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EDITOR’S CORNER
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The September 2014 issue of The SAA Archaeological Record opens the grand discussion concerning the future of publishing within the Society for American Archaeology. All readers should pay close attention to the thoughtful contributions of Ken Ames, Christine Szuter, Michael Smith, Sarah Kansa, John Yellen, Sarah Herr, Mark Aldenderfer, and Christopher Pool as they consider the challenges and prospects for SAA publications and the dissemination of archaeological knowledge in the twenty-first century. We all have some skin in this game, so to speak, and, thus, I want to encourage the membership to think seriously about the range of issues raised in the President’s Forum on Publishing.

This issue also includes a Special Forum on Mentoring, guest edited by Kristin Safi. Safi and contributors to the forum offer a wide range of thoughts on this important topic. Dye and Hawley provide a fascinating historical look at the mentoring relationship between W.C. McKern and Thomas Lewis during the early years of the Society for American Archaeology. This contribution forcefully illustrates the impact that mentoring can have, not just on a career, but also upon the history of an entire discipline. Undergraduate student Ethan Ryan reflects on mentoring experiences from his high school and college years and makes the important point that mentoring can be especially productive when combined with engagement on the part of the mentee. Burchell and Cook remind us that with creative attention to mentoring, student and professor relationships can blossom into long-term collaborations. Mirroring some of the thoughts also conveyed by Ryan, they point out that good mentoring can include permission for mentees to pursue self-directed interests. Joshua Tramper offers a wide-ranging discussion with significant advice for mentors and mentees. He concludes with some particularly cogent recommendations regarding mentors for students who are imagining schooling and careers in archaeology. Finally, Safi points to the importance of mentoring students who may plan to use the techniques, methods, and theories of archaeology in careers outside of our discipline.

I want to point out the usual array of interesting items in News and Notes. However, I also want to draw attention to the announcement for the formation of the Queer Archaeology Interest Group (QAIG). A longer article authored by Chelsea Blackmore and Dawn Rutecki regarding QAIG will appear in the November issue. Looking further into the future, we are planning an exciting array of content for coming issues including a special issue on NAGPRA and partnerships with Native American communities. Finally, I want to encourage everyone to still consider sending images for potential covers for the Record at 300 dpi (9x12 in [2700 x 3600 pixels]). Thanks to Ian Kuijt for this month’s cover photograph.
In preparing for the President’s forum, I searched the electronic publishing literature. As SAA Press editor, I was particularly, but not solely, interested in book publishing. The issues are multifaceted and global; I found discussions published in India, Dubai, Taiwan, and Australia among others. Views of electronic publishing ranged from wild alarm to wild optimism, but, generally, people are vexed about what it portends; it was described as the “Wild West of publishing.” I focus on just two areas: open access journals and electronic book publishing.

A justification for open access in the United States is that taxpayers shouldn’t pay twice for research results: once for supporting research via taxes and a second time by paying journal subscriptions—“pay walls.” The STEM and medical disciplines with large federal research budgets and astronomically high journal subscriptions are the prime impetus here. Social Science and Humanities funding is different; federal budgets are miniscule, research is often unfunded, and journal subscription rates small. The nub is: who pays for content, since content is never free? It costs money, time, or both. Where should the paywall be, and what shape should it take? (The term “paywall” should be dropped. It is a polemical device that obscures more than it helps.) The issue is particularly acute for small professional organizations like SAA, where the journals are a primary membership benefit. The SAA was formed to provide venues for sharing intellectual content; memberships and meeting registrations cover that cost. The SAA supplies essential professional infrastructure, the support for which is diffused across the entire membership. No one has developed a business plan that accommodates open access, ethical objections to charging author’s page fees, and yet not gutting the society’s finances.

Books, authored and edited, are not the important outlets for primary research that journals are, leaving aside project reports from taxpayer-funded field work. They do have significant intellectual content. They are also remarkably expensive, with single books now costing as much or more than a year’s journal subscription. Talk about paywalls! Publishers have an array of approaches to electronic publishing, from none to multiple digital versions of a work, and ways of buying for them, including purchase and rental. There is debate over whether e-books will replace paper books. One thoughtful discussion concerned e-books in Religious Studies (Carrigan 2012; MacDonald 2012). It’s clear that more e-books are coming. Multiple competing platforms muddy the picture. The expectation also is that students in particular will swarm to e-books. My own anecdotal experience is that they are not sophisticated in using e-books as scholarly works (rather than just reading), but then neither am I. SAA Press books are available in Kindle editions, so we have a toe in those waters.

I didn’t gain a clear vision of the way forward. I too am vexed. One step might be a more thorough review of what other small societies are doing. Our confusion is common; maybe there are common solutions.
PRESIDENT’S FORUM ON PUBLISHING
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PUBLISHING ARCHAEOLOGY IN THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY: ARCHAEOLOGICAL VALUES, HIDDEN PUBLISHING COSTS, PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT, AND DATA PRESTIGE

Christine Szuter (Amerind Foundation)

In 448 words, I will attempt to present a coherent statement on the future of archaeological publishing in the twenty-first century—2,100 characters longer than a tweet, two minutes shorter than a PechuKucha, 299 pages shorter than a monograph, a miniscule percent of a festschrift, and about the length of blog post. With this comparison, you glimpse the future of archaeological publishing from peer-reviewed tomes to flash publications.

Less than two decades into the twenty-first century, predictions are a bit foolhardy, but three publishing issues rise in importance as archaeologists create the future world of archaeological publishing: hidden publishing costs, public engagement, and data prestige. The values archaeologists hold drive the unfolding of this new world. Archaeologists are a heterogeneous group of scholars publishing diverse materials in a wide variety of venues, but they hold conservative views regarding open access, experimental publishing, and data sharing (Harley et al. 2010; Herr 2013).

Archaeologists must think about the hidden costs of this future world of publishing, particularly their non-cash contributions, such as copyediting, acquisitions, peer-review, physical space, and course reductions (Waltham 2009). Scholars must be involved in the mode of production for their scholarly publications, but not at the cost of new, innovative, creative research left undone while highly trained archaeologists copyedit articles or search for the right vendor for a publishing platform—tasks better performed by highly trained publishing professionals.

Many archaeologists have embraced the “scholarship of engagement” (Barker 2004; Boyer 1990, 1996; Jay 2013) with indigenous communities. In this new publishing world, scholars and community members conduct research together, presenting their finds jointly. This enhanced public engagement accompanies the creation of a digital identity, which can fall prey to branding, marketing, and choosing trendy research topics in search of more likes, views, or downloads. But more often it expands community-engaged scholarship, leading to greater public appreciation of archaeology.

Once archaeologists become less secretive about their research, then data sets will become prestige publications contributing to the entire scholarly endeavor. The open access movement advocates that data be available to all, while the digital world allows for its transformation by many. Recognizing data sets as genuine publications is critical. Data cannot remain proprietary; ultimately it must be shared.

Adapting to these new publishing realities will require a fundamental change in the values archaeologists hold. We need to embrace openness and not hide behind fears that research will be compromised, ideas will be captured, data will be stolen, or sites will be looted. The future world of publishing will value openness, consider data sets prestigious, recognize publishing’s hidden costs, and continue public engagement by making the world’s cultural heritage available to all.
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DO PUBLISHING TRENDS COLLIDE WITH THE GRAND CHALLENGES OF ARCHAEOLOGY?

Michael Smith (Arizona State University)
Kintigh et al (2014) recently published a bold list of 25 intellectual challenges that archaeology faces in the twenty-first century. The archaeology they envision engages with other scientific disciplines and addresses major social problems. While I applaud this effort, I am worried that the trajectory required to meet these challenges may be on a collision course with two negative trends in publishing today. The first, commercialization of scholarship, is a broad social trend, but the second, decline in quality control, is a problem within our discipline.

The commercialization of scholarship harms archaeology by restricting access to information. Most scholarly journals exist behind paywalls: access is limited to those with paid subscriptions. As a faculty member at a research university, I get access to many online journals, but my colleagues in Mexico (and many other countries) cannot afford access to the journals they need. It is getting difficult to post one’s articles online, with commercial publishers like Elsevier harassing scholars and universities for posting PDF copies of articles on public internet sites. Commercial publishers “own” progressively more of the basic research we do. Also, the increasingly stringent commercial policies on reproduction of images are especially harmful to a visually oriented field like archaeology. With each edition of my textbook *The Aztecs* (1996, 2003, 2012), the publisher has imposed more stringent rules on the use of artwork. These barriers, which have a chilling effect on the dissemination of archaeological knowledge, are part of a broader trend in intellectual property law whereby commercial transactions take precedence over public rights.

The decline of quality control is a more specifically archaeological obstacle. Journal editors find it hard to get good reviewers, and quality suffers. Book reviews are disappearing from the journals. But most alarming is an explosion of poor quality work in our journals and books. Empty citations (citations to works that do not contain any original data for the phenomenon under consideration) are now commonplace; arguments precede more by assertion than by empirical testing; and archaeologists are reluctant to publish critiques of sloppy work. (For further discussion of these issues, see my blog, *Publishing Archaeology*: http://publishingarchaeology.blogspot.com/).

If archaeologists are serious about pursuing lofty goals such as the “Grand challenges for archaeology,” it will require more than intellectual and scientific effort to achieve the necessary empirical foundations. We need to raise the quality of research in our journals and books and perhaps think about expanding our ethical proscription against commercialization of the archaeological record to include commercialization of archaeological knowledge.
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WHAT DOES “FREE” MEAN?

Sarah Kansa (Alexandria Archive Institute)
The forces that shape scholarly publication push and pull in different directions. After several years of consolidation, scientific publication is now heavily dominated by a few major corporations. Costs have escalated far more rapidly than the overall rate of inflation, all while library budgets have shrunk. The rapid escalation of costs in publications (particularly in STEM fields) means that archaeological books and journals see fewer and more impoverished customers. In reaction to this, the Open Access (OA) movement has emerged as a major force shaping public policy in the conduct of science. In 2013, the White House mandated OA to research supported by public funds, and many other granting bodies and research institutions are
following suit. OA’s adoption will enable wide access to research, speed up the research process, and allow for innovative combinations and reuses of diverse data sets.

