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The January 2012 issue features a forum on one of the few common experiences of almost every archaeologist: the field school. Field schools are becoming a topic of interest in archaeology rather than just a longstanding disciplinary institution. Some of the first writing on field schools appeared in The SAA Archaeological Record (2006: Volume 6 Number 1) and in the past two years two monographs have been published on the subject. This forum contributes to this relatively new interest by offering some examples of current approaches to field schools that expand the boundaries of this educational model. The perspectives offered by authors situate field schools in educational, institutional, and community contexts, and are a testament to the innovative ways that methodological training can be integrated in to broader types of learning and experiences beyond archaeology.

This forum originated as a session at the 2011 SAA Meetings in Sacramento, and is one of several conference sessions that eventually make their way into the pages of the magazine either as articles or forums. If you have a session scheduled for Memphis that you believe would make a good article or forum for The SAA Archaeological Record, please contact me in advance of the meetings at jbaxter@depaul.edu. I spend a good deal of time at the meetings recruiting potential authors and topics for the magazine: an effort made easier when eager authors contact me in advance!

This issue also allows us the opportunity to say goodbye to two important contributors to our field: James Benedict and Janet Spector. In addition to the obituary for Janet Spector, her family and colleagues have made available a previously unpublished essay where she, in her own words, reflects upon her career as a feminist and archaeologist. This essay, written in 1998, is paired with an essay summarizing a very recent (November 2011) forum on the futures of women in archaeology, which offers some current perspectives on issues raised by Janet Spector as she reflected on her own career.

Finally, I am happy to report that the 2010 SAA Member Needs Assessment Survey shows that the vast majority of you read all or part of The SAA Archaeological Record, and find it a valuable part of your membership. I also want to remind the readership that this is your publication and the content I publish comes more from suggestions and submissions from SAA members than my efforts to recruit authors to write on particular topics on your behalf. So, if there are topics you'd like to see as content in future issues please let me know—I'd be happy to work with you as an author (or to find the right author) to add some new content areas to the magazine. I wish you all a very happy new year.

Editor’s Note: Kevin Kiernan wishes to change the figure caption for Figure 2 of his article, which appeared in the November issue. The revised figure caption should read, “Restored map of the Sea Island and Charley King Mounds. Courtesy of the National Anthropological Archives.”
Recognizing Superior Governmental Service

We are all too aware that many commentators today have a very negative view of government—without entering into that minefield—we also know that there are a huge number of dedicated public servants in local, state, and federal government who every day do things that make a positive difference in our lives. This is especially true for those public servants who preserve and study the archaeological record. When governmental actions are taken or proposed that endanger archaeological resources, the SAA is quick to speak out and this is as it should be. But we should also be equally willing to congratulate and hold up as an example those who take positive actions. This is not only the right thing to do, it is also wise. Let me provide an example. A few months ago Patty Crown of UNM called to the Board’s attention the excellent work of the Interagency Fire Team in protecting cultural resources while they were fighting the extensive fires in New Mexico. We investigated and followed her suggestion and prepared a letter for the team. Later we were told that the letter had moved through both the NPS and USDA agencies to the top leadership—highlighting and encouraging the activities. So not only did we do the right thing, we also encouraged the leadership to support these activities. We want to do more and we need YOUR help. When you become aware of exceptional acts of governmental service in archaeology at any level please send a letter or e-mail to myself, David Lindsey (SAA Governmental Affairs), TJ Ferguson (Chair of Governmental Affairs Committee), or any member of the GAC. With the extensive network that GAC has we’ll follow up and, where appropriate, prepare a letter or take other appropriate recognition actions.

New Online Publishing Initiatives

At its fall meeting the Board approved a number of significant changes to the SAA journal publication programs. From the beginning of SAA’s relationship with JSTOR, the two most recent years of AQ and LAQ were not available online. Starting in 2012 the current issues of AQ and LAQ will now be available online to all members. They will not, at least initially, be available to institutional subscribers, just to our members. Significantly, the publishing platform will also permit the editors to place pre-publication copies on-line, and this will dramatically increase the speed at which a paper is accessible. I should note that the Board has also been working with the journal editors on other new steps to substantially decrease the delay between article submission and publication. Supplementary materials can also be published on-line with the article meaning that color images, video, databases, or other material can be considered by the editors. The new system will support standard tools such as RSS feeds, bibliographic applications (e.g., Zotero, EndNote etc.) and will be integrated into the larger arena of digital scholarship—growing the impact of AQ and LAQ. Later in 2012 Current Research will also return—but only in a digital format. We’ll be providing more details on that in the future.

I particularly want to thank the current journal Editors Alison Rautman, Gabriela Uruñuela, and Chris Pool and incoming editor Ken Sassaman as well as the Publications Committee under the able leadership of Deb Nichols for all their hard work and for their help in this process.
IN BRIEF

Tobi A. Brimsek

Tobi A. Brimsek is executive director for the Society for American Archaeology.

A Taste of Memphis

The 77th Annual meeting is shaping up to be one of the best ever for networking and other opportunities in beautiful Memphis. The venue will be the Memphis Cook Convention Center, along with the Memphis Marriott Downtown, the headquarters hotel. You can explore meeting content and ancillary activities through the Preliminary Program which is posted on SAAweb (www.saa.org). Preliminary programs were also dropped in the mail at the end of December. If you are already registered as a participant, you may want to peruse the Preliminary Program and take the opportunity to register for all of the events which are now available.

For example, in addition to the President’s Forum on the Media and Archaeology, co-sponsored by SAA and the National Geographic Society, symposia, forums, general sessions, posters, the Ethics Bowl, exhibits and the CRM Expo, you are able to choose from activities including:

- (Wonderful field trips—The C.H. Nash Museum at the Chucalissa Archaeological Site, located on a bluff along the Mississippi River, a Mississippian mound complex just south of downtown Memphis, walking tours of downtown Memphis hosted by noted Memphian, Jimmy Ogle, and of course, what is Memphis without a tour of Graceland to experience Elvis! For itineraries and details, please check out the descriptions of these tours in the Preliminary Program and register now.

- (Enriching Workshops—There are a plethora of workshops this year including 3D Scanning, Submerged Resources, Using tDAR, 3d Object Imaging, Project Archaeology Instructor Workshop, Using Declassified CORONA Satellite Imagery, and a hands-on workshop dealing with the press. Many of the workshops have an additional fee, but some are free. Check them out and enhance your meeting experience by registering.

- (Reprised for Students and Post-Docs—Are you on the job market? Here is the opportunity to have your résumé or CV reviewed by archaeologists in different employment sectors. Representatives from academia, museums, government, and CRM archaeology will be present to look over your résumé and make suggestions to tailor it for the most effective impact for different kinds of job situations. Bring a paper copy of your résumé or CV and sign up for this event being held from 12 pm–1pm on Thursday, April 19, 2012. Please preregister for this event. Spaces are limited, so register soon!

Abstracts Redux

Just a reminder that printed abstract books are no longer offered. The abstracts will be available electronically to all on the public side of SAAweb approximately one month before the meeting. They will be posted in a searchable pdf format so that you may browse/print at your leisure.

Onsite in Memphis, you will be able to browse/reference abstracts at the Abstract Viewing Center in the pre-function space of the Southwest Exhibit Hall at the Memphis Cook Convention Center. The Society would like to thank the Center for Desert Archaeology and Desert Archaeology Inc. for its sponsorship of the Abstract Viewing Center.

Social Media, Anyone?

Through a number of social media tools, there are multiple ways of keeping abreast of news and developments in the world of archaeology and connecting with others in the community. You can visit SAA’s Facebook page (be sure to “like” it!); follow SAA (@SAAorg) on Twitter; and join SAA’s LinkedIn group (search for “Society for American Archaeology under Groups.)

Keep up to the minute with SAA activities and deadlines, as well breaking news about archaeology-related legislation and SAA’s responses to it through Facebook and Twitter. Followers on Facebook can also post their own links and start their own discussions, making the Facebook page a dynamic online meeting place for anyone interested in the archaeological heritage of the Americas. SAA’s LinkedIn group provides a place to announce conferences and events, and share information about their publications and projects. Group participants can connect with one another directly, asking questions about methods or references and fostering a spirit of cooperation and collaboration. Questions get answered on LinkedIn. Discussions are lively on Facebook. Check them out!
The Preliminary Program for the 2012 Annual Meeting was mailed in December and is posted on the SAAweb. Starting on the evening of Wednesday, April 18 and ending at noon on Sunday, April 22, the Meeting includes over 2,700 presentations. The first event is the President’s Forum on Wednesday evening, “Archaeology and the Media: A Symbiotic Relationship.” Sponsored by SAA and The National Geographic Society, this session features science journalists from Science, National Geographic, the Washington Post, NPR, and others in a panel discussion. Following this, the Board of Directors invites students, new members, first-time attendees, and the chairs of committees and task forces to a reception at 9 p.m.

From Thursday morning through Sunday morning, there are oral presentations in two dozen rooms, posters on display in another room, and, of course, the Exhibit Hall to tempt your wallet. The Meeting is large this year, with even more presentations than the 75th Anniversary meeting in St. Louis.

Each day presents many choices for your attention, and not just the traditional papers and posters: the annual Ethics Bowl final round is on Thursday afternoon; there are Workshops each day of the meeting on a variety of subjects; the annual Business Meeting (and cash bar), starts at 5 p.m. on Friday; there are two Graceland tours (advance registration required); and the CRM Expo (co-sponsored by ACRA) will be held Saturday afternoon from 1:00 to 4:00 p.m.

This year there are 13 festschrift sessions, some with both morning and afternoon parts. The honorees include Barbara Stark, David Kelley, Norman Hammond, Dean Arnold, Dee Ann Story, Michael Schiffer, Robert Dunnell, and a pair of sessions that honors the intertwined influences of George Frison and Vance Haynes. There is also a session on the prospects for processual archaeology in the post-Binford era.

The submissions to our Annual Meeting provide a snapshot of the state of anthropologically oriented/Americanist archaeology. As in recent years, technological advances are a prominent subject; this year, the uses of LiDAR imagery are particularly prominent (see the posters on Thursday, 8-10 a.m.). Another theme is the social use of food, with particularly interesting sessions on “The ‘Networked’ Feast” and “Beyond Eating: Food, Drink, and Meaning in the New World.” The theme is continued by this year’s Fryxell Symposium, honoring Christine Hastorf, and by a session that I expect will draw a large audience, “Psychoactive Substances in Ancient Society.” I put that last one in the largest meeting room we have.

Whether you choose to spend your time in the meeting rooms, schmoozing in the hallways, spending your hard-earned money in the Exhibit Hall, or visiting local attractions (such as the original Piggly Wiggly, the country’s first supermarket), there will be lots to hear, see, and do at our 77th Annual Meeting.

As a final note, I wish to thank the members of the Program Committee, who in a remarkably short time each read hundreds of abstracts and helped compose the Program: Mark Wagner, Kathryn Twiss, Mark Slaughter, Tim Pugh, Jill Neitzel, Jorge Montenegro, Ian Kuijt, Kandace Hollenbach, Laura Junker, Gayle Fritz, and Jim Aimers. Thanks also to my grad student assistant, Kayleigh Sharp, whose database skills made my job far easier.
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FIELD TECHNICIANS, MAKING A LIVING?

Doug Rocks-Macqueen

Doug Rocks-Macqueen is a Doctoral Student in the Department of Archaeology at the University of Edinburgh. He also authors a blog, Doug’s Archaeology, at http://dougsarchaeology.wordpress.com/ that investigates different aspects of the profession of archaeology from pay conditions to publishing.

In the March 2008 issue of The SAA Archaeological Record, Scott J. Wagers and Chris Nicholson published an article, “What Are Archaeological Field Technicians Paid?” that discussed the salary and benefits received by field technicians and crew chiefs (senior field technicians) in archaeology for the year 2007. Their article investigated how previous wage surveys either completely overlooked these positions, or had such a low response that the results were not statistically significant. Through the examination of job postings on the websites shovelbums.org and archaeologyfieldwork.com, Wagers and Nicholson created a map of salaries for field technicians and crew chiefs throughout the United States. To date, their research and the semi-annual Wage and Salary Survey for the Cultural Resources by the American Cultural Resources Association (ACRA) are the only detailed descriptions of field technician and crew chief pay in the United States. This information has been invaluable for anyone thinking about a career in archaeology and wondering if it is financially viable, at least for entry-level work.

The goal of this article is to expand upon this previous research and examine the long-term financial feasibility of this type of career in archaeology in the United States. A common complaint among field technicians in online forums and in face-to-face conversations is that pay conditions are not keeping up with the cost of living. In fact, one of the first posts on the shovelbums.org list-serve over ten years ago, before postings were screened, was an observation that wages have been stagnant or worse, decreasing. As of yet, there has only been this anecdotal evidence of declining wages and no further investigations. This paper will seek to rectify this situation and determine the long-term prospects of field technicians, through an examination of the average field technician and crew chief pay over several years.

Methodology

All job postings were examined from the website shovelbums.org from 1999 to October 31, 2010. It was not possible to examine the postings from archaeologyfieldwork.com or other job websites as these websites delete job postings after several months. However, because there is significant overlap in postings between shovelbums.org and other job posting websites, it is likely that only a small sample of job postings were missed. Of the multiple job postings, only the wages for field/lab technician and crew chief positions were recorded. Lab technicians and miscellaneous jobs that required similar or the same education and job requirements as field technicians were included in the field technician category as comparable jobs.

A total of 7,331 postings were examined dating from April 26, 1999 to October 31, 2010. Out of these posts, 1,960 provided valuable information on technicians’ wages and 173 for crew chiefs’ wages. These posts were those that gave detailed salary information, either as a starting wage or wage ranges dependent on experience (DOE). There were many more posts for crew chief and tech positions, but they either did not have wages included in the posting or were duplicates of previous postings for the same position. Posts only counted as a single data point, regardless of the number of positions advertised, because a large percentage of posts gave wages but did not specify how many positions were open. To ensure a sufficiently large enough sample, it was decided to use postings as the unit of measure instead of the number of jobs offered.
Results

The average starting pay for field technicians from 1999 to 2010 has gone from a little under 11 dollars an hour (all figures are in US dollars) to as high as $13.18 an hour in 2009. The current average is $12.87, having lost some ground over the last year (Table 1). This fall in wages is probably due to the recent recession. At the same time, the average starting pay of crew chiefs has moved from $13.00 in 2000 to a high of over $18.23 in 2009 and back down to around $16.50 in 2010 (Table 2). Considering the low number of job postings for crew chief (N = 173), those numbers should be considered approximations. On average, over the last 11 years, the wages of field technicians appreciated 18 percent above starting wages based on experience, while the wages of crew chiefs reflected approximately 13 percent appreciation. This means that with several additional years of fieldwork experience a field technician can expect to be paid, on average, a maximum of 18 percent higher salary than their starting pay. Typically, this increase peaks after about two to five years of additional archaeological field experience, at which point wages stop rising with additional experience.

