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Executive Summary

“I realise now that they are spaces with rich pasts.”
(A visitor to the project exhibition, Whitworth Park: Pleasure, Play & Politics)

The Whitworth Park Community Archaeology and History Project took place between 2011 and 2015. The project investigated the material, social and natural history of Whitworth Park through archaeological survey and excavation, archival research and oral history. At the same time it engaged present-day communities with Whitworth Park’s rich past and its contribution to their urban heritage. The results of the project contributed to a wide range of activities and outputs that promoted public understanding well beyond the original project brief. These included tours of the excavations and the park, open days, a project blog, a Live Tweet, an exhibition, a public leaflet, a park display board, three short films, a series of lectures and workshops, and a number of preliminary publications addressing popular, professional and academic audiences. The project touched the lives of numerous people in diverse ways, ranging from the intensive participation of c.50 volunteers in the excavations and post-excavation work, to workshops for various classes from 6 schools, to some 44.5k visitors to the exhibition, to approximately 3.5k blog visitors and approximately 44.5k twitter accounts. Collectively, the volunteers dedicated 252 days and 1763 hours to the project.

The project has contributed a great deal to our knowledge and understanding of Whitworth Park, providing intimate insights into the everyday lives of those who used it in the past. It equipped volunteers with new heritage-based skills as well as generic skills in team-working, communication and public engagement. Most importantly, it provided a strong sense of camaraderie in the shared excitement of discovery. School workshops facilitated connections and comparisons between childhood past and present, and gave children ranging from primary schools to 6th form colleges a taste of the significance and excitement of history and archaeology. Diverse and rewarding partnerships were created and fostered, many of which will be sustained beyond the lifetime of the project. Above all, the project has made a contribution to the work of those who care for public parks – their heritage and their future – ranging from the Friends of Whitworth Park to the Heritage Lottery Fund and other national organisations.

Note: unless otherwise stated, the photographs used in this report were taken by the project team (and are copyright of the project).
What we wanted to achieve

Overview
Our project was conceived as a way of making Whitworth Park the focal point of a two-year community history, archaeology and biodiversity programme. Working closely with a range of volunteer groups (unemployed local residents, Friends of Whitworth Park (FOWP), schoolchildren, students and park users), the project was intended to equip participants with new heritage-based skills to help them explore, reveal and interpret the ‘hidden’ history of the Park. For the wider public, the project aimed to foster greater awareness and understanding of the historic significance of Whitworth Park, the social history of the communities which use(d) it and the wildlife that inhabits it.

Whitworth Park
Whitworth Park is an 18-acre urban public park situated on the Moss Side/Rusholme border on the edge of Manchester University's campus and opposite the Manchester Royal Infirmary. It is adjacent to the Whitworth Art Gallery with which it is closely associated historically. The Park was established as part of the Whitworth Institute in 1889 and opened in 1890, based on a legacy left by the influential engineer, Joseph Whitworth. The Institute’s Gallery was one of the first English galleries created in a park and its founding mission set out to ‘secure a source of perpetual gratification to the people of Manchester & cultivate taste and knowledge of the Fine Arts of Painting, Sculpture and Architecture.’ The land was drained and laid out with features typical of a late Victorian Park, including a bandstand, large sailing lake (later to become a paddling pool), an observatory, a lakeside pavilion, flower beds water fountains, and various shelters. The park attracted high volumes of use by visitors and children, hosted frequent concerts, and was viewed as an initial success by the Institute. However, funding the operation costs proved problematic and it was handed over to Manchester City Corporation in 1904. Today the basic layout of the original pleasure park is still in evidence but many of the original features have disappeared (the lake, bandstand, observatory, shelters, the covered walkway and the elaborate flower beds). The park is now comprised mainly of mature tree lined walks, lawns, woodland and areas of bulb planting. There is an extant statue of Edward VII by John Cassidy, an important Manchester artist, that was unveiled in 1913 and a War Memorial to the 7th Manchester's. A statue of Christ Blessing the Little Children by George Tinworth dating to 1895 was removed sometime after the Second World War.

The park has a relatively intensive level of use for relaxation and sports by both the ethnically diverse residential communities of Moss Side and Rusholme, as well as large student and NHS populations from the adjacent University and Central Manchester University Hospitals. This position at the junction of the vibrant residential areas of Moss Side and Rusholme and a busy academic, medical and cultural area gives Whitworth Park a unique context untypical of most 'community parks', and makes it a particularly suitable location for a community heritage project.
Map of Whitworth Park in 2015 showing modern features (courtesy of Friends of Whitworth Park)

1922 Aerial photograph of Whitworth Park (copyright Manchester Libraries)
Proposed activities
Led by the Archaeology Department at the University of Manchester, the project partners were to work together to achieve 6 key activities:

1. Recruit a minimum of 40 local community participants by liaising with Jobcentre Plus, FOWP, local residents’ organizations, the project partners’ own community networks and Manchester City Council Cultural Regeneration Team.
2. Conduct background research in collaboration with Friends of Whitworth Park on the Park, including undertaking historical and archival research and surveys of the Park’s biodiversity. Use the results to inform further outreach events and learning workshops.
3. Conduct two seasons of community archaeology fieldwork (lasting 2 weeks each), focused upon the excavation of some of the hidden extant features of the Park. As part of this fieldwork, create opportunities for community and school participation including:
   • Intensive, week-long fieldwork placements for local community participants who have been referred by Jobcentre Plus (10 per season)
   • Shorter, one-day fieldwork placements for volunteers from FOWP (up to 10 per season)
   • A range of post-exavcation and cataloguing placements (6 per season)
   • School workshops on site involving primary, secondary and college level pupils (3 per season)
   • An annual open day with various activities for public engagement
   • Daily public tours of the site run by students and volunteers.
4. Conduct oral history interviews aimed at capturing public memories and thoughts about the Park involving past and present residents, park users and officials.
5. Develop new learning materials and deliver an accompanying schools programme.
6. Create a series of public outputs to showcase the final results of the project including:
   • A historic archive catalogue for Whitworth Park
   • A temporary exhibition in The Manchester Museum
   • Production of a project booklet
   • A project website/blog
   • Improved display information in Whitworth Park itself

Intended outcomes
Through the delivery of these activities we anticipated that the project would lead to a series of positive changes:

1. It would increase public knowledge and understanding of the history, architecture and biodiversity of Whitworth Park, and its relationship to the history of urban public spaces in Manchester and elsewhere.
2. Through participation in week-long placements, it would provide new training opportunities for up to 20 unemployed local residents, supporting them in the acquisition of new heritage-based skills and increased self-confidence.
3. Through workshops and active participation in excavation, it would help to develop practical, social and interpretive skills in both school-age children (primary, secondary and college level) and adult groups.

4. For the Friends of Whitworth Park (FOWP), it would promote wider interest in their work and encourage active participation in the management and regeneration of the Park. At the same time it was hoped that for the residents of Moss Side and Rusholme, participation in the project would enhance social inclusion and a sense of local identity, in particular fostering an enhanced sense of interest in, and ownership of, their local heritage.

5. By increasing understanding of Whitworth Park’s historic and social value it was hoped that the project would contribute to the continued development and conservation of Whitworth Park as an urban public space, including future park management planning.

6. For the Archaeology Department, and the other project partners, it was hoped that the project would create new working relationships with each other and consolidate existing ones. It would also consolidate and extend our community networks. For the Archaeology Department in particular, it would help us to investigate the material, social and natural history of urban public parks and increase our public profile in Manchester. For the Museum it would generate a significant temporary exhibition and increase its archival and educational resources relating to the local area.

7. Finally, by focusing upon the Whitworth Park area, the proposed project was intended to complement the recent £8m investment awarded by HLF towards the Whitworth Art Gallery (WAG) and adjacent Art Garden. Importantly, our project would generate interest in Whitworth Park whilst the Gallery was closed and also increase public understanding of the integral historical relationship between the Gallery and the Park.

Funding
An HLF Your Heritage Grant of 39,700 provided the main project funding. This was supplemented by additional small grants from within the University of Manchester and student training funding. The School of Arts, Histories and Cultures (http://www.alc.manchester.ac.uk/) and cities@manchester (http://www.cities.manchester.ac.uk/) played a particularly important role in this regard. Manchester Museum also played a significant funding role, directly contributing to the cost of the exhibition, along with a grant from Robert Kiln Charitable Trust. Additional external grants were obtained from the Council for British Archaeology (http://new.archaeologyuk.org/) and the Council for British Archaeology North West to supplement the HLF grant in the area of specialist artifact analysis. Manchester City Council provided funding for the cost of fencing and excavation site accommodation in 2011.

A list of grants can be found in Appendix 3.
What Happened

Project Management
The project management and delivery arrangements largely corresponded to those set out in the original application with exception of the timetable. These are discussed in more detail under staffing, partnerships, steering group, timetable and health and safety.

Staffing
The project was led by the Archaeology Department, specifically: Dr Hannah Cobb, Dr Melanie Giles and Professor Siân Jones. They worked closely with Mr Ken Shone, Chair of the Friends of Whitworth Park, who also played a leading role in the project. A part-time Project Assistant (0.3 FTE), Ruth Colton, assisted them in the day-to-day running of the project. Sessional excavation staff included a Site Manager, Dr Nick Overton, and three Trench Supervisors, Ellon Souter, Dr Katherine Fennelly and Dr Stephanie Duensing (two of whom were paid through the HLF grant and one through the School of Arts Languages and Cultures, University of Manchester). Post-excavation artefact processing was supervised by Dr Katherine Fennelly and Dr Stephanie Duensing. Karen Weston, David Barker and David Higgins were commissioned to do specialist artefact analysis (Weston and Barker paid through the HLF grant and Higgins funded by Council for British Archaeology North West). Archival staffing was comprised of Dr Ceri Houlbrook, Katie Mills and Hanna Steyne-Chamberlain (the latter two as part of a bursary funding scheme within the School of Arts, Languages and Cultures).

Some of the staff: from L to R, Hannah Cobb, Nick Overton, Ruth Colton, Ken Shone, Melanie Giles, Siân Jones

In partnership organisations a wide range of staff were involved, and details can be found in Appendix 1. However, key staff included Steve Walsh (Manchester Museum) and Jo Beggs (the Whitworth Art Gallery) who provided support with funding and development. Anna Bunney (MM) who organized joint MM/WAG public programmes and events relating to the project. Bryan Sitch (Archaeology Curator at MM) who led the curatorial team of the Whitworth Park exhibition, alongside Sam Sportun (Conservator at MM) who carried out conservation on artefacts where necessary. Tim Manley (Communications Director for MM and WAG) dealt with press releases, advertising and visitor survey. Mike Addelman (University of Manchester Press Office) was instrumental in stimulating wider press coverage. Kate Glynn (Volunteer Coordinator at MM) dealt with recruitment and coordination of volunteers. Julie Devonald was the key member of staff coordinating events involving the Abdul Iqbal Ullah Race Relations Resource Centre. Finally Nick
Merriman (Director, MM) and Maria Balshaw (Director, WAG) played key roles in orchestrating support for the project.

Many more people were involved in ‘staffing’ the project and a detailed list can be found in Appendix 1. Without these resources the project would not have been possible.

**Partnership arrangements**

Partnerships played a key role in the delivery of the project. They provided access to resources and expertise, and established community networks. Employees from partner organisations were also involved in ‘staffing’ of the project (as above), and their contributions are summarized here. A list of key staff involved in the project from each organisation can be found in Appendix 1.

1. **The Department of Archaeology, University of Manchester (DoA)**

   The University of Manchester has a medium-sized archaeology department with an internationally recognised reputation for social archaeology. The DoA’s main purpose is to carry out archaeological research and deliver a range of archaeology degree programmes to approximately 250 students across four undergraduate and two postgraduate degree programmes. Of particular relevance to this project are staff strengths in fieldwork techniques, historical and industrial archaeology, landscape archaeology and community archaeology. Public engagement and widening participation are a significant part of the DoA’s regular activities, in keeping with the University’s goals of creating social responsibility and improving knowledge transfer. The DoA has established relationships with a number of schools and colleges for widening participation. Its staff also have a growing reputation for innovative use of community engagement and co-production in their research projects, including Ardnamurchan Transitions Project (Cobb) and ACCORD: Archaeological Community Co-Production of Research Resources (Jones).

   The DoA was the lead partner in the project. It managed the project, including its finance and staffing, and liaised with other partners. Its staff provided expertise in archaeological and historical research, and its research students were an important source of sessional staffing for the excavation and post-excavation components. It also provided expertise and experience in the delivery of community archaeology. Finally the DoA played a key role in the production of outputs, as well as overseeing the archiving and wider dissemination of the project.

2. **The Friends of Whitworth Park (FOWP).**

   FOWP was constituted in January 2006 to promote the revival of the Park “as a place of quiet resort for the benefit and the use of the public, especially children, in the spirit of the founders.” Detailed information about the FOWP’s work can be found at: [https://friendsofwhitworthpark.wordpress.com/](https://friendsofwhitworthpark.wordpress.com/). Since then its committee has worked with the Council to find a constructive role for the Friends of Whitworth Park in the repair, improvement and management of the Park. But as a new round of deeper cuts threatened this successful arrangement FOWP sought to work with the renewed Whitworth Art Gallery and others to find new ways to help ensure the future of the Park. This project is part of this proliferation of partnerships.
FOWP played a key role in the current project working closely with the Department of Archaeology at the University of Manchester. The Chair of FOWP, Mr Kenneth Shone, was particularly active and influential, devoting a great deal of time, energy and expertise. Other FOWP Committee members also attended meetings and played an active role during the excavation seasons. Members of FOWP participated in excavation, post-extraction finds processing, oral history recording and archival research.

3. Manchester Museum (MM).
As a cultural asset owned by The University of Manchester, MM uses its international collection of human and natural history for enjoyment and inspiration, working with people from all backgrounds to provoke debate and reflection about the past, present and future of the earth and its inhabitants. Opened in 1888, MM’s collection comprises 4.8 million items and spans three centuries of collecting, in both the humanities and natural sciences. MM has a reputation for innovative and experimental work with a particularly strong public engagement focus. It uses its collection to encourage visitors to engage with some of the major issues of our time, particularly focused around two primary themes: ‘Promoting understanding between cultures’ & ‘Developing a sustainable world’.

MM was a key partner in the project providing support for: the HLF funding bid and other fund-raising activities; volunteer recruitment and management; production of educational materials and work with local schools; organisation and staffing of open days and other public events; developing and hosting the project exhibition. In addition to staffing and expertise MM made a substantial contribution to the direct costs of the exhibition.

4. Whitworth Art Gallery (WAG).
WAG (originally the Whitworth Institute) is located in the northeast corner of Whitworth Park, and was originally created as an integral part of the Park on the basis of Sir Joseph Whitworth’s legacy. The Gallery has been part of the University of Manchester since 1958. A major, HLF-funded refurbishment and extension has just been completed and WAG contains an internationally significant collection of 55,000 works of art.

The project reported on here was undertaken alongside the WAG refurbishment project and is part of the broader agenda to re-integrate the Park and the Gallery. WAG provided accommodation for meetings, support with fund-raising, and staff for education activities (often involving staff shared with MM, see above and Appendix 1).

5. Abdul Iqbal Ullah Race Relations Resource Centre (AIURRRC)
AIURRRC is part of the University of Manchester. It is an open access library specialising in the study of race, ethnicity and migration. During the lifetime of the project, AIURRRC was relocated to a dedicated space within the newly refurbished Central Library, Manchester.

AIURRRC played a key role in terms of liaison with local communities in Moss Side and Rusholme, especially during the early stages of the project. AIURRRC also supported School poetry workshops and contributed to the organisation and
delivery of public events, especially open days. Oral History training was provided by AIURRC.

Steering Group and project team

Membership of the Steering Group evolved through time as the project entered different phases. All project partners were represented by one or more individuals. In addition, the Local Councillors from Moss Side and Rusholme were invited to join the Steering Committee. The Committee included the following individuals:

Chair of Steering Group: Ken Shone (Chairman of the Friends of Whitworth Park)
Secretary to Steering Group: Ruth Colton (WP Project Assistant, University of Manchester)
Siân Jones (Professor of Archaeology, University of Manchester)
Melanie Giles (Senior Lecturer in Archaeology, University of Manchester)
Hannah Cobb (Lecturer in Archaeology/Research Technician, University of Manchester)
Nicholas Merriman (Director of Manchester Museum)
Jo Beggs (Head of Development and Resources, Whitworth Art Gallery)
Andrea Winn (Curator of Community Exhibitions, Manchester Museum)
Anna Bunney (Curator of Public Programmes, Manchester Museum)
Stephen Walsh (Fundraising, Manchester Museum)
Julie Devonald (Project Manager, Ahmed Iqbal Ullah Race Relations Resource Centre),
Alistair Cox (Councillor, Moss Side Ward)
Tom Cass (War Coordination Support Officer, Hulme & Moss Side South),
Ria Page (Park Warden for Moss Side and Fallowfield, Manchester City Council, 2011-12)
Ikhlas Ur-Rahman (Parks Delivery Officer 2012-13, Manchester City Council, replacing Ria Page)

In addition to the Steering Group, there were regular project meetings throughout the lifetime of the project (on average about 4 times a year, but more often during key phases, e.g. during the lead up to excavation seasons). These involved the core project team consisting of: Siân Jones, Ken Shone, Melanie Giles, Hannah Cobb and Ruth Colton. Other staff from project partners attended from time-to-time as appropriate and members of the core project team would also meet with staff from partner organisations on a one-to-one basis (to arrange school workshops, organise fund-raising, discuss project evaluation, make arrangements for volunteer recruitment).

During the exhibition design and development, a curatorial working group was established by Bryan Sitch, Curator of Archaeology, of Manchester Museum. Members of the group included: Siân Jones, Ken Shone, Melanie Giles, Hannah Cobb, Ruth Colton, Anna Bunney, Sam Sportun (Senior Conservator, Manchester Museum), Kat Box (Marketing, Manchester Museum). This group met monthly between September 2013 and April 2014.

Timetable

The most significant departure from the original project plan concerns the timetable. Whilst the original excavation programme planned to run between 2011 and 2012,
the project was granted an extension on the grounds of maternity leave for two of the three directors. The excavation was thus moved from September 2012 to July 2013 in order to accommodate this. 2012 became a ‘gap year’ for the project, but during that time momentum was maintained through blogging, biodiversity and FOWP events, and public lectures. The completion of the project’s final outcomes and its archiving and evaluation was facilitated by a further extension. In part this was to accommodate a delay in production of the display board to coincide with renewal of the existing park display boards by FOWP. There was also a need for extra time to accommodate archiving activities and full expenditure. For the latter activities there was a further two-month extension to August 30th 2015.

Health and safety
A detailed risk assessment was produced for both seasons of work. The project had three first aiders (Dr Hannah Cobb, Dr Melanie Giles and Prof Siân Jones) all with HSE recognised emergency first aid training, as well as a recognised first aid point on site in the cabins with a fully-equipped first aid kit.

All participants on the site were given a briefing regarding the history of the Park and aims of the excavation, and a detailed health and safety briefing was provided. All participants were also required to read and sign project health and safety induction documentation.

A general risk assessment was conducted by the Archaeology Technician for work undertaken in the labs in the Mansfield Cooper Building and all post-excavation work that was undertaken in the labs was covered by this.

Project delivery

Recruitment of volunteers
Volunteers participated in the archaeological excavations, post-excavation recording, archival research, open days, public tours, and object handling in Manchester Museum during the Exhibition. The Manchester Museum Volunteer Co-ordinator, Kate Glynn managed recruitment of volunteers in collaboration with Siân Jones. A recruitment leaflet was produced for both excavation seasons (see Appendix 12). This was given to local job centres in South Manchester and also distributed via noticeboards and counters in libraries and community centres. Kate Glynn worked with Job Seekers Plus co-ordination teams in local job centres, to identify skills and facilitate promotion of the volunteer placements amongst the long-term unemployed. Once volunteers had expressed an interest they were invited to attend a taster induction lecture delivered by Siân Jones. Kate Glynn then interviewed volunteers. All selected volunteers were provided with practical information in advance of the excavations (see Appendix 13). They were also asked to sign a code of conduct (see Appendix 14) and to provide emergency contact details in case of injury. Health and Safety induction was provided on the first day of attendance at the excavation.

The Project Assistant, Ruth Colton, and the Chair of FOWP, Ken Shone, recruited FOWP volunteers. A tailored recruitment leaflet was produced for FOWP participants. The same procedures outlined above were followed.
In 2011 there were 10 community placement volunteers and 10 FOWP volunteers. In 2013 there were 11 community volunteers and 13 FOWP members. There were 1763 volunteer hours devoted to the project. This amounts to 252 volunteer days. A full breakdown of hours by Volunteer category can be found in Appendix 2. Former University of Manchester Archaeology students and MA students who volunteered their time have been excluded from these hours (though a list of those involved can be found in Appendix 1).

Historical research and biodiversity surveys
Research into the history and biodiversity of Whitworth Park was an important aspect of the project. Archival research was supported by FOWP, which had already conducted extensive research on the history of the Park to support their activities. The Chair of FOWP, Ken Shone, was stimulated by the project to extend his archival research and his findings have been archived with the ADS. He worked alongside the Project Officer, Ruth Colton, who conducted extensive archival research prior to the start of the excavations (funded by the School of Arts Histories and Cultures, University of Manchester). Volunteers conducted further archival research, with training from Ruth Colton. During preparation for the exhibition in MM, the project team and curatorial staff carried out further targeted research.

Activities focusing on the wildlife and the biodiversity of Whitworth Park constituted a small element in the overall project. Again these activities were closely tied in with existing work by the FOWP and MM. There were two specific events in 2012. Whitworth Wildlife (14th April) focused on creating a new wildlife area, with seed planting, crafts and archaeology amongst other public activities. A Bio-blitz event (14th July), led by Henry McGhie of MM, gave non-specialist members of the general public the opportunity to take part in a nature survey. MM organized a further wildlife and Bio-blitz event on 5-6th July 2013. These events and wider work by MM and FOWP informed the Nature and Regeneration sections of the project exhibition in MM in 2014.

Archaeological excavations
There were two seasons of archaeological excavation in Whitworth Park in September 2011 and July 2013. Each season was 2 weeks long and was followed by a week of post-excavation finds processing (see below). The excavations focused on examining the archaeological remains of the original late Victorian and Edwardian features, including the boating lake, lakeside pavilion, bandstand, original paths and a shelter. These features had fallen into decline and were removed through demolition and backfilling (in the case of the paddling pool/lake). Geophysical survey carried out by University of Manchester staff and students in 2010, prior to the start of this project, produced evidence for surviving deposits, which informed the location of the trenches. Volunteers and University of Manchester students carried out the excavation by hand. Hannah Cobb, Melanie Giles and Siân Jones directed the excavations and postgraduate students supervised the work of volunteers and undergraduates: all from the Department of Archaeology at the University of Manchester. A JCB was used for backfilling in both seasons. In 2013 it was also used, under archaeological supervision, for re-opening trenches that had been excavated in 2011. A pneumatic drill was used to break through the concrete floor of the paddling pool to explore the boating lake deposits that lay below.
Five trenches were excavated over the two seasons of work.

*Trench 1: the boating lake and lakeside pavilion.* A trench of 5 by 20m was opened and excavated by hand in 2011 in order to expose the pavilion, lake-edge and lake-base deposits. This was backfilled by machine in 2011 and then an area 9 by 7m was partially re-opened in 2013 to examine the lake-edge and lake-bed deposits (which had excellent waterlogged preservation).

*Trench 2: the surfaced area around the bandstand.* A trench of 5 by 5m was opened and excavated by hand in 2011 in order to expose the area to the south of the bandstand. This trench was not archaeologically rich (perhaps due to regular cleaning of the park). It also contained many large tree roots making excavation difficult without potential harm to surrounding trees, so this trench was not re-opened in 2013.

*Trench 3: the bandstand.* A trench of 3 by 4m was opened and excavated by hand in 2011 in order to identify the location of the bandstand. The trench was backfilled by machine in 2011 and reopened by hand in 2013. In the process it was extended (by 3m to the west and 2.5m to the east) to fully excavate the foundation wall and deposits of the part of the bandstand.

*Trench 4: original path and artificial mound.* A trench of 5 by 6m was opened to identify the construction processes of the artificial mound in the northwest of the park and the original appearance of path walkways. The trench was backfilled by
hand in 2011 and then partially reopened in 2013, revealing pre-park garden deposits.