The SAA needs to remember that OA involves much more than free-of-charge access. The term “free” has another, and more important, sense and that is “free as in speech,” as a matter of liberty—that is, your right to freedom of expression, with legal guarantees to access, critique, reuse, and combine research, including text, data, or other media without threat of legal reprisal. Lobbying pressure motivated Congress to enact ever more draconian copyright laws and legislation governing computer networks. Last year, the tragic suicide of Aaron Swartz, who faced 30 to 50 years in federal prison for allegedly violating JSTOR’s “terms of service,” drove home the severity of the legal barriers governing scholarship (see discussion in Kansa et al. 2013). Many of our colleagues who teach and practice archaeology without regular access to key literature as adjunct faculty or as public and CRM researchers often must resort to legally dubious methods of accessing the literature. Moreover, even those institutional libraries wealthy enough to afford access still face complex legal constraints in preserving electronic publications. The default legal context of copyright makes it increasingly difficult and expensive to access, use, and preserve our knowledge contributions.

We have a tremendous opportunity now to fundamentally rethink what publishing means to us as scholars and as a scholarly society. However, the future of publication in archaeology involves much more than choices between author-side fees vs. traditional models of subscription revenues. In shaping publication practices, we need to understand the tensions between the commoditization of knowledge, academic freedom, and our core ethical values as archaeologists. After all, isn’t the published archaeological record, including digital datasets, an integral aspect of the overall archaeological record, and subject to similar principles of stewardship, accountability, commercialization, and intellectual property (see the SAA Principles of Archaeological Ethics)?
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“PUBLIC ACCESS” PUBLISHING: A NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION PERSPECTIVE

John Yellen (National Science Foundation)

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has long held that results of research that it supports be made publically available. “Results” in this context include both primary data as well as publications that derive from them, and NSF requires that all applicants specifically discuss, in a separate section of their proposals, how data resulting from the award will be managed. As a federal agency that supports research and related activities with taxpayer dollars, NSF believes that the public should have access to the outcomes, subject to reasonable restrictions to protect personally identifiable and other sensitive information. Second, NSF holds that science advances most effectively when researchers communicate their findings and can access the data necessary to verify, challenge, and build upon past work. While the general principles and rationale are clear, NSF recognizes the difficulties involved in developing and implementing an effective plan of action. “Primary data” that emerge from research and the “publications” that arise from them are distinct entities that, while closely related, are subject to different constraints. This brief article focuses on publications only.

The Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP), an agency within the Executive Office of the President, published a memorandum on “Increasing Access to the Results of Federally Funded Scientific Research” on February 22, 2013. Of critical importance to the Society for American Archaeology is the guidance on embargoes, which states that federal agencies “shall use a twelve-month post-publication embargo period as a guideline for making research papers publicly available.” Leeway is allowed in recognition of the heterogeneity among fields of science, and there is a provision for petitioning to change the embargo period for a specific field of science.

At the time this article is written (June 2014), NSF is working to craft a plan to meet these and other requirements in the memorandum while recognizing NSF’s unique mission and broad community of researchers, who publish in a large number and wide variety of journals and who may be funded by multiple federal agencies. NSF is also aware of the contributions of scholarly societies, publishers, university libraries, and other stakeholder groups and seeks to balance their sometimes competing, legitimate concerns. In particular, the Foundation appreciates the role journals play as authoritative sources of knowledge and the role of societies such as the SAA in organizing and distributing that knowledge.
While a final NSF plan has not been announced, some definitive statements are possible. The advancement of science will constitute the primary focus. Current policies involving data sharing and the requirement for a data management plan will remain unchanged. Current policies also permit investigators to request funds to defray the costs of publication as part of their budget proposals. The plan is a first step, a framework within which NSF expects future decisions to unfold. As we move forward, we expect to work with our research communities and hope that SAA and other professional organizations will help us to build that future.

CRM PUBLICATION PRACTICES AND ACCESS

Sarah A. Herr (Desert Archaeology Inc.)

Archaeologists working in private sector cultural resource management (CRM) author, broadly speaking, three types of products: technical reports, or “gray literature,” peer-reviewed scholarly publications, and interpretive pieces for the public. I address the first two practices. Technical writing and scholarly publication are valued differently in CRM than in academic practice, with consequences for how research gets distributed and how readers access this work.

Archaeologists working in the private sector write all the time, with tens, if not hundreds, of reports to their credit. Project reports are short and compliance-oriented, written for clients and oversight agencies. Technical reports from projects that yield new information include architectural descriptions, artifact and sample analyses, and low- to middle-range interpretations. Some companies have a peer-reviewed monograph series for sharing the results of large projects. These reports are funded by clients. When the work is on public land or undertaken with public money, reports are distributed to historic preservation offices, permitting offices, land managers, and repositories. Increasingly, reports are delivered in PDF format. Access is allowed to those with appropriate credentials.

CRM companies and authors are committed to sharing our work, and the digital world is changing our opportunities. The most stable way to distribute information is by placing reports and data into digital archives, such as the Digital Archaeological Record, which can be accessed with a password-protected account. T.S. Dye and Colleagues have put their entire publication content on their company website. Other companies make selected reports available or provide lists of Publications Available Upon Request. Authors may use existing online archives such as Academia.edu. All of these sources can be found through standard search engine queries.

Scholarly publishing is rarely funded by companies or clients. An examination of the curricula vitae of 120 archaeologists at 14 companies shows that we publish equally in books and journals and do not avoid peer review (Table 1). About one-third of our publications originated in a conference setting, if that seems a fair interpretation of the edited volumes as well as the conference proceedings volumes. We publish about equally in state, regional, and national journals, but, an examination of the tables of contents in 12 journals (Table 2) over the past 20 years shows...

Table 1. Curriculum Vitae Analysis of Where Private-Sector Cultural Resource Management Archaeologists Publish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newsletters/Other</th>
<th>8.3%</th>
<th>12.1% (N = 74)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Peer-reviewed Newsletter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Peer-reviewed Other (Magazines, encyclopedias, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-reviewed Regional Journal</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>42.7% (N = 262)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable State Journal</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-reviewed National/International Journal</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-reviewed Specialized Journal (e.g., lithics, ethno-botany, remote sensing)</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-reviewed University Press</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>45.2% (N = 277)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-reviewed Monograph Series</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable Conference Proceedings</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-reviewed Edited Volume</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

that CRM archaeologists comprise between 4 and 7 percent of authors in two Society for American Archaeology journals; between 8 and 19 percent of six major regional journals; and, in a very small sample, between 0 and 48 percent of state journals.

What is written in CRM is eclectically distributed but increasingly findable as authors and companies seek inexpensive ways to make content available. Archaeologists in CRM do not shy away from peer review, but publication in a journal with an impact factor matters little. We publish pragmatically. Our impact factor is having our work read by the people most likely to use it.

We all believe that open access publishing is a social good and, further, that it is inevitable. How this will play out, and what journals will look like over the course of the next decade, is less obvious, and I think it fair to say that there will be winners and losers—some journals will survive and possibly thrive, while others will vanish and their remains will be found on JSTOR and HighWire or in other archives.

There are two financial models, each with numerous variations, which fund open access publishing: supply-side and demand-side models. Supply-side models are funded primarily by the producers of the content or by proxies that pay on their behalf. One example of a supply-side model is the use of article processing fees, which represents about 30 percent of revenue generated by open access journals. Currently, 95 percent of these fees come from research grants or institutional libraries, rather than from the author. Sadly, extramural grants are declining in number and size, particularly in the social sciences, and while universities do subsidize author costs, the level of funding for this enterprise has yet to grow. Given pressures on universities to cut costs, it is not clear, even under optimistic estimates, that the base level of funding would reach potential demand should open access, author pays, become the norm. Other potential supply-side funding sources would be advertising and sponsorships, grants and corporate funding, donations and fundraising, endowments, in-kind support from universities or academic organizations (half of open access journals receive university in-kind support and one-fifth receive professional society support), and partnership relationships (e.g., with academic libraries).

Table 2. Proportion of Articles Authored by Private-Sector CRM Archaeologists in National, Regional, and State Journals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>CRM</th>
<th>Number of authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Journals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Antiquity</td>
<td>1994–2013</td>
<td>6.59%</td>
<td>1714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advances in Archaeological Practice</td>
<td>2013–2014</td>
<td>4.35%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Journals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology</td>
<td>1995–2013</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiva</td>
<td>1993–2014</td>
<td>18.86%</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plains Anthropologist</td>
<td>1994–2010</td>
<td>8.51%</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midcontinental Journal of Archaeology</td>
<td>1992–2012</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern Archaeology</td>
<td>1994–2010</td>
<td>8.64%</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology of Eastern North America</td>
<td>1994–2010</td>
<td>13.83%</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Journals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Archaeology</td>
<td>2010–2013</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Archaeology</td>
<td>1992–2012</td>
<td>48.00%</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Archaeology</td>
<td>2011–2012</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern Lore (Colorado)</td>
<td>1993–2009</td>
<td>21.27%</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demand-side models are funded primarily by consumers of the content or their proxies, most importantly, university libraries. Examples of the demand-side model include versioning (such as fee-based subscriptions for print or digital copies of journals or annual compendia), convenience-format licenses (licensing content to third-party information aggregators and distributors), use-triggered fees (that is, pay only for what you download), value-added fee-based services (e.g., online features and functionality provided to increase the usability and appeal of a journal's research content), and e-Commerce (direct selling of logoed goods and/or services). Subscriptions, of course, dominate the demand-side landscape, and it is the control over access to journal content via subscription by large (and small) for-profit (and some not-for-profit) publishers that has led to the open source challenge to them.

There is one immutable bottom line regardless of which model or variant is ultimately adopted for an open access project: someone pays. Both models assume visible or invisible subsidies in time, talent, and treasure, and the level of these subsidies will determine the success of the publication. Even the most successful alternative model of open source publishing—the famous arXiv.org—has the cup out and is soliciting donations, gifts, bequests, and non-traditional sources of funding. It’s not clear to me that the archaeological and anthropological community has deep enough pockets to maintain an open source project for any significant length of time. So hang on—the publishing world for our field is going to have a very rough ride over the next decade!