Averages can distort results and give false impressions, which make it necessary to look at distribution. As shown in Table 3 the majority of starting salaries for field technicians tend to cluster around the averages but there are still some significant outliers (e.g., field technicians offered $21–22 per hour as a starting salary). Furthermore, in most years the distribution shows a long tail towards the higher ranges, which can inflate the average salaries. It should

Table 1. Average field technicians pay from 1999 to 2010 in the USA. *only till Oct. 31st.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Average Starting Salary-per hour</th>
<th>(N) Number of Posts</th>
<th>Average Highest Salary-per hour</th>
<th>% Difference Between Starting and Highest Salary Offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010*</td>
<td>$12.87</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>$16.13</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$13.18</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>$15.66</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$12.76</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>$15.1</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$12.51</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>$14.26</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$12.10</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>$14.04</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$11.75</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>$13.65</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$11.67</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>$13.46</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$11.64</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>$12.95</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$11.37</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>$13.09</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>$10.95</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>$13.01</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$10.94</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>$12.68</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>$11.28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Average crew chief pay from 1999 to 2010 in the USA. *only till Oct. 31st

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Average Starting Salary-per hour</th>
<th>(N) Number of Posts</th>
<th>Average Highest Salary-per hour</th>
<th>% Difference Between Starting and Highest Salary Offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010*</td>
<td>$16.42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$20.93</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$18.23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$20.50</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$15.80</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$19.42</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$12.60</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$14.92</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$13.04</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$15.57</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$14.78</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$17.64</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$14.76</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$16.41</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$15.79</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$17.33</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$15.79</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$16.76</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>$14.09</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$14.67</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$13.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$13.83</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
also be noted that this is a national distribution and that regions and states differ significantly with western states having both higher averages and distributions.

The data shows that wages have been increasing over the last decade, but this does not mean that wages are keeping pace with inflation and thus the cost of living. The most common measurement of inflation is the consumer price index (CPI) and wage increases need to be compared against this index to determine the relationship between pay rates and cost of living (Table 4). Looking at the trends from 2002 to October 2010, field technicians’ salaries rose on average 1.83 percent annually against the 2.33 percent annual average inflation rate, while crew chiefs pay rose 3.31 percent. The years 1999–2001 were eliminated from this particular sample, as shovelburns.org was being established during that time and it is not clear how representative the data is for all field technician job postings. The wage depression resulting from the last recession ultimately may be an anomaly and the long-term prospects may improve. Even without this latest wage depression, however, field technicians have not made any significant gains over inflation in the last decade and are, at best, receiving wage increases that are just keeping pace with inflation.

Table 3. Distribution of field technicians hourly wage postings offered between 1999 and 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$6-6.99</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7-7.99</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8-8.99</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$9-9.99</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10-10.99</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$11-11.99</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12-12.99</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$13-13.99</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$14-14.99</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15-15.99</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$16-16.99</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>.4%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$17-17.99</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$18-18.99</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$19-19.99</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>.3%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20-20.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$21-21.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a*only until Oct. 31st.

Table 4. Difference in average starting wages vs. inflation (Bureau of labour Statistics, 2010) for field technicians hourly wages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Average Starting Wage (CPI)</th>
<th>% Change From Previous Year</th>
<th>CPI</th>
<th>Hypothetical Salary Based on Inflation (starting in 1999)</th>
<th>Hypothetical Salary Based on Inflation (starting in 2000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010*</td>
<td>$12.87</td>
<td>-2.4%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>$14.83</td>
<td>$13.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$13.18</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>$14.89</td>
<td>$13.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$12.76</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>$14.35</td>
<td>$12.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$12.51</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>$13.96</td>
<td>$12.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$12.10</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>$13.52</td>
<td>$12.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$11.75</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>$13.08</td>
<td>$11.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$11.67</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>$12.74</td>
<td>$11.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$11.64</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>$12.45</td>
<td>$11.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$11.37</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>$12.25</td>
<td>$11.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>$10.95</td>
<td>.8%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>$11.92</td>
<td>$11.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$10.54</td>
<td>-3.0%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>$11.53</td>
<td>$11.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>$11.28</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>$11.53</td>
<td>$11.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a*-up to Oct 31st 2010
Additional Data
Due to space constraints it was not possible to include in this paper all of the data examined in this project. For example, the average salaries for 2010 were broken down by state as in Wagers and Nicholson’s (2008) paper. This and other additional data have been placed on an interactive YouTube video: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=spK0yBjQ94g.

Discussion
In 2010, the average yearly income for a starting field technician, assuming they work 40 hours a week and 50 weeks a year, is $25,740; however, there is a range in starting pay (Table 5). The assumption that field technicians are working 40 hours a week, 50 weeks a year does not reflect the working conditions of most field technicians, and therefore actual salaries will vary considerably with time worked (Table 6). Taking into account that many field technician jobs require a BA/BS in anthropology/archaeology and that field technician jobs are among the only jobs in archaeology that someone with these qualifications can obtain, it is possible to compare these salaries against other salaries for individuals holding a BA/BS degree. Looking at the ten lowest paying degrees using starting salaries (PayScale 2010) a BA/BS in archaeology/archaeology has the lowest reported starting wages (Table 7).

Those who manage to achieve a crew chief position have a slightly better outlook for salary prospects. Crew chiefs in 2010 have salaries ranging from $32,840 to $41,860, with the starting salary above those with degrees in Child and Family Studies, Elementary Education, Social Work, and Athletic Training (Table 7). As crew chief generally is not considered an entry-level position in CRM, it is unlikely that a new graduate would be working at this higher pay scale.

These numbers produce a fairly depressing salary picture for careers as field technicians and crew chiefs in archaeology. A BA/BS in anthropology/archaeology used for a career in field archaeology probably has one of the lowest possible returns of any degree. Furthermore, the best-case scenario is that these wages maintain pace with inflation, but the most recent data shows this is currently not the case. There is a strong possibility that as inflation digs into the earnings of field technicians there could be a slow drain on their purchasing power; what field technicians can afford to buy with their salaries.

I think the summary and impact of this information can be put best by one of the reviewers of this paper.

Quite the bleak outlook for someone coming out of college...or even with years of experience. Makes me wonder that if I had known this information when deciding on my major, all those years ago in college, would I...

Table 5. Current distribution of annual pay for field technicians broken down by percentages of postings for 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary per hour</th>
<th>Annual Pay 40 hr weeks 50 week years</th>
<th>% of Field Techs Job Postings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$9-9.99</td>
<td>$18,000-19,999</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10-10.99</td>
<td>$20,000-21,999</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$11-11.99</td>
<td>$22,000-23,999</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12-12.99</td>
<td>$24,000-25,999</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$13-13.99</td>
<td>$26,000-27,999</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$14-14.99</td>
<td>$28,000-29,999</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15-15.99</td>
<td>$30,000-31,999</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$16-16.99</td>
<td>$32,000-33,999</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$17-17.99</td>
<td>$34,000-35,999</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$18-18.99</td>
<td>$36,000-37,999</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Average starting salary for field technicians by number of weeks worked. Assumed 40 hours a week.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weeks Worked</th>
<th>Annual Salary Before Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>$25,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>$25,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>$24,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>$24,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>$23,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>$23,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>$20,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>$18,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>$15,444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ROCKS-MACQUEEN, continued on page 14
**THE VETERANS CURATION PROGRAM**

Deborah Casselberry

Deborah Casselberry is the Laboratory Director at Brockington and Associates.

Dr. Michael “Sonny” Trimble, the Director of the Mandatory Center of Expertise for Curation and Management of Archaeological Collections, St. Louis District, the United States Army Corps of Engineers, developed the Veterans Curation Program (VCP) in 2009. Sonny was in Iraq for almost three years working on the Mass Graves project for the United States Government. His team was protected by the men and women of the armed forces. When he returned from Iraq, he was talking with his friend and colleague, Tom King, and expressed the desire to pay back the military for all their hard work. It was this conversation that sparked the idea of having wounded veterans work on rehabilitating Army Corps collections. Most wounded veterans will tell you that it is difficult to find employment. As archaeologists know, there are collections from the 1950s through the 1970s that are not housed according to 36 CFR 79: Curation of Federally-Owned and Administered Archaeological Collections. This seemed to be the perfect fit in terms of employment and collection care: veterans would be preparing to enter the civilian workforce and neglected collections would be re-housed.

Brockington and Associates, a cultural resources consulting firm based in Atlanta, was hired to set up and run three VCP facilities (Figure 1). In my role as Brockington’s Lab Director, I have been involved with the VCP from the beginning of the program. The first VCP opened in Augusta, Georgia, followed by facilities in St. Louis, Missouri, and Washington, D.C. Setting up these facilities involved unique considerations: when looking for space, we needed to find places that were ADA accessible, in addition to being suited to archaeological curation work. We needed to teach the veterans archaeology basics and about daily processes. Not coming from a military background myself, it is very easy to forget that many veterans face some form of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and/or traumatic brain injury (TBI) in addition to their visible injuries. Any tools to prompt memory are beneficial. Brockington’s History Workshop division was able to create wall panels that not only relate to archaeology in general but also serve as guides for daily tasks. This was another perfect fit; in addition to Brockington’s technical capabilities, we were able to assist the program with our education, design, and human resources capabilities.

The other link in the VCP is David Knoerlein of Forensic Digital Imaging, Inc. Dave is a photographer specializing in digital images for forensic work. Subcontracted by Brockington, Dave set up a camera operation and scanning station at each facility to bring another technological aspect to the program (Figure 2). All the veteran technicians would have the opportunity to photograph artifacts and scan associated documents, creating electronic files and databases for this material, providing another form of record for the archaeology. This photography work also gave veterans technology experience that could be transferred into many other fields of work.

Once two supervisors were hired for each facility, one for archives and one for artifacts, we needed to find veteran technicians. The potential employees, though they had to apply and be interviewed, were recommended by military and civilian agencies. Close working relations with the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, hospitals, and agencies such as the Wounded Warrior Care Program, local Departments of Labor, and the Mission Continues, have greatly supported the VCP. Unexpectedly, Washington, D.C. proved to be the most challenging in finding partners for support help. My thought initially was that Washington would be a treasure trove with all of the federal agencies headquartered in the nation’s capital. There are several close military installations in addition to Walter Reed Army Medical Center. The reality of the political situation is that congressional representatives are from different districts and states, not Washington, D.C., so the area was out of their jurisdiction. It was the agencies at the local and community level that were the most supportive to the Washington VCP, a valuable lesson learned.
The last pieces of the puzzle were the collections themselves. Mobile District archaeologist Joseph Giliberti provided collections for the Augusta Facility. Collections from the Glenn Black Museum and Ball State that are the property of St. Louis District were targeted for the St. Louis Facility. Julie Morgan, an archaeologist in the Savannah District, and Deborah Campbell, an archaeologist from the Pittsburgh District, gladly provided project material for the Washington, D.C. VCP.

While working through the set-up, my thinking changed to, “how is this going to work?” The military actions of today are not like any battles fought before. Veterans return with PTSD and TBI in high numbers, along with physical injuries. How are archaeologists working with collections going to help these individuals transition into a civilian workplace? My thoughts then went to, “how will the vet technicians relate to this,” when most vets’ exposure to archaeology might be a television show or a Hollywood movie? Much to my surprise, this does work out to be a perfect fit after an adjustment period.

I do not work with the vet technicians on a daily basis. My contact is through periodic visits to the three facilities, emails, phone calls, and almost daily contact with the supervisors at each facility. The vet technicians are full- or part-time employees of Brockington and Associates hired for a six-month training program. They are trained to rehouse the artifacts according to the Federal Standards and Guidelines and to generate a basic catalog, which includes general artifact identification, count, and weight (Figure 3). The paperwork is processed according to archival standards, so paper photographs are cleaned, torn paper is mended, all tape, staples, paper clips, etc. are removed, and there is lots of erasing, especially if the paperwork is field notes, to remove as much dirt as possible. Depending on the collection, diagnostic artifacts or interesting items are photographed. And the documents and images get scanned. So even though the vets are working with collection materials, the skills that are being utilized include the Microsoft Office Suite, paper and electronic data filing, digital photography, and scanning. The developments of these office and work skills are very important; however, this program offers the veterans more. Resume building, filling out job applications, practice interviews, and flexibility for VA-related appointments are also included in these six months. Additionally, there is an attempt to impart a greater understanding of archaeology. There have been presentations on different aspects of archaeology, flint knapping demonstrations, field trips to archaeological sites and to events such as Forensic Fridays at the Smithsonian Institution.

All of these tangible skills and opportunities are useful and educational. They’re wonderful for the metrics needed to generate a continued interest and funding for the program, but what about those items that cannot be measured? Every new group of vets goes through the experience of an open house. This is an opportunity for the community agencies along with politicians and potential employers to come see the facility and meet the veterans. This is the first broad social interaction the VCP sponsors. Usually there are one or two veterans that bare-
ly or never participate in this event due to PTSD or TBI. But by the end of the six-month term, when they are adjusted and used to the closeness of co-workers, this type of feeling is either diluted or can be controlled. One young man in the first round at the Augusta facility told me during one of my visits that he was amazed that he could finally sit elbow-to-elbow with another human. This same young man’s counselor at the Georgia Department of Labor said that she was stunned when she got a big hug at the end of his term, when before a handshake was difficult. And one of the veterans from the most recent group told me that when he learned that he could speak up and out without the fear of retribution, he gained a confidence that he lost, enough so, that he has begun dating again. These are great life strides that cannot be measured by how many artifacts are re-bagged, images taken, or pieces of paper filed.