*Trench 5: the eastern park shelter.* A trench of 1 by 2m was opened in 2013 in order to identify the character of the archaeology remaining from the shelter in the eastern half of the park, which archival evidence associated with retired gentleman and war veterans in the 1920s.

Throughout both seasons of excavation work the Whitworth Park Community Archaeology and History Project followed the IFA’s Code of Conduct and Standards and Guidance for excavation, survey and recording. A JCB and pneumatic drill were used, as outlined above, however all stratigraphic excavation was carried out by hand according to these standards, principally by photography, scale drawing and written records using standard project pro-forma record sheets. Special finds were recorded three dimensionally with a Sokkia Set 650R Total Station. All contexts representing *in-situ* deposits from the pre-park, Victorian and Edwardian periods were sampled (min. 20%) using standard bulk sample tubs. The location of all the trenches and exposed sections were surveyed using industry-standard surveying equipment (a Sokkia Set 650R Total Station). All trenches were backfilled and reinstated on completion of the excavation, in liaison with FOWP and with assistance from Manchester City Council and the Park Wardens.

**Excavation training and experience for volunteers and students**

All participants on the site were given a briefing regarding the history of the park and aims of the excavation, and a detailed health and safety induction was provided prior to undertaking any fieldwork. All participants were also provided with practical guidance in advance of the excavation and required to sign a code of conduct prior to beginning work (see Appendices 22 and 23).

Training on-site was a continuous process, with all participants offered tutoring in stratigraphic excavation, plan and section drawing, site photography, writing context sheets and other paper records, environmental sampling, and use of the total station. Training in artefact washing and cataloguing was also provided to those participants for whom the physicality of excavation work was too challenging. This ensured both community volunteers and undergraduate archaeology students benefitted from the same skills training, tailored to their individual abilities.
Written guidance in archaeological field techniques was also provided through the use of copies of the York Archaeological Trust field handbook and the MOLAS field handbook. Additional specialist texts, including archival materials, survey results and the seminal in-field guide *First Aid for Finds*, were also made available.

Excavating the lake sediments, 2013 (courtesy of Bryan Sitch)

The end of dig photo, 2011

**Post-excavation activities for volunteers and students**

After both seasons, volunteers were offered a week in the archaeology laboratories processing finds from the excavations. The post-excavation work was supervised by Katherine Fennelly and Stephanie Duensing. Artefacts were cleaned and organised into type. All artefacts from the excavation were then assigned a catalogue number, with full details of the materials present being entered into an electronic catalogue. The artefacts were then accessioned to a temporary archive store. Volunteers and students were involved throughout this process.

Post-excavation work processing and cataloguing finds in the Department of Archaeology Lab

**School workshops**

The project worked with a variety of schools in the locality, whose students and their families make regular use of the Park: primary schools (Year 6: Medlock Primary School 2011 and 2013, Year 5: Heald Place Primary School 2011 only), secondary schools (Year 9: Manchester Academy 2011 and 2013, Year 11: Sale High School 2013) and sixth form colleges (Year 12: Xaverian College 2011, Year 12: Aquinas College 2011). Archive workshops were delivered to Manchester Academy each year, and poetry workshops to the Manchester Academy and Heald Place Primary School. A hands-on workshop to the Manchester Academy Deaf class was also undertaken in 2011. An opportunistic ‘drop in’ by Year 6 Southern Cross School (for
pupils with special educational needs) resulted in a dedicated day for their high-achieving pupils as an end-of-term reward in 2013. In total, 283 schoolchildren participated in the project. Another ‘walk-by’ visit by 15 Year 6 pupils from Claremont Primary School resulted in a site tour and handling session.

Initial liaison with these schools took the form of e-mail and telephone correspondence, visits to liaise with teachers, and preparation for site visits through Risk Assessments and consent/permission forms for photography (see Appendices 21-22). This was facilitated by a series of educational officers from Manchester Museum and the Whitworth Art Gallery: Menaka Monroe, Steven Roper, Cat Lumb, Hannah-lee Chalk and Debbie Doran. More formal preparation for the dig was requested by two schools, delivered through postcard- and artefact-inspired ‘Poetry Workshops’ organised by the Ahmed Iqbal Ullah Race Relations Resource Centre by Chris Searle with Julie Devonald and Melanie Giles (delivered to Medlock Primary School and Manchester Academy) and ‘Archive Workshops’ (Manchester Academy) delivered to a total of 150 pupils. A further class of c. 10 children with hearing impairment at Manchester Academy were given an in-class ‘Small Finds’ workshop.

Being in the park we were able to seize the opportunity to reach smaller groups with whom we had had no prior contact: in 2014, both a ‘Home Schooling’ and ‘Toddler’ group, attending the Whitworth Art Gallery for art events, were given a site tour and ‘hands-on’ finds session. In 2013, 5 work-placement students at the Manchester Museum also came and assisted with a day of school visits, facilitated by the Education Officer, Hannah-lee Chalk.

During the two seasons of fieldwork, each school visited the site with one or two full classes and two teachers with additional classroom assistants. One primary school and one secondary school opted out of excavation (Heald Place, Sale High School), but otherwise all the children participated in a mix of activities. A Health and Safety induction was followed by an introduction to the history of the Park, using archival materials. A site tour followed, showcasing that year’s discoveries and some star finds, before the children were broken down into 2 groups: alternating between excavation and finds processing. Whilst the primary schools spent just a morning or afternoon session on site, the secondary schools and sixth form colleges spent the whole day with the team. A final round-up at the end of each day allowed the pupils to show each other what they had found – or found out! – during their visit, and complete relevant evaluation forms (Appendix 23).

In addition, we prepared two ‘wet weather’/non-digging alternative activities that were utilised by two groups, delivered in the Whitworth Art Gallery. One of these
was a ‘Drama Workshop’ for primary school groups (designed by Debbie Doran of the Whitworth Art Gallery) based around the Victorian and Edwardian postcards of the park. The other was a ‘Sculpture Workshop’ (designed by Ruth Colton) aimed at secondary schools, based on analysing and interpreting the public monuments in the Park. These were used with Heald Place Primary School and Manchester Academy (respectively).

Many of the school visits featured on our Blog, and teachers from Manchester Academy also took part in the production of a short film (for cities@manchester ‘UniverCityCulture’, see Blog entry December 2011), whilst individual pupils and quotes from them have featured on the Blog, in the exhibition and in local press coverage. All participating schools were formally invited to the opening of the exhibition.

**Development of learning materials for school workshops and public engagement**

The school visits involved the development of on-site learning packs, which were also used for the in-house archival workshops. These consisted of:

1. Historic map regression activity (students compared and contrasted laminated historic maps of the pre-park and Park landscapes, learning how to ‘read’ maps, analyse site names, identify symbols and interpret the significance of historic landscape change, not just in the Park but surrounding area – road and tram networks, housing and gardens, park features etc.)

2. Victorian and Edwardian picture postcards analysis (encouraging the students to explore aspects of dress, appearance, behaviour, facilities and activities in the Park, to help develop their knowledge of Victorian-Edwardian life and the inhabitants of the city, using a master-set of laminated A4 versions of the postcards)

3. ‘Small Finds’ handling workshops (using ‘star’ finds from the survey and dig seasons, as well as some archaeological replicas, children were prompted to identify materials, interpret objects and analyse why they had been left or lost in the park)

4. Drama Workshop (using the laminated picture postcards, pupils were asked to analyse old photographs of children and their families, and ‘act out’ scenes from their imagination, freezing their tableau for a contemporary ‘photograph’)

5. Sculpture Workshop (public monuments in the park were analysed in terms of their materials, location and symbolism, encouraging the students to think
about the role of monuments in conveying values and ideals, facilitating memories, and understanding contemporary sculpture in the park)

6. Poetry Workshops (designed by Chris Searle of the Ahmed Iqbal Ullah Race Relations Resource Centre, assisted by Julie Devonald and Melanie Giles, students read poems about parks by famous poets, before creating their own work, which they completed in follow-up sessions with their teachers)

**YAC**

The project invited the Young Archaeologists’ Club (YAC) members from the Manchester Museum (organised by Clare Pye and Carolanne King) to join us for our ‘Open Days’ in each year of the project, involving a total of c.45 students. Given the special interest (and considerable expertise!) of this group, they spent the whole day with the team, conducting geophysics and landscape survey, excavation and finds processing. Once again, they had a full site tour and Health and Safety induction in the morning, and we encouraged the students (who ranged in age from 8 to 18) to also talk with visitors about their discoveries. In contrast to the school groups we also offered the opportunity for interested individuals to learn about contextual recording and drawing, at an appropriate level to their age. The sessions ended with a round-up session, once again reviewing the discoveries of the day. Reports of these visits have also featured on the project Blog.

![YAC members discovering artefacts, 2011-2013](image)

**Open Days**

Project Open Days in Whitworth Park were organised by the project team and MM during the 2011 and 2013 excavation seasons. Whilst the Open Days focused on the excavations they included a wide range of events and activities. The project team offered hourly tours of the Park and the excavation trenches, as well as facilitated object-handling tables, which encouraged visitors to handle recently excavated artefacts from the Park and park-related specimens from the Museum’s natural history collections. Members of YAC assisted with further excavations on the day (see above for details). Young children could roll up their sleeves and fine tune their archaeology skills in the MM dig boxes. There were nature and biodiversity activities to help identify the insect-, mammal- and bird-life in the Park; opportunities to examine maps, photos and images from the Park’s past; displays of poetry inspired by the Park; and face painting. Volunteers from Manchester Museum’s Youth Board organized a ‘memory tent’ to capture *vox pop* recordings of visitors’ personal stories about the park. FOWP had a dedicated stand about their work regenerating the Park.
In addition to the official Dig Open Days in the Park, the project was also integrated into Manchester Museum Big Saturday events and the Festival of Archaeology. The project Directors, students and volunteers participated in all of these events, and, in total, just over 1,000 local residents, park users and visitors engaged with the project in these ways.

**Daily site tours**

During the two excavation seasons, daily lunchtime tours were offered to members of the public. These were advertised on our Blog and at the site itself, with notices on the site hut and the fences surrounding the trenches. The tours focused on the history of Whitworth Park and the social and economic context of park building, as well as the archaeological discoveries. Laminated copies of early maps and postcards were used as props alongside archaeological finds. All volunteers and students were encouraged to lead tours accompanied by one of the excavation directors, the Project Officer, or a postgraduate student. Guidance in public speaking and engagement was provided. In addition, casual ‘drop-in’ visitors who could not return for these tours were engaged through discussions ‘over the fence’ by students, staff and volunteers.

**Oral history**

Oral history was only a minor part of the project. Feedback from the HLF following the initial project bid suggested the main focus should be the excavations and supporting archival work. Furthermore, resources were not sufficient to identify a large number of oral history interviewees and carry out the interviews. It proved
difficult to identify/locate oral history informants with long-standing association with the park, due to the mobile population in the surrounding areas of South Manchester. Nevertheless, more informal oral history accounts were provided by members of the public encountered in the park and identified through advertising in the Manchester Evening News. During Open Days, short *vox pop* audio-video recordings were made by Manchester Museum Youth Board in 2011 and in a ‘Memory Tent’ run by members of the project team in 2013. The project Blog and media coverage resulted in contact via e-mail with FOWP, from a number of other ex-residents with memories to share in a more informal manner, one as far afield as Canada.

**Outputs**

*Project Blog*
A project Blog was created at the beginning of the project: [http://whitworthparklife.wordpress.com/](http://whitworthparklife.wordpress.com/). It features posts on the project activities, the archaeological discoveries, and the experiences of volunteers, students and staff. The most intensive periods of blogging took place during the excavation seasons, but we also used the Blog to promote other project events, such as public lectures, the exhibition and so forth, as well as to maintain interest during 2012 when there was a break in excavation due to maternity leave for key staff.

*Temporary exhibition – Whitworth Park: Pleasure, Play and Politics*
In 2014, a temporary exhibition was created by MM in collaboration with the project team (see Appendix 8). The exhibition, *Whitworth Park: Pleasure, Play and Politics*, was opened on the 24th May 2014 and closed on 20th October (having been extended from original closing date of 5th October). The exhibition used archaeological and historical artefacts to engage the public in the story of the park through a series of themes. These included: ‘Introduction to the Park and the Project’; ‘People in the Park’; ‘Nature’; ‘The Park at Play’; ‘The Park at War’; ‘Memory and Commemoration’; ‘Decline and Regeneration’. The exhibition was co-curated and co-designed by Bryan Sitch (Archaeology Curator), Sarah Crossland Design (the exhibition design team); Sam Sportun (Senior Conservator), Ken Shone (Chair of FOWP) and the Directors of the excavations, Hannah Cobb, Melanie Giles and Siân Jones.

The exhibition was located in the temporary exhibition space on the third floor of the Museum. It is important to note that during the later phase of the exhibition, from the end of September to 20th October, refurbishment work was being undertaken in an adjacent area on the third floor, which meant that visitor access was restricted to the lift as the stairwell was reserved for the workforce, except in cases of emergency use. The exhibition was advertised using 3 posters, an exhibition leaflet, a dedicated page on the Manchester Museum website, and a press release, which received widespread uptake by the local media. Project partners promoted the exhibition through their community and volunteer networks, as well as via the project Blog. There was a dedicated public programme with talks and workshops. Volunteers staffed a handling table on average once a week during the exhibition and it featured in the British Archaeology Festival. An extensive school and public programme of events accompanied it.
Design drawings and further photographs of the exhibition can be viewed at: [http://www.sarahcrosslanddesign.com/whitworth-park/](http://www.sarahcrosslanddesign.com/whitworth-park/)

**Public programme events accompanying the exhibition**

To accompany the exhibition, the MM collaborated closely with colleagues from the Archaeology Subject Area and other Whitworth Park project participants to develop a varied programme of public events and activities for both adult and family audiences. Talks and demonstrations for the public from staff involved in the project enabled key themes and issues, related to the exhibition, to be discussed in greater depth. Alongside guided tours of the exhibition, this included discussion of archaeological techniques and issues (e.g. ‘Excavation, how, why and what?’; ‘Conservation on Show’); key historical topics (‘Whitworth Park at War’); and ‘Urban Naturalist’ nature exploration activities.

For children and families, a well-attended Big Saturday event (‘Parklife’) offered a packed day of discovery and activities. Inspired by the exhibition, Parklife encouraged more than 500 visitors to find out more about archaeology, acquire hands-on archaeological experience, and learn more about how and what archaeology can tell us about the past. A further popular session, ‘Archaeology and Play’, was created to enable visitors aged 7+ to discover what archaeology can tell us specifically about play in the past, and to enjoy playing with replicas of some of the toys found during the excavations of the Park. Poetry postcards from the Arts Access
project ‘Dig!’ were on display and used to inspire children to make their own collage postcards.

The timeframe for the exhibition meant that, as much of it coincided with the school holiday period (May – early October 2014), it did not lend itself particularly well to the development and marketing of bespoke schools sessions to accompany the exhibition. However, visiting school groups were actively encouraged to include the exhibition as part of their wider Museum visit.

‘Big Saturday’ on parks in the Manchester Museum

Booklet

The booklet or ‘public pamphlet’ was designed to provide a guide for visitors to the park, which connected past and present landscapes (Appendix 9). It drew on the project’s discoveries and used historic photographs and images of archaeological finds to help people visualise the park in the past. It was designed as an 8-page, A5 booklet aimed at a wide variety of audiences, which could be taken into the park (picked up from the Whitworth Art Gallery, Manchester Museum or local shops and hospitals), and kept to be used again. A centre-page map showed the park as it was in the Edwardian era, with a small schematic ‘overlay’ showing the park today and the approximate position of features that have been lost since then (linked to the relevant text box and picture postcard image). The rich number of images and the central map were designed to appeal to the very young or those with minimal English, complementing the written text which was pitched at a general level for both children and adults: retaining a good balance between depth of information and accessibility. We also designed it to be accessible at a distance (electronically) to act as a mobile guide, or downloaded as a pdf, for future visitors. Its design was in harmony with the major exhibition (also produced by Sarah Crossland Design), and copies were available in a box on the wall, to entice museum visitors to explore Whitworth Park for themselves. It is also intended to have a lifetime beyond the exhibition. It can be accessed from the WAG and MM web sites as a downloadable pdf and both institutions display hard copies for visitors to pick up. It is also on the FOWP website and the project Blog.

https://whitworthparklife.wordpress.com/2015/08/04/whitworth-park-then-and-now/
Display board
The display board was designed in keeping with a new set of panels commissioned by the Friends of Whitworth Park (created by Ken Shone), and positioned throughout the park. The other panels cover the Park’s origins, key periods of change and future ambitions, whilst the aim of our project display board is to summarize our archaeological discoveries (Appendix 10). It is situated close to the excavation trenches, and summarizes the results of both survey and excavation, particularly focusing on the lake, mound and bandstand, as well as the lost objects found during the dig. It was also designed to convey the importance of both the archival and oral memory research in adding to our understanding, and to foreground the work of volunteers and local schools as well as university staff and students, in enhancing the heritage of the park.

Archiving
All artefacts from the excavation will be accessioned to Manchester Museum. A digital data management plan was created, following guidance from the Archaeology Data Service (ADS) and the digital archive from the excavation has been lodged with the ADS (DOI: 10.5284/1032009).

Additional activities/outputs
Lectures and presentations
The core project team has taken every opportunity to promote the project to wider public and academic audiences through presentations, lectures and conference papers. These range from the Sale History Society, the Manchester Alumni Association, the Friends of Whitworth Park, and the Manchester Museum Showcase, to professional forums like the Society for Museum Archaeologists Conference and Institute of Field Archaeologists Conference, to academic forums like Nordic TAG and the European Association of Archaeologists Conference. A list can be found in Appendix 6.

Publications
There have been a number of preliminary publications focusing on the project, which address active amateur, professional and academic audiences. For instance, articles in The Archaeologist (Cobb et al. 2011) and The Museum Archaeologist (Jones et al. 2014) reach members of the Institute of Field Archaeologists and the Association of
Museum Archaeologists respectively. These promote the Whitworth Park Project as a model for doing community archaeology in public parks. Two articles in the *Journal of Victorian Culture Online* (Colton *et al.* 2013; Jones *et al.* 2013) reach academics from a range of disciplines and discuss the ways in which community/public engagement can complement one another in the study of the Victorian period. Finally an article for the Council for British Archaeology Northwest Newsletter (Giles and Jones 2010) provided an introduction to the project for CBA members in the region.

In addition to these publications a grey literature report has been produced documenting the results of the excavation (Cobb *et al.* 2015). This is archived with the ADS and accessible through the OASIS system. Specialist grey literature reports have been produced on ceramics (Barker 2014), glass (Weston 2014), clay pipes (Higgins 2014), toys (Gardener 2015), fish/shellfish (Robson 2015), and faunal remains (Overton 2015). These are also archived with the ADS and publically accessible.

A list of publications to date can be found in Appendix 7. Further academic publications based on the results of the archaeological investigations and the community aspects of the project are intended.

**Films**

A number of films were made about the project. Some were commissioned for specific purposes such as the Belle Vue film, which is intended to promote the community volunteer experiences and school involvement. Others were more informal short films produced on people’s smartphones for use in social media.

Belle Vue Film Productions:

http://whitworthparklife.wordpress.com/2014/08/04/volunteers-star-in-new-film-about-the-whitworth-park-archaeology-project/ This is the link to our Blog but the film is streamed from Vimeo and also held on the University of Manchester film site. This film also features in the Manchester Museum exhibition on the results of the project - Whitworth Park: Pleasure, Play and Politics

cities@manchester film:

http://www.cities.manchester.ac.uk/resources/seedcorn/whitworthpark-community/

Informal Youtube videos:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SAHY7Toz9CA (filmed by Steve Devine, Manchester Museum)

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5kM2nRkVj9E (filmed by Jamie Skuse, a Manchester Archaeology graduate)

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NOLw6jkSjyw (filmed by Jamie Skuse)

**Live Tweet from the Dig**

On 10th July 2013, a graduate student, Chiara Zuanni, from the Institute for Cultural Practices at the University of Manchester, facilitated a live tweet day from the dig. The resulting tweets were Storified here: https://storify.com/UoMSALC/wpdig
‘Dig! Creative Interpretations’ Arts Access project (University of Manchester)

‘Arts Access’ 2014 funding was secured by Dr Karina Croucher with Dr Melanie Giles (from the Martin Harris centre, HERC and Manchester Alumni Office, University of Manchester), for a programme of creative writing and artistic responses to the archaeology and history of Whitworth Park. A series of workshops was designed to encourage creative responses from primary and secondary school participants to the Edwardian ‘Picture Postcards’, poems about parks and objects from the dig, including a series of replica finds of clay pipes and children’s ‘five-stones’. Whilst some classes responded to these by creating their own mixed media ‘postcard’ from the park, others imagined a fictional message from an Edwardian correspondent that they wrote on a replica postcard. Others wrote their own poems onto a blank postcard. These workshops were designed and delivered by the project leads, with Ellon Souter (Archaeology Widening Participation Fellow) and Alison Burns (MA student, Archaeology), Jenna Ashton (Art History Widening Participation Fellow) and Jodie Kim (New Writing Widening Participation Fellow). Building on the relationships established through the dig, participating schools included: Sale High School, Medlock Primary School and Matthew Moss High School (a total of 90 pupils from primary to secondary level).

An exhibition of these postcards, poems and messages occurred in October 2013, as part of the Martin Harris Centre’s ‘10th Anniversary’ celebrations, using innovative footfall ‘Tree Stands’ to display the works. This exhibition was also hosted by the Manchester Museum in May 2014, as part of a ‘Big Saturday’ open event, run alongside a ‘drop in’ creative workshop which encouraged children and their families to either design a postcard or a plate, based on their feelings about parks. Finds from the dig and the museum collection were once more used to inspire these creations.

Aftermath with John Rylands University Library

As part of the WWI anniversary, Dr Melanie Giles co-curated a small part of the John Rylands University Library’s WWI anniversary exhibition entitled ‘Aftermath: creative responses to conflict’ (1st February-30th June 2014, main curator: Jacqui Fortnum). This exhibition was designed to showcase material that evidenced ‘protest, reflection, memorial, invention’. A small display of finds, postcards and images, was accompanied by a panel highlighting the role of the Park during periods of conflict, past and present. This text was also produced as part of a public leaflet, to disseminate the results of the exhibition.
'Living Well': The Manchester Histories Festival

The Whitworth Park Project had a ‘handling’ table at the Manchester Dental School as part of the ‘Living Well’ week of events attached to the Manchester Histories Festival, in February 2012. Over 40 patients and staff attended it. The Park had special relevance for this audience, who make regular use of the green space around appointments (for patients) or lunch-breaks (for staff).
Discussion: outcomes, benefits & impact

Impact on the archaeology and heritage of Whitworth Park

Knowledge and understanding of the park’s heritage

The excavations at Whitworth Park were highly successful over both seasons. Five trenches were excavated in total and a range of pre-park and Victorian/Edwardian park features were exposed.

Through exposing these features, pre-park drainage techniques were identified, and their truncation by the lake construction cut demonstrated their chronological and stratigraphic relationship to later park construction activity. Pre-park landscaping and gardens were also identified, and their chronological and stratigraphic relationships to the later park features were also established. Furthermore, artefacts and organic deposits from pre-park garden contexts have allowed us to develop a better understanding of this little-documented period in the history of the area.

In addition the archaeological work exposed a range of historical features of the park that are no longer visible on the surface. These include the foundations to the bandstand, the lake edging, paddling pool and lake base, the remains of a path around the lake/paddling pool and one running alongside the artificial mound in the northwest of the park, and the demolished remains of the ‘Old Men’s Shelter’. In each of these areas well-preserved structural remains allowed us to understand key construction processes of major pieces of park architecture such as the paths, mound and bandstand (see Cobb et al. 2015).

The extensive material culture recovered during our excavations and the rich organic deposits preserved beneath the paddling pool base enabled us to develop a detailed and nuanced account of the social use of the park, which goes beyond the formal textual record. The glass assemblage (Weston 2045) contains a range of whole and fragmented vessels dating between the late 19th and mid-20th century. The complete bottles from the lakebed give us a window into the products being consumed within the park in the later 19th and early 20th centuries, and also enable us to research the beer, soda and mineral water manufactures in Manchester at that time.

Most of the large assemblage of ceramic material dates to between the mid-19th and early 20th century, though some goes back to the 18th century (Barker 2014). Much
of the material is derived from contexts outside of the park and brought in as part of construction and demolition materials (to backfill the lake etc). Some can be securely associated with use of the Park and again gives us an indication of consumption of foodstuffs and other activities, such as children’s play activities (through glass marbles and pieces of ceramic dolls).