The SAA finds themselves at a critical moment in the transition from traditional print to digital media and from a past of relative stasis to a future of constant and increasingly rapid change. For several years, the SAA has made back issues of its journals available on JSTOR, and subscribers can read current and recent issues online by logging into the SAA website. Authors can now submit supplemental figures and other tables for publication with the online version of their articles. With last year’s launch of the fully digital journal Advances in Archaeological Practice, the SAA has embarked on this exciting new path.

I confess—I like ink on paper. It’s easier on my eyes, I don’t need a machine to read it (though I am due for a new pair of glasses), and I don’t need to worry that changes in formats and platforms will make it unreadable in a few years. I hope the SAA will continue to publish print versions of its journals, but I can’t deny the real benefits of digital publishing, even if I identify some challenges it presents.

The most significant advantage of digital publishing is its ability to make articles more readily available to an expanded readership. Greater ease of access is particularly important for students, professionals, and colleagues in developing countries, who may not be affiliated with subscribing institutions or have the resources to pay for a personal membership (though the SAA does employ a sliding scale for dues and subscriptions). Increased access within and across disciplines also contributes to increased impact for the journal, a consideration that has become increasingly important for some university administrators. Because their capacity is not limited by the cost of printing pages, digital journals also can publish more articles. Increased capacity will allow the journals to accept more articles with a wider range of content and publish more book reviews and commentary.

The challenges of digital publishing are significant, however. First, editors must ensure that expanded capacity does not reduce quality. High publication volume contributes to high impact factors for some online journals, but often with a loss of editorial and intellectual quality. Peer review will continue to be essential to maintaining the quality of the SAA’s journals. The most helpful reviews are those that arrive promptly and that critique the manuscript thoughtfully. A one-line review is of little use, as are clearly biased reviews that offer nothing but praise or vilification.

Digital publishing is not free. To ensure their scholarly value, publications must be kept in secure and accessible archives that will migrate files to new formats and platforms. Expanded capacity would also incur higher editorial and administrative costs. Print journals have traditionally covered costs through subscriptions, but as more journals move toward digital publishing with open access, costs are increasingly shifted to authors, in some cases amounting to hundreds or thousands of dollars per article. Such fees can deny authors without sufficient institutional or personal resources (including many students, underemployed graduates, junior faculty, and international colleagues), access to the venues they need to disseminate their research. Fortunately, the SAA has anticipated this issue and is looking toward funding models that do not overly burden authors or consumers.
Under One Roof—SAA’s 80th Annual Meeting, San Francisco, CA

The SAA 80th Annual Meeting will be held from April 15–19, 2015 at the Hilton San Francisco Union Square, which will coziely self-contain the meeting! This hotel is located at 333 O’Farrell Street, San Francisco, CA 94102. Room reservations are now available. There are three separate links for the three separate blocks: the general hotel block, the government block, and the student block. Just as a reminder, the government and student blocks are filled on a first-come first-served basis. More reservation information can be found on SAAWeb (www.saa.org).

Childcare in SFO

Registration for “Camp SAA” will be available through the link on the home page of SAAweb (www.saa.org). Should you have any question about the childcare program, please direct it to SAA’s executive director, Tobi Brimsek (tobi_brimske@saa.org or 1-202-559-4580).

How Do I Get a Free One-Year Membership in SAA?

All you need to do for a chance at a free one-year membership in SAA is to register at the Hilton San Francisco Union Square by January 21, 2015, and your name will be entered into a drawing for the one-year membership. There will be one drawing from the general/government block of rooms and one drawing from the student block.

The European Association of Archaeologists (EAA) & SAA

For the first time ever, SAA and EAA are organizing a joint meeting. Approved by both Boards of Directors, the purpose is to bring together scholars from the two sponsoring organizations on a tightly focused-thematic meeting. The theme for this first joint meeting is Connecting Continents: Archaeological Perspectives on Slavery, Trade and Colonialism. Given the theme, the Caribbean was the logical destination for that meeting, which will take place at the Marriott Caraçao Resort and Emerald Casino in November 2015. Stay tuned for more information on this joint project on SAAWeb (www.saa.org).

Meet & Tweet

In June, the SAA staff expanded to include a new Coordinator of Communications position. Brianna Kelley joined the SAA team to fill this role upon her graduation from American University. She has already started working closely with the Media Relations Committee to beef up our social media presence and looks forward to meeting you at the 80th Annual Meeting, where she will serve as SAA’s Press Officer.

Speaking of social media, we are proud to announce the official 80th Annual Meeting hashtag: #SAA2015. If you haven’t already, connect with us on Facebook (facebook.com/SAAorgfb), Twitter (@saaorg), and LinkedIn (linkedin.com/groups/Society-American-Archaeology-2639725).

See Your Career Take Off with the Launch of SAA’s New Web-Based Career Center

SAA’s new web-based Career Center was launched July 31, 2014. The new Career Center offers job seekers free and confidential resume posting, automated weekly email notification of new job listings, and the ability to save jobs for later review. On the employer side, SAA is offering a special 20 percent discount for job postings on the Career Center jobs board. Just enter promo code SAA20 when you get to the payment screen. The Career Center gives employers targeted access to quality professionals, along with quick and easy job posting and online job activity reports.

Coming in November—Open Call for Service on Committees

This November will mark the fifth year in which SAA has made the process for volunteering for committee service an open one. If you are currently serving on a committee and would like to volunteer for a second term, your volunteer application also needs to be done through the open call. Committee chairs can and should encourage members to apply, as well as to reapply, for second terms through the open process.

Please be aware that the requested statement is the way in which you will introduce yourself to the committee and share what you can bring to that committee. The statement is key in the decision-making process. At its spring meeting, the Board
Welcome to San Francisco, also known through the years as Frisco, Baghdad by the Bay, or simply The City to the surrounding communities. The establishment in 1776 of Mission San Francisco de Asis (Mission Dolores) and the Presidio of San Francisco by the Spanish laid the foundation for the city to become a major port and urban center of the West Coast. The city has a vast history that has spanned decades and centuries. San Francisco was a major destination point during the California Gold Rush, the site of the devastating 1906 Earthquake and Fire, a critical maritime hub during World War II, and the still-remembered site of the famed counterculture movement of the 1960s and 1970s including the Summer of Love in the Haight-Ashbury. San Francisco tends to evoke fond memories among visitors, and we hope that your attendance at the 80th SAA Annual Meeting, April 15–19, will add to your memories of The City.

SAA last held its annual meeting in San Francisco in 1972—43 years ago! (This date also marks my attendance at my first SAA annual meeting.) This compact urban area of 47 square miles is the financial and cultural hub of the San Francisco Bay Area of nearly nine million people. The landscape has changed much since 1972. The Loma Prieta earthquake in 1989 ultimately resulted in the removal of the elevated freeway along the Bay, opening the city to the former historic views down Market Street and of the San Francisco Bay. The quake also resulted in the completion of new tourist attractions as well as development and renovation along the former waterfront. San Francisco is constantly changing and is now in competition with Silicon Valley as it attracts both the headquarters and outposts of the tech industry while simultaneously redeveloping former industrial areas to meet the needs of the technocracy. Construction, ranging from the expansion of the underground subway to development of mega high rises, as well as the repurposing of historic buildings results in an ever-changing city fabric. SAA’s diverse archaeological community should blend in well with the hustle and bustle and diversity of San Francisco, making attendees feel at home during the meeting.

The SAA and its various interest groups are planning several tours within this very popular tourist destination, which is known for its many landmarks and attractions—the iconic Golden Gate Bridge, cable cars, Chinatown, the Presidio, the former prison on Alcatraz Island, the recently renovated WPA murals of Coit Tower on Telegraph Hill, Golden Gate Park, and a myriad of museums, including one at San Francisco International Airport. There is something for everyone, from foodies to shopaholics, and most attractions are easily accessible from the conference hotel via foot, cab, or public transit. Just Google “Things to do in San Francisco” and you will be overwhelmed by the available choices. Perhaps you will want to come a few days before the conference and sample The City and Bay Area or, alternatively, fit in some select activities during the meeting. Keep your Smartphone charged and you can navigate to your destination quickly while reading the reviews of the various attractions.

A favorite diversion is a visit to the National Park Service Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) (http://www.nps.gov/...
goya/planyourvisit/index.htm). The GGNRA includes the Fort Point National Historic Site located under the south anchorage of the Golden Gate Bridge, the former island prison site of Alcatraz, and the San Francisco Maritime Museum which is both a museum and active display of historic ships formerly used on the bay and along the Pacific coast. These ships should not be missed and the view of the bay is well worth the small admission charge. The Presidio Visitor Center (www.presidio.gov/explore/Pages/visitor-center.aspx) is a good starting point for exploring this former military post. At the visitor center you can also obtain information on walking to one of the main anchorage points for the Golden Gate Bridge if you are so inclined to walk across the bridge to Marin County. For Walt Disney fans, the Walt Disney Family Museum (www.waltdisney.org) is next to the visitor center and offers an understated perspective on the Disney family.

Fisherman’s Wharf represents the best and worst of a tourist attraction (www.fishermanswharf.org). It is a focal point for dining, entertainment, shopping, and the jumping off point for various bay cruises. A local favorite is the Musée Mécanique (www.museemecaniquesf.com), an antique coin-operated arcade. The wharf is a cable car ride (www.sfmta.com/getting-around/transit/fares-passes) away from the Hilton and the experience is worth the $6.00 fare—you may find various eateries and shopping of interest on the way, in particular, in North Beach, the historic Italian neighborhood. Alternatively, if you are at the Maritime Museum, then continue to the east for a short walk and you are at the wharf. To further explore the waterfront, hop on one of the restored historic street cars and ride (or you can walk) along the Embarcadero to the Ferry Building for a spectacular view and refreshments or dining.

In the November issue of The SAA Archaeological Record we will suggest some of the many parks and museums to visit as well as provide some details of the SAA planned tours. Start planning your visit to the City by the Bay in 2015!
Volunteering is a crucial way of increasing the public’s understanding of what we do, of building valuable personal and professional relationships, and of supporting pursuits and organizations that we believe in and can become invested in. In my short time as a student of archaeology I have been supported and encouraged by some remarkably talented mentors. These people have shared their time, knowledge, wisdom, thoughts, consideration, and they have encouraged me to volunteer in multiple arenas. Given that this issue of *The SAA Archaeological Record* includes a forum on mentoring, I want to juxtapose my experiences with volunteering and mentoring as both have been important to me in my development as an archaeologist.

