

**MAC** Secretariat

MAC@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk

26<sup>th</sup> October, 2017

### Call for evidence: EEA workers in the UK labour market

Thank you for the opportunity to contribute to the call for evidence. This response is submitted on behalf of the Federation of Archaeological Managers and Employers (FAME) the trade association for commercial archaeological organisations in the UK.

Commercial archaeology is a specialist service to the development planning and construction sector. It provides critical input during the design, planning and delivery of UK commercial, housing and infrastructure projects at local, regional and national level, including major projects such as new roads, rail and airports.

#### General

We draw our evidence for the UK archaeological labour market from (1) the recent survey, *Archaeological Market Survey 2016-2017*, carried out by Landward Research for ourselves and the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (due for publication November 2017) and (2) *Archaeological Labour Market Intelligence: Profiling the Profession 2012-2013* (Landward Research 2013)<sup>1</sup>. We rely for predictions of market growth on research carried out by Historic England (HE), (*National Infrastructure Development and Historic Environment Skills Capacity 2015-33: An Assessment*, Historic England Historic Environment Intelligence Unit, May 2016<sup>2</sup>).

The research shows that 15% of the UK archaeological labour force are currently non UK EEA nationals (up from 2% in 2012/2013). This represent 653 of a total workforce of 4,351 in the applied commercial archaeology sector. There is predicted market growth of between 25% to 64% to 2021 on the basis of planned government infrastructure projects. A major part of the sectors' strategic response to the predicted capacity and skills challenges during this period is for continued and enhanced access to skilled EEA labour. Without this there is significant risk that the archaeological sector will fail to deliver early critical works on major strategic UK schemes such as HS2 leading to delay and extra cost.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> http://www.landward.eu/2013/10/archaeology-labour-market-intelligence-profiling-the-profession-2012-13.html

 $<sup>^2\</sup> https://content.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/national-infrastructure-development-and-capacity-2015-33-assessment/national-infrastructure-development-and-archaeological-capacity-shortages.pdf/$ 



## **Specific Questions**

# **EEA Migration Trends**

• Please provide evidence on the characteristics (e.g. types of jobs migrants perform; skill levels, etc) of EEA migrants in your particular sector/local area/ region. How do these differ from UK workers? And from non-EEA workers?

We are not aware of any separate data for EEA workers. In 2012/2013 (Landward 2013) the majority of archaeologists held an undergraduate degree or higher (92.6%, with 37% additionally holding post graduate qualifications). Job roles were of a technical/professional nature with career progression for most archaeologists reflected in the appropriate grade membership of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIFA). There is no evidence to suggest EEA workers differ from UK workers.

• To what extent are EEA migrants seasonal; part-time; agency-workers; temporary; short-term assignments; intra-company transfers; self-employed? What information do you have on their skill levels? To what extent do these differ from UK workers and non-EEA workers?

We are not aware of any separate data for EEA workers. In 2012/13 82% of archaeologists were on permanent/open ended contracts (this was up from 66% in 1998)(Landward Research 2013). The latest survey (2016-17) records that 75% were on permanent contracts with a further 20% on fixed term contracts. There is no evidence to suggest EEA workers differ from UK workers.

• Have the patterns of EEA migration changed over time? What evidence do you have showing your employment of EEA migrants since 2000? And after the Brexit referendum? Are these trends different for UK workers and non-EEA workers?

As noted above EEA workers in archaeology have increased as a percentage of the total workforce from 2% in 2012/13 to 15% in 2016/17 (Landward Research 2017). During this period the turnover for commercial archaeology grew by approximately 40%. Figures show the largest increases in archaeological employment have been in the commercial sector and this is likely to be where the majority of EEA workers are employed.

During the period since 2000 there was a significant growth in commercial archaeology until the recession after 2007, and the main country of origin for EEA archaeologists during this early period was from Poland. There was a significant number of British archaeologists who migrated to Ireland during the same period as



the sector grew expotentially over this same period. During the recovery years from 2012 onwards countries such as Spain, Portugal and Italy have provided a steady stream of candidates, as well as Poland, Ireland, and other northern and middle European countries.

The relationship between archaeological companies and personnel who operate in both the UK and the Republic of Ireland is a particular concern to us in respect of the potential problems if EEA labour is restricted, as currently the language and policy similarities between these states enables a productive exchange of skills and revenue, which we would not wish to see jeopardized.