These veterans usually form strong bonds with each other, crossing not only the division of rank but also the branch of military service. Playful joking continues but they certainly respect the time each has put into the military. These are the stories that are usually shared in the VCP facilities. One vet tech separated from the Navy told a story of how the ship he was on was anchored off one of the coasts of Africa. It was hit by a swarm of locusts that was followed by hundreds of hungry birds. He laughingly recounted how feathers were still being pulled from areas of the ship weeks after the incident. This is the sharing that leads into the closeness that develops between the veterans and the supervisors. Archaeologists usually have interesting work stories concerning projects that when related to the veterans, help to lessen the divide of two different worlds. The experiences, although different, are in fact very similar. Additionally, since most of the veterans were in the area of the Middle East that is known as “the Cradle of Civilization,” it provides an easy segue for conversation between archaeology and military service. After a couple months of working at the Washington, D.C. facility, one vet technician began talking about how similar archaeological survey is to military personnel on patrol since we all have to carry so much stuff with us for such long distances. There is a bit of truth in this comparison, but the reality is that archaeologist packs weigh much less.

Each session at the VCPs has not been without issues or problems. There have been a few situations where a veteran was not ready to be in the program and needed to leave. For some, a 40-hour work week was too much, and the work hours needed to be reduced. Overall, we deal with the issues and the veterans gain yet more experience in a non-military work environment. Eighty-three veterans have been employed by the VCP over the past two years. Out of this total, 62 are either employed or in an educational program. Many of the veterans have spoken of this program as life-changing. In the last group in Washington, DC, a homeless vet had the opportunity to be an
employee of the VCP. This program allowed this veteran to get out of shelters and into an apartment. It’s yet another step in transition that cannot be measured by program metrics, but outweighs any amount of artifact or archival processing.

Since being part of this program, I have come to realize that each of the VCP facilities have their similarities and differences. And most importantly, each group of veterans hired is very different. It is important for the supervisors to be patient and flexible. We are not training people to become archaeologists, historians, or archivists, but helping veterans transition back into a civilian life. This can be a very difficult and long process for some, since the military might have been their career, had their path not been changed by injuries. And even though we are different, we still share enough of the same traits and wants that programs such as the VCP can be a perfect fit for what might be thought of as unrelated groups. As one of the vets in the first round at Augusta said as he turned a military phase, “Man, you archaeologists, you leave no paper behind.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree (BA/BS)</th>
<th>Starting Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Tech. (Average Starting)</td>
<td>$25,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child and Family Studies</td>
<td>$29,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>$31,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>$31,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Training</td>
<td>$32,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crew Chief (Average Starting)</td>
<td>$32,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation &amp; Leisure Studies</td>
<td>$33,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>$33,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Design</td>
<td>$34,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td>$34,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theology</td>
<td>$34,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horticulture</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I would like to end this paper by asking that you, the reader, please pass on this information to students, people interested in a career in archaeology, or even current archaeologists. The aim of this analysis is not to discourage this line of work as many archaeologists find being a field technician rewarding in many different ways beyond salary. Instead, the aim is to insure that those entering this line of work are aware of the realities of pay so they do not become disenchanted with archaeology when they encounter poor pay conditions.

If you need help accessing the YouTube video or have any additional questions, you can contact the author at drocks.macqueen@gmail.com. Finally, I would like to thank Quonya, Jeremy, and Loic for their feedback and suggestions.
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REMINISCENCES

Janet Spector

This essay originally was presented at the “Doing Archaeology as a Feminist” Seminar at the School for Advanced Research in April 1998. While many of the presented works were published elsewhere, Janet Spector’s essay has never been published. It is being published here with permission of the Seminar co-organizers, Meg Conkey, and Alison Wylie and the family of Janet Spector.

What it means to be a feminist archaeologist or “to do archaeology as a feminist” (the theme of the conference inspiring this paper) depends on our personal history as both: when, where, and how we became feminists; whether or not we were practicing archaeology at the time; and if so, the kind of archaeology we learned. It matters that I became a feminist while doing graduate work in archaeology in the late 1960s at the University of Wisconsin during an era of optimistic political activism: against the Vietnam War, against racism and sexism, for student power, and for the establishment of Black Studies, American Indian Studies and Women’s Studies. We believed we could change things. It also matters that I specialized in “historic” rather than “prehistoric” archaeology, of Indian people rather than Euro-Americans, in the Upper Midwest rather than some other region. It matters that I dropped out of graduate school in 1970 to start a free school with several other anthropologists. And, it matters that my socialization into the profession occurred during a period of change in the field from the “old” to the “new” archaeology, before the existence of any scholarship identified as feminist in any discipline.

I remember my first glimmerings of what feminism could bring to archaeology. It was during a conversation in 1968 with Maria Bode, a graduate student colleague at the University of Wisconsin. Some of us were beginning to talk (quietly) about sexism in the anthropology department. I was a teaching assistant for the introductory archaeology course. One day Maria and I were discussing the new and very popular “Man the Hunter Theory” of evolution we were teaching in Anthropology 101 (Washburn and Lancaster 1968). In the middle of the conversation we had a classic Ms. Magazine “click” experience. In a sudden and funny epiphany, we realized that the theory was, unbeknownst to its originators and adherents, a projection of mid-20th century suburban-American lifestyles and attitudes back into the remote past. Australopithecine males, like their modern counterparts, left their nuclear families each day to do important work, procuring vital necessities for their dependent children and for their dependent wives who were tethered at home by the immobilizing constraints of childbearing and child rearing.

We laughed because the theory was such a parody, because the men who created it were so unconscious of its political ramifications or of their male arrogance (to think that all human characteristics evolved because of early male hunters!) and because it was so seductive. Until our feminist consciousness was awakened, we had not seen the androcentrism or the eurocentrism in Man the Hunter. Afterward, we saw the connections between the treatment of women within the profession and the treatment of women as subjects of study. And we realized that feminism changes the way one sees things.

The good humor and insight of feminist criticism were further exemplified for me by the 1972 publication of Elaine Morgan’s smart and witty book, The Descent of Woman. Morgan raucously deconstructs what she labels the “Tarzan Theory of Human Evolution.” Mincing no words, she exposes the sexism of Desmond Morris, Robert Ardrey and other popularizers of the theory, carefully illustrating how their theories about the past were embedded in contemporary social thought and politics; how they rationalized the subordination of women. As an alternative, she proposed the ingenious “aquatic theory” which explained (much more convincingly in my opinion) how human posture, tool use, intelligence, language, sexual behavior, and the loss of body hair had evolved because of women’s rather than men’s actions and adaptations.
However flawed Man the Hunter is in terms of explaining human evolution, he/it does explain, in part, the emergence of feminist critiques of archaeology. When I came to the University of Minnesota in 1973 that theory provided the perfect foil to use in classes and public lectures about the many facets of archaeological androcentrism. At the time, feminist students and community feminists were very interested in archaeology. They had questions and expected answers about women’s power and status in the remote past. I remember being asked about the existence of ancient matriarchies and Amazons by women eager to have positive and powerful images of life before patriarchy. I couldn’t answer their questions, but I did puzzle over them and gave lectures about how sexism had shaped archaeological reasoning and research.

My enthusiasm about feminist archaeology was reinforced significantly by participation in the vibrant and ever growing community of feminist scholars at Minnesota. We came together in the context of building the Women’s Studies Program (established in 1973-4 year, coincidentally my first year at Minnesota). From the beginning of my academic career, I was intimately involved in all facets of Women’s Studies. The feminist intellectual community, not my “home” department, provided the essential support, encouragement, and safe space for pursuing feminist work. This was true for the feminist faculty (two of us) and students (many of them) in the Anthropology Department during the 1970s and early ‘80s. Bolstered by the existence of our “real” institutional home, we formed an active support group to take on departmental affirmative action battles and to organize feminist anthropology colloquia and other events.

Women’s Studies provided a fertile environment for experimenting with feminist approaches to teaching, mentoring, and research. In spring 1974, I taught my first Women’s Studies course, “Comparative Studies of Women: Anthropological Perspectives,” working with one graduate and 7 or 8 undergraduate teaching assistants. We spent hours every week of the quarter discussing the course content, structure, process and power dynamics. Each undergraduate T.A. led a small discussion/research group that scoured anthropological sources for information on topics like “Ancient Amazons and Matriarchies,” “Women and Power,” “Women as Gatherers,” “Women in Agricultural Societies,” “Women in Early States,” etc. There was very little published in feminist anthropology at that time and we relied heavily on a small pamphlet entitled Women’s Liberation: An Anthropological View (Borun et.al. 1971). Using that reference as a point of departure, each group created bibliographies and presented reports about their research for the rest of the class. The experience deepened our feminist critiques of Anthropology and suggested a host of new topics for future research. It was a heady time.

My first feminist research project began in 1976 when I organized a small group of women students interested in feminist archaeology to work on developing the task differentiation framework. Influenced by feminist anthropology’s new conceptualizations and insights about gender and by the new approaches in behavioral archaeology and ethnoarchaeology, we were confident that we could discover correlations between the social, temporal, spatial and material dimensions of task performance and the sites men and women created and used. Eventually, we hoped to use the archaeological record to determine whether or not there had ever been sexually egalitarian groups and to examine how female subordination and male dominance developed, worked, varied, and changed over time and in different cultural settings. We believed archaeology could have an application in the real world of feminist politics.

The first writing I did about feminist archaeology and the task differentiation approach was in a Women’s Studies setting, a 1977 conference for University of Minnesota students and faculty (Spector 1977). Because the paper was for a multi-disciplinary audience, I felt simultaneously obliged and free to write about the potential contributions of feminist archaeology to Women’s Studies and to the women’s movement more generally. There was a stark contrast in tone and language between that essay and a NSF proposal I wrote at about the same time seeking funding to support task differentiation research.
I situated the Women's Studies Conference paper in the context of issues raised by feminists who looked to archaeology for explanations about past conditions that might explain contemporary sexual asymmetry—the phrase coined by Rosaldo and Lamphere in *Women, Culture and Society* (1974). After describing archaeology's pervasive androcentrism, I argued that the field needed to develop new approaches taking into account the complexities of gender arrangements and their potential material manifestations. Without this, inferences about the division of labor, male and female power or status, and gender-specific artifacts would remain as speculative and untestable as the popular theories about matriarchies and Amazons so easily dismissed by professional archaeologists. I introduced the task differentiation framework as an example of such an approach.

These early experiences demonstrated the importance, power and necessity of collaborative versus solitary work. In feminist studies, there was too much to be done alone. The work was much richer and more fun when done with others. And, as an untenured member of an anthropology faculty that had little appreciation for feminist work, collaborating with other feminists provided the positive energy and support needed to resist pressures to assimilate into the academic mainstream for tenure and promotion purposes.

My next collaborative project began in 1978 when Meg Conkey and I started work on “Archaeology and the Study of Gender” (1984). Michael Schiffer brought us together after we each mentioned feminist archaeology (maybe we said archaeology of gender) in response to a questionnaire he circulated soliciting essay ideas for *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory*. From 1978-1983 we worked long distance, without ever meeting in person. Our correspondence was intense. Many letters and drafts were sent back and forth. There were steady expressions of support for and excitement about each other's ideas; apologies for being overworked and late in responding; digressions about academic worries [both of us were untenured when we started] and about how long it was taking to get the piece out. It was a rich mix of the personal, the political, and the academic—a hallmark of feminist scholarship. And it was a contrast to my work relationships with non-feminist archaeology colleagues (implicitly competitive, compartmentalized, secretive, distrustful).

Another important feminist collaboration for me was serving on the national Advisory Board for the American Anthropological Association's “Gender and Anthropology” project. This three-year project (1986-88) was explicitly designed to bring feminist anthropology into introductory textbooks and classroom settings. It culminated with the publication of *Gender and Anthropology: Critical Reviews for Research and Teaching* (Morgen 1989). All sub-fields were represented on the Board and in the book. As we outlined the format for the essays during Board meetings, we had many thought-provoking discussions about how to increase the overall impact of feminist work on the discipline, still a vexing question.

One of the most exciting parts of writing the archaeology essay with Mary Whelan for *Gender and Anthropology* was designing classroom exercises (Spector and Whelan 1989: 83–88). One of them, “Critically Reading Introductory Texts,” subversively asks students to evaluate their introductory textbooks in terms of ethnocentrism and androcentrism. We provided a set of key questions as a guide:

- Does the author give equal attention to the roles, activities, and experiences of women and men in discussing prehistory (we directed their attention to photos and illustrations as well as the text)?
- In what contexts is the author gender-specific and what are the implications of this in terms of the power and status of men and women?
- What activities, materials, and skills are linked with males vs. females? What characteristics are taken to be universal? Of those, which might be culturally specific? How could you know?
- Given specific cases of gender bias in the text, what alternative “scenarios” can you suggest?

The second exercise, “Material Expressions of Gender in the United States: A Case Study in Ethnoarchaeology,” encouraged students think about the material cultural construction of gender. We posed a series of questions to help them see how materials and spaces not only reflect but also shape gender roles, power relations, ideology, socialization and gender attribution processes. We asked them to create archaeological maps of familiar, gender-specific
spaces, to exchange the maps with someone else in the class, and then to interpret the sites in terms of US gender arrangements. I knew from experience in my own classes, that this exercise convinced students of the importance of gender as an analytical category of analysis.

Among other things, working on the gender and anthropology project reinforced my conviction that archaeological questions can deepen understandings of gender. While it is true that we rely on work done outside of archaeology to conceptualize gender, it is also true that no field is better equipped than archaeology to examine how gender is materially constructed.

I do not know how many people have actually used the book or our article in their classes or texts. I do know that David Hurst Thomas drew on our essay extensively in revising both the second and third editions of his introductory text, Archaeology. In the most recent edition, (1998) he discussed different dimensions of gender bias in the field, and in several parts of the text and he prominently features the work of women and feminist archaeologists. This text will expose hundreds of students a year to feminist work in the field.

The words “feminist” and “archaeology” have been linked in my mind and my work for almost 30 years. When asked what I do as an academic I readily put them together, as in I do “feminist archaeology.” For me, the label signifies several things: that the work is informed by critiques of archaeological androcentrism in its many forms and ramifications; that gender figures as a central analytical category in the work; and that the work is intended in some way to transform the field. It does not imply man hating, reverse discrimination or political correctness as sometimes suggested in media or academic caricatures. I find myself exasperated with those who prefer the more neutral sounding “archaeology of gender” label though I have used it when I feared rejection or disapproval, as in writing for tenure or applying for major grants (see discussions in Bacus et.al.1993; Conkey and Gero 1997). The fear of being labeled a feminist only shows how much more work needs to be done.
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Feminine Voices in Archaeology
Promoting Community, Collaboration, and Mentoring

Sarah L. Surface-Evans, Ph.D., RPA and Misty Jackson, Ph.D., RPA

Sarah Surface-Evans is a postdoctoral fellow of archaeology at Central Michigan University and Misty Jackson is the founder and Principal Investigator at Arbre Croche Cultural Resources.

