

## ASSOCIATION OF PROFESSIONAL HERITAGE PRACTITIONERS

### MENTORSHIP SYSTEM

#### 1 Introduction

The Association differentiates its membership into three categories. On application to join the Association, potential members list their qualifications and other relevant data and they are each accredited by the Association's Accreditation Committee as Accredited Member, Candidate or Associate. These categories are defined as follows:

***Accredited Member:***

A heritage practitioner who is trained in and experienced in and who will be responsible for narrow or specialist parts of assessments as well as a heritage practitioner who has broad experience and who will take overall responsibility for comprehensive assessments or who will be engaged in any part of a wide range of heritage resource-related projects.

***Candidate:***

A Candidate is a member who has some training relevant in the development of heritage practitioners but who has insufficient experience and training to be accredited as a fully-fledged heritage practitioner.

***Associate:***

An Associate is a member who does not have the training and qualifications necessary for accreditation but who is engaged in heritage resource-related practice as a practitioner and who has sufficient experience and background in heritage resource management to be regarded as a professional heritage practitioner and welcomed as a member although does not satisfy the formal training and/or qualification requirements for full accreditation.

#### 2 The Need for Mentoring

Candidates have, since the Association was formed in 2003, found it difficult to progress to Accredited Member. This difficulty is, primarily, because very few Candidates are in the employ of an Accredited Member or other appropriately trained or experienced professional who could direct the Candidate in his/her professional endeavours and assist and/or mentor their development thus enabling them to achieve the expertise required for such accreditation.

Indeed, it is apparent that the incipient profession of "professional heritage practitioner" is in its infancy and there are no large practices which provide the appropriate training, experience and direction to young professionals or new-comers to the profession. Furthermore, with only one or two exceptions, few of the statutory authorities at national, provincial or local level are at present equipped to give the appropriate training, experience and direction.

Furthermore, it has been difficult to get appropriate formal training in the conservation of the built environment or in heritage resource management in South Africa although this is changing.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The School of Architecture, Planning and Geomatics of the University of Cape Town's the Engineering and Built Environment faculty has offered an M Phil (Conservation of the Built Environment) programme (two years, part-time) since 2009. Also, the Humanities faculty offers an M Phil (Heritage Studies) programme (two years, full-time). There are also a number of post-graduate diploma and Masters programmes offered in humanities faculties in other SA universities which deal with heritage although, in most cases, relatively little attention is given to the environment or the management of built heritage. Also, most archaeology programmes include courses in "cultural resource management" (CRM) or similar. Finally, SAHRA (collaborating with Rhodes University) offers a diploma in heritage resource management.

Given these difficulties, this Mentorship System is devised to assist Candidates to establish appropriate relationships with accredited professional heritage practitioners (or other appropriately skilled and/or experienced professionals who may not be members of the Association) by whom they can be mentored and assisted in their professional endeavours and in their applications for accreditation.

## **2 The System**

Given the circumstances, the system devised to assist Candidates is a very simple one; and the Association's Mentorship Committee assists the Candidate in the following steps:

- to identify the necessary experience required for the accreditation of the Candidate by interacting with the Accreditation Committee on behalf of the Candidate;
- to identify the appropriate profile of mentor;
- to assist the Candidate to make contact with an appropriate senior heritage practitioner/professional who is prepared to mentor the Candidate in question;
- to assist the Candidate to draw up a "contract" between the mentor and Candidate that enables the Candidate to accumulate the experience and develop the skills appropriate to that individual candidate's training, background and ambitions; and
- to assist the Candidate to make application to the Accreditation Committee for accreditation.

The required formal academic training, specialist training, work experience and working knowledge of current heritage resource-, planning- and environment-related policy, legislation and management for accreditation as an Accredited Member is outlined in the Association's **Rules for Accreditation** which can be found on the Association's web site: [www.aphp.org.za](http://www.aphp.org.za) .

The system relies on periodic interaction between Candidate and Mentor which is always initiated by the Candidate and who keeps a record of such interaction in a simple table (see the attached example of such a table; and the table filled in recording an example of a one-year cycle of mentorship).

## **3 The Invitation to Candidates**

Candidates are invited to approach the Mentorship Committee through its chairperson, Dr Stephen Townsend (021-4249871 or 072-9271300; but preferably via email in the first instance: [ssquared@worldonline.co.za](mailto:ssquared@worldonline.co.za)), to initiate the process of identifying and making contact with a potential mentor and agreeing on a "contract" with the mentor that sets out the experience required for the accreditation sought.