Another significant assemblage worthy of note is the clay pipes, which provide a window onto the daily lives of Manchester’s inhabitants over the last 400 years (Higgins 2014). The most interesting pipes are perhaps those that can be directly associated with the post-1890 use of the Park itself. These were generally cheap types of pipe that were being mass produced by a number of local firms, although the pipes themselves were often cherished by their owners, as evidenced by broken stems having been smoothed for reuse and notches on the stems from tooth wear. Some smokers even tried to mimic the more expensive meerschaums by smoking composite clays with mounted mouthpieces. Popular styles reflect significant events and social changes of the period, for example, the 17th Lancers or the influx of Irish labourers.

Finally we gained an understanding of the nature and extent of the demolition of park features since the 1950s. In Trench 1, for example, the dragging and levelling of the land is attested by the poor condition of the asphalt path that surrounded the lake and the redeposition of parts of this. In Trench 5 the near total destruction of the ‘Shelter’ was observed.
A report on the excavation has been produced, which essentially takes the form of a data structure report. This has been placed on OASIS where it can be freely accessed and linked to the digital archive. Individual reports have been produced by artefact specialists and these are archived with the digital archive. Academic publications on the results of the excavations will follow.

**New publically accessible archives relating to Whitworth Park’s heritage**

The excavations have resulted in the creation of two permanent, publically accessible archives. The digital archive for the project is archived with the Archaeology Data Service (DOI: 10.5284/1032009). The physical archive is in the care of Manchester Museum. The ADS digital archive also contains the catalogue of textual archival material relating to Whitworth Park created during the project. It also includes some material relating to the community aspects of the project. These archives are produced and curated to existing national standards and we are hopeful that they will be accessed and reused by those interested in Whitworth Park, providing a significant and sustained legacy beyond the lifetime of the project.

**Educational resources**

The excavations, and especially the artefacts, were central to the design and delivery of the school workshops as described above (pp.17-20). The impact of these workshops on pupils who participated is discussed below, but here it is important to note that the educational resources and workshop models resulting from the project will be an ongoing resource for Manchester Museum. As the Museum also holds the archive from the project it will be possible to use the artefacts in future educational and outreach work. The project team have already written a short preliminary article describing the use of archaeological material in this context (Colton et al. 2013). They intend to write a further more in-depth article now that the project is finished which will hopefully be of benefit to archaeologists, heritage professionals and museum educators engaging in similar projects.

**Booklet and display board**

The results of the excavation informed the production of the booklet and the display board. These provide more immediate summary information about the heritage of Whitworth Park for the general public. Both these outputs have a lifespan well beyond that of the project itself. They also have the advantage that they can be experienced and actively used whilst in the Park itself (although in theory the digital archive could also be accessed electronically in the Park via a smartphone or tablet device). We hope that, in addition to increasing the heritage significance of Whitworth Park, they will also inform people about the place of public parks as important aspects of urban heritage.

**The exhibition**

Finally, the archaeological research, in particular the artefacts, formed the core of the temporary exhibition at Manchester Museum. Whilst this was a far more onerous element of the project than we had envisaged, both in terms of person time and cost, we were delighted with the resulting exhibition, which was very well received, and had a clear impact on visitors, as can be seen from the analysis below (pp. 38-39). By taking a thematic approach we used the results of the excavations,
archival research and oral history to address key issues surrounding public parks, including their decline and regeneration.

**Impact on the project participants**

**Volunteer Survey**

This section discussed the results of the evaluation survey (see Appendix 15) conducted with the community placement volunteers (for a full breakdown see Appendix 16). The outcomes, benefits and impact of the project on FOWP volunteers are discussed below (pp.38-40).

The evaluation shows that the project had wide-ranging benefits and extensive impact on of community placement volunteers. Volunteers enjoyed engaging with heritage and archaeology. All the volunteers taking part in the survey stated that the project had increased their interest in archaeology and history and that they would be more likely to visit heritage site as a result. Some highlighted investigating their local history as an especially rewarding aspect.

Responses to open-ended questions also highlighted archaeology and heritage:

- “A chance to feel connected to the past, present and future”
- “Having an opportunity to see how a real dig works, what’s really involved and who’s the kind of people who volunteer”
- “Being in touch with history”
- “Discovering objects and information about my community’s past activities and day to day living”
- “Finding out about Manchester’s history”
- “A good introduction to archaeology and heritage”
- “I liked learning about archaeology, the history of the park and discovering finds”
- “Working together to find local history pieces”
- “Having the opportunity to work at a local archaeological dig is something I never even thought to be possible”

The project was felt to be meeting expectations in terms of offering an opportunity to: increase self-confidence; meet new people; gain new skills; learn more about cultural heritage; and pursue an interest in archaeology/history. Many did see it as providing support for getting back into employment, although this was not universal.

Learning something new was a recurring positive theme, but at the same time specific skills were enhanced, especially those relating to communication, teamwork and interpersonal relationships. Teamwork, camaraderie and meeting new people were repeatedly highlighted as positive aspects of the experience. Physical work and being outside were also sources of enjoyment that were remarked upon.

Teamwork stands out in terms of improvement, identified by 100% of the volunteers participating in the evaluation. Heritage-based skills and volunteering skills also scored highly with 92% of volunteers stating that they had improved. Between 80 and 90% of volunteers felt that a number of other skills improved, including: communication; skills or experience that will help me in future jobs; mixing and
socialising with others; researching and looking for more information on subjects; observation and looking at things.

In terms of future employment, learning and volunteering: 92% stated that they had increased ‘skills or experience that will help me in future jobs’; 86% said they would like to take part in further learning; and 70% stated that the project had made them want to pursue more voluntary work.

Increased confidence and self-esteem are perhaps the areas where volunteers benefitted most. In an open-ended question, 41% of the volunteers identified increased confidence as the most important thing they got out of the project. Having a new experience, meeting new people and finding out about the past also featured as the most important things for some volunteers. For one person the benefits could be summed up as “A sense of belonging, sharing interests with like-minded people.”

Throughout the questionnaire, under open response questions, volunteers highlighted the importance of having a new experience. As one put it “Any experience you didn’t have before enlarges your horizons and makes you see things slightly differently”.

Connections between past, present and future lie at the heart of the project and were nicely captured by volunteers in their feedback:

- A chance to feel connected to past, present and future
- Adventures, connections ..... a hand on the past
- Going back to childhood... being in touch with history
Volunteer Stories – longitudinal studies

Four ‘Volunteer Stories’ were produced, based on qualitative biographical interviews (Appendices 14-15). The four volunteers who participated in this came from a variety of backgrounds, and yet highlighted similar reasons for, and benefits of, volunteering. Directed to the project via local job centres, the volunteers chose to participate in order to fill periods of unemployment and to gain both experience and confidence with the aim of securing employment - “I was looking for something to get back my confidence”. While one volunteer had a history of studying archaeology and viewed the project as an opportunity to resume his work, the other volunteers were attracted to the fact that volunteering in the project did not require a background – only an interest – in archaeology. They cited a number of reasons for participating but the most common were: the opportunity to learn more about history and archaeology; the ability to develop new skills, both practical and within community outreach; and the motivation to get out of the house and meet new people.

All four volunteers believe that their experiences on the project met their hopes and expectations. Whilst there were some aspects of the project that they were less enthusiastic about – for example, finds processing, data entry, and geophysical surveying – these were greatly overshadowed by the more enjoyable activities. The digging, whilst physically strenuous, was viewed as a good form of exercise and a team-building activity, and the excavation of specific features was particularly rewarding: it was “great to see the bandstand come alive again”. The volunteers were also enthusiastic about community outreach, and cited leading site tours and working with the Friends of Whitworth Park as particularly gratifying, offering the opportunity to build confidence in social engagement and to get local people interested in the “history on the doorstep.” However, it was the chance to meet new people from a variety of backgrounds but with similar interests that the volunteers appeared to find most enjoyable.

The benefits of volunteering in this project have been widely felt by the volunteers, in both work and life. They explain how the experience increased their confidence and their self-esteem, the benefits of which have been felt in presenting conference papers, speaking on Radio 4’s Women’s Hour, and handling job interviews: one volunteer felt that they now had a “worthwhile” experience to draw upon when asked about team work, overcoming challenges, and effective communication. Others felt that it had given them the incentive to either rediscover past interests – from sketching (“I stepped into an art material shop for the first time in fifteen years”) to academic research – or to undertake new challenges, from completing courses with the Manchester Museum to climbing Mt. Snowdon: “You’ve got to go and grab these opportunities - go and do it!"

Schools, schoolchildren and YAC

The involvement of schools enabled us to bring the ‘university into the community’, engaging pupils from primary schools to sixth form colleges in our research. Surveys were conducted with teachers and schoolchildren (see Appendix 23). A full breakdown of the results can be found in Appendix 24.
As a form of ‘citizen science’ the school workshops were very successful in raising their awareness of the heritage of Whitworth Park, as well as enhancing pupils’ skills in an active learning environment. Responses to the fieldwork were overwhelmingly positive (100% teachers and 93% pupils), with a similar positive response to the Arts Access creative workshops (19% ‘strongly agreeing’ and 76% ‘agreeing’ that it had been an enjoyable day).

Word-cloud of responses to the on-site and classroom based workshops.

Whilst many pupils failed to make explicit links between the site visits and their curriculum, 70% of pupils recognised they had gained new skills during the day: these included physical skills of excavation but also “how to tell different materials apart”, “[learning] about working in a team” and even “how to get along with adults”. The pupils greatly enjoyed the active learning and responsibility involved in fieldwork: “We were given the independence to do our own work, and when we found things, we felt incredibly proud”. Teachers commented on the “friendly yet intensive educational teaching” delivered in the field. They were impressed by the kinaesthetic dimension of digging and their students’ delight in discovery – the “joy of finding”, which motivated some hard work on site. The level of engagement amongst the pupils was specifically commented on by teachers: “It was almost as if they were competing with each other to find things... a real challenge they enjoyed”. Inevitably, there were some pupils who found the physical work, the weather, or the mundane nature of washing finds, less exhilarating than others, but these formed a minority. From this exposure to the interdisciplinary nature of archaeology, some even realised that the teaching of subjects at school creates rather artificial knowledge boundaries: “[I learned to] explore the links between literacy and history” and “[I learned] that maths and literacy are mixed up classes”.

For the sixth form colleges and the Manchester Museum Young Archaeologists’ Club participants, the dig clearly provided a successful opportunity to put their knowledge into practice and encourage some to plan for a career in archaeology. More widely, the dig enhanced all the children’s understandings of the heritage on their doorstep: “it’s like, where you live, it’s your background, so it’s really interesting to find out about what happened”. Their teachers commented explicitly on the importance of this: “the children are gaining an understanding of the history of the park next to
their school... they walk through it everyday yet they have no idea of the journey the park has gone through”.

The project’s aim to raise children’s ambitions for the future of their local environment appeared to be successful, and some commented explicitly on this e.g. “How come children 100 years ago had a nicer park than we do?” One of the unexpected outcomes of the poetry and postcard workshops was to bring to light the fears and concerns that pupils had over visiting parks, particularly bullying and potential violence, drug-use and littering. Yet we were also able to identify positive reasons for visiting parks: to meet with friends, and find space for reflection and recreation (as well as an ice-cream)! Pleasingly, 76% of the students reporting that they felt more confident about using parks after participating in the project’s activities – whether digging alongside us, or engaging in the art and poetry workshops. Longer term, we hope they will become active volunteers in their local parks, and also engage in archaeology at a variety of levels - a hope also expressed by the children.

There is also evidence that the project has raised educational ambitions, and opened the children’s eyes to the many benefits of studying the past. This was commented on favourably by one of the teachers: “they are learning there are so many aspects to history... so many avenues and careers they could follow”. Another noted that the project made archaeology appear “very tantalizing for a future career”!

Archaeology – a future career?
University students
A total of 23 students undertook fieldwork training on the Whitworth Park Community Archaeology and History Project and the impact of the project can be seen in a range of different ways. Fieldwork is a compulsory element of the undergraduate degree programme. All 23 participating students went on to take the course ARGY20502 Fieldwork Practice and Interpretation during which their field experiences were assessed. As a result engaging with the project impacted their final degree outcome. For some students this impact was even more explicit. Two of the students, Mandy Stanton and Jamie Farrington, did dissertations examining different elements of the project (Mandy examined bottles and Jamie looked at community archaeology). In turn this has had an impact on their future learning and career development. Jamie is preparing to do an MA at the University of Manchester and Mandy is now employed by the Centre for Applied Archaeology at Salford where her expertise lies in finds work.

University students conducting topographic and resistivity surveys
The Whitworth Park Project has also had a wider impact on student experience. Recent studies have demonstrated that university students already gain extensive specific and transferrable skills from being involved in an archaeological excavation. From directly vocational experience such as that in excavation and survey, to broader transferrable skills such as patience, team working, time keeping, numeracy and literacy, archaeological fieldwork is already a valuable exercise which has a significant impact upon students of the subject. However working on a community project adds a further significant dimension to this experience because students work with a range of participants of various age groups from different cultural and socio-economic backgrounds, with different needs and challenges. Being able to encounter and experience difference is an enriching experience for students, but also helps them develop their various career aspirations. For instance several students who wanted to go into teaching or education more broadly, such as Marc Pollitt and Linda Jackson, gained significantly from working with school groups during the project. Linda has subsequently taken and passed a PGCE in primary education, and she is now working in a school in North Manchester. Finally, taking part in a community project integrates students with a range of communities in Manchester. Thus their personal and emotional investment in the area is significantly enhanced and the project contributes to the development of a stronger sense of social responsibility, which students will take with them through their lives.
Impact of specific outputs on the wider public

Exhibition
An exit survey was conducted during the exhibition (see Appendix 19). The Museum’s audience research established that 26% of all Museum visitors (excluding school visitors) attended the exhibition. This equates to 44,567 visits. The exhibition was well received and comments gathered during the survey period reflect a desire to see more exhibitions at the Manchester Museum about topics of local interest. It is important to note in this respect that nearly two thirds of sampled visitors came from the local area (61% saying that they live locally).

Overall, the exhibition had a positive impact on visitor perceptions of both Whitworth Park and public parks in general. It also increased awareness of the important historical, cultural and ecological role parks play in our lives. Overall, 56% of visitors surveyed stated that they felt the exhibition had increased their understanding of both the history and biodiversity of the park. A further 21% stated that it had increased their understanding of the history alone, and 1% of the biodiversity alone. This reflects the weighting of the material in the exhibition with about four fifths of the content focusing primarily on the park’s history and about one fifth on nature and biodiversity. Only 6% stated that the exhibition did not increase their understanding of either.

Comments received from visitors reflect an increased awareness of parks as “places with history” and their value as an archaeological resource. For instance:

“I didn’t think much about them before, but they are places of historical significance.”
“I realise now that they are spaces with rich pasts.”
“I understand how important parks are and how many people have used them through time.”
“They’re an archaeological resource and have been used by people for a long time.”

These comments are enlightening. There is a clear sense of discovery with visitors expressing surprise at the rich history of parks and the kinds of objects people have left in them. There is also a sense of depth of use and signs of an awareness that public parks are a form of urban heritage, and specifically that they have archaeological importance.

Other comments highlight specific visitor responses. Some enjoyed learning about the archaeological process. For others the local dimension was more important with the Park being seen as a local landmark. Memory, nostalgia and a sense of place appear to have been important for some of these visitors.

Perceptions of Whitworth Park had been changed by the exhibition. In particular, one visitor commented that it was a place that they would now “walk through and not around”. Another stated that she would not normally visit parks, but she was now more inclined to do so: “It’s not somewhere I would usually go – as a young woman, I have a fear of parks...I didn’t realise it was such a community space....”

From the sample surveyed, visitors seemed more equivocal about whether the exhibition had made them want to get involved in Whitworth Park in the future. Nevertheless, 11% said categorically that it had, while 43% said ‘maybe’. Many of
those surveyed were in attendance with families and stated that the time they believed would be involved made them hesitant about such a commitment. This points to a need for greater information and clarification about the kinds of activities and voluntary roles available, as well as the level of commitment – and more specifically time – this would entail.

A full question-by-question analysis of the survey data is provided in Appendix 20, including demographic data. It is worth noting here that children under the age of 11 made up over a quarter of the visitors (at 27%), whilst adolescents made up 17%. Perhaps surprisingly given that Manchester Museum is located in the heart of a University, and that the city has a very high student population, 19-25 year olds only made up 11%. Adults between the age of 26 and 59 made up the largest group at 35%, with 10% over 60. In terms of ethnicity, 82% described themselves as white, which is lower than the 2011 Census national average of 86% (and average for the Northwest region of 90%). Most of the visitors were resident in the UK with only 7% from overseas. Within the UK 79% of visitors were from the Northwest. The socio-economic profile of the visitors was in keeping with wider museum visiting data, which shows that museums and galleries remain relatively more popular with categories A/B than C1, C2, D and E categories, as in the case of the Whitworth Park exhibition (Morris Hargreaves McIntyre 2007, Audience Knowledge Digest).

Blog
There were 53 posts in total (at the time of writing, 09/07/15); a mixture of posts by the project team and community generated material (often still uploaded by the project team). The WordPress stats for the Blog show that we reached 3,525 people, with 12,653 views. The highest number of daily views was 212 on 10 July 2013. Interestingly this was not the date of the Live Tweet, which might have been expected to generate more traffic to the blog.

The country data extracted from the WordPress stats shows that, as would be expected, by far the highest number of views were derived from the UK (at 85%, 8165 views) with the USA trailing a long way behind in second place at 7% (690 views). Perhaps more surprisingly, Brazil generated the next highest number of views at 4%, with 383 views. This far outstrips other English-speaking countries such as Canada and Australia, as well as European countries, which also feature in the top 10. India is the only other country outside of Europe or North America to feature in the top 10%.
There were very few comments posted by WordPress authors; only 5 in total (2 of which came from one of the project leaders, Siân Jones in direct response to other comments). The 3 that came from non-project team authors are recorded here, but obviously they represent a very small fraction of the number of viewers:

“It was a fun day, I really enjoyed it and I hope to have a career in Archaeology someday in the future and I really appreciate that you let us join the dig. We are from Aquinas College rather than Xaverian College. I just thought I would point that out.”

“Hi there! Someone in my Myspace group shared this website with us so I came to take a look. I’m definitely loving the information. I’m book-marking and will be tweeting this to my followers! Wonderful blog and wonderful design”

“My mother used to live at the side of Whitworth park when she was a child in 1930s – I have a photo of my mother and her brothers paddling in the lake a Whitworth park. Do you have an email address I can sent it to?”

Overall, the Blog was a useful means of extending the reach of the project, beyond the immediate locality. Whilst most of the visits derive from the UK, it reached an international audience and WordPress stats show that the number of international visits and the range of countries are not insignificant. The stats are inevitably more impressive for the years that we excavated (2011 and 2023) and the numbers of views are greatest during excavation seasons when we were blogging more and the excitement associated with discovery was clearly a hook. The core project team were mostly new to blogging, and it was a very useful learning experience for us. In future we would aim for shorter, more frequent blogging and try to find more ways to sustain interest between excavation seasons. Participation in the form of comments and active followers was disappointing. One way to increase followers is to sign up to following other blogs and in future we would actively pursue this.
**Live Tweet and Storify**

A Live Tweet took place on 10\textsuperscript{th} July 2013, and the resulting tweets were Storified ([https://storify.com/UoMSALC/wpdig](https://storify.com/UoMSALC/wpdig)). The total number of tweets on #WPDig was 247, and of them, 78 came from UoMSALC (the School of Arts Languages and Cultures Twitter account). @UoMSALC was also mentioned 135 times. Approximately 44 people participated in the Live Tweet conversations (either by using #WPDig, or by mentioning @UoMSALC). Although this is a seemingly small number the estimated reach (number of unique Twitter accounts that received #WPDig tweets) is of course far greater, being estimated at 44,439 (for the period: 8-12 July). Exposure to tweets about the project was also impressive, with the total number of times #WPDig tweets were delivered to people's timelines being estimated at an estimated 275,212 (period: 8-12 July)

Some examples of tweets from users:

- @JoBeggs1: I'm very excited to be working on the Whitworth Park dig tomorrow #WPDig
- @Sarah_May1: @UoMSALC great! I love live tweets of conferences but have never followed a day on a dig through twitter, really excited
- @SM_T1: Check out the live blogging from the #WhitworthPark dig...makes me proud to be a UOM alumna!! [whitworthparklife.wordpress.com/the-blog/wpDig](https://whitworthparklife.wordpress.com/the-blog/wpDig)
- @simonjbains: Archaeology meets social media at #wpdig. Good to see Whitworth Parklife using Twitter to engage [bit.ly/12lt7QJ](https://bit.ly/12lt7QJ)

The Live Tweet session was Storified at: [https://storify.com/UoMSALC/wpdig](https://storify.com/UoMSALC/wpdig) There were a total of 236 views logged by Storify on 10/07/15.

Dr Kostas Arvanitis (School of Arts Languages and Cultures, University of Manchester) suggested and resourced the Live Tweet and the Storify, both of which were above and beyond the original project brief. We were delighted with how they extended the reach and exposure of the project beyond the locality. The Live Tweet encouraged active participation in the project through social media, with Twitter users asking questions and commenting on everything from the community aspects of the project to individual discoveries and the identification of objects.

**Booklet and display board**

There is no direct user evaluation of these outputs. It is important to note that the leaflet is the first and only public leaflet focusing on the landscape and history of Whitworth Park. It will be made widely available in physical form though WAG, MM and electronically on the WAG, MM, FOWP websites and project blog. The new dedicated WAG park engagement staff will also promote it, especially through their guided tours of the Park. We therefore expect it to be extensively used. We will also attempt to monitor use through stocks of physical copies and electronic downloads.

The display board is placed in a prominent position in the Park. It is one of a number of display boards, which FOWP are refreshing and renewing. It will provide visitors with a taster of the project, focusing on the excavations, and direct them to the FOWP and Project Blogs. We do not intend to monitor use, as it is in an unstaffed public space and any study of use would require considerable resourcing.
Impact on Project Partners

**FOWP**

When FOWP was first constituted in 2006 it was in response to the deteriorating condition of the Park, and the first priority was the regeneration and maintenance of physical aspects. Development funding was acquired to support this work, which highlighted the need to engage the public in the history of the Park and its future. Nick Merriman, Director of Manchester Museum, became aware of preliminary historical research by FOWP and, following discussions with Siân Jones from the Department of Archaeology, plans for an HLF application were initiated. The project therefore had its roots in FOWP itself, but collaboration with the Museum and the Department of Archaeology was critical to the acquisition of funding and the implementation of the project. The project has allowed FOWP to develop links with these and other partners, sharing knowledge, expertise, contacts and resources. The involvement of WAG as a partner was crucial in terms of the new relationship between the Gallery and the Park, summed up in the concept of ‘the Gallery in the Park’. FOWP has played an important role in this vision, and WAG is actively using the results of the project to inform their tours and activities in the park. On a slightly less positive note, some of FOWP’s activities and roles have been displaced by WAG activities, and we look forward with anticipation as to how the partnership will develop beyond the life of the HLF project.

The HLF project played a key role in the development of FOWP’s community activities, which had previously been restricted to one-day events with books stalls and children’s activities. The HLF project, especially the archaeological excavations were very successful in generating interest from park users and residents. Open Days in the Parks during the excavations were well attended, and these allowed us to promote the work of FOWP, as well as educate people in the history of the park and the importance of securing its future. With staff from the Department of Archaeology and the Manchester Museum we were able to engage in a wider range of activities for children at the open days as well as establish relationships with local schools through school workshops. These activities have not resulted in ongoing relationships with FOWP itself but we hope that the activities will have a lasting impact on children’s attitudes to Whitworth Park and other parks. The main project outputs – the exhibition, public leaflet and park display board – are also important tools for public education and raising awareness of park heritage. FOWP has contributed actively to these but also benefits from them, integrating them in its ongoing work.

The archival, biodiversity and oral history aspects of the project were less successful. It was harder to generate interest in these areas and whilst training in both archival research and oral history was offered attendance was poor. The Museum did facilitate some biodiversity survey work, and wildlife and wildflower activities were integrated project Open Days. But there could be closer collaboration with FOWP in this regard and these events have not been sustained beyond the life of the project. In part the archaeological research simply generated greater interest amongst volunteers. For many FOWP members who participated in the dig and the post-excavation work, there were pressures on their time that meant they could not commit to the archival, biodiversity and oral history activities as well. Finally the archaeological excavations were at the heart of the project and demanded greater
resources. In particular this meant that the Project Assistant’s time was often directed away from the oral and archival history. To support volunteers in these latter areas fully there perhaps needs to be greater resourcing and direct support (though this would have made the project more expensive). Having said this the project officer and the Chair of FOWP did a great deal of archival work on their own, which they shared with one another. This informed the exhibition, along with research by the curator and staff from the Department of Archaeology.