Women in the discipline of archaeology continue to make recognized contributions to the field. Great strides have been made by women in the discipline since the 1960s and 1970s; however, there are lasting legacies of inequality that affect female archaeologists in all stages of their careers. In the spirit of this year’s American Anthropological Association (AAA) annual meeting theme “Traces, Tidemarks and Legacies,” Dr. Sarah Surface-Evans and Dr. Misty Jackson organized and chaired a roundtable entitled “Legacies, Shifting Realities, and (Re)Inventing Roles for Women in Archaeology” as a way of addressing the challenges faced by women archaeologists in the twenty-first century. The panel and roundtable attendees participated in lively discussion, which included scholars and practitioners from academia, cultural resource consulting, and government. The roundtable discussants and audience members also ranged from retired faculty to current undergraduate students, making the conversations intergenerational as well. This article provides a brief summary of the discussions that took place at the recent AAA Meetings, and the authors identify some of the critical issues raised and offer some suggestions for action that stem from these conversations.

A Look at the Numbers: Context for Conversation

The roundtable began with presentations of data drawn from various sources that bear on the current state of women in institutions of higher learning generally and in archaeology specifically. Several articles published during the last decade in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* indicate that women are underrepresented in tenured positions at top tier universities and overrepresented in adjunct and nontenured positions (Glenn 2008; Wilson 2004; Wilson and Fogg 2004). This trend corresponds with the general pattern of reduced tenure-track positions at academic institutions, and a higher reliance on nontenure-track faculty. Female scholars appear to be most affected, as they are more likely to accept part-time employment as an adjunct, particularly if they have children (Williams 2003; Wilson 2003). Correspondingly, women still suffer from significant wage gaps in academic settings (Glenn 2008; Wilson 2003). Some of these inequities can be attributed to gendered roles of women as nurturers and the unreasonable demands of academic schedules (Williams 2006; Wilson 2003).

According to data complied from the AAA’s Anthro Guide 2010-2011, female anthropologists are nearly equally represented in what are traditionally viewed as “feminine” roles, including positions in museums, government, and nonprofit organizations. However, women are less likely to have roles of power and prestige, particularly “masculine” positions of leadership. Women are currently academic department chairs at only 35.7 percent of universities and colleges in the United States. Positions of leadership in cultural resource management and other areas of industry remain underpopulated by women at 41.1 percent.

More specific to archaeology, the 2010 SAA Needs Assessment Survey supports and mirrors the trends noted in the AAA’s data (SAA 2010). The survey shows that 44 percent of the SAA membership are female, and 56 percent are male. Of those who answered the ‘current work-setting’ question, 36.1 percent work in academia, 38.6 percent are employed in non-academic settings, and 25.2 percent identified as student, retired or “other.” Of the academics, 49 percent are female, and 51 percent are male. The numbers of archaeologists who identified as women drop slightly for non-academic settings: 44 percent female, 56 percent male, which closely reflect the AAA data. Despite fewer
women in work settings, female students outnumber their male counterparts (71 percent female, 29 percent male). The SAA’s retired members reported different numbers: 35 percent are female, 65 percent are male. If the numbers of men and women in the retired category reflect the proportions in the discipline some thirty years ago, these numbers reflect the history of women’s underrepresentation in the discipline, and it is clear that the number of women working in archaeology has increased. However, women are still far from being equally represented in terms of numbers and even less so in terms of a “feminine” voice in the discipline.

Relating the Numbers to Lived Experiences: Collaboration and Change

As the roundtable participants discussed these statistics, several issues were identified that participants felt should be addressed in order to further the progress of women in archaeology. Chief among these issues was the realization that institutional structures negatively impact the success of women and the very conduct of archaeology. Current systems of tenure, promotion, and merit recognition reward entrenched ways of doing research and value a limited range of perspectives, voices, and activities. Participants voiced experiences of having collaborative projects viewed as less important and valuable than those reflecting strong, singular leadership. They noted that women often prefer collaborative forms of leadership and research, rather than traditional, singular forms of working that reflect the masculine tradition of academia and archaeology.

The greater willingness of female scholars to engage in collaborative projects was characterized as one benefit of feminizing archaeology. Collaboration is contrary to the conventional approach that rewards individual exploration, interpretation, and publication. In fact, the very notion that one’s research is a solo venture, as single-authorship implies, is in itself dishonest. The panelists argued that the practice of archaeology is skewed toward a masculine and hierarchical perspective that excludes consensus building and “minority opinions” when interpreting the past. While public scholarship initiatives are gaining increasing prominence in many disciplines, there remains a disconnect between research projects that produce successful outcomes for public communities and the type of scholarship that is rewarded in academic circles (e.g., Cantor and Lavine 2006).

Participants advocated for institutional changes that reward the benefits of collaborative research, and that broaden the criteria of excellence in scholarship and research to include work that reflects multiple voices, as well as projects that engage the public and descendant communities in the research process. These types of structural and philosophical changes should also result in a reevaluation and modification of the “rules” of archaeological practice. For example, archaeological field schools should become venues of collaborative education, where students learn new approaches for explaining the past through consensus and true teamwork. Such collaborative methods have the power to challenge definitive, singular statements about the past as the status quo of archaeological interpretation. While it was recognized that some researchers and institutions have endeavored to conduct their work in the manner described, to date the efforts are not far reaching enough. To have a significant impact, these types of changes would ideally involve fostering collaboration, forming communities, and providing opportunities for mentoring peers, students, and the public.

Participants felt that these types of changes would not only benefit female scholars in archaeology, but also improve the discipline as a whole. This assertion reflects an underlying disjoin between dominant disciplinary philosophies and practices, and a large number of its practitioners. This assertion also reflected general concerns over the current trend to call so-called academic pursuits into question at all levels in our society. It was felt that embracing collaboration is one way to make our research relevant by creating valid and important connections between our research and the public.

Value, Visibility, and Invisibility

Discussion among the panel and attendees also made it clear that archaeology still suffers from another hierarchically related issue: that of the continued perceived divide between those engaged in academic and non-academic employment. While recognition of the necessary part played by those involved in government, consulting, museums, and other pursuits exists, the primacy and higher status assigned to academia remains a stumbling block to
achieving a full sense of integrated community. The higher number of academics as opposed to non-academics present at the roundtable was considered a reflection of those perceptions and the differing professional requirements for those practicing in this dichotomized archaeology.

Another setback identified by the roundtable participants is the visibility of women in a discipline with near equal numbers, but a continued invisibility of women in important aspects of disciplinary leadership and practice. There are more female archaeologists with Ph.D.s today than ever before, as indicated by the statistics cited above. However, increased numbers do not necessarily mean increased visibility or influence on the discipline, nor does it mean that women are visible in the same ways as their male counterparts.

The ways female scholars are represented and the positions in which they work provide a picture of the discipline to students, both female and male. An investigation of depictions of women in anthropology and archaeology textbooks conducted by panelist Janet Dunn determined that these publications reinforce a lesser position for women in the discipline. Women are rarely presented as archaeologists in this form of teaching material, and most examples of projects and quotes about fieldwork come from male practitioners. Students who engage these materials do not see women as significant contributors to archaeological research and practice.

Equally troubling for participants are public perceptions of women in archaeology, particularly experienced through direct contact with the public in the course of fieldwork. Several panelists recounted stories of how members of the public assumed that they were not “in charge” of a field project that they were, in fact, running. Visitors would walk right past the woman directing the project, and ask questions of males in the group, particularly if the male appeared older than the average field crewmember, because the visitor was looking for the “project leader.” One possible explanation for this phenomenon is that female archaeologists are not part of the typical experience of the American public. Not a single female archaeologist has been cast as the host of a television program, so it is perhaps not surprising that the public does not perceive them as contributing to the discipline.

The persistence of under- and mis-representation of female scholars is, in part, because women generally are not in positions where they can affect change in the discipline. Within the academy, female scholars are disproportionately represented at the adjunct and non-tenured level and remain poorly represented in research positions. Similarly, women working in the private and public sectors are less likely to find employment in higher-level positions of leadership than their male counterparts. As Ruth Rosen (1999) pointed out in her article “Secrets of the Second Sex in Scholarly Life” in the Chronicle of Higher Education, “we have not yet gained the power to define the terms of our participation.” The legacy of inequity will persist if nothing is done to empower women in the discipline. To be clear, the panelists felt that empowering women in archaeology does not mean that female scholars should take on masculine attributes of practice, nor does it mean the removal of masculine perspectives. Rather, a feminization of archaeology would help to achieve a balanced perspective that recognizes multiple voices and acknowledges diverse practitioners. Change does demand active efforts to alter existing cultures of bias, and must involve the education of our colleagues and students about the unique voices and contributions of women in archaeology.

Avenues for Active Change

Mentoring is one area that can create real change in the discipline. Mentoring has a powerful influence on how students perceive female scholars and how they view the discipline. Many of the roundtable participants have engaged in leadership initiatives for female students through mentoring activities. Similarly, peer mentoring is one way for female archaeologists to assist each other and inform their male colleagues. Communities for mutual support need to be created that are centered on the needs of women. Mentoring should not be relegated to the professional sphere, but rather should include support for integrating the personal with the professional. The fact remains that personal demands on women are greater than that of their male counterparts, and this has tangible impacts on the professional success of women and how there are perceived (Wilson 2003). The sciences and engineering have developed online resources such as www.mentornet.net with the goal of increasing diversity in these fields. A similar model should be incorporated into professional organizations in archaeology.
While our discussion here has been limited to gender, it is important to recognize that gender is one of many complex and interrelated factors, including class, region, ageism, current economic conditions, and the changing nature of higher education, that are influencing the future success of our discipline. In our short time together, the roundtable participants only addressed a small portion of the issues facing women in archaeology today. Many additional topics should be considered, which is why we have decided to create an online blog to continue the discussion and create a community for mentoring female archaeologists.

“Feminine Voices in Archaeology” is our newly created blog that promotes community, collaboration, and mentoring to support female scholars and the goal of feminizing archaeology (http://femininearchaeology.blogspot.com/). We are looking for individuals to make one-time or regular contributions to the blog, so that the conversation that was initiated at our roundtable can continue. We cannot be content with the fact that women are closer to achieving equal numbers in archaeology. The feminist critique must be ongoing if we are to bring about much need changes that will strengthen archaeology as an inclusive, multivocal, and collaborative discipline.
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One of my favorite things to do at the SAA meetings is to get together with colleagues and swap stories about the latest field season. This is always good for a laugh, often at the expense of some poor green recruit who had trouble adjusting. But, it is also a good chance to compare notes on teaching field schools, particularly as this is how many of us are getting to do research these days. To formalize some of those conversations, at the 2011 SAA meetings in Sacramento I organized a session, “Field Schools, What Are We Doing?” The panel was made up of people who teach field schools, as well as people from CRM who hire technicians trained at field schools. This group consisted of myself; Jane Baxter of DePaul University (author of Archaeological Field Schools: A Guide for Teaching in the Field (2009); Wes Bernardini of the University of Redlands and Chair of the Register of Professional Archaeologists (RPA) Field School Committee; Samuel Connell of Foothill College; Bill Doelle of Desert Archaeology, Inc. (now Archaeology Southwest); and Mike Lerch of Statistical Research, Inc. Ran Boytner, formerly of the UCLA field school program (now at USC and director of the Institute for Field Research), was in the audience and contributed significantly to the conversation. The articles in this forum are a direct result of that session, and tend to focus on two main themes: (1) The scope of the field school experience, and (2) finding support for field schools and their associated research.

Scope

To my surprise, the subject of field school content, or which skills should be taught at field schools, was quickly brushed aside by our CRM representatives. To paraphrase: exposure to the field itself is the most important part of a field school. CRM firms expect to train new employees in the specific methods, equipment, and record-keeping systems of their company. What they need are employees who are able to maneuver in the out-of-doors without getting hurt or lost, who can put in a long days' work without complaint, who can be part of a team, and who understand the measurements and math well enough to at least have a sense of when some fancy equipment isn't working.

This revelation was, to me, quite liberating. Many of my students are not aiming toward a career in archaeology. They come to the project because of the allure of earning university credits for making exotic finds. And, although all of my students learn how to use a compass, draw a map, keep their sidewalls straight, and take proper notes, what has the greatest impact on them is learning simply how to be outside. These are members of the smart phone generation. It takes them a week to stop texting or playing solitaire in between shovelfuls—but they do stop, and then they discover salamanders and foxes. They start to get to know their way around the woods. They stop constantly trying to brush off the dirt, and they get comfortable on their planet. What a priceless gift for any student, regardless of major (Figure 1).

Realizing that teaching archaeological methods is only part of what an archaeology field school does, Sam Connell's paper discusses his attempts to broaden the scope of Foothill College's program. By adding natural history and applied anthropology to the curriculum, students receive a much more holistic experience. Here the emphasis is on a field experience, rather than on archaeology school. This does not mean the program lacks academic rigor. To the contrary, Sam has been an avid proponent of incorporating students into the research design process. When I first heard him talk about this, I thought it was very ambitious. I had always made a point of “thinking out loud,” so my students were exposed to the kinds of decisions a researcher needs to make, but I had always firmly kept the reigns. Having discussed Sam's suggestion with my Co-PI, Laurie Weinstein, we tried it (on a small scale) during our five-week field school in Connecticut this summer. Each student selected the locations for five shovel test pits. They had to explain what research question those pits would address. They dug the pits, recorded their findings, and reported the results. It worked brilliantly. Honestly, the pits rarely yielded what the...
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students had hoped for, but that's the reality of archaeology, and after that experience, they never complained about digging empty holes. They got a chance to try out the scientific method and exercise their critical thinking skills. We got a crew who felt empowered, who were invested in the project, and who better understood and respected their PIs.

Support
Each of the articles in the forum, in some way, addresses the issue of securing moral or financial support for field schools. Ran Boytner and Sam Connell both suggest using student fees to fund research expenses both in and out of the field. This may seem difficult to achieve in a climate where students are being pepper-sprayed at anti-tuition-hike protests. But, both of these authors also make valid suggestions for marketing your field school, and making it more attractive to a larger audience. As an umbrella program for many different field schools, The Institute for Field Research will become a place where prospective students turn to find a good selection of quality “products.” Boytner and Connell each also encourage promoting your school as the kind of experiential learning necessary to succeed in the modern world. Engaging in and highlighting community outreach efforts can also earn you favor with your institution and with prospective students.