As archaeologists, many of us find ourselves in leadership positions, whether academic, professional, or both. But leadership should not be measured simply by one’s ability to set guidelines or direct tasks. To me, leadership involves much more; it requires the ability to communicate information accurately and comprehensibly, and necessitates that we construct a culture of curiosity and learning in which both students and peers alike feel invested in the accumulation of knowledge, whatever that may be. Such abilities are exemplified by many in the SAA community, and are integral to the continued development of our field. Without talented (and vigilant) mentors willing to invest in the grave responsibility of cultivating disciplinary development, future generations of archaeologists, as well as the general public, could easily lose sight of why the study of the past is both vital to our understanding of the present and future, but indeed to our elucidations of what it means to be human.

My first SAA experience was in 2007, attending the Annual Meeting in Austin, TX, as a co-author on a paper with Drs. Ben Fitzhugh and Mike Etnier. Mike and I had been working on the zooarchaeological analysis from our recent field season in the Russian Far East as part of the Kuril Islands Biocomplexity Project, of which Ben was the head PI (Fitzhugh et al. 2006). As a budding archaeologist with a keen interest in paleozoology, working with Ben and Mike was an absolutely fantastic experience, and one that I believe greatly influenced my own standards of competence as well as my interest in helping others attain their full potential. As a mentor, Mike possesses a talent for exhibiting equal parts intellectual pressure and good-natured, nurturing calm. During our years of field and lab work together he challenged me to reflect on, and engage with, source materials and data, while maintaining an air of professionalism that not only fostered accuracy but also sustained a positive work environment in the lab. As just one example of the mentor’s art, Mike’s ability to be patient, empathetic, and above all, enthusiastic while imparting his vast and varied archaeological knowledge, created a landscape of learning that encouraged exploration and refined (and reified) the learning process. When this kind of learning landscape is opened up, the results can be truly wonderful. Good mentors make such possibilities a reality.

This influence is but one example of how a mentor can have a profoundly positive influence on future generations, and it is but one of many such experiences that I have been so lucky to have. Certainly, mentoring can be a challenge, but it can be unfathomably rewarding, both professionally and personally. As a graduate student and Ph.D. candidate, I have had the opportunity (as many of us have had) to stand on the shoulders of some remarkable mentoring giants—individuals who have taught me the value of caring about others’ learning experiences, reminded me to be patient and concise, and instilled in me a professional...
Volunteer Profile

An ethic that goes beyond doing what is necessary toward striving for what is possible. In my own work I strive to be a positive mentor. I volunteer at every level of education, from giving flint knapping demonstrations, to general lectures on archaeology, historic preservation, and cultural resource management, to supervising zooarchaeological laboratory analyses. One of my most profound (and rewarding) opportunities has been teaching elementary school children about archaeology and its pursuit of the past. Not only do you get to dispel the ubiquitous myths (i.e., we don’t dig up dinosaurs, and no, cavemen never rode them), but also these kinds of opportunities allow one to share in a wonderfully intimate engagement with learning that few of us let ourselves experience. The looks of curiosity and wonder that accompany children’s learning processes are spectacular to behold, and worth every moment of preparation. For rewards like these, volunteering and mentoring are two of the few true win-win opportunities most of us will ever encounter.

As SAA members we have the significant opportunity to volunteer in the public sector as well as among our own colleagues and peers. As one example, choosing to volunteer at the Annual Meeting has benefited me on multiple occasions, as it encouraged me to engage with subjects and people that I may never have otherwise had the opportunity to, and in my experience it can genuinely foster a sense of both empowerment and satisfaction in knowing that ones’ efforts are not only needed, but appreciated. As an impecunious graduate student, over the years, the chance to volunteer has also been beneficial to my pocketbook, in fact, on occasion it has been the deciding factor influencing whether I could afford to attend the Meeting, or not.

Volunteering in the local community, with professional organizations like the SAA, and actively seeking out mentoring opportunities is a crucial step toward making a difference in the lives of others, and that difference can be the spark that ignites an appreciation for the archaeological pursuit of the past that may be the beginning of a lasting pursuit of knowledge. As stewards of the past we are in a unique position (and have a responsibility) to reach out to others and pass on something valuable. We should all be so lucky for such brilliant opportunities.

New for Introductory Archaeology Courses

Introducing Archaeology, Second Edition

By Robert J. Muckle
Paperback 304 pp | $49.95
ISBN: 9781442607859

“Muckle has written a textbook that conveys all of the excitement, uncertainty, and deep insight that accompanies that wonderful and complicated thing we call archaeology. This is the perfect example of how archaeology can be presented to students in an accessible and inviting way while maintaining intellectual integrity.”

—Jason De Leon, University of Michigan

Visit www.introducingarchaeology.com for a range of extra materials, including study questions for students and a test bank for instructors.
Despite the clear value of mentoring between an academic advisor and a student, opportunities for mentoring in archaeology extend far beyond the academic context. Improving mentoring and broadening the context in which mentoring relationships develop in archaeology is a discussion receiving more attention by members of the SAA. As archaeological practitioners, we stand to improve the quality of our work by recognizing the value of good mentoring and its benefits to the discipline, regardless of the subsection of archaeology in which we are involved. This special forum stems from a forum sponsored by the Committee for the Status of Women in Archaeology (COSWA) titled “Mentoring: Peaks, Pitfalls, and Perspectives” at the SAA Annual Meeting in Honolulu and is paired with COSWA’s speed-mentoring session at the Austin meeting. COSWA’s interest and involvement in this topic is to promote positive mentoring within archaeological practice and to open a dialogue on how to forge successful mentoring relationships.

Mentoring in archaeology is not a new practice, but it needs to expand to encompass a broader range of analytical and technical skills as well as in the selection of career choices available. Archaeological practitioners are entering this field from diverse personal and professional backgrounds, necessitating an expansion of our mentoring practices to incorporate a wider range of mentees. As the members of the discipline diversify, so do the contexts in which positive mentoring can and should occur. We can begin by assessing our own mentoring experiences. Many, if not most, among our membership have received unequal mentoring across their careers and can identify the effects of both good and poor quality mentoring. Most can also identify how either positive or negative mentoring impacted their archaeological opportunities. As such, a conversation on mentoring should open by addressing the following questions: In what contexts is mentoring applicable and appropriate? How does good mentoring affect both the mentor and the mentee? How can we alter our mentoring style to better prepare mentees for careers outside of traditional academic or cultural resource management boundaries? How can mentoring more positively impact groups that are under-represented in archaeological practice? How does one recognize and move beyond a negative mentoring relationship? When do we transition from mentee to mentor?

Our objective within this forum is to address some of these questions. We focus on characteristics of good mentoring, the opportunities for positive mentoring in multiple research and employment settings, on recognizing both positive and negative mentoring relationships, and transitioning from mentee to mentor. Despite some variation in specifics, two major themes unite the following contributions. First, the contributors stress the importance of recognizing both successful and failed mentoring relationships, and the characteristics that lead to successful mentoring. Dye and Hawley provide a brief history of a particularly successful mentoring relationship, one forged between W.C. McKern and Thomas Lewis during the New Deal era. The mentoring relationship between McKern and Lewis promoted, among many things, positive interactions and collaborations between professional and avocational archaeologists. Ryan brings the discussion to the present by reflecting on his own career to date as an undergraduate with several successful forays into archaeological research; he highlights three key aspects of mentoring that have influenced his own career path, including a mentor’s willingness to engage and a mentee’s initiative to actively seek out mentoring opportunities. The historical example provided by Dye and Hawley and the modern perspective provided by Ryan underline many of the benefits mentees can gain through positive mentoring activities.

However, this discussion must also address the benefits to the mentor for engaging in mentoring. Mentoring can become time consuming, stressful, and not personally fulfilling, in particular, when a mentoring relationship is
unsuccessful. Recognizing nonproductive mentoring relationships allows mentors and mentees to redirect their energies into activities that are more beneficial to each. To this end, Burchell and Cook emphasize the importance of providing support for mentors so that one can move beyond negative mentoring relationships and enable positive mentoring practices. In addition, the values of mentoring to the mentor are often overlooked. Building a strong relationship with a mentee can lead to productive collaborations, to interdisciplinary research, to personal and professional development, and to an increase in the overall skill and research quality of the discipline. All contributors identify examples within their own mentoring history that exemplify the value of positive mentoring and the benefits to be gained by engaging as mentors in archaeological practice.

A second theme uniting these contributions is that archaeology can and should contribute to more than just academia, and that mentoring efforts should cultivate skills that can support a range of alternative career paths for mentees. That archaeological research should be applicable to more than just archaeological knowledge is widely acknowledged; that we can effectively mentor individuals into non-academic or non-CRM careers that can also benefit from archaeological research skills has only recently become part of the discussion. While each contributor tackles this topic from a different angle, all are united in promoting the expansion of our traditional mentoring practices to encourage growth in new analytical, theoretical, or methodological skills in order to prepare mentees for a wider range of alternative career paths and opportunities, and each contribution emphasizes the varied backgrounds by which one can approach an archaeological career. Safi highlights positive mentoring characteristics that, when combined with a broader awareness of “alternative” career paths, can lead to greater job placement for our graduates that draw on archaeological training and strengthen archaeological practice within the discipline. Trampier tackles the transition from mentee to mentor and stresses the technical skills and innovation potential that archaeologists can contribute to a broader range of applications through better mentoring practices. By refocusing our mentoring efforts to place less emphasis on preparation for narrow career options and greater weight on skill building, archaeological backgrounds can better contribute to modern, global concerns.

By opening this dialogue, we look forward to a larger discussion on modern mentoring in archaeology. The nature of archaeological inquiry has expanded significantly in recent decades. Alongside this, our membership, skills, viewpoints, and career paths are incredibly diverse. The combination of these factors should precipitate a restructuring of how we mentor. Such a restructuring could emphasize enhanced professional development of mentees and better connecting of mentors to provide support and promote improved mentoring practices. The long-term benefits to archaeologists and to the field of archaeology can only be strengthened by building on that range of diversity and working as a community to improve the discipline by encouraging growth in our mentoring practices.

