yours faithfully,
Dr. Tim Phillips

INCLUSIVE, ACCESSIBLE, ARCHAEOLOGY

The data you supply in the questionnaire will be used by the “Inclusive, Accessible, Archaeology” project team in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998. The data will be used for research purposes only as part of the project outlined above and for no other purpose. The final report and any other documents that will be produced will be written in such a way that it will not be possible to identify individual persons, institutions or other organisations as participants. We will use the fact that you return a completed questionnaire to us as evidence of your consent to use your data in the manner outlined above.

This survey has been designed to collect a certain amount of quantitative data, but we are especially interested in your personal experiences of disability in archaeological education, both positive and negative aspects, and any case studies that you are aware of.

The following identifies the scope of disabilities/impairments you may like to consider when responding to the questions. However, please feel free to identify any other disabilities/impairments you have experience of:

Dyslexia (and similar conditions)
Unseen disabilities/impairments, eg. Allergies, Arthritis, Asthma, Ataxia, Diabetes, Epilepsy, Heart Condition, ME, Phobias, etc.
Hearing impairment
Wheelchair user/restricted mobility
Asperger’s Syndrome/Autism
Mental illness
Visual impairment

INCLUSIVE, ACCESSIBLE, ARCHAEOLOGY QUESTIONNAIRE

To: Heads of Disability Offices in English HEIs

(electronic versions are available from the email address at the end and 'www.hca.heacademy.ac.uk/access-archaeology/inclusive_accessible')

Please continue any answers on a separate sheet if necessary

Part 1: Your experience of dealing with disabled students undertaking archaeological fieldwork and practical teaching sessions as part of an Archaeology degree

1.1 Have you, or your staff, had experience of advising or dealing with disabled students at the pre-enrolment stage who were considering taking an Archaeology degree? (please tick):

Yes	
No	

If yes, please give details of any issues relating to the fieldwork part of the course that were raised:

1.2 Have you, or your staff, had experience of advising or dealing with the issue of disabled students undertaking archaeological fieldwork and practical teaching sessions as part of an Archaeology degree? (please tick):

Yes	
No	

If yes, have you advised or dealt with (please tick):

Staff	
Students	

Please give details of any issues relating to the fieldwork part of the course that were raised:

1.3 Have you, or your staff, advised on the writing of risk assessments for disabled students undertaking archaeological fieldwork or practical training sessions? (please tick):

Yes	
No	

If yes, please give brief details:

1.4 Where you, or your staff, have had experience of dealing with a disabled student(s), who was participating in practical teaching sessions or archaeological fieldwork projects, please give brief details of their disability/impairment and the support/advice you have provided for them (please continue on a separate sheet if necessary):

1.5 Where you, or your staff, have had experience of a member of staff approach you seeking advice or guidance concerning a disabled student(s), who was participating in practical teaching sessions or archaeological fieldwork projects, please give brief details of their disability/impairment and the support/advice you have provided for them (please continue on a separate sheet if necessary):

1.6 Are you, or your staff, aware of any disabled student(s) who has changed degree programmes out of Archaeology because of the actual or perceived difficulties of undertaking practical teaching sessions and archaeological fieldwork? (please tick):

Yes	
No	
Don’t Know	

If yes, please give brief details:

1.7 Are you, or your staff, aware of any cases where, following staff or student consultation with you, a practical teaching session has been (please tick):

	Waived for a disabled student?	Modified for a disabled student?
Yes		
No		
Don't Know		

If yes to either of the above, please give brief details:

1.8 Are you, or your staff, aware of any cases where, following staff or student consultation with you, a fieldwork project has been (please tick):

	Waived for a disabled student?	Modified for a disabled student?
Yes		
No		
Don't Know		

If yes to either of the above, please give brief details:

Part 2: Staff training and policy

2.1 Have you, or your staff, been involved in disability equality training for staff from Archaeology? (please tick):

Yes	
No	

If yes, please could you indicate the nature of this training:

2.2 Does your unit produce any written policy or guidelines relating to disabled students undertaking practical teaching sessions and archaeological fieldwork? (please tick):

Yes	
No	

If yes, we would be very grateful if you could send us a copy of the section(s) relating to disabled students undertaking fieldwork and practical training sessions.