Finally, from the point of view of the experience of FOWP volunteers the project has been a great success. Those who participated in the excavations expressed high levels of satisfaction. Friends found investigating the archaeology of the park first-hand very rewarding. In addition many emphasized how the project allowed them to mix with other diverse groups. The social solidarity engendered was a very positive aspect of the experience. One FOWP member sums up the experience as follows: “Inspirational. Amazing that so many people are involved. A wonderful educational experience... everyone feels as if they are part of something important. I really like the change in dynamics... one minute there is great activity and the next, we’re doing painstaking work... And aged 70, I am surprised I can spend all day on my knees and it’s fine!”

Another important dimension of the project, especially the archaeology digs, was that they provided an environment where people could share diverse views of the park and its future. As one FOWP committee member noted “Since the digs involved different groups, they allowed the Friends to make contact with not only university and school students but also with [other] park users, park enthusiasts and those who wanted to find out how they could be more involved. I learned how diversely people regard the Park and how differently they regard the way it is being tended and developed”. The project also allowed more sustained public activities in the Park, which were important for FOWP members themselves as well as local residents and other Park users. One FOWP member commented that: “I felt encouraged to spend more time there and it was good to see people who were involved in the digs (or who were merely curious about them) coming back to the Park.”

The friendliness of everyone on the site made this ‘oldie’ feel part of the team and even that I - a complete novice - was doing something that mattered

As I lay in my bath at the end of each day I imagined the band playing on the bandstand, children being pushed round the park on a Sunday afternoon
Archaeology Department, University of Manchester

The Department of Archaeology has benefitted immensely from participating in this project, and indeed from acting as lead partner. The project has provided us with numerous opportunities for public engagement, allowing us to address the University’s Social Responsibility Agenda (http://www.manchester.ac.uk/discover/social-responsibility/). In particular the project allowed us to target 3 priority areas: engagement with communities; research with impact; producing socially responsible graduates. By working with the communities associated with Whitworth Park, and also engaging new communities in the Park and its heritage, we have been able to harness the University’s knowledge and resources to make a difference. There is a particular focus in the University’s Social Responsibility strategy on local communities and the city of Manchester. By focusing on Whitworth Park, we are recognized as making a significant contribution to this goal. Furthermore, individual project team-members have been able to develop and enhance their skills in public engagement and project management. They have also developed a new and distinctive area of research as a result of the project.

The Whitworth Park Project has also enabled us to undertake a significant body of research in collaboration with FOWP and community volunteers. Achieving some kind of synergy between engaging communities and undertaking research is a difficult balance, but the Whitworth Park project has gained increasing recognition for its success in this regard. On this basis for instance we were invited to contribute to the Journal of Victorian Culture Online (Colton et al. 2013; Jones et al. 2013), The Archaeologist (Cobb et al. 2011) and the Journal of Museum Archaeology (Jones et al. 2014). Our research has increased knowledge and understanding of the social, material and environmental history of Whitworth Park in particular, but also urban public parks in general. Having completed the HLF outputs we will also use the results of the project to write academic publications on the archaeology of public parks and on community archaeology as public engagement. Aspects of the project will also inform a PhD thesis on Victorian public parks and childhood. Using this new knowledge to produce public outputs such as the exhibition, booklet and display board means that we are fulfilling our obligation to carry out research with impact. This in turn may result in future funding applications for research on public parks.

I really enjoyed the work on this dig – the supervisors were incredibly patient with the large numbers of volunteers and schoolchildren – and my previous knowledge about the history of the Park made the findings even more interesting for me because things are never quite what you expect them to be.
Producing socially responsible graduates is another important area of impact. As part of our undergraduate degree programmes we offer our students training and experience in archaeological fieldwork. The Whitworth Park project provided them with a particularly rewarding experience working alongside communities in partnership with various external organisations. It also allowed them to gain skills in communication and public engagement, which are extremely valuable in terms of increasing their employability. Most importantly though, it allowed us to instil in our students a sense of social responsibility, which they will take with them when they graduate.

Finally, the project has allowed the Department of Archaeology to develop all sorts of partnerships that will be sustained beyond the life of the project. It has strengthened and enhanced ties with MM and WAG. It also created new working relationships with FOWP, the Ahmed Iqbal Ullah Race Relations Resource Centre and cities@manchester (with Siân Jones invited to be a member of the Steering Committee). We also enhanced our ties with the Manchester Young Archaeologists’ Club and forged links with numerous schools and colleges. In these latter partnerships, the project allowed us to promote archaeology as a discipline and hopefully recruit a new generation of archaeology students.

**Manchester Museum**

For Manchester Museum, involvement in the Whitworth Park Archaeology and History Project has brought wide-ranging benefits. In particular, through the Museum’s close involvement in the extensive public engagement activities that have been integral to this project, we have been able to create a wealth of fantastic new learning and participation opportunities for the Museum’s audiences. The highly local nature of the dig, in particular, really helped to capture the imagination and meant that archaeological research at The University of Manchester was truly brought to life for our visitors. Additional highlights included the intergenerational conversations that were stimulated by access to archaeological finds from the Park – particularly those focused on the topic of play – and the project’s Bio-blitz events, which created valuable new opportunities to raise awareness about the diversity and importance of plants and wildlife in the Park.

The opportunity to host the high profile “Whitworth Park: Pleasure, Play and Politics” temporary exhibition, and its accompanying public and community programmes, created significant potential for the Museum to engage with new audiences, particularly those in communities living in the immediate vicinity of Whitworth Park. The multi-disciplinary nature of the project, encompassing both archaeology and the natural world, complemented the Museum’s own collections very well, and actively contributed towards the twin strands of the Museum’s mission to ‘promote understanding between cultures’ and to ‘develop a sustainable world’. Through the thematic content of the exhibition and its programmes, MM was also able to contribute to 2014’s commemoration of the centenary of the outbreak of the First World War.

In terms of the exhibition itself, the content took the Museum outside of its traditional chronological period. Normally, another Manchester institution such as the Museum of Science and Industry (MOSI) would collect material of this date. In the Museum’s archaeological collection, visitors are usually far more likely to
encounter ancient Greek and Roman artefacts than Victorian or Edwardian material. However, whilst the artefacts discovered during the excavations of Whitworth Park were of relatively recent date, the project amply demonstrated how archaeology as a discipline is just as useful in interpreting what had happened on the late-19th-century park site, as it is in understanding a prehistoric site. The deposition of archaeological material from the project with Manchester Museum - and its ultimate incorporation into the Museum’s collection - will form a fitting legacy of the project; one which provides a valuable new resource for future Museum public engagement activities in relation to local archaeology.

The project enabled the Museum to strengthen new and existing partnerships. For engagement and curatorial staff at the Museum, the project offered important opportunities to work closely with academics from the University of Manchester’s Archaeology Department. In addition to the new territory that this has covered for visitors to the exhibition, it has certainly extended the knowledge and range of experience of Museum staff. That the project contributed to the diversity of the Museum’s programme of temporary exhibitions, and generated valuable evidence of research impact and public engagement for the academics involved, is deeply gratifying.

Whitworth Art Gallery
The Whitworth has recently undertaken a £15m capital development, creating an extension on the back of the building designed to open the gallery up to its Park. Improvements to the infrastructure of the Park over the past few years have made it an ideal ‘add-on’ for gallery visitors, returning to the late Victorian/Edwardian principals of the two being visited together.

The archaeology project played an important role in increasing the amount of activity in the Park, raising interest and attracting new volunteers. As part of the capital project the gallery has created new landscaped outdoor areas designed by landscape designer Sarah Price. Forty Art Garden volunteers have been recruited to work with Sarah Price to create the garden and help to maintain it in the future. They will also work with Friends of Whitworth Park on planting and maintenance projects in the wider Park.

The gallery has recently appointed two new staff members to help develop work in the Park. A Landscape and Sustainability Technician will oversee maintenance of the sculptures in the Park and planting and maintenance in the gallery grounds. A Cultural Park Keeper (the only post of this kind in the UK) will develop programmes, offer public engagement, community, health and well-being activities. Both posts are funded for two years by the Esmee Fairbairn Foundation. The Whitworth has also sited a number of new sculptures in the Park, creating a sculpture trail, which encourages people to combine a walk in the Park with a visit to the gallery. These offer a starting point for walks, tours and activities, many of which draw on the results of the Whitworth Park Community Archaeology and History Project for their content. At the opening weekend in February 2014, 140 people took part in tours of the Park with gallery staff, which reported on some of the findings of the project. These walks will be a regular feature in the gallery’s programme.
Ahmed Iqbal Ullah Race Relations Resource Centre

We were delighted to be a partner in this project and our organisation certainly benefited from participation. The project has contributed to our collections. Poetry focusing on parks created by school children during the workshops has been added to our collection. Photographs of Whitworth Park showing anti-racist demonstrations, have also been added to our collection and we hope will form part of the virtual archive display in Manchester Central Library.

Participation in the project also contributed to our public engagement and outreach activities. We reached more people because of the project, both in terms of working with school children in the poetry workshops and in participating in events in Whitworth Park.

Finally, an important outcome has been increased knowledge of our organisation both within the University and outside of it. Taking part in this project allowed us to publicise our organisation at events and make schools more aware of our work. One of the greatest benefits of taking part in this project was ensuring that other parts of the University were made more aware of our presence and potential, especially the Archaeology Department and the Museum. This has led to further opportunities of working together.
Conclusions: overall project review

Overall the project was very successful in the breadth and depth of its impact. It made Whitworth Park the focal point of a unique community project exploring the role of public parks in our urban heritage. In terms of academic knowledge and understanding it contributes to the development of an ‘archaeology of public parks’; a distinctive approach to exploring their entwined material, social and natural histories that is necessarily interdisciplinary, but which places archaeology at the heart of the enquiry. At the same time the project engaged present-day communities with Whitworth Park’s rich past and its contribution to their urban heritage. The combination of research and community engagement can be challenging, but we see both elements as not just complementary, but integral to one another. Through archival, archaeological, and oral historical research, the project successfully explored the changing role of the urban public park in terms of class, consumption, citizenship, leisure, memory and place, whilst engaging people in these issues. Community volunteers participated in the archival and archaeological research. At the same time they often brought specific forms of knowledge and understanding (oral histories, personal photographs, knowledge of both formal and informal events and practices) that made an invaluable contribution to the project. Finally, the project has also contributed to current ideas and debates in the field of community archaeology, and provided an arena for the production of various forms of memory. The project successfully pioneered an approach to community archaeology that was neither ‘top down’ nor ’bottom up’; creating a partnership-approach that balanced interests, responsibilities and roles in a more equitable yet accountable structure. We hope this will become a widespread model for future projects within the sub-discipline of community archaeology.

In terms of advancing our knowledge and understanding of the park’s rich biography, we have learnt a great deal about how late Victorian and Edwardian park features were constructed and also demolished/back-filled as a result of changing approaches to park landscape management in the twentieth century. It is fascinating to see how those involved in these acts of construction and demolishment employed waste materials from industrial, commercial and domestic contexts in the process. We gain insight into the production and circulation of goods at a time when most were being produced in Manchester or the Northwest. Perhaps most importantly of all, through the material culture left behind by those who used the park, we gain intimate insights into their lives and identities; details that that are usually absent in textual sources like Park Committee Minutes, newspaper articles and picture postcard messages.

There was some divergence from the original project design in terms of the precise focus of the archaeological investigations. The plans for fully surveying and excavating Whitworth Park were rightly ambitious, and in some areas that ambition was not fully realised due largely to constraints on time and resources. A great deal was achieved, and a large body of artefacts recovered, but in the end we decided to focus entirely on the late Victorian/Edwardian park features in terms of excavation strategy. Pre-park deposits and artefacts were investigated through trenches
focusing on park features, but we did not extend the excavations to investigate the remains of Rusholme House as originally proposed. Whilst Grove House was incorporated into the Whitworth Art Gallery, Rusholme House was demolished to make way for park landscaping. It is likely that extensive foundation deposits still exist and this is reinforced by our survey work, which reveals raised topography in the area. This is something that could be the focus of a future community archaeology excavation in the park.

*Intimate insights into past lives and identities*

![Pottery with a Manchester stamp](image1)
![A clay tobacco pipe bowl with Irish symbolism](image2)
![A medallion celebrating the coronation of Edward VII](image3)

Whilst not an original project objective, another area that would benefit from further research is Whitworth Park during and between the Wars. A programme of extended documentary research in the MoD archives would be useful to further refine our understanding of how the Park was used in both World Wars. This could be complemented by further archaeological excavation and geophysics following up on documentary findings to pinpoint the location of air raid shelters, barrage balloon tethers and other structural features. In addition, re-examining features identified by the project could be productive. For instance, further excavation of the ‘Old Men’s Shelter’ (which became a meeting place for war veterans and elderly/invalided men in the 1920s) may be fruitful in finding pertinent material culture and any remaining foundations beneath the destruction layers. Further, an unusual feature identified in the geophysical survey, comprised of a set of small, parallel linear features in the south of the park, may also represent a feature related to activity from the World Wars, such as an allotment, military training area, or temporary structure.

A large body of archival research focusing on the period between the 1880s and the 1920s was carried out by the project team, in particular the Chair of FOWP, Ken Shone, and the Project Assistant, Ruth Colton. Bryan Sitch, Hannah Cobb, Melanie Giles and Siân Jones conducted further targeted archival and textual research for the exhibition. However, volunteers were much harder to motivate in this area. The excitement of discovery and the sense of camaraderie surrounding the excavations seemed to overshadow working with textual sources. Furthermore, although our Project Assistant provided training and support, her time was already under considerable pressure dealing with other aspects of the project. We have learnt that more resources need to be devoted to developing archival/library-based research with documents if it is to be a successful community/volunteer activity. We also feel that in future, if such research were to be the main focus of a community project, then it would be useful to develop some kind of team working, so that the sense of
shared discovery and experience that volunteers value so much in excavation is carried over.

Similar issues with volunteer engagement and under-resourcing impacted on the oral history side of the project, although here we also found it difficult to recruit oral history interviewees. The complexity and mobility of the urban population means that it is hard to reach potential interviewees who may have moved to other parts of Manchester or well beyond (we did get one response from Canada to an MEN article seeking people who remember Whitworth Park in the past!). Our strategy was to shift to more informal, *vox populi* style story-telling, which we encouraged at Open Days and through other events. Indeed we even enlisted the Manchester Museum Youth Board who ran a ‘Memory Tent’ at the 2011 Open Day. Other oral history interviewees were identified during excavations. Although one or two of these informants had memories of the Park dating back to the 1950s or 60s, many had moved to the area much more recently. A few of these informal contacts eventually resulted in more in-depth interviews, but most were short narratives based on fragmented memories; more often than not stories recounted at the side of the excavations. Indeed the power of the material remains of previous park features to stimulate memory-work, alongside intimate items of clothing and material culture left by previous park users, was a striking aspect of the project. As a result, in future we would take a more flexible approach to social memory, and build this into the project design from the start. We feel this approach might also be the best way to then build a collection of more in-depth traditional oral histories in complex urban environments.

Having remarked on some of the issues surrounding volunteer participation in various aspects of the research, it is important also to highlight the overwhelming success of the participatory and community elements of the excavations and the post-excavation work. Recruitment of volunteers was a challenge, but the hard work of the Chair of FOWP (recruiting Friends for the project) and the Manchester Museum Volunteer Coordinator (recruiting community placement volunteers), who worked closely with Siân Jones and Ruth Colton, paid off. As a result, the project more than met its objectives in terms of number of volunteers and volunteer hours. Excluding University of Manchester students, there were 20 volunteers in 2011 and 24 volunteers in 2013 (figures combine FOWP members and community placements). These individuals devoted 252 days (1763 volunteer hours) to the project and played a key role in its success.

The evaluation we conducted with volunteers shows that their experience was very positive and that the project had a significant impact on their lives. It equipped
participants with new heritage-based skills to help them explore, reveal and interpret the 'hidden' history of the Park. It also supported the development of generic skills, particularly team-working and communication. This aspect was particularly important for the community placement volunteers, who were recruited through local Job Centres, and signed-up in part as a means to support their career development and employability. Interacting with people of different age groups was also a noted aspect (ranging from schoolchildren, to University students, to members of FOWP, many of whom are retired). In the end it transpired that a sense of community, creation of new friendships and associated increase in self-confidence were the most important and valued aspects of the project for our community placement volunteers. The results of the volunteer questionnaire support this, but it is the evocative volunteer stories generously shared by 4 of our volunteers that reveal the, at times profound, impact of the project on their lives.

For FOWP volunteers, the project was also a great success, with participants expressing high levels of satisfaction. Not surprisingly, given their prior personal investment in caring for Whitworth Park, members of FOWP found investigating the archaeology of Whitworth Park first-hand very rewarding. The social solidarity engendered was also a very positive aspect of the experience. Working with two different categories of volunteer did create challenges for the project team. For instance, many of the members of FOWP who participated are retired professionals with diverse interests and commitments. This meant that we had to accommodate irregular working hours on site, with associated health and safety and management issues. In contrast, the community placement volunteers, like the University students, were expected to commit to a full working day (which meant the project would be recognized as work experience for the unemployed volunteers by the Job Centres). In addition, the various participants came with different relations and attitudes to the Park that had to be negotiated as part of the project. Nevertheless this was largely a positive aspect, as summed up by one FOWP volunteer: “I learned how diversely people regard the Park and how differently they regard the way it is being tended and developed”.

The outreach work with local schools allowed us to engage the next generation in Whitworth Park’s future, by way of its past. Children and teenagers are some of the most important users of the Park, in keeping with the original vision of Whitworth Park as ‘Whitworth Children’s Park’. Furthermore, the large number of toys we recovered through the excavations, combined with the evocative Edwardian picture postcard images (courtesy of Bruce Anderson’s collection), enabled us to make connections between past and present children. It brought archaeology into their curriculum, and established new relationships with local primary and secondary schools. The archive, poetry and art workshops worked well, and provide the foundation for future workshops or teaching packs, making an additional sustainable outcome from the project. Some of the outcomes from this work were the most unsettling, yet they enabled us to better appreciate the mixed feelings that children have about public parks, and how we could encourage future use.

There were some practical issues relating to recruitment of schools, consent forms for film and photography, and evaluation response rates from children and their teachers. In part these stem from understandable pressures on the time and resources of all involved: the project team, the Manchester Museum education
team, and the Schoolteachers involved. Changes in museum and school personnel also created discontinuity and communication difficulties. Whilst written confirmation of photographic and film consent was secured eventually this was only achieved by Melanie Giles going to considerable effort. In future we would consider insisting on our own project specific consent rather than relying on Museum paperwork and that of participating schools. However, there is no doubt that this is a complex issue and creating project specific paperwork for each pupil would be onerous for schools who tend to obtain generic consent at the beginning of each year. To achieve a higher rate of response to the evaluation questionnaires we would need to place more emphasis on dedicated space at the end of the programme of activities with a given school (something that was often sacrificed due to pressures of departure time, weather conditions, tiredness of the children etc).

Some school activities worked better than others. Digging for example, was almost unanimously successful – but finds washing was perceived by a minority as boring or tedious. Yet we would strongly resist partitioning classes according to pupil preferences, as it would likely reproduce pre-existing divisions along lines, such as gender. The drama workshop was very popular, and whilst this was designed as an emergency ‘wet weather’/non-digging alternative, it might become a more central element for future primary school visits. The excavation was the main highlight of the YAC and sixth-form college visits, so these groups could have longer periods on site, incorporating a wider range of archaeological activities such as survey and recording. The sixth formers were able to draw on that experience to foster ambitions about university, and consider archaeology or history as a potential degree. We have yet to find out if it has actually created any new recruits for the discipline, as many of these pupils will be applying to institutions outside of Manchester. Some of the more ‘ad hoc’ or happenstance relations with children (the drop-in ‘home schooling’ and ‘toddler art’ group, the deaf class from Manchester Academy or the small class from Southern Cross School) produced particularly rewarding sessions, and we would seek to build this as a more strategic dimension of future projects, rather than just targeting mainstream schools and GCSE/A-level classes.

Public understanding was promoted through a variety of successful events and outputs including: open days; a blog; a Live Tweet; an exhibition; a public leaflet; a park display board; three short films, and a series of public lectures and workshops at Manchester Museum and beyond. These snowballed as the project progressed and far exceeded the original objectives. To date we have been generally pleased with levels of public engagement in regard to these activities and outputs. The exhibition was on the top floor of the Museum, and a more prominent location near the entrance would no doubt have increased chance visiting. Our blogging could have been more frequent and consistent instead of such intense bursts around the excavations. In future we would aim for more frequent shorter blogs, and we would also actively seek links with other blogs to generate more traffic. The Live Tweet was successful but conducted through the School of Arts, Languages and Cultures Twitter account. In future we would create a project-specific Twitter Account, with a link to the project blog. Regardless of these qualifications we have evidence for good engagement and impact: an estimated 44,567 exhibition visitors; 3,525 people
visited the blog (12,653 times); and an estimated 44,439 Twitter accounts received #WPDig tweets in the 4 days around the Live Tweet.

Through these activities and outputs, the project has promoted greater knowledge and understanding of the heritage of public parks, and increased aspirations for their conservation and future development. This is evidenced by feedback from volunteers, but also the wider public in the form of visitors to the temporary exhibition and contributions to the Live Tweet. Through its thematic focus on cultural and natural components of urban public parks, alongside their importance in terms of citizenship, health, leisure, play and remembrance, the museum exhibition emphasized the centrality of these urban green spaces, and the need to support their continued conservation and regeneration. In this way we hope that the project contributes to the long-term future of public parks, which remains insecure at a time of public funding cuts (see HLF 2014, State of UK public Parks, http://www.hlf.org.uk/state-uk-public-parks). We intend to build on the success of the project, to strategically engage with park initiatives in the NW/UK, and where possible to influence public policy and forms of park management. In particular, we hope to promote the importance of public parks as forms of urban heritage, but also to show how an ‘archaeology of parks’ can offer new and exciting ways to encourage public investment in their future.

Finally we come to working in partnership and benefits to partners. This project has been characterized by an incredibly productive and rewarding set of partnerships, both formal and informal, which continued to evolve throughout the project. The partners benefitted a great deal from the project. For the Archaeology Department at the University of Manchester, the project has contributed to the development of an exciting new area of expertise, as well as providing an arena for us to pursue research impact and community engagement, which directly support the University’s Social Responsibility Agenda. The individuals involved have also gained valuable experience in project management, public engagement and working with schools. It has contributed research material for a PhD focusing on parks and childhood, as well as a number of undergraduate dissertations. It has also provided a model, which cultivates socially responsible students and enhances their employability. We have new relationships with local schools and colleges, as well as a range of public institutions as a result of the project, which we hope will endure well beyond its lifetime.

The strongest partnership, which sat at the heart of the project, was between the Archaeology Department and FOWP. For the Friends, the project has contributed a great deal to their ongoing investigations into the history of the Park. It has also extended the range of activities in Whitworth Park and enhanced the public profile of FOWP in the process. The project informed the new management plan for Whitworth Park and supported the successful Green Flag nomination (the resulting award specifically noting the work being undertaken on the park’s heritage). Whilst there was some disappointment that the project did not swell the ranks of FOWP membership greatly, it has done a great deal to promote the Friend’s work and cultivate a wider commitment to the park’s future. Greater recognition of the diverse ways in which people view Whitworth Park and engage with it – along with the multiple ways of ‘caring’ for it – is another positive outcome of the project.
Three of the University’s important cultural institutions, Manchester Museum, the Whitworth Art Gallery and the Abdul Iqbal Ullah Race Relations Resource Centre were also formal partners in the project. Whilst the Museum was the lead day-to-day partner and host/facilitator for many of the public events and activities, all three organizations were involved in staffing/resourcing. The Project also benefitted from their community networks and experience, especially those of the Race Relations Resource Centre. For all these organizations, the project extended their range of public programmes and local community engagement. It also provided new materials for school workshops that will endure beyond the lifetime of the project and ultimately contributed to the collections of the Museum and the Race Relations Resource Centre. For WAG, the project held special significance, complementing the HLF-funded capital project extending and re-orientating the Gallery to create a new relationship with the Park. The new evidence produced by the project about the Park’s heritage, along with public outputs like the leaflet and display board, are already important components in the Gallery’s park-related activities and events.