We Want You! Volunteers Needed for the Annual Meeting!

For the 80th annual meeting in San Francisco, California. SAA is seeking enthusiastic volunteers who are not only interested in archaeology but who are also looking to save money and have fun.

To give volunteers more flexibility, SAA will again require only 8 hours of volunteer time! The complimentary meeting registration is the exclusive benefit for your time.

Training for the April 15–19 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 the SAAweb (www.saa.org) or contact Josh Caro at SAA: 1111 14th Street, Suite 800, Washington, DC 20005, Phone +1 (202) 559-7382, Fax +1 (202) 789-0284, or e-mail josh_caro@saa.org.

Applications will be accepted on a first-come, first-served basis until February 3, 2015.

See you in San Francisco!
MENTORING TOM LEWIS

David H. Dye and Marlin F. Hawley

David H. Dye is Associate Professor of Archaeology at the University of Memphis. Marlin F. Hawley is an Independent Researcher at the Wisconsin Historical Society.

The archaeologist of 50 years ago had few mentors to whom to turn for guidance.
Haag 1986:63

Mentoring relationships in archaeology are often overlooked in one’s education and as a source of informal knowledge, and perhaps even inspiration. The fortunate archaeologist may look back fondly to those who provided advantageous advice, an encouraging word, or a helping hand. We remember the advisor, the committee chair, or the faculty member who opened doors for graduate admission, or field opportunities, or research endeavors—professional courtesies that often went beyond normally anticipated or expected guidance and support. The relationship of a mentor might be found in the field supervisor’s instruction, the lab director’s encouragement, or the thesis advisor’s help. However, as William G. Haag points out, archaeologists of the 1930s had few academicians or guides—not because senior scholars were unwilling to help, but because they often lacked experience due to the new bureaucratic conditions and problems that beset New Deal archaeologists. In many respects, they were typically self-taught when it came to federal and state procedures and regulations. The times were changing, and that change was rapid and unpredictable.

In this article we focus on an example of a mentoring relationship that is associated with the origins of the Society for American Archaeology, one that proved pivotal to the New Deal archaeology programs in the United States. The mentoring relationship that arose between W. C. McKern and Thomas M. N. Lewis was based on the encouragement and nurturing of a Midwestern artifact collector and toy manufacturer by the first editor of American Antiquity. McKern practiced what he preached by reaching out to bridge the gap between avocationals and professionals, and Lewis sought whatever aid he could find to accomplish his desire to become a professional archaeologist.

Thomas M. N. Lewis and W. C. McKern

A mentor is a teacher, a trusted and wise counselor who coaches and provides advice or guidance to a less-experienced person. The term, first used in the early seventeenth century, comes to English speakers via the French, who had adopted it from the Greek word mentor. McKern was all these things and more for Lewis, beginning when they first met in 1926 and continuing throughout the Tennessee Valley New Deal programs (Hawley and Dye 2014a). Although only four years older than Lewis, McKern had accumulated considerable experience, including a decade of archaeological and ethnographic fieldwork. He was a major behind-the-scenes force who provided intellectual support and served as a sounding board for Lewis in times of often intense and vexing problems.

Will Carleton McKern was born July 6, 1892, in Medicine Lake, Washington. Identified professionally as W. C. McKern, he was known to his colleagues and friends simply as “Mac” (Figure 1). He graduated from the University of California, Berkeley, in 1917, where he earned an A.B. degree in ethnology under Alfred L. Kroeber. Prior to his induction into the military in 1918, he studied the northern Yana of California’s Sierra Nevada Mountains. After service in the trenches of France with the U.S. Army infantry during World War I, he taught anthropology at the University of Washington. From 1920 to 1922 he conducted archaeological and ethnographic fieldwork as a research associate in ethnology directed by Edward W. Gifford as part of the Bernice P. Bishop Museum’s Bayard Dominic Expedition to the Kingdom of Tonga. He worked as an assistant archaeologist for the Bureau of American Ethnology from 1922 to 1924 at Mesa Verde under the Bureau’s director, Jesse Walter Fewkes (Basile 2000; Fisher 1988; Lyman and O’Brien 2003).

McKern moved to Wisconsin to chair the anthropology department at the Milwaukee Public Museum (MPM) from...
1925 to 1943. He then became the museum director until his retirement in 1958. The founding editor of *American Antiquity* from 1935 to mid-1939 and then president of the Society for American Archaeology from 1940 to 1941, McKern is perhaps best remembered for his efforts to establish archaeological controls based on the upper Midwestern sites, creating and employing the Midwestern Taxonomic Method. The archaeology of the 1930s had few standardized field and laboratory methods, and McKern sought to address these issues through a more scientific approach to culture history (Lyman and O’Brien 2003).

Much of the credit for the early development and growth of *American Antiquity* goes to McKern, “who devoted four years of intense effort to establish the overall quality and intellectual liveliness that are the journal’s hallmarks” (Sabloff 1985:228). When the journal was founded in December, 1934, one of its aims was to foster cooperation between amateurs and professionals, a point McKern (1935:82) made clear in his editorial in the first issue, in which he stated that “we believe that it will become an instrument of value in coordinating the research efforts of all sincere students of American archaeology, and in greatly encouraging an improved understanding and friendly cooperation between such students, professional and amateur.” One of the local amateurs with whom McKern became acquainted in Wisconsin was Tom Lewis. The friendship and mentoring extended to Lewis enabled him to negotiate the path to a successful career in archaeology and to become the acknowledged leader of New Deal archaeology in Tennessee (Hawley and Dye 2014a, 2014b).

Thomas McDonald Nelson Lewis was born in Chambersburg, Pennsylvania, on March 27, 1896, to wealthy maternal and paternal families who owned numerous entrepreneurial enterprises (Figure 2). He grew up in Watertown, Wisconsin, the location of his grandfather’s business, the G.B. Lewis Company, which manufactured bee ware, shipping crates, toys, boxes, and wooden propellers. Tom Lewis developed an early interest in collecting from his maternal grandfather, with whom he walked the fields along the tributaries of the Upper Potomac River near Chambersburg. After military service in World War I, serving as a boatswain’s mate in the U.S. Naval Reserve Force, he returned to Princeton, graduating in 1920 with an economics degree. Following in his father’s footsteps, Lewis took a job in the family business. Progressing through sales, he was eventually promoted to head of the Arktoy division; his business travels afforded him the finances and time to seek out sites and to scout for collections to purchase. Within a few years, he boasted of possessing one of the largest private collections in Wisconsin.

Figure 1. W. C. McKern, Grant County, Wisconsin, summer 1931.

Figure 2. Thomas M. N. Lewis.
When McKern moved to Wisconsin, he set into motion an ambitious program of survey and excavation across the state. His affiliation with the Wisconsin Archeological Society (WAS) was key to both surveys and mound excavations, as he was able to enlist local collectors with knowledge of artifacts and sites. While walking the fields near Watertown in the early spring of 1926, Lewis chanced to meet two members of the WAS who encouraged him to join the organization, which he promptly did in April. At the WAS meetings, Lewis exhibited his collection and, beginning in 1931, he began to present talks on his collecting activities undertaken during business travels to Arkansas, Florida, Tennessee, and Virginia. Lewis soon rose in the ranks of the WAS, serving on the Public Collections committee, the State Survey committee, and then the Board of Directors, before finally becoming vice president from 1934 to 1935. As evidence of his growing interest in professional archaeology, in 1933, at McKern’s urging, Lewis wrote Carl E. Guthe—chair of the Committee on State Archaeological Surveys of the National Research Council—concerning the need for a national archaeology organization, from which was born the Society for American Archaeology (Griffin 1985:262).

In 1926, Lewis also joined the Central Section of the American Anthropological Association, where he became acquainted with the leading archaeologists of the day. His circle of acquaintances and professional friends soon expanded to include prominent figures in Midwestern archaeology: Glenn Black, Charles E. Brown, Fay-Cooper Cole, Thorne Deuel, Alton K. Fisher, Carl E. Guthe, Eli Lilly, W. C. McKern, Towne L. Miller, and William S. Webb. Perhaps as soon as Lewis joined the WAS, he fell under the spell of McKern’s engaging personality and began visiting the MPM mound excavations, such as the Nitschke Mound Group, as early as 1927 (Figure 3). Beginning in 1930, Lewis and McKern began to correspond with one another (Hawley and Dye 2014b). Soon Lewis was being asked to work on sites in Kentucky, surveying and testing first along the Ohio River in 1931 and then at Wickliffe in 1932 by invitation of Fain W. King. He gained firsthand experience through fieldwork with McKern in Wisconsin and Walter B. Jones and David L. DeJarnette of the Alabama Museum of Natural History at the Wickliffe site. Lewis’s fieldwork and membership in the WAS and the Central Section of the AAA provided him entry into the ranks of professional archaeology.

**McKern as Mentor, Lewis as Student**

McKern was the most important influence on Lewis’s professional career, patiently directing and guiding Lewis toward archaeology as a science and as a profession and encouraging him to think about classification systems and innovative excavation strategies. McKern also introduced Lewis to prominent archaeologists. We present several examples of how McKern’s mentorship influenced Lewis’s professional standing, including his first encounter with ethical dilemmas, his rift with William S. Webb, and the nagging problem of how to classify, organize, and interpret the mounting...
accumulation of artifacts and records that were rapidly pouring into the University of Tennessee laboratory from the massive Tennessee Valley New Deal excavations.

Lewis gained his first exposure to scientific controversy while working with Paducah artifact collector and lumber magnate Colonel Fain W. King, who was conducting excavations at Wickliffe in fall 1932. The National Research Council was beginning to prune some of the more unruly branches of what passed for archaeology, including King’s apparent turn to commercialism (Wesler 2001). The initial controversy, fueled by Webb, flared in 1932–1933, taking Lewis by surprise and leaving him dismayed. The Lewis-McKern correspondence from 1930–1933 documents Lewis’s intellectual maturation, and the Wickliffe controversy, as refracted through his friendship with McKern, transformed his perceptions and understanding of archaeology as a profession and a science. McKern’s friendship and patient mentoring proved crucial in Lewis’s transition from artifact collector to interested amateur and, finally, to professional archaeologist.