Mike Lerch presents a model of collaboration, where no single institution is responsible for planning, teaching, funding, and reporting the field school activities. By bringing together the resources of a CRM firm, a national forest, and a university, the burden on each was lessened, and the benefits increased. As a result, students were afforded a high-caliber educational experience, the CRM firm trained many prospective employees, the university attracted a new audience, and the forest fulfilled its Section 106 and 110 responsibilities.

By focusing their field school on preservation, Bill Doelle and Deborah Huntley are promoting community awareness and fostering future support for preserving the past. As we all know, archaeology cannot survive in a culture that does not value its work, so training preservation-minded citizens now (whether or not they go on to be archaeologists) will help ensure social and political support for archaeology (and field schools) in the future. I might also add that a self-funded program that focuses on preservation is never wanting for sites to study and rarely has trouble getting permits.

It has been an extreme pleasure to work with the panelists and authors about this subject. This is not the first, nor should it be the last, conversation about how field schools are taught. As public opinion, funding opportunities, and archaeology itself change over time, it is important, on occasion, to reflect on how we are meeting the needs of our science, our students, and our society.
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BROADENING THE SCOPE OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL FIELD SCHOOLS

Samuel V. Connell

Samuel V. Connell is a Professor of Anthropology at Foothill College.

We all know that field school programs both financially support research and promote successful teaching practices. There are various ways to design and manage a program. This paper presents a series of practical ideas developed over the last decade in California, South America, and Mesoamerica. I cover how we include students in the research process by allowing them to develop their own research programs. Next, I explain how at the community college level we are including an applied anthropology segment. I describe how our efforts to create local California field experiences have raised the profile of the college’s anthropology department by providing an accessible hands-on learning experience for students that is highly valued in today’s discussions of successful student learning. In order to create the next generation of field programs we must understand that the undergraduate experience is absolutely vital to anthropology’s own sustainability, especially as an emphasis on STEM curriculum threatens the viability of a liberal arts education. If we ignore attempts to align ourselves with undergraduate needs we can be written out of curriculum. We have a real problem when people with considerable power ask and answer, “Is it a vital interest of the state to have more anthropologists? I don’t think so” (Florida Gov. Rick Perry to The Herald-Tribune, October 10, 2011).

Embrace Field School Funding

In light of its own sustainability it is imperative for anthropology to improve both its public image and funding models. A field school does both. Setting old funding models aside we can operate as small business entities in search of customers who want an experience like none other. I write this from the heart of Silicon Valley where small businesses can be quite successful ventures. Archaeology is sexy (Google that phrase) and can fund academic work on that basis. The model is workable because while more time is used for planning and logistics, less time is spent on the preparation of grants. The model is also scalable, meaning that the size of the program can change yearly depending on the funding needs and the potential applicant pool.

I work at a community college with a heavy teaching load that makes it impossible to write yearly grant applications. The field school program provides financing for the project in the form of student program fees. Last summer, Foothill College enrolled just over 60 students in three field programs in California, Ecuador, and Belize. In my case perhaps a quarter of the total intake was applied directly to research. Program fees not used become departmental monies to improve labs over time, support local research, purchase supplies, and provide scholarships. In addition, summer class instruction may count as salary overload or can count towards your load. We try to spread course loads among the co-PIs hired as department adjuncts. Our credits transfer as GE credits and do articulate with most schools; however, success often depends upon undergraduate advisors and articulation officers at the home institutions. For students I have found that while 8 or 12 units of transferable credit initially is a big attraction, later it becomes less about the credits and more about the experience itself that can be put on a CV. Your administration is keying in on this experiential learning, as new learning formats are increasingly being promoted (High-Impact Practices see below). Most job postings now request an active field program because it provides out of classroom opportunities for student growth. For both institution and student alike the archaeology field program is seen as a valuable learning tool.

Engage the Students in the Research Process

My field programs use various techniques that broaden the scope of field schools. First, a cornerstone of my projects has been to engage the students in independent original research. Because of this requirement the greatest moments of each field season inevitably occur when students step into the unknown world of Ecuadorian or Maya archaeology and begin to think like scientists. In the early years students tended to focus on low-impact ethnoarchaeology research—but as we recognized the value of engaging students directly in the research process we have encouraged students in recent years to tackle larger questions that require the processing of significant amounts of data coming out of the
field and into the lab. By design, then, our field program has evolved into a teaching-focused research project involving students in many levels of decision making, logistics, and analysis.

What does this look like in practice? For starters, we are always pleased that many of the students arrive on the project with their own research questions already formed having read through pre-assigned relevant literature. In these cases, the task of project directors is simple: encourage the students to complete “micro research projects” on subjects tailored to their interests—and thus was born the central pillar of the academic program.

For example, in Ecuador we asked every student who joined the program to pursue original research of some kind that focused on the Pambamarca region, which is home to one of the largest pre-columbian fortress complex in the New World. What began as a small field school in 2002 has blossomed over the years into an incredibly diverse and successful endeavor, with more than 50 students, staff, and volunteers in 2011—including many archaeology students from Ecuador. For several years we also supported a local field school led by Dr. Ernesto Salazar.

Obviously the demands on the project directors and staff are significant as each student needs to be carefully supervised and monitored. Basic research scheduling is often the most important first step: each student needs to set aside time every day to conduct their own investigation and analysis.

Like any scientist, they have to think about the research design, logistics, feasibility, and implications of their project. During the early weeks on the project, most students spend time developing their research plan and consulting with the PIs and senior staff. During the latter weeks, more and more turn in long hours in the lab trying to amass and analyze as much data as possible. Their final reports are then written when they return home. They have approximately a month to finalize the report and hand it in, often bringing in outside sources and data from library research at their home institution. Grades often do not need to be submitted until just before the start of the fall term, and I have found that giving students extra time to incorporate outside research has greatly improved the papers.

In general, the research papers have been impressive. In recent years, we have had papers submitted on a wide range of topics—including Inca roads, ground-penetrating radar, warfare tactics, GIS viewshed analysis, obsidian studies, weaponry, pottery, museum studies, human remains, conservation, and more. Many of these students also present their research at professional meetings for the first time, which gives them professional experience to complement their studies. These undergraduate research experiences often lead to graduate studies. Currently, we have five homegrown Ph.D.-track students working on the project, four other completed M.A. theses, and countless senior honors projects and theses for institutions worldwide, including Ecuadorian universities.

I think this teaching model has been a success because it
keeps everything fresh each field season. It also helps drive the overall research of the project, provide new ideas, attract smart students, create good work, help to organize material quickly as it comes to the lab and is washed, and provide much of the preliminary analysis that should be required in order to complete a field season. That is how it helps the project. But it also helps the students, who are part of a new generation that is thirsty for meaningful research. We have amazing return rates, with many students coming back to be staff members. Students who have shown the motivation to return to archaeology for a second summer are the future of our field. But even if they are not destined to be archaeologists in the end, the leadership experience our students take with them is equally important. Much of the day-to-day teaching and interaction with students is carried out by our staff of former students who have specific tasks within the larger project. They become the life blood of the project, and it is because of this continuity year to year that we have such support from the town and surrounding communities. I would even argue that engaged students who return to continue the experience are some of our country’s best ambassadors.

Experiential Learning: A High Impact Practice

A recent vision statement by the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AACU) presents “Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World” as the essential learning outcome of a Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP). They cover High-Impact Practices such as undergraduate research, service learning, community-based learning, diversity/global based learning, collaborative assignments and projects, and first year experiences—ALL of which you provide with a field school. One of the strongest professional associations in academe is practically begging us to create more field programs (http://www.aacu.org/leap/vision.cfm). Experience outside the classroom has become critical to our new century of learning.

It is critical not to consider field archaeology as the only experience students can gain on a field program. Every summer my Ecuador and Belize programs have integrated service learning and applied anthropology coursework that emphasizes the role of the project members as responsible community-minded anthropologists. From the outset the American Institute of Archaeology (AIA)–Archaeological Fieldwork Opportunities Bulletin (AFOB) website has done well in recognizing the potential for mixing anthropological experiences. They were open to broadening the definition of archaeology field school and allowed us to promote the program on their website as a multifaceted anthropological field experience.

The great bulk of our students will not become archaeologists, but instead civic-minded thinkers who will continue to see the relevancy of their experience for the rest of their lives. At Foothill College the student government awards money for a service learning project to be designed by the students while in the field. Brilliant plans are generated after sustained debate among students coming on the heels of extensive ethnographic fieldwork in the communities. Two great examples come from Belize in 2010 and Ecuador in 2011, but I could describe the results from any year. In Belize, the students developed a plan to train school children in the art of traditional pottery making. No children from the community of Succotz, Belize were involved with pottery production for the tourism industry. By paying the local workshop to conduct a week-long ceramics training seminar, our field school students made the connection for Belizean kids to explore the village’s modern creation of a Maya heritage.

Students in the Ecuador program identified a disjunction between the youth and their parents that created tension in the town of Cangahua. They arranged funding for two very successful conferences (encuentros) in which hip-hop listening teenagers and their tradition-minded parents were given the opportunity to sound off in a small Andean community. In both cases, the importance of having the students develop these ideas cannot be understated. We believe that the field
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They love salt. Rebecca Landman feeding the llamas at Cochasqui. (Becca was a staff member in Ecuador and has used her GIS MA degree to find employment at many CRM firms in California, but now wants to become a veterinarian).

School should be viewed as something to integrate study and experience as a way to provide a new anthropological view of the world.

Collaboration with the Community Near Your University or College

Field school programs foster a sense of cooperation rarely seen in academia and the CRM world. Everyone senses the inherent goodness of the endeavor and what it is trying to accomplish. At Foothill College we have managed to cultivate wonderful relationships with agencies and organizations in the area, including the California State Parks, local City and County Parks, private foundations, museums, libraries, local K-12 schools, and open space organizations. This school year we are continuing our excavations of a Columbia mammoth near Monterey, testing of several historic era trash dumps, and surveying stage coach stops and a lumber mill. Being heavily invested in the local scene often gets the department in the press and attracts students. We have created the Center for Applied Anthropology through which we do our projects and receive funding. During any semester we have upwards of 20 students enrolled in independent study courses who are working on these local projects. Today they are working on cleaning mammoth bones, preparing artifacts for photography, reconciling databases, creating GIS maps or interviewing informants. These experiences are great opportunities for making contacts with community professionals with whom they work side by side. Local field programs become a collaborative effort that rewards the students as well as the community at large. A great example is our Anthropology-in-Action program designed to reach out to K-12 local schools that come to college for modules like “Experience Evolution” or “Beyond the Bones” and then tour the campus. While many school-age kids have never been to a college campus let alone seen a mammoth tusk, many college-age kids have never thought about the rewarding experience of teaching.

Because we have created an active learning community at Foothill College, our student population has changed somewhat. Today a significant portion of our students are continuing students or returning students who already have degrees in some other field and now are looking at graduate schools. These continuing students or returning students become a vital part of the departmental organization. Embrace these students and make them feel at home; they will become your staff members and lab technicians, not to mention being ever present mentors for younger students in their first or second year.

Improved Public Image

Let’s be blunt, the public image of archaeology needs to change. We could be big players on the educational stage. In practice, the field school provides reasoned experiential learning coupled with science-based training in the field. This does not necessarily compromise research goals and in fact could fuel them. Good things happen when students are allowed to take more of an ownership stake in a program or project. In my experience, field programs and anthropology departments that do this have produced the best results pedagogically and academically. As future graduate students in training, field school students become the basis for our next generation of anthropologists. And if they don’t become anthropologists, they surely will internalize the experiences as citizens of the world perhaps designing computers here in Silicon Valley.

A lot of people in our industry haven’t had very diverse experiences. So they don’t have enough dots to connect, and they end up with very linear solutions without a broad perspective on the problem. The broader one’s understanding of the human experience, the better design we will have [Steve Jobs quoted in Wired, February, 1996].
The future of archaeology field schools is unclear. Although there are more field schools today than ever before, failure to evolve and adapt to the rapid economic and structural changes that are sweeping higher education will result in the extinction of many programs. This paper outlines current challenges and describes potential opportunities for archaeology field schools. It then presents the Institute for Field Research, of which I am the director, as one possible path for adaptation that may improve the outlook for the future of archaeology field schools and strengthen the discipline as a whole.

Every crisis presents opportunities. As dire as current financial and political conditions may be, they alter student perception of, and willingness to pay for, excellence in education. As costs of higher education rise across the board, students are becoming more discerning and carefully choosing where to spend their limited resources. Programs that combine intensive experiential learning with rigorous academic standards and research, award significant amount of credit units and operate in international locations are growing exponentially. Archaeology field schools are doing just that and are, therefore, facing great growth opportunities.

In 2006, Brian Fagan discussed the future of archaeology. Citing a conversation he had had with a friend, Fagan wrote, “We’re in the golden years [of archaeology]. Enjoy, for it’s going to be very different in a generation or so. Archaeology is in a crisis that threatens its very existence.... Support for academic archaeology is at best level, rather than increasing” (Fagan 2006:59). Since 2006, the financial strength of our universities has declined and public attention to cultural issues has diminished as fiscal concerns have taken center stage.

Contemporary archaeology is facing many challenges. Reduction in overall funding and the shift in the focus of university administrations towards “Big Science” are threatening the growth or even preservation of archaeology’s current status and funding. Archaeology itself is becoming an ever more expensive endeavor. More analytical work requires increased levels of funding. Further, the strongest archaeological projects now include a range of experts working together as ‘research groups’, a model adopted from the hard sciences but without the corresponding levels of funding. Yet funding from both private and governmental sources is level or even decreasing.

Economic Realities and Field Schools
Archaeology field schools traditionally have been viewed as training grounds for future academic archaeologists (Figure 1). As such, universities have customarily supported them. Schools would pay staff salaries, subsidize tuition, and help with housing and equipment. Faculty members can seek release from teaching on-campus classes that might be larger and more lucrative to departments. In this model, field schools were seen as an extension of classroom training and as a service that universities should provide to their students.

The present economic crisis has dramatically altered this praxis. Across the board, budgets are being cut to an unprecedented degree. Administrators must make hard choices, and field schools can be easy targets because a small number of students are trained at a relatively high cost. Many universities have cut field school subsidies, which shifts more costs to the students. Although a few field schools are still supported by a faculty member’s institution, typically support for student participation is reserved solely for students of the home institution.