The scale and scope of what has been achieved as a result of the generosity of partners cannot be over-emphasized and it is fair to say that the project has been tremendous value for money in terms of the direct funding that underpinned it. We feel it is important to acknowledge the contribution of all the formal partners in committing very significant staff time and resources to the project. This was not fully specified in the project application for a variety of reasons, partly because the *Your Heritage* application form only has limited scope for detailing such contributions in kind, partly because we under-estimated the staffing and resources involved, and finally, more positively, because the scope of the project expanded. At times the distributed and changing nature of staffing presented considerable challenges in terms of project management. Furthermore, in all these organizations staff are faced with ever greater pressures on their time, which made the project difficult to sustain at times, not least for the lead partner. Indeed, sadly for the academic staff involved, committing to similar projects in future will require careful thought, because of new forms of workload management and changing priorities, not least the increasing weight being placed on fully-costed research funding.

In the case of this project, however, the benefits and rewards outweighed the challenges and pressures. All partners have emphasized the importance of the project in developing new working relationships that will outlast the project itself. It is also striking how the project seemed to have a built in capacity to generate new and exciting opportunities, nourishing existing relationships and creating new ones, such as those with cities@manchester, the Council for British Archaeology (and CBA North West), Manchester Histories Festival, the John Rylands Library, and many more. These new connections often generated further small-scale funding, along with creative openings for research and public engagement.

We would like to end by stressing the contribution of all our volunteers, and indeed University of Manchester students; their dedication and hard work was vital to the success of the project. We would like to convey our sincere thanks to all these individuals, as well as the project partners and funding bodies.
Appendices

Appendix 1: List of project participants / staff

NB This list does not include volunteers who are recorded in Appendix 2.

Core Project Team:
Hannah Cobb, Lecturer in Archaeology and Technician, University of Manchester
Melanie Giles, Senior Lecturer in Archaeology, University of Manchester
Siân Jones, Professor of Archaeology, University of Manchester
Ken Shone, Chair of FOWP

Project Officer (0.3 FTE):
Ruth Colton (PhD student in Archaeology)

Project Partners and key members of staff:

Department of Archaeology, School of Arts Languages and Cultures, University of Manchester (Lead Partner)
• Hannah Cobb (as above)
• Melanie Giles (as above)
• Siân Jones (as above)

Friends of Whitworth Park
• Ken Shone (as above)
• Alistair Smith
• Gill Reddick
• Dorothy Ennis-Hand

Manchester Museum & The Whitworth Art Gallery (Staff are shared across the two institutions unless otherwise indicated)
• Nick Merriman, Director of MM
• Stephen Walsh, Head of Development, MM
• Jo Beggs, Head of Development, WAG
• Anna Bunney, Engagement Manager
• Bryan Sitch, Deputy Head of Collections and Curator of Archaeology, MM
• Sam Sportun, Collection Care Manager / Senior Conservator, MM
• Andrea Winn, Curator of Community Exhibitions
• Victoria Grant, Family Programme Coordinator
• Tim Manley, Head of Marketing and Communication
• Kathryn Box, Marketing Officer, MM
• John Miller, Senior Museum Technician, MM
• Cat Lumb, Secondary and Post-16 Coordinator (Humanities)
• Steven Roper, Primary School Coordinator
• Kate Glynn, Volunteer Coordinator
• Lee Ashworth, Volunteer Coordinator
• Henry McGhie, Head of Collections and Curator of Zoology, MM
• Rachel Webster, Curator of Botany, MM

Abdul Iqbal Ullah Race Relations Resource Centre
• Chris Searle, former Director, Ahmed Iqbal Ullah Race Relations Resource Centre
• Julie Devonald, Project Manager
• Sam Kalubowila, UG Recruitment & Widening Participation Coordinator (BME)
• Ruth Tait, Library Assistant

Project Steering Group:  
Chair of Steering Group: Ken Shone, Chair of FOWP  
Secretary to Steering Group: Ruth Colton, Project Assistant, University of Manchester  
Siân Jones, Professor of Archaeology, University of Manchester  
Melanie Giles, Senior Lecturer in Archaeology, University of Manchester  
Hannah Cobb, Lecturer in Archaeology and Technician, University of Manchester  
Nick Merriman, Director of MM  
Jo Beggs, Head of Development and Resources, WAG  
Andrea Winn, Curator of Community Exhibitions, MM  
Anna Bunney, Engagement Manager, MM  
Stephen Walsh, Head of Development, MM  
Julie Devonald, Project Manager, Ahmed Iqbal Ullah Race Relations Resource Centre,  
Alistair Cox, Councillor, Moss Side Ward  
Tom Cass, Ward Coordination Support Officer (Hulme & Moss Side)  
Ria Page (Park Warden for Moss Side and Fallowfield, 2011-12)  
Ikhlas Ur-Rahman (Parks Delivery Officer, replacing Ria Page 2012-13)

Excavation staffing:  
Nick Overton, Excavation Manager  
Ellon Souter, Excavation Supervisor  
Katherine Fennelly, Excavation Supervisor  
Stephanie Duensing, Excavation Supervisor  
In 2013, the above staff were also supported by voluntary Assistant Supervisors:  
Hannah MacGuire, Adele Cauldwell, Alison Burns, Sarah Paris, Holly Atkinson and Jamie Skuse (all graduates of the Department of Archaeology).

Department of Archaeology, University of Manchester, Students:  
Emily Atkinson  
Emma Bratby  
Kelly Daniels  
Jamie Farrington  
Lindsay Fricker  
Insar Haq  
Harry Harbord  
Florence Hill  
Mohsin Iqbal  
Linda Jackson  
Jagoda Jasinska  
Sam Jobson
Rosalind Kirkbride
Helen Lalor
David Leonard
Heather Musgrave
Ruqaiyah Naqshbandi
Anthony Parker
Marc Pollitt
Vinay Prajapat
Razia Shah
Mandy Stanton
James Watson

Post-exavation supervisors:
Katherine Fennelly, Department of Archaeology, University of Manchester
Stephanie Duensing, Department of Archaeology, University of Manchester

Artefact specialists:
David Barker, Ceramics
David Higgins, Clay pipes
Karen Weston, Glass
Susan Gardner, Toys
Nicholas Overton, Faunal remains
Harry Robson, Fish and shellfish

Illustrators:
Irene Garcia Rovirez
Joanna Wright

Exhibition design working group:
Bryan Sitch, as above
Sarah Crossland and team, Sarah Crossland Design
Siân Jones, as above
Ken Shone, as above
Melanie Giles, as above
Hannah Cobb, as above
Ruth Colton, as above
Anna Bunney, as above
Sam Sportun, as above
Kat Box, as above
Suzannah Haddow, Archaeology MA student, voluntary research assistance

Archiving:
Ceri Houlbrook, Department of Archaeology, University of Manchester
Katie Mills, Department of Archaeology, University of Manchester
Hanna Steyne-Chamberlain, Department of Archaeology, University of Manchester
(The latter two as part of a bursary funding scheme within the School of Arts, Languages and Cultures).
**Schools:**
Medlock Primary School
Heald Place Primary School
Manchester Academy
Matthew Moss School
Sale High School
Southern Cross School
Xaverian College
Aquinas College

**Other participants:**
Manchester Young Archaeologists’ Club
Stuart Jeffrey, Glasgow School of Art
Kostas Arvanitis, Academic Web Director, School of Arts, Languages and Cultures
Mike Addelman, University Press Officer
## Appendix 2: List of volunteers and hours

### 2011 Season: Week 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
<th>Total Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Oliver</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Frodsham</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Whitworth</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katy Wales</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Taylor</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>105</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alistair Smith</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Moore</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Shone</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Shone</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gill Reddick</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Walters</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Bowles</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terri Lucas</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Pound</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Ennis-Hand</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.71</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 1 Excavation Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>215</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.71</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2011 Season: Week 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
<th>Total Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auman Quyoum</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela Cooke</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laila Malik</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Curran</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Smith</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Oliver</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Frodsham</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Taylor</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>163</strong></td>
<td><strong>23.29</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alistair Smith</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Moore</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Shone</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Shone</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gill Reddick</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Walters</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Bowles</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terri Lucas</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Ennis-Hand</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Pound</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>176</strong></td>
<td><strong>25.14</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 2 Excavation Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>339</strong></td>
<td><strong>48.43</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2011 Season: Post-Excavation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
<th>Total Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
<th>Total Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auman Quyoum</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela Cooke</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laila Malik</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Curran</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Smith</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maevi Holt</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Oliver</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Frodsham</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Whitworth</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katy Wales</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Taylor</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alistair Smith</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Anderson</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Moore</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Shone</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Shone</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gill Reddick</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Walters</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Bowles</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terri Lucas</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Pound</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloe Clifford</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Ennis-Hand</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-Ex Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>140</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2011 Season: Open Day**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total hours</th>
<th>Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auman Quyoum</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maevi Holt</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Oliver</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Frodsham</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Whitworth</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katy Wales</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Taylor</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alistair Smith</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Shone</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Shone</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Ennis-Hand</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Day Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2011 Grand Totals**

- Hours: 742.00
- Days: 106.00

**2013 Season: Week 1**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
<th>Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paul Cusik</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Dawson</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellie Rocca</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Collins</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ged Callaghan</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace McKenna</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>168</strong></td>
<td><strong>24.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Shone</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Shone</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Moore</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Walters</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Bowles</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terri Lucas</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Pound</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Essex</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alistair Smith</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gill Reddick</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Ennis-Hand</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>106</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.14</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Week 1 Excavation Totals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
<th>Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Motta</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Ellingham</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael O’Connor</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghazala Ehsan</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Dawson</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellie Rocca</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Collins</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ged Callaghan</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>232</strong></td>
<td><strong>33.14</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Shone</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Shone</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Essex</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Pound</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Bowles</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Moore</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alistair Smith</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gill Reddick</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonia Chapman</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Ennis-Hand</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>163</strong></td>
<td><strong>23.29</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Week 2 Excavation Totals**

2013 Season: Post-Excavation
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
<th>Total Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Motta</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Ellingham</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ged Callaghan</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellie Rocca</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>98</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alistair Smith</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Ennis-Hand</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Moore</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Shone</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Shone</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gill Reddick</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloe Clifford</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>126</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-Ex Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>224</strong></td>
<td><strong>32.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2013 Season: Open Day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
<th>Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holly Atkinson</td>
<td>Student Volunteers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Burns</td>
<td>Student Volunteers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alistair Smith</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Shone</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gill Reddick</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Pound</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloe Clifford Astbury</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Shone</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Ennis-Hand</td>
<td>FOWP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.86</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2013 Season: Wet Sieving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
<th>Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Ellingham</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ged Callaghan</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Motta</td>
<td>Unemployed placement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaina Kaiser</td>
<td>Student Volunteer</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie Skuse</td>
<td>Student Volunteer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.43</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2013 Grand Totals**

- Hours 1021
- Days 145.86

Excluding University of Manchester students, there were 1763 volunteer hours devoted to the project. This amounts to 252 volunteer days.
Appendix 3: Project funding

Main funding body: Heritage Lottery Fund

Other funding:
Council for British Archaeology Challenge Grant
Council for British Archaeology North West, Small Research Grant
cities@manchester, University of Manchester, seed-corn funding
School of Arts Languages and Cultures, University of Manchester, seed-corn funding
Manchester City Council, cost of fencing and excavation site accommodation

Exhibition funding:
Manchester Museum
Robert Kiln Charitable Trust
The Camelia Trust
cities@manchester, University of Manchester
## Appendix 4: List of project events and numbers of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>No of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Throughout the project</td>
<td>Blogging: <a href="https://whitworthparklife.wordpress.com/">https://whitworthparklife.wordpress.com/</a></td>
<td>3,525 people 12,653 views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/09/11-16/09/11</td>
<td>Season 1 dig</td>
<td>Staff: 8 Students: 11 Friends of Whitworth Park (FOWP): 10 placements: 10 Park visitors who engaged with the dig: average 20-30 per day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 09/09/11 | School visit – Xaverian College  
School visit – Aquinas College | 15  
15 |
<p>| 10/09/11 | Open Day | 164 |
| 12/09/11 | School visit – Medlock Primary and Heald Place Primary | 60 |
| 13/09/11 | School visit – Manchester Academy (and pre-visit archive workshop) | 30 |
| 19/09/11 –23/09/11 | Post-excavation finds processing and cataloguing with volunteers | Staff: 3 Students: 4 FOWP: 5 Unemployed Placements: 5 |
| 10/2011 | Outreach workshop – Manchester Academy Deaf Class | 10 |
| 19/11/11 | Manchester Museum Bio-blitz event | 335 |
| 26/1/12 | Presentation to FOWP and FWAG members at Whitworth Art Gallery - “Whitworth Park Archaeology and History Project 2011” | 25 |
| 06/02/12 | Outreach ‘hands-on’ session at Dental Hospital (part of Manchester Histories Festival) | 40 |
| 07/03/12 | Showcase seminar at Manchester Museum | 40 |
| 14/04/12 | Big Saturday in Whitworth Park (MM Youth Board and FOWP) | 290 |
| 18/06/12 | Outreach poetry workshop – Heald Place Primary School | 30 |
| 14/07/12 | Manchester Museum Bio-blitz event | 65 |
| 28/11/12 | Presentation to Society of Museum Archaeologists conference at the Manchester Museum on November 28-29 2012 - “‘Parklife’: Whitworth Park Community Archaeology and History Project” | 60 |
| 07/03/13 | University of Manchester Alumni Lecture | 60 |
| 04/2013 | Project Paper at Nordic TAG Conference, Iceland | 30 |
| 01/07/13 – 12/07/13 | Season 2 dig | Staff: 8 Students: 15 FOWP: 13 Unemployed |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Visitors/Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06/07/13</td>
<td>Whitworth Park Archaeology Open Day and Bioblitz</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/07/13</td>
<td>School visit – Medlock Primary</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/07/13</td>
<td>School visit – Manchester Academy</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/07/13</td>
<td>School visit – Sale High School</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/07/13</td>
<td>Live Tweet from the dig #WPDig</td>
<td>44 people directly involved on 10/07 Period 8-12 July: Reach = 44,439 Exposure = 275,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/07/13</td>
<td>School visit – Southern Cross School</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/07/13</td>
<td>Big Saturday - “Dig Now” (CBA Festival of Archaeology)</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/07/13–19/07/13</td>
<td>Post-extraction finds processing and cataloguing with volunteers</td>
<td>Staff: 3 Students: 7 FOWP: 7 Unemployed Placements: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12/2013</td>
<td>Wet sieving lake sediments and finds processing with volunteers (various dates)</td>
<td>Students: 2 Unemployed Placements: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/11/13</td>
<td>University of Manchester Engagement@Manchester event – “Citizen Science”</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-03/2014</td>
<td>Conservation work in Manchester Museum on excavation finds in advance of exhibition – with volunteers (various dates)</td>
<td>Conservation staff: 3 Volunteers: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/2/14</td>
<td>Lecture to Sale History Society - “The Park in the City: Whitworth Park Community Archaeology and History Project”</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/05/14</td>
<td>“Whitworth Park: Pleasure, Play and Politics” - exhibition private view</td>
<td>100 (estimate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/05/14–05/10/14</td>
<td>“Whitworth Park: Pleasure, Play and Politics” exhibition open to the public</td>
<td>44,567 visitors over the lifetime of the exhibition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/05/14–05/10/14</td>
<td>Object handling sessions delivered by Whitworth Park volunteers in conjunction with Manchester Museum (average one session per week)</td>
<td>3 volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/06/14</td>
<td>Talk from project team and exclusive tour of exhibition</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/07/14</td>
<td>English Corner (free English conversation class) Whitworth Park exhibition</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/07/14</td>
<td>Collection Bites - “Excavation, how, why and what?” (Hannah Cobb)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/07/14</td>
<td>Schools session in the Whitworth Park exhibition – “The Art of Identity”</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/07/14</td>
<td>Big Saturday – “Parklife” (CBA Festival of Archaeology)</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/07/14</td>
<td>Demonstration - “Conservation on Show”</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/07/14</td>
<td>Activity session - “Archaeology and Play”</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/07/14</td>
<td>Urban Naturalist event - “Parklife”</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/08/14</td>
<td>Public talk - “Whitworth Park at War”</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5: List of films and visual ephemera

Films:

Belle Vue Film Productions:
http://whitworthparklife.wordpress.com/2014/08/04/volunteers-star-in-new-film-about-the-whitworth-park-archaeology-project/ This is the link to our blog but the film is streamed from Vimeo and also held on the University of Manchester film site. This film also features in the Manchester Museum exhibition on the results of the project - Whitworth Park: pleasure play and politics

cities@manchester (UniverCityCulture) film:
http://www.cities.manchester.ac.uk/resources/seedcorn/whitworthpark-community/ or accessible at: https://whitworthparklife.wordpress.com/2011/12/

Informal Youtube videos:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SAHY7Toz9CA (filmed by Steve Devine, Manchester Museum)

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5kM2nRkVj9E (filmed by Jamie Skuse, a Manchester Archaeology graduate)

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NOLw6jkSjw (filmed by Jamie Skuse)

Visual mashup: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vhR28OVK9MI (created by Dr Stuart Jeffrey, Glasgow School of Art)
Appendix 6: List of lectures and presentations

‘Whitworth Park: a proposal for a collaborative project’ (Friends of Whitworth Park June 2010)

‘Whitworth Park’ (Manchester Museum Community Event Lecture 2010)

‘Whitworth Park: summary of survey field season’ (University of Manchester Away Day research lecture September 2011)

‘Memory, temporal belonging, and the material world.’ (Community Connectivities/Temporal Belongings Workshop, University of Manchester, June 2011)

‘Whitworth Park: excavation summary’ (Friends of Whitworth Park, January 2012)

‘Whitworth Park Community Archaeology and History Project’ (Manchester Museum Big Saturday lunchtime lecture 2012)

‘Park life: producing and negotiating community through archaeology at Whitworth Park, Manchester.’ (Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Institute of Field Archaeologists, Oxford, April 2012)

‘Engaging the Urban Public Park: identity, memory, improvement and regeneration’ (Transforming Manchester Cities 2012)

‘Unearthing Whitworth Park’s Past’ (University of Manchester Alumni Evening Lecture Series 2012)


‘The park in the city: Whitworth Park and the negotiation of identity, memory and place.’ (Showcase Seminar, Manchester Museum, March 2012)

‘Parklife: Whitworth Park Community Archaeology and History Project.’ (Annual Society for Museum Archaeology Conference, April 2012, Manchester Museum)

‘The Park in the City’ (CRESC Conference, July 2013)

‘Integrating Research and Public Engagement’ (University of Manchester Research Lecture 2013)

‘The University as Community’ (Nordic Theoretical Archaeology Group Conference, 2013)

‘“Parklife” Past and Present’ (Paper presented to the Sale History Society, February 2014)

‘Whitworth Park Community Archaeology and History Project’ (Museum Showcase Open Evening 2014)

‘Remembering in the Park: Whitworth Park Community Archaeology and History project’ (Objects and Remembering: University of Manchester one-day interdisciplinary conference June 2014)
“‘Parks for the people’: using archaeology to engage with urban heritage and its future.’ (Paper presented at the European Association of Archaeologists Conference, Istanbul, September 2014)

‘Whitworth Park at War’ (University of Manchester WW1 Lecture Series Outreach Programme October 2014)

‘Parklife: using archaeology to engage with urban heritage and its future’ (Theoretical Archaeology Conference Manchester December 2014)

“‘Parklife”: Past, Present and Future.’ (Lecture to the York Philosophical Society, February 2015)
Appendix 7: List of publications and reports


Whitworth Park Community Archaeology and History Blog, [https://whitworthparklife.wordpress.com/the-blog/](https://whitworthparklife.wordpress.com/the-blog/)
Appendix 8: Project exhibition poster
Appendix 9: The project booklet

Front page of the booklet

Back page

The centre page spread with location map
The leaflet is available to pick up at the Whitworth Art Gallery and Manchester Museum. To download an electronic copy please go to:

https://whitworthparklife.wordpress.com/2015/08/04/whitworth-park-then-and-now/

Or

http://www.alc.manchester.ac.uk/abouttheschool/news/whitworthparkdig/
Appendix 10: Copy of the project’s public information board in Whitworth Park

Whitworth Park was laid out by the Whitworth Institute and opened, with its Art Gallery, in 1890. The Institute was funded from the bequest of Sir Joseph Whitworth, a local precision engineer, inventor and industrialist. The Park was leased to the City Council in 1904 on a 999 year lease. The Whitworth Institute was taken over by the University of Manchester in 1958 and became the Whitworth Art Gallery. Manchester City Council manages the Park.

The Archaeology of Whitworth Park

Between 2010 and 2013 the Whitworth Park Community Archaeology and History Project investigated the rich heritage of Whitworth Park. People from the park’s diverse communities worked with University of Manchester Archaeologists and the Friends of Whitworth Park to uncover its hidden past. The Park’s history stretches back to the 19th century when Manchester became an important industrial city. It was created to give people access to nature and open space. It also provided entertainment, exercise and a place to interact with others.

The excavations revealed the foundations of park buildings and features, such as the lake, the bandstand, and some of the paths. The discoveries helped the team to understand how these features were constructed and demolished.

For example the boating lake had been created in 1892 and the earth from it was used to create the artificial mound in the northwest corner of the Park. The original boating lake was quite deep, but in 1927 it was turned into a paddling pool. Sadly, the paddling pool was filled-in completely in 1936. The team found many artefacts that had been used and discarded in the park in the past. These finds help us understand how the park was used, and what it meant to people in the past. For instance, the boating lake was a big attraction for children who played round its edges, and often their treasured possessions fell into the lake. When the lake sediments were excavated, the team found many children’s toys, including marbles, a miniature china tea set and a small lead soldier. They also found bits of shoes, ribbons, brooches, coins, and even a starring pistol! They even found beer bottles and lids, showing that people flouted the strict park rules that forbade alcohol in the park.

The excavations were a fantastic community event, bringing together local residents, students, academics, volunteers, and schoolchildren. Their hard work and community spirit has brought the heritage of Whitworth Park to life!
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To report problems in the Park email parks@manchester.gov.uk or 07841271940

This notice has been provided by Friends of Whitworth Park

For more information or to join the Friends please call at the Whitworth or telephone the reception - 0161 273 7400

Alternatively contact them at park@friendsatwhitworthpark.org.uk

www.friendsatwhitworthpark.org.uk for Friends of Whitworth Park.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task / premises: General archaeological field survey and excavation in Whitworth Park, Manchester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity (8)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of manual survey and excavation equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles on site/in Whitworth Park, or encountered on the way to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavation in trenches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All fieldwork in Whitworth Park (including survey) and walking between the department and the park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All fieldwork in Whitworth Park (including survey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All fieldwork in Whitworth Park (including survey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All fieldwork in Whitworth Park (including survey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All fieldwork in Whitworth Park (including survey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of the ball park in Whitworth Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All fieldwork in Whitworth Park (including survey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All fieldwork in Whitworth Park (including survey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All fieldwork in Whitworth Park (including survey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any travel on foot between Whitworth Park and the rest of the campus that may involve walking on roads or tracks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of hours use of the park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with the Young Archaeology club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with all children under 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General personal safety and personal illness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
or visitor to the project is unwell or otherwise at risk.

Project members, volunteers and visitors to the project will be told that if they have any concerns over security or personal safety they must tell a member of staff immediately.

At least one of the project directors (Hannah Cobb) will make their mobile phone number available or the directors will use project mobile phones and distribute the numbers of these to all, Project members, volunteers and visitors in case of emergencies. We will also ask University of Manchester students to provide theirs for us so we can reach them if we have reason to be concerned about their well-being.

Result: T = trivial, A = adequately controlled, N = not adequately controlled, action required, U = unknown risk

REFERENCES:

HSE guide to Reporting of Injuries, Diseases and Dangerous Occurrences Regulations 1995. (RIDDOR) HSE
Health and Safety at Work Act 1974. HSE
Health and Safety (First-Aid) Regulations 1981. HSE
Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulation 1999. HSE
Advice on travel-related DVT. The Department of Health
Appendix 12: Sample volunteer recruitment leaflet (2013 season)

Whitworth Park Community Archaeology and History Project Volunteer Placements

Are you unemployed? Do you live locally or have links to Whitworth Park?  
Do you enjoy working outside and meeting new people?

If so why not join us on this exciting project investigating the community history, archaeology and biodiversity of Whitworth Park?