By the next year, in the late fall of 1933, Lewis apparently had a mid-life crisis that prompted him to question his future with the family business selling children’s Arkitoy lumber sets. Writing to McKern, he lamented: “I have reached the point now where the commercial world has less appeal to me than it ever has had if that is possible. I desire eventually to make anthropology my profession if it will offer me an opportunity to eke out an existence for my family” (Lewis 1933).

When Webb was appointed consultant to the newly formed Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) archaeology program in late December 1933, he immediately began searching for district field supervisors to oversee fieldwork in the first two reservoirs to be excavated within a few weeks. He tapped David L. DeJarnette to oversee the Wheeler basin project in northern Alabama, and he hired Lewis, based on McKern’s recommendation and Webb’s own acquaintance with him, to supervise the Norris Basin excavations in eastern Tennessee. Once again Lewis turned to McKern for advice, carefully weighing the pros and cons of the job before accepting Webb’s offer. McKern expressed his misgivings, advising Lewis against involvement in the New Deal archaeology programs. In fact, just weeks before, McKern had turned down the TVA consulting job that was subsequently offered to Webb. Having made his decision, however, Lewis resigned from his lucrative position in the family business and moved his wife and daughter to Knoxville under a cloud of financial uncertainty in early January 1934 to oversee the Norris basin fieldwork. After the fieldwork was completed in June, Webb formally requested that officials at the University of Tennessee (UT) provide Lewis with a permanent appointment, which became official in September 1935.

With Lewis’s growing sense of independence and a newfound power base, friction with Webb was perhaps inevitable. The friction erupted into a major feud between April 1937 to September 1939 (Dye 2013; Lyon 1996:144–146; Sullivan 1999:72–74) that stemmed from control of funding, program development, and publication authorship.

But the underlying cause was authority and power. The relationship began to unravel when Lewis published a synopsis of his excavations in Tennessee since his appointment at UT a year and a half earlier (Lewis 1937a). Webb was especially peeved at Lewis for publishing photographs from the Chickamauga basin—work that was still ongoing under the direction of Webb as TVA’s consulting archaeologist. Lewis wrote to McKern that, while he admired Webb, he thought that Webb was becoming increasingly sensitive to any criticism (Lewis 1937b) and that Webb had earlier complained that he was undermining his prestige and standing with the TVA by publishing the research that was under his watch as archaeological director (Webb 1937). Lewis was perplexed by these allegations, explaining to McKern that he did not understand why Webb was so vexed. He confided again that, by late spring of 1937, he had become aware of a “diminishing friendliness” during Webb’s frequent visits to monitor the ongoing progress of the Chickamauga basin field work (Lewis 1937c). Interestingly, Webb’s effort to undermine Lewis’s growing authority and independence with, for instance Carl E. Gute and the NRC, offers parallels with Webb’s earlier push to censure King’s activities at Wickliffe (Hawley and Dye 2014b).

The festering relationship that finally escalated into an open rupture between Lewis and Webb took place over the question of authorship of the Tennessee Valley basin reports. Even though Lewis had supervised the fieldwork and had undertaken the laboratory analysis and report preparation for the Norris basin project (Webb 1938a), as DeJarnette had done in Wheeler basin (Webb 1939), Webb had assumed sole authorship for both volumes. Perturbed with the previous arrangement, Lewis had insisted on co-authorship for any future publications as part of the agreement with UT, specifying that he would prepare and write the overall field reports, even though they would be submitted to Webb for discussion prior to being published by the Smithsonian Institution. Lewis and Webb continued to clash until September 1939 over who would control archaeological resources, who would maintain the standards of archaeological reporting, and who would write the reports. Lewis appealed to McKern for advice and McKern served as a...
sounding board for Lewis, although he was cautious not to take overt sides in the ongoing feud.

One area that was a major sticking point during the Lewis and Webb feud was whether the reports should be analytical and comprehensive, focusing on key sites, as Lewis envisioned them, or abbreviated, descriptive, and timely, as Webb had previously done for the Norris (Webb 1938) and Wheeler (Webb 1939) basin reports, published through the Smithsonian's Bureau of American Ethnology. Lewis had the support, once again, of McKern, in addition to Fay-Coope Cole and others, to issue comprehensive, professional reports, as opposed to Webb's earlier published summaries. During this period, Lewis turned to McKern with increasing regularity while they worked on and worried about issues of mutual concern: the relationship between amateurs and professionals; methodological issues, such as artifact classification and excavation techniques; and publication formats and styles (Hawley and Dye 2103a). McKern's influence was so pervasive that, soon after taking the UT job, Lewis wrote, “this Department is going to be nothing more nor less that the Southern Extension of the Milwaukee Public Museum as far as I am concerned” (Lewis 1934).

McKern offered detailed comments on various drafts of the Chickamauga report—always with an eye to helping Lewis advance the UT program and move the Chickamauga basin analysis and classification along. In June 1939, Lewis and Madeline D. Kneberg, with McKern's urging, proposed and organized a symposium on artifact classification at the joint SAA/AAA's Central Section meeting in Ann Arbor. The session's topic was “Methods of Analysis, Taxonomy, and Interpretation” (Kneberg 1939). At the request of Lewis and Kneberg, the symposium was headed by McKern. According to the minutes, it was “one of the most successful sessions... . Brief informal statements were made by various members of the Society upon such subjects as petrography, field excavations, analysis of archaeological materials, ceramic technology, pottery classification, culture classification, recording data, and terminology” (Guthe 1939:37).

Upon meeting Lewis in 1926, McKern must have seen something in the young man that prompted him to take an active role in mentoring the collector, amateur archaeologist, and successful businessman. Due largely to McKern's efforts, Lewis was slowly molded and transformed into a professional archaeologist and a capable academic administrator. The slight difference in age made Lewis almost a younger brother to McKern. Their mutual experience in World War I and their respective degrees from prestigious universities must have provided a common bond between the two men. The mentoring relationship rested on McKern's considerable anthropological experience and knowledge, but as friends, McKern treated Lewis as a protégé. Few individuals were as loyal to Lewis as McKern—from his tangential involvement in the Wickliffe problems of the pre-TVA days to his advice against working in the TVA New Deal program. In the course of the brutal feud with Webb, McKern advised and defended Lewis's interests and positions on various fronts and issues. With the TVA pressing for the Chickamauga basin report in the early 1940s, McKern supported Lewis, doing what he could behind the scenes to encourage and help him. Kneberg, Lewis, and their staff at UT repeatedly turned to McKern for advice on how to apply the MTM to the Chickamauga basin (Lewis and Kneberg 1941; Lewis et al. 1995) and Hiwassee Island (Lewis and Kneberg 1946) reports.

The workload involved in managing the fieldwork logistics, procedures, and techniques, meeting laboratory demands, and preparing reports for the New Deal Tennessee Valley basins was beyond anything Lewis—or anyone else—could have anticipated or imagined. The Tennessee Valley excavations were among the most complex and demanding archaeological programs imaginable. It comes as no surprise that, to his critics, Lewis failed to measure up to the challenge thrust upon him (Fagette 1996:107; Jennings 1994:89–90). However, McKern remained a constant confidant and a reassuring mentor in the crises that faced Lewis over some two decades as head of the UT anthropology program. Out of McKerris mentoring of Lewis, a remarkable career was forged that fundamentally transformed Lewis, as well as leaving a lasting stamp on eastern North American archaeology as a result of the reports produced by Lewis and his staff.
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As a university student who is close to completing a degree in archaeology and who has experienced moderate success in the field so far, I am able to look back at those who have shaped me and helped me to get to where I am today. It seems that in every profession, one can pick out a few defining moments of the journey to the present and name a few people who helped along the way. These people and their actions that helped me pave the road toward success are a part of my personal mentoring process. This brings up the big question, what is mentoring? What works? What doesn't work? In my opinion, these questions are more complex than one might think because the mentor and the mentored are not always conscious of mentoring that is taking place. I have come to realize that this is a process that typically comes organically and is not always initiated by an intentional decision by either party. A second vital piece of the mentoring process is the role of the mentored going out of his or her way to initiate relationships with professionals within the field of interest. Finally, a third part, dealing with the mentor, is the crucial need for interaction on an equal level with those being mentored, in particular, in academia. Below are my reflections on the key successful and unsuccessful moments and mentors that have led me on a path toward success.

Early Years

As an undergraduate it may seem odd to discuss my “early years,” but I was fortunate enough to begin this process during my first few years in high school when I first met individuals who I now consider to be my mentors. As part of an art class, we visited Legend Rock, Wyoming, a well-known rock art site of the Dinwoody and Early Hunting traditions. Archaeologists from the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) showed us around. Their willingness to answer the constant questions of this excited high school student led to a conversation about how I could personally get involved with local archaeological projects. This led to an invitation to join a Passport In Time (PIT) volunteer project the following summer at Legend Rock where an updated recording of the site was to take place. The PIT project was the experience that made me pursue archaeology as a career. The archaeological staff and even the volunteers on the project started me out in this direction because of their genuine willingness to help me while sharing their enthusiasm for the project. They were able to teach me what I needed to know to successfully assist with the research process while I was also learning more about the cultures we were studying. These people helped and instructed me not because they had to, but because they wanted to.

The shared enthusiasm for archaeology and their genuine interest in helping me was the most beneficial lesson I took away from this experience. The BLM staff were especially passionate about what they did for a living and it was this passion, rather than the amazing archaeology (although the site is spectacular), that impacted my decision to pursue archaeology. When I saw people genuinely enjoying what they do and how they conveyed this to those around them, it created an atmosphere of inspiration and excitement. It was a refreshing outlook on a profession in a world where so often people just show up for a job.

Opportunities

A few years after this project, I was able to use my relationships that I had built with the BLM staff to land a student internship as an archaeology aid in Wyoming. My two field seasons with this BLM field office provided one of the most well rounded experiences I had as an undergraduate student. There are seven principles suggested by the SAA Task Force on Curriculum—stewardship, diverse pasts, social relevance, ethics and values, written and oral communication, fundamental archaeological skills, and real-world problem solving (Bender and Smith 2000; Kamp 2014). These are crucial elements of governmental Cultural Resource Manage-
ment (CRM) and the internship with the BLM encompassed all of them. The involvement in an agency such as this allowed me to see into a part of the archaeological world that is not well known to the general public. One lesson I took away from the internship was that archaeology does not always include running from giant boulders and finding lost arks; in other words, it isn't the most exciting at times. But even with the lack of constant adrenaline rushes, I quickly came to realize that a CRM specialist plays an important role in the field of archaeology. Between experiencing the seven vital principles listed above and gaining a bit of healthy humility I have been allowed to better approach not just archaeology but also the world of academia.