• Have you made any assessment of the impact of a possible reduction in the availability of EEA migrants (whether occurring naturally or through policy) as part of your workforce? What impact would a reduction in EEA migration have on your sector/local area/region? How will your business/sector/area/region cope? Would the impacts be different if reductions in migration took place amongst non-EEA migrants? Have you made any contingency plans?

As noted above the archaeology sector has carried out research which indicates market growth of between 25% and 64% to 2021 (HE 2016). Any reduction in currently available labour resources will impact very negatively on the sector's role in the delivery of nationally important housing and infrastructure projects. The research undertaken by Historic England identified a number of recommendations to address capacity/skills issues, one of which involves continued access to EEA workers. The sector is also working on increasing skills capacity within the UK at graduate, NVQ and apprentice level, but it is accepted that only through utilizing all labour resource channels will the sector be able to respond to the demands placed on it as a result of planned new housing and infrastructure.

### **Recruitment Practices, Training & Skills**

• Please provide evidence on the methods of recruitment used to employ EEA migrants. Do these methods differ from those used to employ UK and non-EEA workers? What impact does this have on UK workers? Have these methods changed following the Brexit referendum?

The commercial sector relies for recruitment largely on openly advertised posts. These are open to UK and non-UK EAA staff alike. There has been no change since the referendum.



• Do recruitment practices differ by skill-type and occupation?

No

• What are the advantages and disadvantages of employing EEA workers? Have these changed following the Brexit referendum result?

EAA workers have similar academic and professional archaeological skills as UK workers and it is normally possible to demonstrate how different qualifications provide the appropriate accreditation. Nevertheless, UK workers are normally at an advantage as a result of language and direct experience of UK archaeological work

• To what extent has EEA and non-EEA migration affected the skills and training of the UK workers?

No effect. In general increased training for all workers has been driven by demand for increased skills. Both UK and EEA workers have benefited from this, but particularly UK workers who can more easily take advantage of NVQ and apprentice schemes.

• How involved are universities and training providers in ensuring that the UK workforce has the skills needed to fill key roles/roles in high demand in your sector? Do you have plans to increase this involvement in the future?

The majority of archaeological employees are UK graduates. The HE report into sector capacity, as well as recommending continued access to EEA workers, also mapped out strategies to improve archaeological vocational training at both graduate and non-graduate level. An Archaeological NVQ is now in place with plans for graduate and Level 3 non-graduate apprenticeships well advanced. In addition, archaeological employers are now increasing operating more formal internal training schemes and the CIFA has a scheme to accredit these.

• How well aware are you of current UK migration policies for non-EEA migrants? If new immigration policies restrict the numbers of low-skilled migrants who can come to work in the UK, which forms of migration into low-skilled work should be prioritised? For example, the current shortage occupation list2 applies to high skilled occupations; do you think this should be expanded to cover lower skill levels?

We are aware of employment regulations in respect of Tier 2 and Tier 5 visas, although the significant barriers in time and cost mean that this approach is very seldom used in archaeology (sector research indicates that non-EEA workers represent only 2% of those employed within archaeology). Our concern, is to



maintain access to skilled EEA workers. Any new proposals should avoid equating only high levels of pay (e.g. £30,000 plus pa) with high skills. While archaeological workers are highly skilled (see above) average pay is relatively low, factoring in the vocational aspects of the job and market forces. The CIfA recommended minimum pay levels for qualified field workers are set at £18,000, with experienced management level jobs set at £27,100.

### Economic, Social and Fiscal Impacts

 What are the economic, social and fiscal costs and benefits of EEA migration to the UK economy? What are the impacts of EEA migrants on the labour market, prices, public services, net fiscal impacts (e.g. taxes paid by migrants; benefits they receive), productivity, investment, innovation and general competitiveness of UK industry?

UK archaeology benefits greatly from having access to skilled EEA workers. The research demonstrates that they represent a significant part of the workforce and this demand is predicted to grow. There is no evidence to suggest that they impact negatively on UK workers and in any case there are sectoral plans in place to increase the supply of UK workers at graduate and non-graduate level. Only a combination of increasing the numbers of both UK and EEA workers will address the significant capacity and skills challenges facing archaeology and we see it as vital that in the formulation of any new rules covering EEA migrants/workers some differentiation by sector is applied to ensure that new regulations recognize the specific needs and circumstances of archaeology.

We would be happy to discuss in detail the issues raised in this call for evidence insofar as they affect archaeology. In the meantime, if there is anything further that we can do to assist please do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours sincerely,

Nick Shepherd BA PgDip MCIfA Chief Executive, FAME