Part 3: Other Information

3.1 Are you willing to talk to us in more detail about your experiences? (please tick):

Yes	
No	

3.2 Contact details:

Name ……

Position ……

Address ……

……

Telephone No ……

Email ……

3.3 Are there any other issues affecting the provision of support/advice for disabled archaeology students undertaking practical training sessions and archaeological fieldwork that you have experience of, or are a concern to you, your colleagues or your students? We would also be interested in any suggestions that you can make that are based on your experiences. If so, please provide brief details:

Dr. Tim Phillips, Dept. of Archaeology, University of Reading, RG6 6AB.
inclusivearchaeology@reading.ac.uk 0118 378 8293

APPENDIX IV

EMPLOYERS' QUESTIONNAIRE

Tel:
0118 378 8293

Email:
inclusivearchaeology@reading.ac.uk

Dept. of Archaeology,
University of Reading,
PO Box 227,
Whiteknights,
Reading,
RG6 6AB.

To: Archaeological Employers

Re: Inclusive, Accessible, Archaeology

Dear Colleague,

The passing of recent legislation relating to the employment and education of people with a disability (DDA 1995, SENDA 2002) presents archaeologists with a new set of challenges. By law, we must not discriminate against any individual on the grounds of their actual, or perceived, disability in relation to their employment or education. In response to this, the Archaeology Departments at Reading and Bournemouth Universities are researching the issues surrounding disability and archaeological fieldwork. We are being funded in this by the Higher Education Funding Council of England (HEFCE), and we also have the support of the Institute of Field Archaeologists, the Council for British Archaeology, Oxford Archaeology, the Higher Education Academy and English Heritage. Our aim is to investigate how individuals with a disability can be integrated into archaeological education and employment. This will be of benefit to not only archaeological students and employees, but also to the employers.

The first part of the project is to survey existing practices in archaeological education and employment in relation to disability. I have enclosed a short questionnaire which we would be most grateful if you would complete. Also appended are a few notes to help you in this. If you would prefer, we can contact you by telephone, and electronic copies of the questionnaire are also available from the email address on the header of this letter and at: 'www.hca.heacademy.ac.uk/access-archaeology/inclusive_accessible', and on the IFA website: 'www.archaeologists.net'. I have also enclosed an SAE.

Yours faithfully,

Dr. Tim Phillips

INCLUSIVE, ACCESSIBLE, ARCHAEOLOGY

The data you supply in the questionnaire will be used by the “Inclusive, Accessible, Archaeology” project team in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998. The data will be used for research purposes only as part of the project outlined above and for no other purpose. The final report and any other documents that will be produced will be written in such a way that it will not be possible to identify individual persons, institutions or other organisations as participants. We will use the fact that you return a completed questionnaire to us as evidence of your consent to use your data in the manner outlined above.

This survey has been designed to collect a certain amount of quantitative data, but we are especially interested in your personal experiences of disability in the archaeological workplace, both positive and negative aspects, and any case studies that you are aware of.

The following identifies the scope of disabilities/impairments you may like to consider when responding to the questions. However, please feel free to identify any additional disabilities/impairments you have experience of:

Dyslexia (and similar conditions)
Unseen disabilities/impairments, eg. Allergies, Arthritis, Asthma, Ataxia, Diabetes, Epilepsy, Heart Condition, ME, Phobias, etc.
Hearing impairment
Wheelchair user/restricted mobility
Asperger’s Syndrome/Autism
Mental illness
Visual impairment

INCLUSIVE, ACCESSIBLE, ARCHAEOLOGY QUESTIONNAIRE

To: Archaeological Employers

Name:

Address:

Telephone No. Email:

1. Please indicate your approximate number of employees in a year, including voluntary workers and trainees:

2. Please indicate the approximate number of disabled employees working for you over the last 5 years, including voluntary workers and trainees. This includes registered disabled and physical or mental disabilities that could impair working (see cover letter for list of examples):

If you have never employed disabled people, please go to Question 5.

3. If you have employed disabled workers over the last 5 years, how would you best describe their disability/impairment? (see cover letter for list of examples):

4. If you have employed disabled workers over the last 5 years, in which roles have they been involved? (please provide approximate numbers):

Disability (see cover letter for list of examples)	**Field Investigation**	**HE Advice**	**Education/ Research**	**Support Staff**

5. Will the new Disability legislation affect your recruitment and working practices? (please tick):

Yes	
No	
Don't Know	

If 'yes', please give brief details; if 'don't know', do you know how to find out?

6. Would you be willing to talk to us in more detail on the telephone? (please tick):

Yes	
No	

7. Are there any other issues in relation to the employment of disabled people in Archaeology that you have experience of, or are a concern to you and your colleagues? We are very interested in both your positive and negative experiences (please continue on a separate sheet if necessary):

Dr. Tim Phillips, Dept. of Archaeology, University of Reading, RG6 6AB.
inclusivearchaeology@reading.ac.uk 0118 378 8293