Feeling confident in the world of academics is important because, as my mentor at the BLM taught me, archaeology is a multidisciplinary science that connects natural and cultural resources. Examples ranged from the effects of wildfires on archaeological sites to the relationship between the Wyoming oil and gas industry and archaeology. I have always been encouraged to seek out other opportunities and field experiences with other disciplines, leading to a richer education and broader understanding of the interconnectedness of the archaeological world.

My two summers with this agency were filled with perhaps the most influential people and experiences I have come to know thus far in my career. However, one of the overall messages in mentoring I have discovered is to encourage myself to personally take initiative. It is amazing what a simple phone call or meeting can do, which leads me to my next point, that the one being mentored has just as much of a role in the process as the mentor. This means that one has to initiate and sometimes even create these opportunities by actively searching for them. It is the rare occasion that these situations manifest by themselves without any personal effort. Although this seems obvious, it is a common trend among undergrads to wait for a job, internship, or volunteer opportunity to come to them instead of taking the initiative.

The Undergraduate

Being a young undergraduate trying to get involved in the field of archaeology among professionals, Ph.D.s, and graduate students can be highly intimidating whether it be on the job or in the classroom. This atmosphere of intimidation is not created on purpose for I strongly believe that there is a natural hierarchy within a professional or academic setting with good reason. There are obvious differences in qualifications between, for example, a professor, a graduate student, and an undergraduate student, but despite this natural hierarchy undergraduates should still be treated in a professional and adult manner. An example of a comment that unintentionally made me feel less of an adult surfaced when I completed a term paper that had taken a great amount of work and effort to complete. After multiple revisions and incorporating advice and critiques from peers and faculty, I was able to turn in my paper with pride. Upon receiving it back, there was a comment that read, “Good voice for an undergrad.” Although it was meant as a compliment for a job well done, I felt I was being complimented on the good work for my age and not for the work itself. Comments such as this are without question said and written with the intention of providing positive feedback, but it is far more gratifying to be evaluated on the quality of your work and not your age when it was completed.

Conversely, I have had many positive experiences in which mentors have treated me as an adult, giving me more responsibility and judging me on the work I completed. A good example is my internship with the BLM. As I grew more experienced with the day-to-day routine, I was given enough independence to learn to complete simple recordings, small surveys, and write documents or assist with reports. When handed this freedom from my mentor, I was able to thrive. I have come to realize that when I am learning a new skill or process, I cannot truly grasp the concepts unless I am left to be on my own, leaving me to use my own knowledge to complete the assigned task. Independence has proven to be one of the most successful ways for me to grow and learn under a mentor. It allows for an authentic, real world experience that cannot be easily achieved otherwise.

Working in a laboratory setting at the university has also been a positive experience for me because once again I was granted some independence while analyzing lithic debitage collected from excavations. It allowed me to develop skills with which I was able to form my own logical approach to lithic analysis. I was also able to work on the same sorts of things that graduate students were involved with. Working together and being involved in discussions to figure out problems or questions we encountered in the lab has proven to be an effective part of the mentoring process. It sometimes takes a peer to teach you important skills and lessons as opposed to a professor or professional who may not be able to connect as successfully.

Conclusion

Everyone responds differently to mentoring. Things that have worked for me may not work for everyone. However, some of the experiences I’ve had and lessons I’ve learned can
be applied universally. As stated above, those in the role of the mentor have a responsibility to be willing to go out of their way to help the younger or more inexperienced individual. A relationship should form naturally, and when a mentor can show passion and interest it makes all the difference. A second universal lesson about mentoring that I have learned puts great responsibility in the hands of those being mentored. One has to actively seek out opportunities that place you in a situation where growth and learning can take place. Students and budding professionals need to complete this crucial step on their own. The third and final aspect that makes mentoring successful derives from interactions between those higher up and lower down on the professional and academic hierarchy. The one being mentored will only thrive if treated in a professional and adult manner. Responsibilities also need to be given to allow some form of independence for it is one of the best ways to learn from a mentor. As I approach graduate school, I recognize that experience working with passionate mentors, development of personal initiative, and high-quality professional interactions have played a large role shaping and assisting my development into a budding professional archaeologist.
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Mentorship is the warm, fuzzy buzzword for teaching and education these days. University departments and faculties everywhere are discussing it, forming specialized taskforces, and investing in new curricula to formally integrate it into undergraduate and graduate programming. Mentorship, however, has formed an important part of archaeology for decades. The problem is that mentorship opportunities have not changed that much, whereas the rest of the field has been transformed by paradigm shifts, technological developments, and changes to the archaeological “jobscape.” So despite strong traditions of mentorship, new generations of archaeologists are emerging from their academic cocoons quite unprepared for the realities of the field today.

This mentorship double act got its start nearly a decade ago at McMaster University in Ontario, Canada as a graduate mentor (Burchell) and an undergraduate mentee (Cook). Eventually we both came to mentor and co-mentor archaeology students in classrooms, labs, and the field. This partnership certainly has a practical side—the complimentary skill sets and strengths of an analytical and technical archaeological scientist and a theoretically minded historical archaeologist have come together in unexpectedly productive ways. However, one of the greatest benefits has been that we can come together to rejoice in the successes of our students, reflect on the outcomes and impacts of our collaborative efforts, and support each other when problems arise—provisions that are not often available to mentors, but are certainly necessary for the development and sustainability of mentorship programs.

With this in mind, we hope that our adventures within the realm of academic mentorship, successful or not, can contribute to the development of a supportive network to bring mentorship in archaeology into the twenty-first century. University systems, job markets, legislation, and public engagement have changed substantially. The types of opportunities that we provide to students, from the field to the lab, need to provide the experiences that will produce new generations of archaeologists who can do more than just replicate traditional methods and models. In particular, students need experiences that will prepare them to think critically and innovatively in a constantly changing discipline. This includes providing mentees with real opportunities to progressively explore and build their own identity and place within the discipline (Figure 1). There also has to be a balance within mentorship that provides support for mentors—the reality that not every initiative will succeed and the strain that this can cause is rarely acknowledged. Nonetheless, mentorship provides invaluable opportunities for mentors and mentees to learn from each other, with long-term impact on education and career trajectories, not to mention the ways in which we approach archaeological research and interpretation.

Building Opportunities for Students within Academic Archaeology

Mentorship has always held a place in archaeology departments, largely because this discipline cannot be completely taught in the classroom. Field, lab, archival, and museum experiences are critical to grounding lectures, assignments, and theory in the realities of archaeological research design and practice. This is particularly important to prepare students for a slew of career paths—including the academic world, professional consulting archaeology, heritage, and museums, and the blurry spaces between. Mentorship opportunities, however, are rarely diverse enough to provide this kind of springboard of experience.

Perhaps as a result of juggling teaching loads with research, and pressures to stretch funding to the limits, in conjunction with students’ eager (or even desperate) desire to build their CVs, it is easy to use students as a means to an end. In this situation, “mentorship” can become synonymous with free labour, with undergrads paying their way to travel to remote
and “exotic” locations in order to do the most menial tasks. While this might be in line with glamorous impressions of the field, it does not necessarily provide the greatest opportunities for growth.

Stripping away the glitz might be a harder sell, but the large-scale excavations that dominated the discipline in the past are not as representative of research today. Giving students the opportunity to work on small-scale projects, lab analysis, and archival research can teach new generations about the diverse and alternative approaches to sustainable and innovative archaeological research (Figure 2). Working on smaller projects can also expose them to all the practical dimensions of archaeology from design and background research to testing, survey, excavation, lab analysis, and even writing and presenting finds.

Involving students in all aspects of archaeology, including management of labs and collections, administration, report writing, background research for funding applications, to name a few examples can be the most direct way of highlighting the range of tasks and roles involved in maintaining archaeological research. Flexible volunteer days in labs, incorporating undergraduates into the dusty and daunting process of maintaining collections, and finding projects that suit their own personal growth can be low-cost ways to proceed, building students’ experience while contributing to a functioning department or research project (Figure 3).

Where possible, paid work experience should be made available—even if it takes some creativity and planning to fund the endeavours. Real opportunities where students are accountable for their work, within the realms of larger projects, will lead to a better appreciation for responsibilities in archaeology, while developing skills in cooperation and collaboration, time management, professionalism, reporting, and how research projects are carried out.

**Cutting Ties and Setting Boundaries**

When we set out to write this article, our discussion quickly fell upon the issue of failures in mentorship. Most of us can probably name at least one mentor that fell short during our early years in the field, and any archaeologist who has been mentoring long enough has had situations that just did not turn out. But as with all failures and disappointments in life, it is important to reflect and build on experiences. In this spirit, this is what we have learned from mentoring gone wrong.

Not all students need a mentor in archaeology, nor do all students want one. For the majority of students, the opportunity to work on a field-, lab- or archival-based project is exciting, valuable, and critical to advancement in the discipline. However, differences in school and work environments, and the responsibilities and relationships that go with them, can be difficult to balance. The reality is that there are students who are not capable of conducting themselves in a manner that meets the standards set by the supervisor —this may be an issue for health and safety, for the integrity of the project, or for the working environment of others. In these situations, mentors might find themselves in a position where they are spending more time supervising, guiding, and coaching a student, rather than moving forward in a productive work environment. This leads to the question: when do you cut ties with a student?

*Figure 1. An undergraduate student presents the results of their independent research at the Canadian Archaeological Association Annual Meeting.*

*Figure 2. An undergraduate research assistant quantifies shell midden matrix from British Columbia.*
The answer may not always be clear—after investing time and energy in developing a mentor–mentee relationship, it may be difficult on a number of levels to deal with the problem. However, it is important to recognize the limits of being able to effectively mentor a student. Violations of health and safety procedures, research integrity, or any form of unprofessional behaviour on the part of the student should not be tolerated and should be addressed immediately.