Living in Manchester you are probably familiar with the Park and its surroundings today, but it was a very different place in the past.

When it was opened in 1891 the Park had a large lake, a bandstand, pavilions, a weather station, elaborate flowerbeds and covered walkways. Like other urban parks, it was meant to help with the overcrowding and stress of urban life, providing access to nature. The Park became an important part of people’s lives and identities. It was a place for everyone, from the working classes to the factory owners, and it became a space for people to play and socialize as well as talk about the political and social issues of the day. It was even the focus of political marches and civil rights rallies in the twentieth century. This all makes Whitworth Park an important part of Manchester’s history and a place that stands out in many people’s memories.

We will investigate the history of the Park by looking at old documents, photographs, conducting archaeological excavations and recording people’s memories. This is your opportunity to get involved, to have a go at archaeology and experience the excitement of discovery!

What do the Volunteer Placements involve?
In July 2013, we are looking for 10 volunteers to work on an archaeological excavation for a week. There will then be the opportunity to take part in a number of post-excavation sessions, which will last for 2-5 days. The post-excavation sessions will take place in our laboratory and will focus on the artefacts found during the excavation.

You will be fully involved in the activities, working alongside professional archaeologists and students from the University of Manchester. The activities on the excavation involve digging, recording (including scale drawing and photography), washing finds, and helping to give daily site tours for the public. Laboratory placements involve identification of artefacts, cataloguing, and marking up finds. These placements are less physically demanding but equally fascinating.

The dates are:
1st – 5th July 2013 – 5 volunteers to work on an archaeological excavation for a week
8th – 12th July 2013 – 5 volunteers to work on an archaeological excavation for a week
15th – 19th – post-excavation lab placements (lasting between 2-5 days)
Training and Support?
You will receive training and supervision from professional archaeologists. You’ll get to dig up the remains of past buildings and other buried features from the Park’s history, as well as discover objects from the past. Ultimately the volunteer programme is also intended to increase self-esteem, interpersonal skills and confidence through teamwork.

Are there any volunteer benefits?
The project will cover out of pocket volunteer expenses (including travel and lunch) and you will be able to claim up to £7.00 per day on submission of receipts. Volunteering does not affect your state benefits. You will also be entitled to a discount at Manchester Museum and Whitworth Art Gallery cafes and shops as partner organisations of the project.

Where might this volunteer programme lead to in the future?
Volunteers on this programme will be given the opportunity to join the ongoing Manchester Museum Volunteer Programme. We also hope that the experience will help volunteers to:
• Increase knowledge and understanding of the cultural sector
• Develop skills for future employment,
• Undertake further learning including, literacy and numeracy, ICT, Access courses in Archaeology, History and other subjects.
• Carry out further volunteering, especially in the cultural sector.

How do you apply?
Application is by completion of a simple form. All those who apply will be invited to a taster session, this will be an opportunity to find out more about the project and meet the staff involved. Support workers and friends are also welcome to come along to the taster session. This will be followed by an informal one-to-one session with the Volunteer Co-ordinator.

For further information and to request a registration form please contact:
Kate Glynn, Volunteer Co-ordinator, The Manchester Museum and Whitworth Art Gallery
0161 306 1773 / Kate.Glynn@manchester.ac.uk

The closing date to register your interest is 31.5.13.
Appendix 13: Sample volunteer instructions (2013 season)

The Whitworth Park Community Archaeology and History Project 2013

1st – 12th July 2013

Advance Preparations – Tetanus vaccination:
Volunteers are advised to ensure that their tetanus vaccination is up-to-date. Please check with your doctor/practice nurse if you are unsure about this. You should be able to get this relatively quickly at your GP practice as practice nurses usually do vaccination.

What to bring:
As a general rule we advise you to wear/bring:

• Functional trousers and tops
• Sturdy footwear with a good tread (e.g. walking boots or steel toe-capped boots)
• Waterproof clothes (a good waterproof jacket and waterproof trousers)
• Gloves
• Kneeling mat
• Sun block and insect repellent and any medication you may need
• Water and/or something to drink during the day. We don’t have tea/coffee-making facilities so please bring a flask if you want a hot drink.
• Packed Lunch (unless you have arranged in advance with the volunteer coordinator for this to be provided)

Equipment:
Excavation equipment will be provided including a trowel. However if you wish to purchase one you would need:

• WHS 4” archaeologists’ trowel

Structure of the day:
We will be working every weekday between 1st and 12th July, from 9.30am - 5pm. Saturday 6th July will be our Public Open Day and there will be opportunities to get involved in that. Sunday 7th July is a day off. The working day will follow a provisional structure of:

• 9.30am: Start work – Meet at the site office (portacabin)
• 11am: 15 minute tea break
• 12.30-1.15: Lunch Break
• 3pm: 15 minute tea break
• 5pm: Finish work
Appendix 14: Sample fieldwork code of conduct (2013 season)

Whitworth Park community archaeology and history project fieldwork Code of Conduct

The object of this Code of Conduct is to promote the standards of conduct required of volunteers in the interests of the public and in the pursuit of archaeological research.

1. Volunteers will conduct themselves in a manner that will not bring Archaeology or the University into disrepute.
2. Volunteers are expected to follow any emergency procedure as directed by project staff.
3. On-site Health & Safety inductions will be provided, which will draw attention to hazards and risks on and off-site. Volunteers must adhere to safe working procedures, including the use of prescribed routes of access, and the wearing of Personal Protective Equipment (such as hard hats and high-visibility clothing) as directed. This will be provided where it is necessary.
4. In addition, volunteers will be given guidance on appropriate site policy, including the safe use of tools and standards of archaeological excavation and recording, particularly in relation to human remains and sacred objects. As a result, the volunteer shall not undertake archaeological work for which he or she is not adequately qualified. He or she should ensure that adequate support and training has been arranged and that their conduct and practice is in line with site directives.
5. Volunteers are responsible for their own personal health, including keeping themselves hydrated, wearing appropriate footwear, the application of sun-cream and wearing of UV protective clothing/hats or warm, waterproof clothing, as appropriate. They should also ensure their actions do not threaten the safety of others, on or off-site.
6. It is your responsibility to ensure your tetanus jab is up-to-date. We advise you to consult your doctor/practice nurse if you are unsure about this.
7. The purchase or use of any illegal substance is strictly forbidden, as is the consumption of alcohol on-site.
8. Volunteers are expected to treat all members of the University community and general public with respect, consideration and courtesy. This includes the Field Trip/Project Director, supervisors, students, university staff, other volunteers, and visitors.
9. Volunteers are expected to attend all timetabled activities (unless there is a good reason for absence, such as illness, child care responsibilities, appointment with Job Centre Plus which should be reported to the Project Director as soon as possible).
10. Staff may make additions to the code as necessary. It is expected that you will adhere to these for your own health & safety, for the safety of others and to maintain the integrity of the archaeological project.

Serious incidents of misbehaviour

In the event of serious incidents of misbehaviour, such as deliberate damage to the site, theft, fighting, serious verbal abuse, the use of illegal substances, or repeated infringement of any of the above, the volunteer(s) concerned will not be allowed to continue on the project.
**Declaration to be signed by the volunteer**

I have read the information presented in this code of conduct and agree to adhere to the rules listed.

I agree to adhere to any additional rules explained to me whilst I am a volunteer on this programme.

**NAME OF VOLUNTEER:**

**SIGNATURE OF VOLUNTEER:**

**DATE:**

If you have any questions please contact:
Kate Glynn, Volunteer Coordinator, The Manchester Museum and Whitworth Art Gallery
0161 306 1773 / Kate.Glynn@manchester.ac.uk

NB This example code of conduct form is addressed to volunteers, but University of Manchester students participating in the excavations were also required to follow the code of conduct.
Appendix 15: Copy of Whitworth Park volunteer evaluation questionnaire

Volunteer Placement Evaluation

Thank you for taking part in the Whitworth Park Community Archaeology and History Project, we hope you enjoyed your volunteer placement.

We would really appreciate it if you could take 10-15 minutes completing this form, we would like to know what difference this project has made to you and what you did and didn’t like about it. So please answer the questions as honestly as you can. Remember that your answers may be negative as well as positive – it’s important that we know about it all - good and bad!

Name (Optional): __________________________________________

Please confirm which placement you took part in:

☐ Week long archaeological dig   Days completed ________
☐ Post-exavation lab placement
☐ Both

Before / after the project

1. Had you visited the Whitworth Park before the project?
   ☐ Yes   ☐ No

2. Have you visited other Manchester parks before the project?
   ☐ Yes   ☐ No

3. Have you visited other Manchester parks since the project?
   ☐ Yes   ☐ No

4. Did you bring family / friends to Whitworth Park during or after the project who would not otherwise have visited?
   ☐ Yes   ☐ No

If yes, please state how many people: ______

5. Has the project increased your interest in archaeology?
   ☐ Yes   ☐ No   ☐ Don’t know

6. Has the project increased your interest in heritage?
7. Are you more likely to visit other heritage sites since completing your placement?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Don’t know

Your experience on the project

8. Do you feel you were fully briefed about what your placement would involve before you started?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Don’t know

If no, please state how this could have been improved?

9. Was your induction useful?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Don’t know

If no, please state how this could have been improved?

10. Did you receive sufficient support from staff during your placement?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Don’t know

If no, please state how this could have been improved?

11. Would you say involvement in this project has increased your confidence?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Don’t know

12. Would you say involvement in this project has improved your wellbeing?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Don’t know

13. What did you particularly enjoy about your placement?
14. What did you least enjoy about your placement?


15. Please tick the boxes which best describe your motivations for taking part in this project and state if your expectations were met?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Expectations met?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Increase confidence</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Meet new people</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Gain new skills</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Learn about cultural heritage</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Help back into employment</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Interest in archaeology</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unsure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. During your placement you may have learnt new skills. We would like to know how you would rate your skills as a result of taking part in the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Increased</th>
<th>No Change</th>
<th>Decreased</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numeracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working as part of a team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills or experience that will help me in future jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixing and socialising with other people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage based skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating to the public individually and in groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researching and looking for more information on subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking about things and making decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. What was the most important thing you got out of the programme?

18. Is there anything you were hoping to get out of the project that you did not get out your placement?

Next Steps

19. Would you say involvement in this project has given you new skills and experiences that will help in future employment?
   □ Yes  □ No  □ Don’t know

20. Has your involvement in this project changed your future career plans?
   □ Yes  □ No

If yes, please state how?
21. Has involvement in the project made you want to do any of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I would now like to…</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Don’t know / not sure</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer at The Manchester Museum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer elsewhere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take part in further learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get a job / gain employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk with an information, advice and guidance advisor about CV’s, jobs or interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Are there any other things you have got out of this project which we haven’t asked you about which have made a difference to you in any way? Please tell us here:

---

Thank you for completing this form
Appendix 16: Summary of volunteer evaluation responses

The Manchester Museum Volunteer Coordinator, Kate Glynn, carried out the Volunteer placement evaluation in the autumn following the two summer field seasons (2011 and 2013). The evaluation questions, designed by Kate Glynn and Siân Jones, focus on parks, heritage, skills, and learning (see Appendix 12). Closed-response categories are used, but there are also open-response sections for volunteers to describe their experience in their own words.

The evaluation focuses on the community volunteers, most of whom were recruited through the local job centres in Moss Side, Rusholme, Levenshulme, and Hulme. There were 18 community volunteers in total and 12 of them completed the evaluation, making a response rate of 66%.

1. Public parks
A number of questions focused on familiarity with public parks. 45% of the volunteers had visited Whitworth Park prior to their involvement in the project. 83% had visited other Manchester parks before the project and 50% since (though it must be remembered that only a few months would have passed between their participation in the project and the evaluation).

Perhaps the most information arising from this set of questions is that 58% had brought family/friends to visit Whitworth Park during or after the excavations. In the view of the volunteers concerned these friends/family members would not otherwise have visited.

1 Had you visited Whitworth Park before the project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Have you visited other Manchester parks before the project?

- Yes: 83%
- No: 9%
- Don't know: 0%
- No answer: 8%

3 Have you visited other Manchester parks since the project

- Yes: 50%
- No: 50%
- Don't know: 0%
- No answer: 0%

4 Did you bring family / friends to Whitworth Park during or after the project who would not otherwise have visited?

- Yes: 42%
- No: 58%
- Don't know: 0%
- No answer: 0%
1. Heritage and archaeology
Volunteers were asked whether the project had increased their interest in archaeology and heritage (questions 5 & 6). All respondents stated yes. 100% also stated that they would be more likely to visit other heritage sites since participating in the project.

Responses to open-ended questions (12 & 17) also highlighted heritage and archaeology. Volunteers valued:

- “A chance to feel connected to the past, present and future”
- “Having an opportunity to see how a real dig works, what’s really involved and who’s the kind of people who volunteer”
- “Being in touch with history”
- “Discovering objects and information about my community’s past activities and day to day living”
- “Finding out about Manchester’s history”
- “A good introduction to archaeology and heritage”
- “I liked learning about archaeology, the history of the park and discovering finds”
- “Working together to find local history pieces”
- “Having the opportunity to work at a local archaeological dig is something I never even thought to be possible”

1. Project briefing and induction
Volunteers were asked about briefing, induction and support during the project (questions 8, 9 & 10). 92% stated that they felt fully briefed in advance of their placement and that the induction was useful. The remaining 8% represents one person who did not attend the briefing and induction events. 100% stated that they received sufficient support from project staff during their placements.

1. Enjoyment
Volunteers were asked to explain what they particularly enjoyed about the project placement (question 13) and what they least enjoyed (question 14). These were open-response questions, which allowed volunteers to specify what they enjoyed in their own words. These have been broadly classified into categories for the purposes of analysis. Individual respondents have been included under multiple categories where more than one area was specified.

Various forms of ‘learning and skills’ were the most commonly specified area of enjoyment making up 20% of those cited. In total 6 of the 12 volunteers who took part in the survey specified some aspect of learning or skill acquisition. Comments concerning learning focused on the pleasure of finding out more about archaeology and history. Some highlighted the local dimension of history as particularly rewarding. Two people specifically highlighted working with objects and classifying them (‘finds processing’ on the chart).

Other aspects that were identified as sources of enjoyment include ‘teamwork and camaraderie’ (making up 17% of the sources cited) and ‘meeting new people’
(making up 13%). Five volunteers specified the former and four the latter, highlighting the social dimension of the project. The friendly nature of the project, the variety of people involved, and the feeling of working together towards a common goal all stand out in terms of people’s comments.

The historical nature of the project and the sense of discovery were also significant sources of enjoyment (‘historical interest’ making up 13% of area cited and ‘discovery’ 10%). One person highlighted the pleasure they got form “Discovering objects and information about my community’s past activities and day to day living”.

Physical work and being outside were also sources of enjoyment that were remarked upon (being mentioned by 5 people). Often the same people highlighted these aspects in the same sentence, illustrating a connection between the two.

When asked about areas they least enjoyed 59% (7 people) either left the question blank or asserted that there was “nothing!”. Interestingly for those who did specify things that they least enjoyed hard work (25%) and the weather (8%) are the two areas that stand out. 8% (2 people) said that they least enjoyed finds processing.

13 What did you particularly enjoy about your placement? (Open response analysed in broad categories)
1. Motivations and benefits

The questionnaire explored people’s motivations for participating in the project by asking them to tick a range of boxes that best describe their expectations (question 15). Most respondents ticked all the motivations except for 'Increase confidence' (2 volunteers felt this was not a source of motivation) and 'Help get back into employment' (3 did not see this as a primary motivation). When asked if their expectations had been met all of the respondents stated yes except for two who said no in relation to 'Help back into employment'. The project was therefore felt to be meeting expectations in terms of offering and opportunity to: increase in confidence; meet new people; gain new skills; learn more about cultural heritage; and interest in archaeology. Many did see it as providing support for getting back into employment, although this was not universal.

The question focusing on the most important thing volunteers got out of participating in the project (question 17) provides more useful evidence of benefits. This was an open-response question so it is of particular note that 41% of the volunteers stated that increased confidence was the most important thing they got out of the project. Having a new experience, meeting new people and finding out about the past also featured as the most important things for some volunteers. For one person the benefits could be summed up as “A sense of belonging, sharing interests with like-minded people.”

Throughout the questionnaire, under open-response questions, volunteers highlighted the importance of having a new experience. As one put it “Any experience you didn’t have before enlarges your horizons and makes you see things slightly differently”.

14 What did you least enjoy about your placement?

- Nothing: 59%
- Finds processing: 8%
- Bad weather: 8%
- Hard labour: 25%
1. Skills
As noted above, forms of learning and skill acquisition were often cited as particularly enjoyable aspects of participating in the project. This demonstrates that community archaeology is a learning context in which skill acquisition is perceived to be enjoyable rather than hard work.

Under question 16, volunteers were provided with a list of specific skills and asked whether these skills had increased, stayed the same or decreased. None of the specified skills were perceived to have decreased as a result of participating in the project and most of the skills listed were perceived by most volunteers to have increased.

Teamwork stands out in terms of improvement, being seen by 100% of the volunteers participating in the evaluation. Heritage-based skills and volunteering skills also scored highly with 92% of volunteers stating that they had improved. Between 80 and 90% of volunteers felt that a number of other skills improved, including: communication; skills or experience that will help me in future jobs; mixing and socialising with others; researching and looking for more information on subjects; observation and looking at things.

Literacy and numeracy are worthy of note because most volunteers felt that there was no change in these skills (less than 10% feeling that there had been any increase). These are skills that were identified as areas where volunteers might benefit as part of the funding application. In some instances it may be the case that volunteers had less opportunity to increase their literacy and numeracy skills than we had originally envisaged. However, it is also the case that many of our unemployed community volunteers had been through some form of tertiary education and therefore had reasonably good literacy and numeracy skills to start
with. This meant that scope for improvement in the context of excavation was more limited. This is in contrast with teamwork, communication and confidence, which for a number of our volunteers were areas which had suffered as a result of unemployment.

1. **Future volunteering and employment**
Volunteers were also asked about the likely impact of the project on future employment and volunteering. As noted above, 92% stated that they had increased ‘skills or experience that will help me in future jobs’ (see question 16). 59% also stated that they had acquired ‘new skills and experiences that will help them in future employment’ (see question 19), whereas only one person stated that they did not. 33% did not respond to this question, some perhaps because they were not sure. There was less impact in terms of future career plans, with one third stating that the project had changed their plans as a result of participating. This is not necessarily a negative result because the responses for most of the remaining two thirds of the volunteers suggest that participating has enhanced skills for existing career paths/plans.

In terms of volunteering and future learning (question 21), 86% said they would like to take part in further learning. Between 60 and 80% were motivated to seek
employment or speak to an employment advisor. Finally, 60-70% stated that the project had made them want to pursue more voluntary work.

19 Would you say involvement in this project has given you new skills and experiences that will help in future employment?

- Yes: 59%
- No: 8%
- Don't know: 0%
- No response: 33%

20 Has your involvement in this project changed your future career plans?

- Yes: 33%
- No: 67%
- Don't know: 0%
- No response: 0%
1. Conclusions
The evaluation shows that the community volunteer placements were very successful on the whole. Volunteers enjoyed engaging with heritage and archaeology. Some highlighted investigating their local history as an especially rewarding aspect. Learning something new was seen as a recurring positive theme, but at the same time specific skills were enhanced, especially those relating to communication, teamwork and interpersonal relationships. Teamwork, camaraderie and meeting new people were repeatedly highlighted as positive aspects of the experience. Related to this, increased confidence and self-esteem are perhaps the areas that benefitted most.

Connections between past, present and future lie at the heart of the project and were encapsulated by some of the volunteers in their feedback.
Appendix 17: Volunteer Stories interview questions

Before starting go through the Volunteer FAQ and invite questions. Ensure consent is given and form signed.

Before WP

1. Can you tell me what you were doing before you volunteered for the WP Community Archaeology and History Project?
2. Had you been in work or education recently?
3. Had you volunteered in any capacity before?
4. How did you hear about the project and what attracted you to it?

During WP

1. What activities were you involved in as a volunteer on the WP project?
2. Had you done any of these activities before in any capacity?
3. What was it like being involved in the WP project?
4. What did you most enjoy about participating?
5. What did you least enjoy?
6. How did the experience of participating in the project impact on you?
7. Did volunteering for the project increase your understanding of the history of public parks? Did it increase your interest in cultural heritage/archaeology generally?
8. Was there anything you were hoping to get out of volunteering for the WP project that you didn’t?

After WP

1. What have you been doing since you volunteered for the WP project?
2. Have you been in work or education?
3. Did the experience of participating in the WP project inform or help you in any way?
4. Have you engaged with heritage or archaeology since the project? Have you been to see the WP exhibition?
5. Finally, what was the most important thing you got out of volunteering?
Appendix 18: Whitworth Park Volunteer Stories

These Volunteer Stories are based on qualitative biographical interviews conducted by the Whitworth Park Community Archaeology and History Project Assistant, Ruth Colton. Four volunteers from 2013 responded to requests to participate in these interviews, which were used to create a narrative with select quotations. The Stories are intended to complement the questionnaire-based evaluation conducted by the Volunteer Co-ordinator at Manchester Museum, Kate Glynn, immediately after each excavation season.

Andrea’s Whitworth Park Story

Andrea moved to England from Italy three years ago in search of employment and opportunities. Being trained in both graphics and web design he had been working as a freelancer before a work experience opportunity in Wales led him to settle in England. For the first year and a half he worked on various short-term contract jobs interspersed with periods of unemployment. An interview with his Job Centre advisor led him to consider the Manchester Museum volunteer programme, which had unfortunately just ended. He was directed to the Whitworth Park Community Archaeology and History Project by Kate Glynn. Andrea states that volunteering in Italy is usually vocational only and so he was intrigued by the use of volunteering in Britain to gain work experience and skills. Having looked on a number of volunteering websites prior to finding out about the Whitworth Park Project he felt that many volunteering opportunities required participants to already have considerable skills. For this reason the Project seemed different, as it was willing to take on volunteers with no background in archaeology. Andrea admits that his only prior knowledge of archaeology was gleamed from watching Indiana Jones movies, yet he had always been fascinated by cultural institutions like museums and so was willing to get involved.

During the excavation Andrea took part in a range of activities including digging, trowel work and finds washing, while he also took part in the post-exavagation work and in the conservation work carried out in the Museum. Andrea felt that working within a team ensured that the digging, which could have felt like hard work, was made easier by the camaraderie. The more detailed work meanwhile was deeply rewarding, as he stated “when you are close to it, the work was so hot and dry, but then you stand back and see that everything is clean and pristine.” Working in trench 3, he stated that it was “great to see the bandstand come alive again” after it had been “passed by hundreds of times by people never knowing” what lay underneath the soil. Andrea stressed that the atmosphere was really pleasant to work in, that there was a shared goal and everyone felt valued as part of a team working together towards that end. It was this that made it easy for him to get up out of bed early and with enthusiasm for the day ahead. On the completion of the excavation work, the whole team celebrated in the pub, an ending that Andrea really appreciated because
it reinforced his role within the team. This experience was tinged with sadness as Andrea felt that the worst part of the experience was the last day of the dig when the things that had been revealed were covered over again and the work came to an end. While he felt that there were some volunteers who took the work too seriously, ultimately everyone got out of it what they wanted, or needed to.

One aspect of the excavation that Andrea highlighted as a positive experience was the opportunity to lead site tours and to be interviewed on site. As a naturally introverted person, he wanted to see if he could overcome his shyness and take part. While his initial reaction was fear and concern he took part and now feels both proud and happy that he did it.

The post-excavation work at the Museum was another significant experience for Andrea. He felt that the opportunity to go “behind the scenes at the Museum” was very special and has filled him with an increased enthusiasm for engagement with the cultural institutions of Manchester, in particular the Manchester Museum. This has been further supported by the project exhibition in the Museum. Having had the opportunity to show his family around the exhibits Andrea states that he is “very proud to have taken part in it.”

For Andrea, the overall experience of the project has been very positive. The interaction with people from all backgrounds helped him to overcome some of his natural shyness and to be able to approach people and forge relationships and partnerships. He states that “communication is the most important thing a person can do – without it you cannot achieve what you want.” As his ability to communicate has developed he has also grown in confidence in his own experiences. He explained this in relation to his last successful job interview. He felt able to respond well to the interview questions presented to him as he felt he had a “worthwhile” experience to discuss, one which had furnished him with examples of undertaking team work, overcoming challenges and using effective communication. Andrea is currently working in a permanent, full-time role. While it is not in the area he would like to be in, he feels that he is proud of what he achieved and has the confidence to keep looking for the dream job.