Structural Changes and Field Schools
New economic realities are accelerating structural changes within and outside archaeology. Over the past two decades, in order to gain additional participants and to have a broader base of field school tuition support, directors of some field schools reluctantly admit non-archaeology majors. These students are typically seen as “dead weight,” filling the ranks...
of laborers and providing necessary funding (through tuition) to enable continuation of research work. This attitude represents a failure to adjust to changed conditions. Archaeology is a discipline that cannot survive without broad public support and disgruntled students may grow up to be adults either lacking enthusiasm or harboring antipathy for archaeology.

**Potentials: The Political Domain**

The US Federal Government views the participation of students in international programs as vital to its national and strategic interest. The Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Act (S. 473 & H.R. 2410), which passed in 2010 both houses of Congress with strong bipartisan support, seeks to increase the number of students studying abroad from the present 270,000 to 1 million annually.

Approximately 38 percent of study abroad students in the past four years participate in the summer months (100,000 annually; Education 2011). Many students are seeking programs that are both academically rigorous and culturally enriching. Archaeology field schools are often international, in exotic locations in comparison with the student’s home, but even domestic programs provide excellent opportunities for students to encounter cultures dramatically different than their own. Many parents view study abroad as a means for their child to cement language skills or develop an international perspective on an increasingly globalized society. As this perception increases, the demand for these experiences will grow, and this represents a major resource for entrepreneurial archaeologists.

Archaeology field schools are currently a niche market. About 1,400 U.S.-based students participate annually in archaeology field schools (Perry 2006:25). As the federal government promotes the development of new, quality international experiences for American undergraduates, there is great growth potential for archaeology field schools—both in the number of committed attending students and in their quality.

**Potentials: Impacting the Future of Archaeology**

Archaeology field schools will always be training grounds for future scholars. Yet, if archaeologists embrace students who are seeking careers outside archaeology and provide them with positive and quality experiences, field schools will become effective vehicles for increased public awareness and support for archaeology. Surveys conducted by the now-defunct UCLA Archaeology Field Program indicate that 90 percent of all participating students reported archaeology field schools as “life changing events” (Boytner 2011:85). These are astounding numbers. Managed intelligently, these students will develop lifelong relationships with archaeology. They can become part of a broader and ever-expanding base of support for the preservation of the past and protection of global cultural heritage.

Designing field schools to accommodate non-majors and non-specialists does not require dumbing-down either research or pedagogy. Archaeology is exciting to practice and basic fieldwork techniques can be taught in a fairly short period of time. Students react in overwhelmingly positive ways to the physical nature of archaeological work and to the anthropological ramifications of the data collected in the field.

**Potentials: Student Tuition as Funding Streams**

The grim reality is that public funding for higher education across the US is declining. This trend likely will continue for some time. College degrees are increasingly viewed as financial investments that are the responsibility of individuals, not the state. Similar patterns are seen across the world (UK, Chile, etc.). Evaluating the moral or ethical implications of such processes is beyond the scope of this paper. The relevant issue is that students consider their education a long-term investment; they are ready to allocate significant resources for quality returns.
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Figure 2: Dr. Maria Cecilia Lozada (University of Chicago) instructing field school students at the site of Millo II, Vitor Valley of Southern Peru.

Tuition is an important source of revenue for projects that run field schools as part of their operation. While it is usually designed to pay for room and board only, it can, and should, do more. Funding from student tuition should be used to advance entire research agenda. Students are being trained through experiential research, and therefore the research program should be supported, at least in part, from their tuition.

There are a number of advantages to this arrangement, both to the student and the senior project team. First, recognition of the positive contribution students make to projects should serve as a motivation to provide quality pedagogy. If students can choose from a range of field schools, they will select those programs that excel not only in research but also in teaching. Competition will, therefore, improve teaching quality. Second, as student tuition becomes an important revenue source for the long-term support of projects, scholars will be able to allocate less time for grant writing and more time for analysis and publication. Excellent programs will attract excellent students who will contribute to excellent research. With the knowledge that there will be a stable stream of revenue as long as a project’s staff is committed to excellence in pedagogy, scholars will be able to engage in long-term planning of research that should yield improved research designs, better results, and faster turnaround time for publications.

Funding research through field schools may never replace the role of grants. Nevertheless, it can leverage those resources and enhance the financial capabilities of research projects.

The Institute for Field Research: Collaboration and the Economy of Scale

There are important advantages in economies of scale—in this case, the synergies of resources created by grouping many field schools in one place. In early 2011, the Institute of Field Research (IFR) was created to achieve many of the goals outlined above. The IFR Board of Directors is largely composed of academics and includes leading scholars from across the world. All are intimately familiar with and strongly committed to field schools and teaching through research.

The IFR will run 16 field schools in 2012. Growth in the number and breadth of offerings is planned to continue. Based on this economy of scale, the IFR was able to negotiate a favorable agreement with the California State University Northridge (CSUN) in order to provide each participating student with eight semester credit units for a 5-6 week long field school. While CSUN is a full partner, IFR’s independence in selecting, monitoring, and rejecting potential field schools using a system of peer review is guaranteed. Thus, the interests of both organizations are served equally, but separately. CSUN benefits from exposure and revenue from a large number of programs that are off-campus and thus have marginal costs. The IFR benefits by being able to offer students a significant number of credit units, which makes the costs of its field schools reasonable.

The IFR has three central goals. First, it aims at professionalizing how field schools teach through research. The IFR has a rigorous set of criteria and monitoring procedures to ensure high standards in both student instruction and archaeological research. Traditional field schools, even those operating out of large universities, have very little oversight by departments or deans. Students frequently rely on the reputation of the university offering the program, not that of the field school itself. By creating an organization solely focused and strongly committed to field school quality, students can now choose programs with greater certainty of academic, pedagogical, and research excellence.

Second, the IFR seeks to attract new student populations to archaeology field schools. The economy of scale produced by overseeing such a large number of projects allows the IFR to aggregate resources for marketing efforts, study student expectations (and whether they are met or not), and train field school directors and their staff in better field teaching techniques. Field schools must no longer act as independent operators but enjoy the benefits of a large organization managing the administrative component of programs and allowing directors to focus on research and recruitment of excellent students. A friendly competition among field school
directors over best students improves overall quality and thus increases field school standards across the board.

Third, the IFR uses program fees as a significant resource to support long-term archaeological research and publication. IFR economy of scale reduces the contribution required from individual student tuition costs to support its overhead. Significant portions of student tuition can then be transferred directly to support field school-based research.

Because the IFR is an independent, academic, nonprofit organization, it can partner with any academic archaeologist regardless of her/his home institution. Academic archaeologists that wish to work through the IFR must go through a rigorous approval process that takes an average of 18 months and includes an initial site visit by IFR academic staff and a submission of a full proposal by the potential field school director.

The IFR seeks to offer students a broad range of research experiences. It embraces projects from locations and time periods throughout the world, as its strength is built not only on scale but also on the diversity of its offerings. At the same time, the IFR recognizes that its financial model—providing funding through student tuition—is attractive primarily to U.S.-based students. Projects, therefore, must demonstrate the capacity to understand the needs and requirements of U.S. students.

The IFR is not an exclusive club. Yet, it is also not a membership organization open to all. The IFR rigorous, ongoing peer-review process is designed to ensure the highest possible academic and pedagogical standards. IFR and its field schools provide leadership and aim for a long-lasting and positive impact on the discipline of archaeology, both now and in the future.

Conclusions

The IFR is only one adaptation to the short- and medium-range challenges facing archaeology field schools today. Other models are emerging. Brian Billman in Peru and Sam Connell in Belize are incorporating strong community service elements into their field schools, connecting the past to the present, the dead with the living. Others are offering shorter programs, two weeks on average, which include extensive travel and site visits.

It is clear that archaeology can be attractive to the increasing number of students that are seeking academic experiences abroad or outside of traditional classrooms. Archaeologists can, and I would argue that we must, embrace these multitudes of students and turn them into lifelong supporters of the discipline. We all stand much to gain from this way forward.
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PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP IN ARCHAEOLOGICAL FIELD SCHOOLS


Michael K. Lerch

Michael K. Lerch is a Research Director and Principal Investigator for Statistical Research, Inc., Woodland, California.

Just after the turn of the millennium, a unique public-private partnership in archaeological field schools developed in the San Bernardino Mountains of southern California. The collaboration involved four field schools at two locations: the first in 2001–2002, and the second in 2005–2006. Each field school had a unique roster of students and a different set of instructors. The results have been documented in multiple interim and two final reports (Douglass et al. 2009; Lerch et al. 2010). The results of a fifth field school, held in 2003, will be reported as soon as funding is available.

Here, I examine the details of the 2001–2002 and 2005–2006 field schools, and consider the nature of the partnership between a state university, a federal agency, and a private cultural resource management (CRM) firm that made the field schools possible. I conclude with a review of the lessons learned by the public and private partners, as well as by the students.

California State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB) and Statistical Research, Inc. (SRI) offered the field schools in cooperation with San Bernardino National Forest (SBNF) to provide instruction and training in archaeological field methods to university students, and to assist SBNF in its ongoing management of heritage resources on the forest. CSUSB offered the field program as a regular-credit undergraduate class (Anthropology 320: Archaeological Survey and Excavation), arranged by Dr. Peter T. Robertshaw, chair of the CSUSB Department of Anthropology. Dr. Donn R. Grenda, president of SRI, was the instructor of record for all the field schools, although he was assisted in the day-to-day instruction by numerous SRI staff members and outside lecturers. Mr. Daniel F. McCarthy and Dr. Bill Sapp, former and current forest archaeologists respectively, selected the areas and sites that were investigated.

Funding for the field schools also reflected the public-private nature of the partnerships. The university provided a stipend for the instructor and charged a lab fee to students, which covered the cost of food and supplies for the field camp. The forest and SRI arranged Challenge Cost-Share Grant agreements in which SBNF provided some Heritage Resources Staff assistance, group campgrounds at no charge, and funding to support report writing and production. For its part, SRI provided in-kind contributions in the form of a variety of guest lecturers (up to 26 per season), instructors from its senior staff (Figures 1 and 2), archaeologists to serve as field school crew chiefs, and a camp organizer and cook.

The field schools involved the participation of two local Indian tribes with traditional ties to the study areas. Each field school opened with a blessing, songs, and a cultural background lecture by Ernest Siva, tribal historian for the Morongo Band of Mission Indians. In 2005, school children from the San Manuel Band of Serrano Mission Indians visited the field school sites and went with the field school students to another nearby site, guided by SBNF Tribal Relations Program Manager Daniel McCarthy. Public outreach also included visits from a local Boy Scout troop, which spent a day with the field school in 2005 and 2006 to fulfill a portion of the requirements for the Archaeology Merit Badge. The scouts worked with field school students, helped excavate a unit each year, and visited various archaeological sites in the area as part of their experience. In both 2005 and 2006, members of an anthropology club sponsored by SBNF visited the field school and interviewed students and staff. Finally, in 2006, a film crew from CSUSB visited the field school and interviewed students and staff for a student recruitment video.

Over the course of five field schools, approximately 75 students (an average of 15 per year) were trained at the CSUSB-SBNF-SRI field schools. The field school students came from a number of universities, in addition to CSUSB. Each field school ran for four weeks, Monday to Friday, with students staying in SBNF group campgrounds in tents. Meals included breakfast, a sack lunch, and dinner each day. The daily schedule involved survey and excavation fieldwork in
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The morning, laboratory instruction in the afternoons, and campfire lectures by guest speakers each evening. In addition to field and laboratory methods, lectures included topics on local and regional archaeology and ethnography, geology, soils and stratigraphy, ceramics, osteology, faunal analysis, ethnobotany, historical archaeology, and discussions on careers in archaeology. On behalf of CSUSB, SRI applied for and received certification from the Register of Professional Archaeologists (RPA) as an RPA4 field school.

The 2001–2002 Field School

The 2001–2002 archaeological field school was held in the vicinity of the Balanced Rock Mine. One goal of the field school was to help SBNF meet its obligations under Section 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA), which requires that federal agencies identify historic properties within their jurisdictional boundaries and evaluate them with respect to their eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). To this end, the field school was designed to inventory the area in and around the Horse Spring Campground and the Balanced Rock Mine.

A second equally important purpose of the field school was to resolve a lapse in compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA related to the rehabilitation of a road and its removal from the SBNF road system. Section 106 requires federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties, and to allow the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (AHP) the opportunity to comment. The Forest neglected to consider the effects of rehabilitating the road, and damaged portions of several archaeological sites through which the two-track dirt road had passed. The rehabilitation process involved placing physical barriers to vehicular traffic at junctions with other roads, and ripping and scarifying the ruts in the road to encourage vegetation growth. These activities resulted in disturbance of the surface and near-surface portions of these sites. Because the forest had not complied with Section 106, it foreclosed the opportunity of the ACHP to comment on the effects of its undertaking on historic properties.

SBNF staff suggested this location for the field school and assisted the SRI staff in developing the scope and goals for the project. Field school activities included intensive pedestrian survey and limited test excavations. The field school crews surveyed 1,028 acres in 2001, and approximately 400 acres in 2002. This combined survey work resulted in the identification and recording of 22 isolates and 35 sites, seven of which had been recorded previously. Three sites affected by the road closure were tested with surface scrapes and test units during the 2002 season. The majority of the sites within the project area date to the historical period, whereas many of the isolates are prehistoric artifacts. Taken together, the information obtained provides a diachronic picture of the use of this small portion of the San Bernardino Mountains.

The 2005–2006 Field School

The 2005–2006 archaeological field school, taught by SRI staff Dr. John G. Douglass and Dr. Kathleen L. Hull, conducted survey, testing, and data recovery excavations at a late prehistoric site located near a stream crossing along a Forest Service road in the SBNF (Figure 3). Testing was conducted...
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in June and July of 2005, and data recovery excavations took place in June and July of 2006. Excavations at this site, located at the confluence of Deep and Bear Creeks, exposed several thermal features and numerous bedrock milling features, as well as ground stone and flaked stone artifacts. Features and artifacts suggest that this site functioned as a habitation site and resource procurement and processing area. In addition to testing and data recovery work, surveys were conducted in nearby areas covering a total of 155 acres. Within the survey area, three previously unrecorded sites were recorded in 2005 and 2006. Five isolates were also identified and recorded. Several previously recorded sites in the survey area could not be relocated.

Benefits and Lessons of a Public-Private Partnership

Each of the three parties, CSUSB, SBNF, and SRI, contributed to the success of these collaborative field schools, and each received benefits. As a university with a relatively small anthropology program, CSUSB was able to offer a field school for its own students and those from other universities. The collaborative nature of this field school program allowed student participants to learn archaeological skills in a particularly rich educational environment. Because a team of experts taught the students, it can be argued that they received a better and more thorough education in archaeological field methods than if they had been taught by a single instructor. Students not only received excellent training in methods generally, but they also obtained first-hand experience solving real-life CRM problems. This CRM exposure and having the field school certified by RPA meant that students from these field schools have strong qualifications for future employment opportunities.