**24/8/2016**

**Agreed by Exco and Accreditation Committee**

**APHP Mentorship Programme - Mentor/ Mentee Record of Interaction (MRI) since ..... (date)**

**Mentor:**

**(PHP) Mentee:**

**(CHP)**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Type of Interaction</b>	<b>Brief summary of Engagement/ Issue Discussed/ Feedback &amp; Guidance provided</b>

<b>Date</b>	<b>Mentor signature:</b>	<b>Mentor comment:</b>

**APHP Mentorship Programme - Mentor/ Mentee Record of Interaction (MRI) since February 2014**

**Mentor: Dr Stephen S Townsend PHP**

**Mentee: Raymond Smith CHP**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Type of Interaction</b>	<b>Brief summary of Engagement/ Issue Discussed/ Feedback &amp; Guidance provided</b>
9 Feb	Tel & E-mail	Verbal agreement of Mentor/ Mentee relationship confirmed. Two levels will apply: 1. General guidance & proof reading of NHRA applications/ reports. 2. Joint ventures on larger complex projects such as Section 38 and major surveys etc.
12 March	Tel	Mentor advised Mentee on specific issues and process involved in a Section 38 tender submitted by the Mentee for work to be done on the Parel Valley Avenue of trees. It was felt that the scale and complexity suited the mentee's level of knowledge and experience at this stage. This would be the mentee's first Sec 38 if the tender is successful.
17 March	Tel	Discussion on a potential Section 38 application involving infill housing in Khayelitsha, which the mentee was considering to tender for. The process and tender doc's were interrogated and it was decided that it would not be of benefit to the mentee to engage with this type of tender in which the ROD was clearly not thought through properly.
24 March	Tel	Discussion regarding the merits of an approval for the demolition of Romney Rd 81 , Greenpoint, which was debated in the media. Mentor provided an overview of the issues involved. As it was a marginal case, the articulation of significance becomes critical. A neighbour seems more interested in protecting views than in heritage conservation.
17 April	Meeting	Discussed a demolition permit application in Voelklip Hermanus. The process with regards owner/ authorities and practitioner relationship explored. The implications of this grade 3C building was briefly reviewed to establish a relevant response.
24 April	Meeting & E-mail	Mentor conveyed the newly re-written conservation guidelines for the Stanford village which includes the management process and its integration with the new zoning scheme overlays - OZ1.
20 May	Meeting	Follow up discussion on Erf 2716 Voelklip Hermanus application for demolition. Inherent (not significant enough on its own) and Contextual (devaluing) significances was debated to ascertain the feasibility of retention as opposed to demolition in relation to the economic sensibility of the property.
30 June	Tel	General discussion on level of competence required of architectural practitioners on heritage projects. With reference to the SACAP matrix and NHRA. SACAP to regulate, not local authorities. Each case to be judged on own merit. Some work on heritage sites has nothing to do with sensitivity level.
4 July	Tel	Proof read Sec 34 application on Erf 2716 and provided comments on structure & detail of the report.
19 Sept	Tel & E-mail	Proof read Sec 34 application on Erf 81 & 576 Kleinbaai and provided comments regarding clarity of intention and powers of the authority.
22 Sept	Meeting	Discussed, Erf 188, Stellenbosch. Advice on responsibilities and legalities pertaining to a site older than 60 years, to which additions were made by existing owner wishing to sell while no plans and approvals exist.
22 Sept	Meeting	Completing a NID for Western Province Cricket ground. Possible Sec 38 Collaboration project between Mentor & Mentee.
30 Sept	Tel	Discussed Erf 5553, Betty's Bay – the implications of the grading on conservation intensions and making the argument for specific recommendation.
21 Nov	Meeting	Review/ De-Briefing session on the three Sec 34's completed to

		date. General discussion on lessons learnt.
21 Nov	Meeting	Collaboration with mentor on Sec 38 project – WPCG. Initial discussion around HWC requirements for HIA.
21 Nov	Meeting	WPCG meeting with mentor & clients to receive project proposal briefing.
23 Nov	Site visit	WPCG Site visit with mentor to familiarise ourselves with the context, site lines, character & general sense of place during a match.

2015 8 Jan	Meeting	Reviewing research material with mentor on WPCA project and assisting on general material for the HIA report.
20 Feb	Meeting	Reviewing the Draft HIA with mentor and discussed further illustrative material needed to communicate the recommendation. Also discussed Erf 2392 Section 34 Heritage Statement & Architectural proposal prepared by the mentee with mentor for compliance and ensure that a responsible approach was followed.

<b>Date</b>	<b>Mentor signature:</b>	<b>Mentor comment:</b>