**Anthony’s Whitworth Park Story**

Anthony has a background in archaeology having studied the subject at Bradford University, graduating in 2003. Prior to this he had volunteered on the Woodhall Project in North Yorkshire for five years. He did a number of commercial archaeology jobs, including a placement on Shetland, which saw him appear on *Time Team*. In 2010 he began his MA at Leeds University and on finishing had worked a number of part-time jobs in admin before seeing the Manchester Museum volunteer placements advertised on the Department for Work and Pensions website. Anthony instantly felt “this is me” and began volunteering. The Whitworth Park Project was discussed with Kate Glynn at the Museum, but initially there were too many people
applying to be volunteers and Anthony was thought to be too experienced. Having volunteered previously, both with the Woodhall Project and at a charity shop, Anthony felt that he knew what to expect on the dig and was particularly enthusiastic about the community outreach aspect of the project.

During the excavations Anthony worked mostly in Trench Four, mattocking and trowelling, activities which he said were “brilliant – second nature.” He conducted two public site tours, which he really enjoyed as it allowed him to express his enthusiasm for the project to others. He felt it was an opportunity to get others interested in the “history on the doorstep.” Anthony was unable to take part in much of the post-excitation work, but would have enjoyed the opportunity had there been more on offer.

Working on the dig was for Anthony “fabulous – it was like being at home.” The fact that the students already knew one another was initially off-putting to him; however he felt that any cliques disappeared within half a day as it is impossible not to get on with everyone when you work in a trench in the rain. The involvement of the Friends of Whitworth Park was especially appealing to him, as the interaction with them changed his way of viewing parks. Anthony felt that there was good clear leadership from the staff, yet he occasionally felt awkward being a volunteer with experience. It was sometimes frustrating for him having to adapt to how others worked and he felt particularly aggrieved with other volunteers who weren’t sure about what they were doing and who he felt didn’t want to get involved. For him the evening trips to the pub after work helped to forge the camaraderie in the group and those who did not go were perhaps viewed as not wanting to get involved. Anthony felt that a greater discussion of the process of archaeology would have been useful for the volunteers and students, and the public during the site tours, to be engrossed in the work.

Despite these frustrations, which Anthony characterised as just part of the parcel of being on a dig, he really enjoyed his time excavating, his main criticism being that “a fortnight was not enough.” For him the project acted as a “massive shot in the arm;” a reminder of why he loves working with people and in archaeology in particular. It provided the impetus for him to join a local history society and to begin his own research once again. He felt “a lot less isolated” having taken part in a project with “like-minded, enthusiastic people” and it was his confidence and social skills that he felt really benefitted from the project experience. Anthony presented a paper at a conference not long after the excavation and felt that the experience had acted like “a really good tonic” in helping him to crystallise his ideas and to practice speaking to people. The sharing of ideas within the group helped him to think through how he presents himself and his research, adding “the human element” to it.

Anthony hopes to continue being involved in local history and was particularly impressed by the project exhibition at the Manchester Museum which he felt reflected the richness and complexities of the Park and the communities who have
used it. Since the excavation Anthony has written a history book on the soldiers of the Crimean War. He remains interested in the project and hopes to get involved again in the future.

**Caroline’s Whitworth Park Story**

Before joining the Whitworth Park Project, Caroline says she was doing “*not a lot.*” However, being a carer, looking after her animals and helping out an elderly neighbour with day-to-day chores filled up much of her time. Throughout her childhood and early adulthood she had taken on many challenges and responsibilities, working for rides at a local riding stable, helping out on trips for children with learning disabilities organised by volunteer groups and learning to swim in order to qualify as a lifeguard. She had initially begun studying psychology at college before leaving in order to earn “*real money*”. She took part in the Youth Training Scheme working in the fashion and retail industry as well as living and working in Australia for a year. In 2010 she completed a Level 2 Diploma in Health and Social Care, but had been frustrated in finding work relevant to this. This had affected her perception of herself and she lost confidence in her own abilities to get things done, despite having been clearly quite dynamic in the years prior to this. While at the Job Centre, Caroline was given information on the Whitworth Park Project by her advisor. She was instantly interested and knew that she really wanted to take part. The hands-on element of the programme particularly appealed to her given that she is a practical person. She thought it would be a good experience and an opportunity to both meet new people and to learn more about history and archaeology, which had always been an interest of hers. “I *just knew I was really interested*!”

Caroline volunteered on the second week of the dig and so was involved in excavation straight away in Trench 3: “*the bandstand trench.*” To begin with she had to ask where to put artefacts every time she encountered them while trawelling; however, after a while she started to recognise patterns and types, “*knowing what was what.*” Finds washing and processing the finds in the lab during the post-excavation week further improved this knowledge and as she stated “*I ended up knowing quite a bit, I went from knowing nothing to being able to tell the public things*” during the exhibition and public events at the Museum. Caroline went on the public tours during the dig but hadn’t felt confident enough to speak at the time so speaking to the public in this way, as an expert, was really significant to her. Much of the finds processing she found to be a bit monotonous but she didn’t mind this as she felt it was important to see the proper process and she got the opportunity to really see all of the artefacts. The final activity she took part in was the wet sieving, conducted over a number of weeks. This was “*pretty messy*” and very smelly as she remembers it. While the dig and the activities were an important aspect of the WP Project experience, Caroline felt that it was more than this. More than anything it was the experience of being part of the team, “*the banter*” and getting to meet new
people from all different backgrounds and yet feeling like they had lots in common. This experience, as well as the opportunities for learning were the most enjoyable aspects of the Project for Caroline, while the data entry work was the least enjoyable. As she put it “it’s the people that make the experience what it is.”

Caroline felt that the experience of participating in the project had made a significant impact upon her. “It has made me more of a confident person and increased my self-esteem. I feel like I can go out and succeed at things.” She stated that being around people, working as part of a team gave her a greater awareness of her own abilities and as a result she felt that she had “lost the fear of doing things – I’m not afraid to fail.” While on the project she felt that people were accepting of each other’s backgrounds and experiences “even if you hadn’t been working...you were still valued.” The project she felt benefitted from this variety: “it needed everybody to make it happen, from all walks of life.” While she felt that she learnt more about parks themselves, and particularly Whitworth Park, the greatest impact was that it made her aware of how much there was to learn. As a result she became interested in cultural heritage and started seeking out more information herself. Unfortunately the one outcome she had hoped for which hasn’t materialised is a job. Apart from some temporary work transcribing interviews at the Whitworth Art Gallery, she has yet been unable to find the work she hoped to – “not for a lack of trying.”

Caroline has been volunteering for the Manchester Museum and for the Elizabeth Gaskell House since taking part in the project, as well as continuing with her caring duties. She has completed a few short courses with the Manchester Museum with the aim of improving her employability further. It is her goal to work helping others within the heritage sector, and she continues to pursue this. The project has had some unexpected outcomes outside of work for Caroline, giving her the confidence to take on new challenges and to do things that she would not have done otherwise. These include appearing on the stage in the chorus line of a number of well-known operas and speaking to Radio 4’s Women’s Hour alongside members of the Whitworth Park Project. More recently she climbed Mount Snowdon in Wales, having set it as a goal for herself. She stated that if she hadn’t taken part in the project she would still be procrastinating now, whereas the project helped her to realise her capabilities. “You’ve got to go and grab these opportunities - go and do it!” Great “friendships and connections,” to other people, to heritage, to nature and to herself were the most important things Caroline got out of volunteering for the Whitworth Park Project.

**Frank’s Whitworth Park Story**

Frank had worked within the cultural sector for the company *Design Initiate* for 12 years, supporting artists and designers to set up businesses; providing mentoring, helping with funding applications and creating projects to work on. The company
began to struggle when the recession led to a decline in funding from large bodies like the Arts Council. Despite being the only company offering the service they did, without regular funding the company struggled before finally folding at Christmas. “It seemed terribly cruel, to leave people out in the cold.” Frank initially went freelance as a writer on film and TV history, before taking on a temporary role project managing the transfer of the graduate art show at MMU. During this time, along with building up his freelance contacts, Frank was hoping that a more permanent position might materialise with MMU. When this didn’t happen he started applying for part-time jobs. As time went on with no success in this job search his confidence started to plummet and after a year of this job search he decided to sign on. Frank states that the benefits system made him feel like a second class citizen; it was demeaning. In order to fulfil the requirements of the Job Centre he spent 35 hours a week stuck in his house filling in applications and paperwork. This lack of contact with others further undermined his confidence.

Three months after first signing on, during a meeting with his Job Centre advisor, he saw an advert for the volunteer programme at the Whitworth Art Gallery. He had never volunteered before, but “I was looking for something to get back my confidence.” He joined the programme, which counted towards his job searching hours, but also got him out of the house and learning new things. It felt like a much better use of his time than the job searching he had done before. At the end of five weeks Kate Glynn mentioned the Whitworth Park Project: “I had never done anything like that before!” Despite reservations about the physical nature of the work, Frank thought that the chance to gain more of a connection with the city he had lived in for ten years and to find out more about its history was compelling. Furthermore he was looking for social engagement, a chance to get out of the house and to meet new people: “Combating the isolation you feel being unemployed.”

Before the excavation started Frank attended a project meeting during which his fine art background was discussed. He was asked if this was something the project might be able to draw upon. Despite not having done any sketching for ten to fifteen years before the project, he was keen: “I wanted to find out if I still had the skills and if they are as good as they once were.”

During the first week of the excavation, Frank was mostly involved in preparation work, digging and de-turfing. He found this very tiring yet enjoyed the challenge of the exercise, being out in the fresh air and the bonding with the team. He noticed an increased sense of mental wellbeing and felt the time flew by until going home dirty, tired and exhausted in a good way. Alongside the excavation, Frank participated in the technical drawing on site, a process he found very different to the sketching he was trained in. Leading site tours for members of the public was initially daunting, as it had been a significant part of his previous work and yet something he hadn’t practiced in a while. He felt it soon came back to him, empowering him: “I felt, yeah I can still cut it.” He also took part in geophysical surveying, an exercise he found
interesting yet not as enjoyable as the other activities, though perhaps compounded by the pouring rain. During the second week Frank became involved in sketching the excavations in progress. He found it interesting to compare this to the technical drawing he had undertaken in the first week. He’d found it hard to be so precise and to leave out the textures and light that formed such an important part of his sketching; “I wanted to go outside these borders.” Frank was surprised that the project team valued his sketches given that technical drawings were not impressions.

Frank felt that the project experience was invaluable to help build his confidence. Meeting new people, forming teams and being part of a really sociable group helped him rediscover his outgoing nature. The interaction between students and volunteers felt easy with no barriers of communication. Frank was also pleased to note that the social interactions have continued beyond the dig. The excavation work was physically tiring but a great exercise and it also felt like “a great leveller,” as everyone was in the same boat. One particular highlight of the experience was in learning of the fascinating history of the rapidly changing community in the area; something which was made more relevant due to the participation of The Friends of Whitworth Park.

On discussing his favourite aspect of the project experience Frank highlighted the opportunity he was given to draw. While this helped him to realise he was still very capable, it also challenged him as landscapes were a new subject matter for him and the fast moving pace of the excavations was difficult to capture. He initially worried that not digging would make him feel like he wasn’t pulling his weight, however he was given ample time and space to draw and people were so positive it really felt like he was contributing. Alongside this, meeting people and regaining his confidence both in his social skills and his technical ability were real highlights of the project for him. The geophysical surveying served as a low point in Frank’s experience as he found it frustrating and boring.

Frank felt that the experience of participating in the project had a significant and lasting impact on him. He stated “I can’t stress enough how helpful it was in getting my confidence back and in finding a job.” After the excavations, Frank was offered two jobs and was able to take on one of these positions. The project experience further helped him in beginning this work: “I felt I could walk in with a degree of confidence as I’d been doing stuff.” Outside of work, Frank has been able to enjoy having rediscovered his artistic talents: “I stepped into an art material shop for the first time in fifteen years.” His increased confidence has encouraged him to explore using tools he hasn’t used before giving him freedom to meet new challenges. Sadly the nature of his full-time work doesn’t often allow him the opportunity to draw, however he knows that he is able to retain the skills if he ever chooses to make his living this way. Frank stated that “If someone asked me to do it again – absolutely!”
He would strongly recommend volunteering to others in the same position as him and if he found himself redundant once more he would seek out another similar project.
Appendix 19: Copy of exhibition visitor questionnaire

*Whitworth Park: Pleasure, Play and Politics*

Manchester Museum Visitor Exit Survey

1. Is this your first visit to Manchester Museum?

2. How did you hear about this exhibition?

3. Do you have any comments about the exhibition?

4. Please specify your occupational field

5. If so, does the exhibition make you feel differently about the park?

6. Has this exhibition made you want to get involved in the park in some way in the future (such as in its upkeep)?

7. Has it increased your understanding of the history and biodiversity of the park?

8. Has the exhibition increased your awareness of the importance of parks?
Appendix 20: Summary of exhibition visitor questionnaire results.

1. Introduction
Manchester Museum developed a temporary exhibition based on the results of the project in collaboration with the Department of Archaeology and the Friends of Whitworth Park. The exhibition, *Whitworth Park: Pleasure, Play and Politics*, was opened on the 24th May 2014 and closed on 20th October (having been extended from the original closing date of 5th October). It was located in the temporary exhibition space on the third floor of the Museum. It is important to note that during the later phase of the exhibition, from the end of September to 20th October, refurbishment work was being undertaken in an adjacent area on the third floor, which meant that visitor access was restricted to the lift as the stairwell was reserved for the workforce, except in cases of emergency use. The exhibition was advertised using 3 posters, an exhibition leaflet, a dedicated page on the Manchester Museum web site, and a press release, which received widespread uptake by the local media. Project partners promoted the exhibition through their community and volunteer networks, as well as via the project Blog. There was a dedicated public programme with talks and workshops. Volunteers staffed a handling table on average once a week during the exhibition and it featured in the British Archaeology Festival.

This report provides visitor statistics for the period of the exhibition collated by Morris Hargreaves McIntyre (MHM). It also sets out the findings for the visitor exit survey conducted in the exhibition space during the summer of 2014. The objectives of the visitor exit survey were to:

- Collect reliable and accurate qualitative and quantitative data from visitors about their opinions on the message and content of the exhibition
- Use the data to assess the success of the exhibition and its impact on visitor attitudes towards public parks

2. Methodology and sampling
Visitor numbers are recorded by the Museum using electronic eye counters at the entrances. Visitor demographics and exhibition attendance are established by 600 assisted surveys per annum completed by MHM with museum visitors according to Market Research Society best practice. The survey asks if visitors have attended any specific temporary exhibitions. This provides a % to apply to the overall visitor count (from which schools visits are subtracted before the % is applied). The visitor survey also establishes socio-demographic data, which can be applied to overall and exhibition-specific attendance.

Two visitor exit surveys were conducted: one by project staff from the Archaeology Department at The University of Manchester and one by the Manchester Museum. Both surveys were designed to gather opinions on the content and assess its impact on their understanding of, and attitudes towards, public parks. With a couple of exceptions the questionnaires covered the same questions and the data from both has been amalgamated.
In total, 72 questionnaires were completed during the survey period (with 13 non-respondents) which ran from July to September 2014. Data was collected by museum visitor services assistants and a postgraduate research student on randomly selected days and according to staff availability. Potential respondents were approached randomly and asked if they would like to participate as they neared the exit to the gallery. In order to complete the questionnaire, respondents were required to have been inside and around the exhibition and be nearing the end of their visit.

3. Visitor numbers
The Museum’s audience research established that 26% of all Museum visitors (excluding school visitors) attended the exhibition. This equates to 44,567 visits. (Total Museum visits for the period (excluding schools) was 171,410).
Socio-demographic data on attenders including gender, age, ethnicity, origin (country and region), social grade and disability can be found below.

4. Results of the exit survey
4.1 Question One: visiting habits

![Pie chart showing the distribution of responses to Q1. Is this your first visit to the Manchester Museum?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over half of the visitors surveyed for this study had visited the Manchester Museum previously, with just under one quarter attending for the first time. NB This question was not included in the Archaeology Department Survey, so those visitors have been added to the ‘no response’ category.
4.2 Question two: finding out about the exhibition

Visitors primarily came to the exhibition as part of a general visit to the Museum, with 40% ‘stumbling across it’. Those who heard about the exhibition via ‘word of mouth’ and through advertising (combining the museum website, posters/flyers and social media categories) each account for 19%.

4.3 Question three: response to the exhibition
Visitor comments regarding the exhibition were largely positive, with 65% of those surveyed commenting on what they had seen in favourable terms. Visitors expressed appreciation for an exhibit on a local landmark, feelings of nostalgia, an interest in the range of objects left behind in the park and fascination with the archaeological process:

“Always interesting to find out about the history on our doorstep and how local people used to live.”

“Reminds me of when I was a boy.”

“I’m surprised at the number of things that get left in parks!”

“I found it really interesting, particularly learning about the process of excavation.”

“It’s very informative – I thought it would be dull, a park’s a park, after all.”

“It’s interesting and unusual – I didn’t realise archaeology extended into 20th century.”

Amongst those surveyed, particular objects – postcards of the park, glass bottles, a toy soldier and a clay pipe with teeth marks – were mentioned as highlights of the exhibition due to their ability to “connect us with the past.”

Negative responses towards the exhibition account for only 3% of the comments expressed by surveyed visitors and these relate to its location in a temporary exhibition space, somewhat tucked away from the other galleries and therefore more difficult to locate within the museum.

4.4 Question four: visitor occupational fields

![Occupational fields chart]

The majority of visitors to the exhibition worked in sectors such as administration and retail, the details of which were only collected anecdotally. The Manchester Museum is part of the University of Manchester and situated on its main campus. Not surprisingly therefore, the second largest group of visitors to the exhibition comprises of students.
4.5 Question five: local residence

Over half of visitors attending the exhibition lived within the Greater Manchester area and this may explain why the majority of those surveyed were making a repeat visit to the museum, due to its proximity to where they live.

4.6 Question six: exhibition impact

Over half of visitors felt that their perceptions of Whitworth Park had been changed by the exhibition. In particular, one visitor commented that it was a place that they would now “walk through and not around”, whilst another stated that it was not somewhere they would have previously visited, but were now more inclined to do so:
“It’s not somewhere I would usually go – as a young woman, I have a fear of parks...I didn’t realise it was such a community space...”

4.7 Question seven: getting involved in the park

Just under half of visitors were non-committal as to whether they would be willing to get involved with the future of the park, such as assisting with its upkeep. Many of those surveyed were in attendance with families and stated that the time they believed would be involved made them hesitant about making such a commitment. It is perhaps therefore unsurprising that a further 29% of visitors explicitly stated that they would not like to get involved with the future of Whitworth Park. Despite this, 11% of visitors commented to survey staff that they would be interested in finding out more about their local park so that they can better support it.
4.8 Question eight: impact on understanding

Overall, 56% of visitors surveyed stated that they felt the exhibition had increased their understanding of both the history and biodiversity of the park. A further 21% stated that it had increased their understanding of the history alone, and 1% of the biodiversity alone. This reflects the weighting of the material in the exhibition with about four fifths of the content focusing primarily on the Park’s history and about one fifth on nature and biodiversity. 6% stated that the exhibition did not increase their understanding of either.

4.9 Question nine: significance of parks

Over half of the visitors surveyed stated that they felt the exhibition had increased their awareness of the importance of public parks. Comments received from visitors...
reflect an increased awareness of parks as ‘places with history’ and their value as an archaeological resource.

“I didn’t think much about them before, but they are places of historical significance.”

“I realise now that they are spaces with rich pasts.”

“I understand how important parks are and how many people have used them through time.”

“They’re an archaeological resource and have been used by people for a long time.”

5. Visitor socio-economic profile

![Gender Pie Chart]

- Male: 45%
- Female: 55%

![Age Pie Chart]

- 0 to 5: 13%
- 6 to 10: 14%
- 11 to 16: 11%
- 17 to 18: 14%
- 19 to 25: 10%
- 26-59: 13%
- 60 or over: 3%
### Ethnicity

- **White**: 82%
- **Mixed ethnic group**: 9%
- **Asian (Balngledeshi, Indian, Pakistani)**: 2%
- **Asian (Chinese)**: 1%
- **Black**: 2%
- **Other**: 1%

### UK vs Overseas

- **UK**: 93%
- **Overseas**: 7%

### Region (showing only those categories with respondents)

- **East Midlands**: 4%
- **North East**: 4%
- **North West**: 7%
- **South East**: 2%
- **South East**: 4%
- **West Midlands**: 4%
- **Overseas**: 79%
6. **Conclusions**

- The exhibition was well received and comments gathered during the survey period reflect a desire to see more exhibitions at the Manchester Museum about topics of local interest. It is important to note in this respect that the majority of sampled visitors came from the local area (61% saying that they live locally).

- Overall, the exhibition was a success in terms of making a positive impact on visitor perceptions of both the Whitworth Park and public parks in general, as well as increasing awareness of the important historical, cultural and ecological roles they play in our lives.

- Visitor comments about the historical significance are enlightening. There is a clear sense of discovery with visitors expressing surprise at the rich history of parks and the kinds of objects people have left in them. There is also a sense of depth of use and signs of an awareness that public parks are a form of urban heritage, and specifically that they have archaeological importance.
• Other comments highlight specific visitor responses. Some enjoyed learning about the archaeological process. For others the local dimension is important with the park being seen as a local landmark. Memory, nostalgia and a sense of place appear to have been important for some of these visitors.

• From the sample surveyed, the exhibition appears to have had less impact in terms of making people want to get involved in Whitworth Park in the future. This may be because visitors required greater information and clarification about the kinds of activities and voluntary roles available, as well as the level of commitment – and more specifically time – this would entail. Nevertheless, a small proportion of those surveyed stated a desire to find out more about their local park and expressed an interest in playing a role in its future.

• In terms of the demographics of the visitors there was a slightly higher percentage of females to males. Children under the age of 11 made up over a quarter of the visitors (at 27%, whilst adolescents made up 17%). Perhaps surprisingly given that Manchester Museum is located in the heart of a University, and that the city has a very high student population, 19-25 year olds only made up 11%. Adults between the age of 26 and 59 made up the largest group at 35%, with 10% over 60.

• In terms of ethnicity, 82% described themselves as white, which is lower than the 2011 census national average of 86% (and average for the Northwest region of 90%). Most of the visitors were resident in the UK with only 7% from overseas. Within the UK 79% of visitors were from the Northwest.