SBNF provided the opportunity for the students to learn archaeology as they studied the forest’s heritage resources. Using the resources of the field school, SBNF was able to meet some of its NHPA Section 110 obligations, and more importantly, was able to resolve two Section 106 foreclosures to the satisfaction of the SHPO and the ACHP.

SRI was interested in developing stronger ties with SBNF, CSUSB, and the local tribes, as well as training students that might one day become future employees and colleagues. SRI subsequently recruited three students from these field schools, and two were hired by agencies that contract with SRI for ongoing work.

The only difficulties experienced in this collaboration had to do with funding. Delays in the execution of the cooperative agreement during the 2001–2002 field school required a separate contract to prepare the report 4 years later, and a report for the 2003 season is still unfunded. However, SBNF learned from and appreciated the value of hosting a field school, and ran its own version of it for several years after 2006. Ongoing and severe budget cuts to the Heritage Resources Program throughout the region have caused the forest to cut back even further, so that current field school activities are limited to the weekend participation of students from another state university. Doing field schools like this are important for many reasons, and their fairly minimal costs provide good value for all they achieve. These should be priority activities for federal agencies to give back to the tax-paying public that supports their mission.
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The subject of preservation of American antiquities is now receiving an amount of attention never heretofore accorded it. – Edgar Lee Hewett, 1905

What is a Preservation Archaeology field school? Why is it different than any other archaeological field school? The answers lie in the philosophy and practice of Preservation Archaeology.

What—and Why—is Preservation Archaeology?
The American Southwest has played a special role in the development of New World archaeology. Late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century investigations by Adolph Bandelier, Frank Cushing, Jesse Walter Fewkes, and A.V. Kidder provided glimpses of a rich archaeological landscape connected to living cultures at contemporary Pueblos. As awareness of this remarkable heritage grew, so did the realization that it needed legal protection at a national level: many previously well-preserved ruins had been decimated by nineteenth-century settlers, and it was not uncommon for artifacts to be shipped to points east by the boxcar load, far from their rightful disposition. Archaeologist Edgar Lee Hewett played a critical role in drawing professional and political attention to the urgent need to preserve and protect our nation’s antiquities. Following the passage of the Antiquities Act of 1906, many of the Southwest’s most impressive sites and landscapes became National Parks or Monuments.

Since the end of World War II, populations have boomed in the Southwestern states, culminating in the unprecedented growth rates of recent decades. Development has removed thousands of archaeological sites from existence, and, despite greater legal protections, only some of those sites were professionally excavated before their demise. As pressures on the region’s finite and fragile archaeological resource base intensify, it is not unreasonable to ask: how can archaeologists justify consuming sites or portions of sites that are not currently threatened, whether for research or field training?

At Archaeology Southwest (formerly Center for Desert Archaeology), we have kept this question firmly in mind for the past three decades, where it remains as we develop and implement a field school in partnership with the University of Arizona’s School of Anthropology. Our response is Preservation Archaeology, an approach that derives from principles established by the previously cited archaeological pioneers, as well as from our own on-the-ground experiences. Some of Preservation Archaeology’s guiding principles are also reflected in SAA’s Principles of Archaeological Ethics, particularly numbers 1, 2, 4, and 7. Preservation Archaeology serves as the foundation for the field program’s curriculum and all of Archaeology Southwest’s endeavors.

First, we follow Hewett in prioritizing preservation of the archaeological resource base. Second, we subscribe to the tenet set forth in William Lipe’s seminal conservation model (Lipe 1974): a nonrenewable resource must be consumed with great care and forethought. Third, we are guided by research designs that address large-scale questions, and we take seriously our responsibility to broadly share our findings. Fourth, our research and field school programs integrate with our powerful site protection program. And last, but by no means least, we respect the interests of local communities, viewing residents as donors and partners who permit us to explore the places that make their communities special.

The Preservation Archaeology Field Experience
Let us be clear: at present, our field school is centered on an archaeological site that is not threatened. Because of the research, protection, and outreach initiatives this location is tied to, however, we believe that the situation affords us a unique opportunity to teach students the integrated Preservation Archaeology approach and enable them to experience aspects of it firsthand.
The program takes place in the community of Mule Creek in the upper Gila River region of west-central New Mexico. Students live and learn on a working private ranch in a rural setting. Archaeology Southwest began work in the region in 2008, as part of a long-term research initiative to understand demographic and cultural changes across the southern Southwest in late prehistory. In 2008 and 2009, in collaboration with Hendrix College, we undertook limited test excavations at three privately owned sites. In 2010, a crew of Archaeology Southwest staff and volunteers returned to one of these, the Fornholt site, in order to produce a detailed site map. In 2011, in conjunction with the University of Arizona, we initiated the current program. Students from across the United States spent five weeks investigating Fornholt and playing an active role in our interpretation of the site.

The program incorporates experiential learning, helping students discover how to learn—which is not the same as making them “job-ready” (an unrealistic goal for any five-week field school, we would argue). Instruction in excavation technique, mapping, and field documentation remains a key component of the curriculum, and students wash sherds, label artifacts, and write short papers as in any program. Instruction in the principles of Preservation Archaeology is where our program adds value—and builds values.

Preserving the Archaeological Resource Base
In our “classroom” discussions, we begin to engage students’ commitment to preservation through critical thinking exercises. During our 2011 program, legal and ethical issues surrounding looting and vandalism of archaeological resources, antiquities trafficking, the curation crisis, and the use of archaeology for political means were introduced and later hotly debated in our Preservation Archaeology Ethics Bowl, modeled after the SAA Ethics Bowl.

Lectures by staff and guests also explore various approaches to collecting archaeological data. Students learn that Archaeology Southwest’s overarching research, of which the field school's investigation is a part, is grounded in work with existing collections of ceramic and flaked-stone artifacts. We discuss our use of Neutron Activation Analysis (NAA) and petrographic analysis to determine clay and temper sources for previously collected pottery. Archaeology Southwest Preservation Fellow and University of Arizona doctoral candidate Robert Jones shares his research, which uses X-ray Fluorescence (XRF) to pinpoint the geological origins of previously and newly recovered obsidian artifacts. Students come to understand that meaningful answers to certain kinds of questions can be found without breaking new ground.

Consuming with Great Care and Forethought
At the Fornholt site, we intend to maximize information return and minimize our impact. To this end, our investigation employs low-impact data collection strategies. In previous years, we gathered representative artifact and environmental samples from trash middens; we did not excavate in architectural areas of the site. In 2010, we used non-destructive wall-clearing techniques to create a site map. This map was used to designate small units within well-defined rooms, which our 2011 field school crew excavated. Of the estimated sixty rooms at the site, only a few will be sampled in this way, and the others will be left intact. This strategy will provide us with useful information about the organization of space and features within rooms, as well as room construction and remodeling sequences.

Much of this work directly informs the doctoral research of University of Arizona student and Archaeology Southwest Research Assistant Katherine Dungan. Together with the entirety of the field school experience, Katherine’s research serves as one example for our students at the graduate level, who are assigned the task of writing a low-impact research design adhering to the tenets of Preservation Archaeology.

There are other, more philosophical, but no less practical, aspects to considered consumption that we address. In keep-
innovations in archaeological field schools

photo 3. field school students relax after a day's work by learning to flint knap. preservation fellow rob jones (left of center in the white shirt and cowboy hat) teaches students about local raw materials. image credited to meaghan troubbridge.

ing with our obligation to maximize information gain and long-term preservation, we committed to the field school partnership only after we had secured funding for excavation, analysis, reporting, and permanent curation of the artifacts and records. our holistic, yet limited, site sampling ensures that materials are conserved for future researchers both in the ground and in a public repository, in case the site is ever destroyed.

protecting sites
archaeology southwest's site protection program involves varying levels of control over the long-term management of archaeological sites. owning an archaeological site and holding a conservation easement are two of the strongest protective measures, and we pursue both of these strategies. partnerships with the nature conservancy and the archaeological conservancy lengthen and strengthen our reach.

although long-term protections are less certain, a landowner's commitment to stewardship of the archaeological sites on his or her property can also achieve positive outcomes. in all cases, a basic understanding of the archaeological sites present, their extent and condition, and their research potential constitutes an essential baseline for managing protected sites over the long term.

the coordinator of archaeology southwest's site protection program, andy laurenzi, provided our 2011 students with an introduction to this aspect of our work. students also visited a site in the nearby mimbrres valley that is protected by one of our conservation easements.

asking big-picture questions and engaging the public
our work in the upper gila region is just one part of a much larger investigation that asks: what happened to southwestern peoples in the centuries before the spaniards arrived? to address this question, we are exploring migration, community formation and collapse, and interaction and integration within and among diverse, multi-ethnic settlements across the southern southwest. in addition to our scholarly reporting, we share what we are learning with the public through our popular quarterly magazine, exhibits, website, and "mule creek underground" blog.

as our students come to appreciate — through their interactions with mule creek residents, email updates to their own friends and family members, and the writing of their assigned blog entries — the challenge is not so much engaging public interest in archaeology as it is learning to communicate why what we are doing is important and how we know what we know. we believe that this is not only an essential skill, but also a responsibility. by moving the focus away from artifacts and "finds" and expanding the perspective to settlements, local cultural landscapes, and even broader scales that link modern native american communities to our research, we tell a more compelling story that puts local resources in a big-picture context.

cooperating with local communities
the mule creek community is an important partner in our field program. in fact, some of our partners in mule creek are landowners who have protected sites on their properties for generations. students routinely interact with these community members, sharing what they are learning in informal conversations. these kinds of interactions add a very personal dimension to our directive to integrate research efforts with the goals and needs of the communities in which we work. we are obligated to provide the resources they need to help them protect and manage local archaeological resources, and we must always leave behind a bigger story than was there when we started.

fulfilling hewett's legacy
clearly, each of these aspects is enmeshed with the others, and that is another message of our program: preservation archaeology demands holistic thinking. whether or not our students go on to careers in archaeology, the resources and the profession are well served by the lifelong commitment to preservation we hope to inspire in this program. and for those who do become professionals—most likely in cultural resource management settings—we hope that this next generation of stewards brings holistic thinking to the problem of threatened archaeological sites, and gives serious consideration to preserving more of our nation's rich heritage in place.

reference
lip, william h.
As readers of *The SAA Archaeological Record* are hopefully already aware, the Register of Professional Archaeologists (RPA) is a listing of archaeologists who have agreed to abide by a common code of conduct. The Register represents an effort to establish standards of archaeological practice by which professional archaeologists can be distinguished from all others who are involved with or interested in archaeology.

Perhaps less well known is that for the past ten years RPA has had a Field School Certification Program. The goal of this program is to establish standards of practice and an ethical code of conduct for this critical area of archaeological training, and to provide a platform for publicizing the field schools that meet these standards. We recognize that field schools include a wide variety of research objectives, field methods, and theoretical perspectives. For that reason, the RPA certification review emphasizes structure and purpose more than methods and procedures. The criteria for certification, revised in 2010, are summarized briefly here and presented in more detail at www.rpaorg.net:

- **Purpose:** In our view, a field school is a research project that also aims to train students in how to do the research. Both the research and the training components are essential; an ethical field school cannot do one without the other.

- **Personnel:** The Director or Principal Investigator of the field program must be RPA certified, must have primary responsibility for direct supervision of field school participants in the field and the laboratory, and must be affiliated with an institution that meets the “Sponsor” criteria outlined below.

- **Operational Procedures:** We detail a short list of required procedures including the plotting of sites on 1:24,000 scale maps, the recording of provenience for all collected artifacts, and formal student instruction in field and lab methods.

- **Reporting:** All field schools are expected to produce an annual, publicly accessible report summarizing their findings within one calendar year of the end of the field school.

- **Sponsor:** The institution sponsoring the field school must meet minimum specifications for institutional support, including appropriate space for laboratory work, adequate curation, and support for publication/distribution of the research results.

- **Profit:** Certified field schools may not be run for profit; fees charged to participants may only be used to cover the cost of fieldwork, personnel, and associated research expenses.

- **Field School Duration and Certification Criteria:** We label certified field schools according to their duration; e.g., “RPA-4” designates a four-week field school. Field schools of less than four weeks can be certified as “RPA-Introductory.”

As this summary indicates, the criteria for certification are not overly burdensome, and most field schools could be certified with relative ease. As with the broader Register, certification is not a weeding process but a voluntary submission to ethical standards that, we hope, raises the standard of practice for the discipline as a whole. The certification process also provides the opportunity for a small group of peers to provide constructive feedback on field school structure and practice—feedback that the directors of certified field schools have told us is quite helpful. Certification also comes with a perk: all certified field schools are automatically eligible for one of four, $500-$800 Field School Scholarships (see www.rpanet.org for details).
We recognize that archaeological field schools are in flux as funding sources decline and the political landscape (especially in North America) shifts with the increased role of indigenous communities in archaeological practice. We note that field school size is shrinking, with most projects involving about ten students rather than the twenty-to-thirty of a generation ago. Project directors must increasingly fund field schools with student fees, which limits both the number of students who can afford to participate and the scale of the field- and laboratory work that can be financed. An increasing number of field schools are being taught by faculty at colleges lacking graduate programs, raising difficult issues of crew oversight in the field and lab without graduate assistants.

The papers in this issue raise some interesting issues and new models for archaeological field schools. We applaud (and have certified) field schools taking diverse approaches to the field school experience. The “RPA-Introductory” category was designed in part to recognize the importance of such field programs. We also recognize the need to find new ways for field schools to become integrated into the curricula of higher education institutions if they are to survive. Re-branding field schools as experiential learning or study abroad opportunities, rather than strictly pre-professional training, is a viable option from our perspective. Samuel Connell’s student-research focused field projects (which have been RPA-certified) represent an especially well developed example of the experiential learning model. Positioning field schools as preservation projects, as advocated by Huntley and Doelle, and integrating field schools into the local community, as described by Connell, are also excellent ways of integrating them into broader educational and societal objectives.

One caution, however, concerns the long-standing tension in archaeological field schools between the teaching and research components of the experience. Because almost all archaeological field methods damage the cultural resources being studied in some way, ethical standards (such as SAA Principle 1 and RPA Code 1.1b) do not permit fieldwork to be conducted for training or “experience” detached from a research agenda. If field schools are to evolve in the direction of study abroad programs, the balance of teaching and research and the qualifications of project directors will have to be carefully observed.

We also applaud the creation of umbrella groups like The Institute for Field Research at USC, which provides a level of structure and support that isolated projects do not enjoy. We would hope and encourage that participating field schools in such organizations will also apply for RPA certification, both to support the establishment of discipline-wide standards of practice and to receive the benefits of certification.

Field schools are not just the training ground for the next generation of archaeologists anymore; if they are to survive, and thrive, they must evolve to satisfy a broader constituency while still adhering to disciplinary standards and ethics. We are encouraged by the models presented here and look forward to interacting with many more field school directors through the RPA Field School Certification process in the future.
IN MEMORIAM

JANET SPECTOR

Janet Spector, a pioneer of and for feminist archaeology, died at home in Albuquerque, NM on September 13, 2011, as a result of complications of breast cancer. Janet is perhaps most well-known among archaeologists for her book, What this Awl Means: Feminist Archaeology at a Wahpeton Village (1993; Minnesota Historical Society Press), but other articles and 25 years of activism at the University of Minnesota have also left lasting impressions and changes.

Janet was born and raised in Madison, Wisconsin and attended the University of Wisconsin there for her undergraduate and graduate degrees. Following her MA degree (1970) in archaeobotany, Janet began work in feminist and antiwar movements, which were, to her, much more relevant and immediate. Among other activities at this time, she was part of a group of anthropology students who started an alternative school in Madison and developed a hands-on archaeology curriculum for first and second year undergraduates that marked the beginning of a lifelong concern with pedagogy and teaching. She herself was to be awarded the highest teaching honor of the University of Minnesota—the Horace Morse-Amoco Award—in 1986. Janet returned to the University of Wisconsin for her Ph.D. and subsequently took a position in the Department of Anthropology at the University of Minnesota in 1973. Her archaeology experiences included fieldwork in Wisconsin, Minnesota, Canada and Israel.

Janet worked at the University of Minnesota for 25 years and in a number of capacities that helped change the landscape of research and practice. She was one of the founders of the Women’s Studies program, serving as its Chair from 1981–1984. She was later appointed to a task force to assess conditions for women at the university following landmark sexual discrimination litigation. In 1992, she was appointed as an assistant provost, chairing a large Commission on Women that was intended to transform the academic culture that perpetuated a “chilly climate” for women. Janet was also instrumental in establishing the Center for Advanced Feminist Studies. She retired from the University in 1998, maintaining an active professional life as an archaeologist and consultant.

Janet’s legacy of scholarship includes several especially important contributions. From 1986–1988, Janet served on the Advisory Board for the American Anthropological Association’s "Gender and Anthropology" project that was intended to bring feminist anthropology into introductory textbooks and classrooms. Her essay on archaeology for this project publication (1988), co-authored with Mary Whelan, designed classroom exercises for critical readings of archaeology texts as well as for inquiries into the material expressions of gender. In writing the 1984 article (“Archaeology and the Study of Gender”) with Meg Conkey, Janet brought the required (by reviewers) “case study” or method to the essay, her work with what she called the “task-differentiation framework.” However, by the time of the 1988 conference, Women and Production in Prehistory, co-organized by Meg Conkey and Joan Gero, Janet had become disillusioned with the application of such a framework and had turned instead to her narrative and object-biography approach that was first published in her chapter in the edited volume from the conference (Gero and Conkey 1991), “What this Awl Means.” This was but a prelude to what became to book of the same title, based on her fieldwork and fully collaborative archaeology at the Little Rapids site in Minnesota. To this day, this monograph remains the single most important, influential, and path-breaking work of feminist archaeology. Janet was not only “ahead of the curve” with attempting a task-differentiation framework that sought to better understand and document in empirical detail the activities and practices of gendered subjects, but in the monograph about the Little Rapids site, Janet not only provided a compelling narrative that put the people—and a young woman, in particular—at the center of the site interpretation, but it also stands as one of the first and most successful examples of a truly intersectional approach that included gender and the indigenous participation and perspectives.

Janet Spector will be remembered by all who have worked with her for her integrity, honesty, reliability and for her commitment to feminist goals and practices. She is survived by her partner, Kathleen O’Malley of Albuquerque, NM; her brother, Robert Spector, and his wife, Diane Brinson of Madison, WI; David Rogers of Singapore, and Travis and Nancy Rogers and their two children, Will and Drew, of New Brighton, Minnesota. David and Travis are the children of her partner of more than 20 years, Susan Geiger, a historian who died in 2001.
Dr. James Bell Benedict (72) died March 8, 2011, at his home in the shadows of Sawtooth Peak west of Boulder, Colorado, following a hard-fought battle with kidney cancer. Jim was born November 11, 1938, in Cincinnati, Ohio. He graduated high school from Andover Academy, and went on to earn a BS in Geology from the University of Colorado in 1961 and a Ph.D. in Geology from the University of Wisconsin in 1968. Although his formal academic training was principally in geology, he took a single archaeology course from David Beareris while at Wisconsin, and that apparently was all he needed. Over the next 40 years, he successfully undertook a great number of exacting and creative archaeological excavations, mostly within his beloved Indian Peaks Wilderness Area of northern Colorado. The resultant body of work has been admired and acclaimed by his geological and archaeological colleagues for decades. He was the quintessential geoarchaeologist, combining plant ecology, glacial and periglacial geology with the archaeology of the high country. He pioneered lichenometry in the New World, providing a model for dating stone cultural features above timberline that has been adopted by others from the Rockies to the Sierras. His work with the Altithermal and its impacts on high altitude occupation continues to create much discussion. After establishing the Center for Mountain Archaeology, he went on to produce the acclaimed Center for Mountain Archaeology Research Report Series.

Archaeology came into Jim’s life during the summer of 1961, when he was shown the Murray game drive along the Continental Divide in the high tundra, while working at the CU Institute of Arctic and Alpine Research (INSTARR). Identifying drive walls and hunting blinds and recognizing lichen growth and their potential for dating these cultural features, he returned to his doctoral studies intent on combining geology and archaeology to understand the interaction of humans and climate above timberline.

Working independently, there was no opportunity for Jim to develop the cadre of formal students professors often do. However, Jim made up for that deficiency by always being willing to work with graduate and undergraduate students who approached him from across the nation. He welcomed them to his research center in the mountains and accompanied them into the field to introduce them to the intricacies and joys of doing archaeology at high altitude. Ultimately, the list of those of us fortunate to be counted as part of his “students” became quite lengthy.

He was part of Sigma XI, Phi Beta Kappa, and received the C.T. Hurst Award from the Colorado Archaeological Society, the W.A. Tarr Award from the University of Colorado, and the Kirk Bryan Award from the Geological Society of America.
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**POSITIONS OPEN**

**POSITION: THREE-YEAR PRESERVATION FELLOW**

**LOCATION: TUCSON, ARIZONA**

The private nonprofit Archaeology Southwest (formerly the Center for Desert Archaeology) invites applications for a three-year doctoral fellowship in southwestern archaeology, to be effective September 1, 2012. The Fellow will be expected to define a research problem that is compatible with the requirements of his or her degree granting institution and to work within Archaeology Southwest's current research priorities which are focused on the late precontact period (A.D. 1200–1540). The Fellow is provided a monthly stipend of $2,250 plus health insurance, office space, administrative support, and volunteer labor through Archaeology Southwest's membership program. Applicants should review the information available at http://www.cdarc.org/who-we-are/preservation-fellowship/. Applications should be postmarked no later than April 1, 2012.

**POSITION: TENURE-TRACK ASSISTANT PROFESSOR**

**LOCATION: CHICO, CALIFORNIA**

Chico State's Anthropology Department is searching for a tenure-track Assistant Professor to start August 2012 (Position 12-ANTH-01). Hire is contingent on funding. The minimum education requirement is a Ph.D. (by time of appointment) in anthropology with a specialization in archaeology. Concentration in California/Western United States, and the capability to contribute to the Cultural Resource Management program is required. Ability to teach or experience teaching courses for the Anthropology Major and Graduate Program, and a strong record of professional and scholarly activities complementing those of current faculty are necessary. Preference will be given to candidates with expertise in areas that complement the background of current faculty. These concentrations may include but are not limited to evolutionary ecology, zooarchaeology, or other relevant topical areas. Ability to teach and conduct research involving archaeological fieldwork is desirable as is the potential to work with and/or direct research engaging MA level graduate students in archaeology. In addition, the candidate should demonstrate potential for successful grant and contract activity that supports scholarly and/or applied research. Salary commensurate with education and experience. Review of applications will begin on February 1, 2012 and continue until the position is filled. To apply, applicants must complete the Application for Academic Employment Form, which is available on-line at http://www.csuchico.edu/faaf/facultyrecruit/facultyapplication.pdf to be submitted with curriculum vitae or resume; names, addresses, and telephone numbers of 3 references; and a cover letter stating how the applicant’s qualifications relate to the position. Send materials to Chair, Anthropology Search Committee, Department of Anthropology, California State University, Chico, CA 95929-0400. Phone: 530.898-6192; e-mail: anth@csuchico.edu. For information concerning the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences, as well as this vacancy announcement in its entirety, see http://www.csuchico.edu/bss/index.shtml.
**CALENDAR**

**2012**

**MARCH 30–31**

28th Annual Visiting Scholar Conference at the Center for Archaeological Investigations, Southern Illinois University Carbondale. This year’s conference, entitled “The Archaeology of Slavery: Toward a Comparative Global Framework,” will be held March 30-31, 2012. The goals of the conference are (1) to develop an interregional and cross-temporal framework of the archaeological interpretation of slavery and (2) to promote a diachronic approach to the topic, extending from before the moment of capture to beyond emancipation. Abstracts are due to lw3r@virginia.edu by December 5, 2011. More information on the conference and the call for papers can be found here: http://cai.siuc.edu/vspages/marshall/vsconf.html

**APRIL 9–13**

The First International Conference on Best Practices in World Heritage-Archaeology aims to generate a meeting point on Archaeology management and treatment of World Heritage sites. It will focus on Archaeology, keeping in mind that it needs to consider not only the sites, which have been inscribed as World Heritage due to its Archaeological nature, but also any site, property or group of material properties, inscribed as World Heritage, which can be studied using an archaeological methodology. The Conference is organised by the Complutense University of Madrid, and sponsored by the Council of Menorca Island (Balearic Islands, Spain), so that Menorca Island will become a place of reference for studies on the treatment of properties inscribed by UNESCO. Web: http://www.congresopatrimonio.mundialmenorca.cime.es/portal.aspx?IDIOMA=A-3. Email: congresopatrimonio.menorca@cime.es

**LETTER TO THE EDITOR**

“American Archaeology is Anthropology or it is Nothing.”
Anna S. Agbe-Davis (The SAA Archaeological Record volume 11(5), September 2011:21) is not the first person to truncate and thereby falsely universalize Willey and Phillips’ (1958:2) famous dictum, which in full reads “American archaeology is anthropology or it is nothing.” For American, and especially North American, archaeology this made some historical sense, in that Manifest Destiny’s extinction of Native American culture in the nineteenth century resulted in anthropology turning into archaeology in front of contemporary scholars’ eyes; but for archaeology across most of the world the generalization had little meaning.

It may be of some historical interest that Gordon R. Willey, after retiring from the Bowditch Chair at Harvard in 1987, joined the Department of Archaeology at Boston University as a Senior Research Fellow and for more than a decade participated in our Intellectual History of Archaeology AR701 graduate core seminar. On one occasion he was asked about the 1958 dictum, and his response was “I wish we’d never said it, it’s not true.” Agreeing, I drew to his attention, and now in the light of the present debate to your readers, to what I had said some years earlier: “If archaeology is only anthropology, then it is not nearly enough” (Hammond 1983:389).

Gordon Willey was a Corresponding Fellow of the British Academy, the humanities and social sciences partner to the Royal Society of London in the natural sciences; Alan Osborn’s obituary of Lewis R. Binford (September 2011: 53) omits to mention that he, too, was accorded this signal honor in 1998, three years before he was recognized by the U.S. National Academy of Sciences.

Hammond, N.
Willey, G. R., and P. Phillips

Sincerely,

Norman Hammond
Professor Emeritus
Department of Archaeology
Boston University
Boston MA 02215-1406.
nndch@bu.edu
WE WANT YOU! VOLUNTEERS NEEDED FOR THE ANNUAL MEETING!

For the 77th annual meeting in Memphis, Tennessee, SAA is seeking enthusiastic volunteers who are not only interested in archaeology but also looking to save money and have fun.

In order for volunteers to have more meeting flexibility, SAA will again only require 8 hours of volunteers’ time! The complimentary meeting registration is the exclusive benefit for your time.

Training for the April 18-22 meeting will be provided from detailed manuals sent to you electronically prior to the meeting along with on-the-job training. As always, SAA staff will be on hand to assist you with any questions or problems that may arise.

For additional information and a volunteer application, please go to SAAweb (www.saa.org) or contact Lorenzo Cabrera at SAA: 1111 14th Street, Suite 800, Washington, DC 20005, Phone +1 (202) 559-7382, Fax +1 (202) 789-0284, or e-mail lorenzo_cabrera@saa.org.

Applications will be accepted on a first-come, first-served basis. The deadline for applications is **February 1, 2012**, so contact us as soon as possible to take advantage of this wonderful opportunity!

See you in Memphis!
SEND US YOUR POSTERS!

Don’t forget to submit your Archaeology Week /Month Poster to SAA for the 2012 contest. This year’s contest will include posters dated April 2011 through March 2012

• Submit a cover sheet with contact name, title, mailing address, email, and phone number. Please include written permission to display images of winning posters on the SAAWeb and in the newsletter of the SAA Council of Affiliated Societies.

• Mail two copies—unfolded and unmounted—of your state poster to: Maureen Malloy, Society for American Archaeology, 1111 14th Street NW, Suite 800, Washington, DC 20005 by March 1, 2012.

• Email a digital copy of the poster to Maureen_Malloy@saa.org

All submissions received by the deadline will be displayed in the exhibit hall at the annual meeting in Memphis, Tennessee, April 18–22. Meeting participants will vote for their favorite poster and the top three winners will be announced at the SAA Business Meeting on Friday April 20, 2012.

Check out the archive of winning posters on SAAWeb at http://www.saa.org/publicftp/PUBLIC/resources/ArchMonthforpublic.html

The poster archive includes winning images dating back to the first competition, held in 1996.