• The socio-economic profile of visitors compared with the 2011 census data show that ‘higher & intermediate managerial, administrative, professional occupations’ (A and B combined) are over-represented making up 37% of visitors in comparison with 22% of the wider population. ‘Supervisory, clerical & junior managerial, administrative, professional occupations’ (C1) at 26% versus 31%, as skilled manual occupations (C2) at 12% versus 21%. ‘Semi-skilled & unskilled manual occupations’, ‘Unemployed and lowest grade occupations’ (D and E combined) are under-represented at 16% compared with the wider population at 26%. The visitor profile is not out of keeping with wider museum visiting data, which shows that museums remain relatively more popular with categories A/B than C1 and C2 (Morris Hargreaves McIntyre 2007, Audience Knowledge Digest).
Appendix 21: Copy of schools risk assessment

SCHOOL OF ARTS, HISTORIES AND CULTURES
General Risk Assessment Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date: (1) Friday 26th Oct 2012</th>
<th>Assessed by: (2)</th>
<th>Validated by: (3)</th>
<th>Location: (4) Whitworth Park and South Gallery</th>
<th>Assessment ref no (5)</th>
<th>Review date: (6) October 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Task / premises:** (7)
Whitworth Park Schools Activities/Photography Sessions/Archaeology Dig and Finds Processing/Drama Workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity (8)</th>
<th>Hazard (9)</th>
<th>Person(s) in danger (10)</th>
<th>Existing measures to control risk (11)</th>
<th>Risk rating (12)</th>
<th>Result (13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles on site/in Whitworth Park, or encountered on the way to the site</td>
<td>Danger of project members, all volunteers and visitors to the project walking in front of vehicles</td>
<td>All those on site who may be near vehicles</td>
<td>All visitors to the project will be instructed to be aware of the security vehicles that patrol the tracks of Whitworth Park, and of other vehicles including those supplying a service to the excavation. At all times the project staff will keep vehicles a safe distance from the site and Crash Barriers will ensure that vehicles remain a safe distance from the trenches.</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entering the Gallery</td>
<td>Steps leading to the entrance.</td>
<td>Pupils, families and teachers</td>
<td>All participants will walk, not run, and be advised on steps and disabled access alternative.</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to the session</td>
<td>Slipping on the polished gallery floor</td>
<td>Pupils, families, teachers, workshop leaders</td>
<td>No running in the gallery, children to be briefed on gallery Low ‘rules’.</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tour of the Park</td>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>Pupils, families, teachers and workshop leaders by vehicles</td>
<td>Children to be supervised by responsible adults and teachers (refer to Child Protection policies) and warned about sharp objects, slippery mud and branches.</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tour of the Park (cont)</td>
<td>Sharps, People of the Park, Dogs</td>
<td>Pupils, families, teachers and workshop leaders</td>
<td>Children to be supervised by responsible adults and teachers (refer to Child Protection policies) and warned about sharp objects, slippery mud and branches.</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet break</td>
<td>Slippery floor, sinks and toilets</td>
<td>Pupils and families</td>
<td>Responsible adults to walk the children to the toilets and stay around until all are back.</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Slippery floor, chairs, tables.</td>
<td>Pupils and families</td>
<td>Children will be supervised by responsible adults and teachers. Children will be advised about being aware of the space around them.</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet Resources Activities</td>
<td>Handling objects, washing and cleaning brushes,</td>
<td>Pupils and families</td>
<td>Children will be advised clearly on the handling objects rules and best practice. Children will be advised thoroughly about how to apply resources.</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet Resources Activity</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Result</td>
<td>Low Risk</td>
<td>Action Required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet Resources Activity</td>
<td>Falling of branches, trees</td>
<td>Weather check before all sessions</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet Resources Activity</td>
<td>Steps leading down (nr South Gallery)</td>
<td>Children will be supervised by responsible adults and teachers. Children will be advised about being aware of the space around them.</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All fieldwork in Whitworth Park (including survey)</td>
<td>Wet weather, very hot weather, insect bites and stings, minor injury from dust/sharps/tools</td>
<td>Children will be advised to bring their own suncream, waterproof clothing, and insect repellent. All visitors to the project will be given adequate time for breaks and all project members have been advised to bring their own drinks which they will be allowed to consume at all times. No work will be undertaken in extreme weather. Children will be appropriately briefed in the safe use of tools and equipped with gloves for safe working. A site induction will cover Health &amp; Safety risks, and supervision at all times will be delivered by project staff and teachers/parents. An on-site First Aider will be present throughout. All participants will be advised to wash their hands thoroughly before eating. Visitors to the project with allergies to insect bites and other allergies will be asked to notify the project directors, and all staff will be made aware. Additionally we ask that visitors to the project bring any required medication with them to ensure that this will be available on site for immediate use if necessary.</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Result: T = trivial, A = adequately controlled, N = not adequately controlled, action required, U = unknown risk

REFERENCES:

HSE guide to Reporting of Injuries, Diseases and Dangerous Occurrences Regulations 1995. (RIDDOR) HSE
Health and Safety at Work Act 1974. HSE
Health and Safety (First-Aid) Regulations 1981. HSE
Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulation 1999. HSE
Advice on travel-related DVT. The Department of Health
Manchester Cemeteries ‘Code of Conduct’
Appendix 22: Copy of consent form

Photograph and Film Authorization

Dear Manchester Museum,

I ........................................................................................................, the parent / legal guardian of ......................................................... give The Manchester Museum and The Whitworth Art Gallery authorization to use any appropriate photographs and / or film footage taken of pupils participating in the archaeological dig project as part of our collaboration with Friends of Whitworth Park and The University of Manchester’s archaeology department, in publications such as the Newsletter, the Museum website, Museum Learning Blog and other material relating to the activity including the final exhibition. Any photographs or film footage used for publicity purposes will not identify pupils or the school by name.

Signature: __________________________ Date: ______________

N.B. For the purposes of this document the term ‘The Manchester Museum’ encompasses both staff working within the Museum and also those who represent the Museum in relation to any activities involving contact with children. Examples of such a representative may include a member of University staff from another office attending an event on behalf of the Museum, an artist running a workshop or a teacher from a local school acting as a supervisor at a Summer School.
Appendix 23: Copies of school evaluation questionnaires

Primary School Evaluation Form

Primary School visitor: your opinion please!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full name:</th>
<th>Male / Female</th>
<th>School name:</th>
<th>Year at school:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did you enjoy today?</th>
<th></th>
<th>Did your visit link to any of your school work?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was it good to be working outside?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Did you learn any new skills today?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What did you find most interesting and enjoyable about today?</th>
<th>Why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What did you want to do more of today? Why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What did you want to do less of today? Why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Please let us know whether or not you agree with the following...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I understand more about archaeology now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am now more interested in archaeology that I was before</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am now more likely to be interested in or study archaeology in the future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Secondary School/FE College Evaluation Form

Secondary School / College visitor: your opinion please!

Full name:          Male / Female
School name:          School year / Level:

The most enjoyable thing about today was...

I was surprised by.../I didn’t realise that...

I was disappointed that...

The most interesting thing I learned today was...

The one thing I would change is...

Because of today, something new / different that I will now do / think about is...

I hope that...
Teachers’ Evaluation Form

The Manchester Museum and the Whitworth Art Gallery would value your comments about the session you attended today. Please take a moment to fill out the following evaluation, using the starter sentences below. Thank you.

Session Name: Date:
School Name:
Postcode of School:
Teacher’s Name:
Subject:

Do you think the pupils enjoyed the session?
YES NO

Was the session successful in terms of your aims and objectives?
YES SOMEWHAT NO

I was amazed to see...

I was surprised that...

I was disappointed that....

Please use this space to note down four or five words that describe your reaction to the workshop:
DIG! Creative Arts Evaluation Form

Dig: Creative Interpretations. Evaluation form: Arts Access Workshop
The Whitworth Park Community Archaeology and History Project

Date: ……………………………… Home Postcode (optional): ………………………………

School: ……………………………………………………………………………………………

Did you visit Whitworth Park with your School?  Y / N
Had you visited Whitworth Park before the trip?  Y / N
Which parks do you usually visit (if any?)
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

How often do you visit parks?
☐ Every day
☐ At least once a week
☐ At least a month
☐ Hardly ever
☐ Never

What is your main purpose for visiting parks? (tick any that apply)
☐ Passing through on my way somewhere else
☐ Using facilities (playground, football field, skate park)
☐ Peace and quiet
☐ Privacy
☐ To spend time with friends
☐ Other …………………………

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...I enjoyed today’s workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a result of the workshop today...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...I am more likely to visit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitworth Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...I am more likely to visit my local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>park(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... I feel more confident about</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>using parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... I feel that parks are valuable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for local communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What did you enjoy most about today’s workshop?

What would you change about today?

Thank you 😊
DIG! Creative Arts Teachers’ Evaluation Form
Dig: Creative Interpretations. Evaluation form: Arts Access Workshop
The Whitworth Park Community Archaeology and History Project

So that we are better able to measure the impact of our activities, please can you answer the following questions:

The workshop was a valuable experience for my students
They developed their team working ability
Student attainment is likely to increase as a result of today’s event
The students’ personal or academic aspirations were raised

To what extent do you anticipate that the activity will support the student’s development?

Very likely/Quite likely/Neither/Unlikely/Very Unlikely/Don’t know

Increased motivation to learn
Increased confidence
More positive about themselves

Which part of today’s workshop do you think your students found most useful and enjoyable? Why?

Do you think this workshop will be helpful in motivating students with their studies? How?

Do you think this workshop has provided your students with sufficient challenges? Please comment.

How do you intend to take this experience forward with your students?

Are there any aspects of the workshop that could be improved? How?

Please note below any anecdotes relating to differences in behaviour or engagement that you have noticed in today’s workshop.

Do you have any other comments/feedback on today’s workshop, or ideas/suggestions on what you would like to see in the future?
Appendix 24: Analysis of school evaluations

During the fieldwork seasons of 2011 and 2013, the school and college participants were asked to fill in evaluation questionnaires designed by the Education Officers for Manchester Museum, and their responses were digitally curated by Hannah-lee Chalk (Manchester Museum). During the ‘Dig! Arts Access’ project, the evaluation was designed and collated by the project team. Four of these evaluation forms contain a mix of both closed and open response sections (Primary School forms, Arts Access forms and Teachers’ responses) whereas the Secondary/FE College evaluation only contains open response questions. Upon reflection, this evaluation could have been better designed in mind of the project’s objectives, to evaluate a range of experiences and views on parks rather than simply responses to the day’s events. Response rates were generally quite poor, and this was usually due to a lack of time at the end of the events for feedback, as well as pressing weather conditions/tiredness of the children: schools who promised to return forms seldom did so, despite follow-up correspondence – for the future, capturing this data in the field is advisable. As a result, only 4 school visits completed their evaluations on site making a response rate of only 45%. Within these forms however, the qualitative feedback tended to be very rich. The Arts Access programme also only has a response rate of 33% but this tended to encourage less free-response text. However, individual free responses were gathered from other schools in the field, and selective quotes have also been taken from the short films produced for the project. The following analysis therefore gathers together a variety of responses under thematic headings.

1. Park visiting
The main project did not gather data on individual pupils’ experiences of parks but the Arts Access evaluation revealed that knowledge of Whitworth Park was highly dependent on locality: unsurprisingly, students tended to visits parks closest to them. Interestingly, from that cohort, 29% of teenage children visit a park at least once a week, and another 52% visit parks at least once a month (figures for urban primary age children might be considerably higher). 91% of the Arts Access students though parks were a valuable resource, but their reasons for visiting parks varied – ‘meeting friends’ and ‘using the facilities’ (football, basketball pitches etc.) were their main reasons, though ‘peace and quiet’ also featured strongly. As with Whitworth Park, others simply ‘passed through’ as part of a journey, suggesting this kind of casual and fleeting visitor is another important user group for whom the overall ambiance and appearance of the park, as well as its safety, is key. Free response reasons included ‘visiting with families’ (perhaps for younger siblings), ‘buying an ice cream’ (an interesting insight given our rich oral history encounter with the ice cream seller in Whitworth Park), ‘dog walking’ or, quite movingly, ‘to get away from problems’. One of our Manchester Academy poems also captured this therapeutic role of parks: ‘Walking and thinking about your feelings/In too much crowd and muttering/Come and calm yourself down’. Importantly, of those surveyed, 76% said that the events had increased their confidence in using parks, whilst the poetry workshops in particular provided a rich opportunity for pupils to voice what they feared as well the things they enjoyed most.
2. Enjoyment of the day
The overwhelming response of school groups to the varied activities on offer was strongly positive, both from teachers (100%) and pupils (93%). There was a similar response to the in-school workshops, with 19% ‘strongly agreeing’ and 76% ‘agreeing’ that it had been an enjoyable day. The word cloud below expresses the range of ‘free response’ comments on the day, capturing the dominant feelings of excitement, surprise at the hard work involved, their delight in finding things, and their reflections on how much they had learned about ‘past lives’. Others spoke of the ‘fun’ they had had, and the ‘laughter’ involved in the drama workshops.

Wordcloud of free responses on the field-day and workshops

3. Working outdoors
One of the key aims of the dig was to provide an out-of-the-classroom learning experience that engaged students with the natural world. During their day with us, most school groups got wet, dirty, hot or cold, and tired: this physical exertion and hands-on experience was a shock to some. Yet many enjoyed the chance to ‘get dirty’ as one child put it, and felt invigorated by their hard work or exhilarated about their use of tools. For the sixth form students thinking about studying archaeology, this gave them a real insight into the working conditions of professional practice (see below). Meanwhile the YAC students often had prior experience of digging: they anticipated the hard work and really seemed to relish it.

Events like ours thus form an important complement to physical education and ‘messy play/hands-on learning’ that encourages embodiment engagement with the natural material world, but does not feature as strongly in the primary and secondary school curriculum as it might. Even the Arts Access workshops to make postcards or decorate plates with park designs involved the students in ‘a kinaesthetic activity where they could be creative’. Amongst the schoolchildren who did not dig, physical activities still came top: as one pupil put it ‘[I liked best] the part where we did drama because I like moving about’!
4. Learning new skills, gaining independence
From the schools feedback, most students realised that they were gaining new skills during the day, but others were negative or unsure – this may relate to their comments on links to the curriculum (see below) or indicate they did not recognise the dig as a learning environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did you gain new skills?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes 70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No 23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure 7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yet one of the repeated comments, particularly from the secondary schoolchildren, was how they valued being given “independence” in the field. They were trusted to get on with the digging or the washing, and to make their own discoveries. One primary school pupil particularly relished using a wheelbarrow and learning how to “shovul” [sic] whilst another “enjoyed the shovelling best”. Even one of the teachers wrote that they had particular enjoyed learning about “the particular mattocking movements and routines to more efficiently remove soil etc. – I value this though
rather tiring, as I’ve always wanted to be a palaeontologist”. Other pupils enjoyed looking closely at the artefacts they were uncovering or washing: learning about “how to tell different materials apart”. Alongside these physical and material skills, the students “learned about working in a team”, and teachers commented favourably on the “friendly yet intensive educational teaching” delivered in the field. The inter-generational nature of the project also taught them (as one perceptive student put it) “how to get along with adults”. Key amongst these figures was the chairman of the Friends, Ken Shone, whose quiet air of authority, digging skills and knowledge of the Park quickly earned him the nickname ‘King Ken’!

“We were given the independence to do our own work, and when we found things, we felt incredibly proud” (Manchester Academy and Xaverian students)

5. Active learning: the ‘place of finding’
‘Yet no less dispensable is the cautious probing of the spade in the dark loam, and it is to cheat oneself of the richest prize to preserve as a record merely the inventory of one’s discoveries, and not this dark joy of the place of finding itself.’
Walter Benjamin. ‘One Way Street’ (1979: 314)

One of the keywords in feedback was the notion of discovery: “we got to find all sorts of mysterious things”. Some expressed real surprise at what was hidden under the ground, just below their feet (“things can be found in unexpected places”) but also how good they were at finding things compared with some of the adults. Anecdotally, we know that young, sharp eyes are often beneficial in field-walking or combing spoil heaps for what has been accidentally overlooked or discarded, but we were delighted by the fact that this gave some pupils an unexpected chance to shine: “I was surprised I was the best!” The rewards were clear: not only did the teachers report “It was almost as if they were competing with each other to find things... a real challenge they enjoyed”, but the children also felt that once “we started digging and found stuff, it made it fun”. Yet even over the finds processing, there was a renewed delight in “seeing things come to light” – “washing the things that we found... learning about their history”.

The importance of “holding things” and “touching things” described by numerous children captures this joy of ‘hands-on’ visceral experience. No longer distanced from artefacts in a museum case, they were able to make connections with their
own lives – things they wore, ate, played with – and the drama activity in particular encouraged them to put all of this knowledge together to act out a scene from the Edwardian Park: a use of imaginative and embodied re-enactment which (as one child put it) “made the past realistic”. This active and independent form of learning through research was captured by one teacher in her reasons for signing up for the day – “to make history a little bit more practical, more hands-on... to have a go at ‘doing history’ if you like”.

The joy of finding with students from Medlock Primary and Southern Cross School: “finding a threepence coin and a marble was great!”, “the joy of finding a good piece of pottery”, “every time we found something you got excited”.

6. Linking the project to the curriculum
The schools events did not set out explicitly to dovetail into particular Key Stage objectives or curriculum aims: we intended to offer a rather different kind of learning experience. Unfortunately this is reflected in formal feedback where students overwhelmingly failed to make explicit links between the on-site activities or workshops and their curriculum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did your visit link to any of your school work?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No 57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure 29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the Secondary Schools for whom we delivered in-house archive workshops in preparation for their visit, we suspect this answer would have been much stronger, as we spent time with their teachers discussing links to GCSE History, and identified key skills to target such as map regression, documentary critique and visual analysis of historic images. For the College students learning Archaeology, the links with their curriculum were also much more explicit in terms of the fieldwork skills they had
been learning in the abstract: geophysics, survey and excavation, as well as working with different archaeological materials.

Yet even amongst the primary schools, qualitative comments indicate the pupils had learned a great deal about their local environment, and specifically, the history of Whitworth Park. Some commented on the physical features but also social behaviour (“I found out that it had a lake and some statues, and when people went to the park they use to dress fancy”), differences in prices and food (“how oysters were cheap in the other centuries”) and more generally “what people’s lives were like back then”. Apart from historical knowledge, they were surprised by “the amount of clay they used in the past” and “the amount of glass found”, or even “that there is a type of rock called a ‘slag’”! Others enjoyed learning that “in the past they had different toys”, that “rich people had thin plates” and generally “finding out how the past used to look” through the postcard images. Rare children expressly commented on how important this was to their sense of place: “it’s like, where you live, it’s your background, so it’s really interesting to find out about what happened” though the teachers were more acutely aware of this: “the children are gaining an understanding of the history of the park next to their school... they walk through it every day yet they have no idea of the journey the park has gone through”. Most impressively, one child noted that the poetry workshops had helped them “explore the links between literacy and history” whilst another pupil who was captivated by the survey and recording, captured succinctly the interdisciplinary nature of archaeology: “I learned that maths and literacy are mixed up classes”!

7. Archaeology, heritage and citizenship
As one of our staff members put it in the short film made by Manchester Museum: “one of the project’s overall aims is to get local children to care a little bit more about their park... these are vital green, urban spaces... This is the park they come to, after school or with their families... [we want them] to know more about the heritage on their doorstep... and to get involved!” But another important objective, as a University department, was to teach children what archaeology is and how they can participate. Both aims were successful. Children learned a great deal about park heritage, and felt excited to be involved in its re-discovery:

Learning about Whitworth Park’s heritage
Whilst sixth-form AS/A-level students were able to put their classroom learning into practice, even primary school students began to understand the ‘archaeological process’ from discovery to display: from “[learning] how to use a trowel and how the grass was taken off and put back” to “how archaeologists take the things to the museum” whilst others realised that “archaeology takes a while to research” expressing surprise “that it was such a slow process” and the care this took: “you had to be careful and clean each thing”.

Interestingly, several pupils commented on the methodology of field-work and how proud they felt to have understood it: “[I have learned] the correct technique of digging”, and “that there is a systematic way to how they dig”. Astute students grappled with the notion of stratigraphy; “they had a great system to dig, layer by layer”; “you have to take it layer by layer or you do damage”; “[I learned] how layers in the soil are completely different”. Even the finds washing intrigued some: “I loved how I got my own fancy toothbrush from the miss” and “I have learned that you don’t submerge finds!” Amusingly, the staff were a source of amusement to some of the older students expecting a more ‘Time Team’ style set of experts: “I was surprised there was no-one here with a beard!” noted one, whilst another wanted “someone else like Phil Harding here!”

One of the final aims of the project was to raise their ambitions for the Park and its future: hoping that this would sow the seeds for future involvement or even volunteering as they approach adulthood. Being aware of its rich heritage was a first step: as one pupil said, “I will think about its history every time I walk through the park”. By bringing the university into the community, and getting the schoolchildren to engage in a form of ‘citizen science’ we also hoped to raise their educational ambitions and career prospects. A teacher from the Manchester Academy noted that “the school is a business and enterprise school so they are learning there are so many aspects to history… so many avenues and careers they could follow”. Another teacher from Xaverian College noted their experience on site should make archaeology “very tantalizing for a future career”, whilst even the Arts Access workshops – and the contact between university staff/students and schoolchildren – had made them think “not just about college but college”! The last comment on many of the feedback forms was that they hoped to get more involved.

“I will be joining this again”

“I’m gonna do this again!”

“some day I can do this again”

“(I hope) I can be able to do this again in life”

“I would like to do this in the future”

8. More and less

Part of the purpose of the evaluation was to establish whether we had achieved our aims but also learn about both the highlights and the disappointments of the school-group visits. A wider hope of this project is that this ‘University in the Community’ model might be disseminated more widely in park settings across the UK, and it
would be good for other Archaeology departments or indeed, contract units, to know what worked best and what we would do differently in the future.

One of the teachers was disappointed that so much time was spent handling, interpreting and then processing finds, rather than (as one child put it) “having more time to dig!” Another felt we spent too long talking to the students rather than getting them involved straight away (an unfortunate necessity with H&S inductions and the provision of background history on the Park). Inevitably, a small minority of children did not enjoy the digging, especially on cold, wet and windy days (of which there were a fair few): despite good briefing materials advising warm and waterproof clothing, and ample drinks and snacks, pupils complained that “the weather was bad”, “it was cold and windy” and that “the weather froze us to death”!

Food featured in a few comments, not least the pupil who responded that the best thing in the day had been the “chocolate brownie” left over from the Art Gallery lunches for the students! Many students felt physically tired, particularly from the unexpected kneeling, crouching or sitting on the ground (“get more chairs... my legs really hurt!”; “[I was] sitting on knees for long periods of time”) and this led one teacher to leave before filling in the evaluation forms stating that the class were “too tired” to complete it. In particular, the finds washing seemed unpopular amongst many pupils (“[I hope] we can do this again but don’t wash up!”; “washing the objects – it was a waste of time!”; “less time with a toothbrush” etc.). Although we did not gather the data associated with this to probe whether this bore any relation to gender or age, I wonder whether this is not also symptomatic of a ‘dish-washer’ generation for whom washing by hand is deemed a menial chore. Others, however, enjoyed the gentle revelation of finds in the wash-bowl: “the most enjoyable thing was washing the things that we found”; “seeing the artefacts after they were clean”; “finding out about the things we were cleaning”.

Given that we were in the park, some children were sad they were not permitted to enjoy its facilities: “I was disappointed that we wasn’t allowed on the swings”, “[the worst thing was] we didn’t play in the park”. Another pupil was upset that “we didn’t go round the museum”. Permission for the former could be built into future Risk Assessment and Consent forms, not least because gathering pupil feedback on playgrounds might be a useful corollary to historic reports on Victorian and Edwardian ‘play in the park’.

Meanwhile, feedback from the Arts Access events suggested that 1-to-1 supervision was preferable to ‘floating’ supervision from a wider variety of individuals, as it focused group attention, steered engagement and enabled questions to be answered quickly. On the dig, this was achieved through a dedicated staff member working in the trench with the dig team, whilst another member of staff supervised the finds washing.

9. **What we learned from them**

There were three strong, unexpected research outcomes from working with the schools groups. The first was rather shocking, and it emerged particularly in the poetry workshops both with the Ahmed Iqbal Ullah Race Relations Resource Centre, but also the postcard workshops as part of the Arts Access programme. This was that
whilst many children loved their visits to parks, seeing them as joyous or beautiful places, they could also – particularly at certain times of the day, in certain weather conditions, or in certain contexts – be frightening, intimidating or lonely places. Although we had anticipated this from the negative press associated with Whitworth Park during its period of financial neglect and rising crime (indeed it was one of the images we sought to challenge), it was a shock to see this feeding through to pupils as young as this. Their artworks, written and visual, captured these contradictory feelings vividly. Gang crime, drugs use, and litter featured strongly in such poems, yet others were moved by the sounds, sights and smells of the Park, conjuring a place of endless play.

“The leaves rustle and the trees sway/As the children play on the soft green grass”
“Flowers smell like honey”
“It was the breeze waking up the trees”
“Playing football... All day through, with I don’t know who”
“The park is a place that takes all your troubles away”
“Staying out until it starts to get dark”

“The teenagers, just like wolves hunting and destroying”
“Feeling scared – no-one shared”
“Graffiti on the dull climbing frames, rubbish rustling around the chewing gum filled tarmac”
“Why are we them children that are scared to go in the park because they think that they will get shot?”

On a stronger note, the very act of taking part in the dig or the workshops increased the children’s likelihood of visiting a park as well as increasing their confidence.
The second unexpected outcome was the performance of the children who did the Drama workshop in the Whitworth Art Gallery. Led by Debbie Doran, their connection between what they saw in the images, felt through the finds, and imagined in their ‘photograph’ scene, brought to life aspects of performance, dress, comportment, and display, which had been a minor theme in our research. It made us focus more explicitly on this for our exhibition, realising that a ribbon from a fancy bonnet or shiny button, alongside the ‘posed’ tableaus of the postcards, could be used to conjure quite complex themes of wealth, age, gender and class.

*Acting out wealth, age, gender and class in Whitworth Art Gallery, and artefacts and memory-work in Whitworth Park.*
Finally, in the handling of objects, whether gritty with dirt, washed clean in the bowl, or even handed round from the protective tissue of our crystal boxes, we started to develop a stronger awareness of the power of archaeological objects in making memories, and in mediating contemporary identity. This has become an explicit focus in some of our conference papers and academic articles.
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