Issues that arise relating to differences in ideas, opinions, and attitudes may be a bit less cut and dry. Dealing with the issue rather than letting it slide on account of their inexperience may be the most positive thing for both mentor and mentee to move forward. Setting clear boundaries and expectations is of course crucial—and if these are in place, theoretically a student should be able to work towards those goals. Nevertheless, students may go rogue from time to time, without even being aware they are crossing a line—in particular if they do not understand the full spectrum of archaeological research, the politics of academics, or the importance of reputation in a professional environment.

Reminding a student of their responsibilities may be helpful, and trying to give context to the issues at hand can be a great learning opportunity for them. Recurring issues, however, redirects the mentor’s energy from the project and from other students, and although it is not always easy to tell the student they are not suitable for the position, the task, or even graduate studies in archaeology, it may in fact be the best outcome for all parties involved.

As a mentor, knowing what your own boundaries are for students and being confident in your decision is crucial. This is another area where having support from a co-mentor can be extremely helpful in making decisions about how to proceed. Acknowledging that a student is not “the best fit” does not indicate a failure on the part of the mentor, nor should it discourage them from continuing to provide positive learning experiences for other students. With support and reflection, these stumbles can lead to stronger mentorship opportunities for students in the future.
Communities of Learning

Mentorship suggests something more than simply instruction or supervision of students. It is difficult to define but it suggests a much more hands-on, collaborative, and individualized experience (Figure 4). This will of course involve building strong relationships with students, spending time on their development of important skills and communicating with them about not only the work that they are doing, but also the larger picture. As students develop, room for self-directed learning is integral. Learning to solve problems on their own is perhaps one of the most important skills for them to develop. This can help to foster more independent thinking and self-confidence, putting students in charge of directing their projects or facets of projects, rather than simply doing what they are told and replicating what their mentor has showed them.

However, mentorship should not be completely isolated; an important part of this process can be setting up communities of learning with students at a variety of levels working together. Bouncing ideas off of their peers can be less intimidating than immediately presenting solutions to their mentor (Figure 5). It also gives students the opportunity to be exposed to more projects, methods, interpretations, problems, and solutions, than does a one-to-one relationship with a mentor. These larger-scale communities, which may take the form of lab or research groups, may place more responsibility on a mentor, another area where co-mentorship or networks of mentors in a department can be valuable. It can also provide students at the graduate level the opportunity to mentor undergraduate students, and in turn, get experience as mentors themselves.

These cycles of mentorship have long-term implications for the field of archaeology, and thus it is worthwhile taking time to critically reflect on the opportunities we are providing for new generations of archaeologists. It is not without value to consider what we need as mentors, and greater networking and discussion can certainly help us to reflect on the highs and lows. Very little in archaeology can be accomplished by isolated individuals, and the same is true in the realms of mentorship. It is time to band together to bring mentorship opportunities in line with where archaeology is today.
In my sophomore year, I changed majors. When I walked nervously into my new advisor’s office, Mrs. A. sat me down to learn more about her young advisee. She asked me why I wanted to major in history. Because I was taking a couple of courses in archaeology and Egyptian history that semester, I replied that I saw myself as a future Egyptologist. I wanted to dig around the pyramids, study pottery— that sort of thing. I was even learning hieroglyphs on my own (using Roth and Zauzich 1992), eager to show my newfound commitment. To her credit, Mrs. A. took me seriously. She asked several ancient historians for career advice. A couple of weeks later, I sat in the pleather chair across from her desk and learned that self-taught Egyptian was generally discouraged; mistakes would need to be unlearned. Her colleagues offered that I should take French and German, the major languages of scholarship in Egyptology. She advised that they would strengthen a grad school application far more than a haphazard knowledge of Middle Egyptian, and she was right. This was probably one of the best, non-intuitive pieces of advice I ever received. With advice like that, she kept me on track to the first day of grad school.

Besides my parents, Mrs. A. was my first mentor in my adult life. She wasn’t a friend with privileged access to my emotions; nor was she a supervisor with expectations of performance—not to suggest that any of these roles are mutually exclusive. Rather, by saying that she was a “mentor,” I mean that she took an active, enduring role in a dialogue about my professional development. When I reflect on people like her that I have known, it evokes a profound feeling of gratitude and duty: gratitude for their frankness and for the conversations we have had, and a duty to pass on their gifts. It is this sense of gratitude that prompted me to share my thoughts in this piece.

In my experience, one of the greatest challenges an aspiring archaeologist faces is the transformation from student to peer. One can take class after class, train, write reports, read articles, intern, and climb the ladder from bucket hauler to project director and still not realize this transformation. All too often in the CRM world and in school, I have seen colleagues sacrificing themselves on the altar of knowledge or experience and losing their way. That is, they become stuck in a bubble where they lose track of how their efforts relate to the industry or to larger disciplinary narratives. Some linger on in school or in work, falling prey to the sunk cost fallacy. By this, I mean that the decision to stay can be colored by past investment: “I can’t quit now, otherwise the time and money I’ve spent so far would be for nothing.” It cannot be stated enough that being a professor or principal investigator is not for everyone; it involves an amalgam of opportunity and skill unevenly shared across the field. Yet each member of our field has something to offer (to the field or to humanity) and can make those contributions in a concrete and satisfying way. Realizing that potential depends upon initiative, resourcefulness, a good-spirited willingness to embrace discomfort and opportunity, and having good role models as mentors.

In what follows I canvas five of my own experiences in mentoring and being mentored within corporate, academic, and government roles and reflect on the growth-enabling aspects of each. By tracing these experiences, I hope to help archaeological neophytes value and understand their own process of transformation and recognize mentoring matches and mismatches when they see them. In the process, I also hope to stimulate self-reflection about effective mentoring in our field.

When the Student Is Ready, The Teacher Will Appear

Five Experiences of Mentoring in Public and Private Worlds

Joshua R. Trampier

Joshua R. Trampier, Ph.D., RPA, is a Project Scientist at the Department of Defense.
Role Models in Mentoring through Managing

Years ago I came upon a book by Peter Drucker (1993) espousing the idea that superlative managers lead best by creating the leaders of tomorrow. Though one of my grad school mentors, Mr. B., has not read this book, he embodies this principle professionally and personally. Mr. B acted as a strong and positive academic role model, serving as a supervisor and informal advisor. He entrusted me with a number of increasingly challenging responsibilities that encouraged my professional development: implementing multi-year R&D projects, making hiring decisions, guiding purchasing and acquisitions, and planning long-term organizational goals. When I made mistakes on the job, even one that embarrassed him publicly, he affirmed the positive aspects of my choices while patiently walking me through the logic of why I should not repeat the mistake. Mr. B. is also a careful reader and listener. For me and many others, he provided constructive critiques with multiple close readings of job and grant application drafts, articles, and dissertation chapters. This support continued even when I began pursuing jobs outside of academia; I am only one of dozens of students he has similarly supported. Simply put, Mr. B. consistently sets time aside to empower his students to meet their aspirations, and his calm tutelage was foundational to my intellectual identity.

By comparison, though my relationship with Mrs. C. was antagonistic, it was nonetheless instructive. She was a supervisor and the director of a field project; though that project did not align with my previous research, she made it clear that she expected me to develop a topic linked to her project. Despite initial misgivings, I applied for research funding and organized past field records and future season logistics. Efforts were not necessarily reciprocated, and things got awkward around deadlines when I had to repeatedly request a recommendation letter or check on whether field permits had been submitted. One of our biggest challenges was a clash of management styles and personality types. That is, if I saw a problem that I could fix, I tried to fix it. Mrs. C. was a bit more hands-on and so regularly checked my initiative. Experiences like these taught me how to balance being tactfully assertive while keeping one’s supervisor in the loop.

Learning the Ropes through Peer Mentoring

As a friend of mine once said, “All scientists really want is a pat on the head and a tasty biscuit to keep doing what they’re doing.” I’ll admit it—in school, I competed with my peers for scraps of praise from faculty. More than that, I viewed individual attention as a means to get ahead, and I spent my education in a system largely tailored to reward that approach. With the exception of team efforts and class projects under Mr. B., most of my education emphasized individual performance to distinguish oneself from one’s peers. This model curiously persists despite the inherently team-organized aspect of archaeological research. Here’s an open question for the archaeological community: how common is this, in your experience?

In two jobs in the corporate and government worlds, I was exposed to a different model of performance and support, that of peer mentoring, a system that encourages colleagues to look out for one other. Ms. D. and Mr. E. work for a CRM firm, and Ms. F. and Mr. G. are civilian employees for the U.S. Government. In both environments I was given minimal training, assigned to a project, and expected to do my job. In the corporate world, though I often held a more “advanced” degree than my colleagues, I found that we had much to learn from one another. Ms. D. and I sat in her office countless times, while she walked me through the ins and outs of CRM law. Mr. E. brought me up to speed on the region’s archaeology and passed along the seminal references. We traded pointers on techniques and budgeting. In peer mentoring, I brought things to the table as well, offering GIS- and geomorphology-related insights to their research. At times, I supported projects that Mr. E. directed, and occasionally he would work in a supporting role on my team. I observed that in an environment where peer mentoring is promoted, large parts of the organization tended toward being flat (horizontal), rather than hierarchical (vertical). This runs the risk of bruising egos of nominal supervisors when work roles and expertise can be malleable, so one must tread tactfully. On that note, Ms. D. role-modeled how to deftly build consensus among strong personalities (including my own!). This I still strive to emulate.

Later on in a government role, my mindset continued to transform. I shifted away from seeing the workplace as an opportunity to compete for scraps of praise and instead sought opportunities to learn from and collaborate with peers. Unlike my experiences in academia, in public service I observed a greater emphasis on getting the job done over individual accolades. Harry Truman summarized the benefits of this attitude nicely: “It is amazing what you can accomplish if you do not care who gets the credit.” A major component of this is ensuring that peer mentoring is integrated into the institutional culture. I remember the first weeks at my new job, when Ms. F. talked about linking object-based image analysis and Markov chain Monte Carlo methods. From Ms. F. and another colleague, Mr. G. I began to understand that a project’s success rests not only on the merit of an approach, but also on effectively interconnecting dis-
parate persons and resources within or outside an organization. Both provided resources and patient explanations to help fill knowledge gaps, even as they solicited my feedback. Mr. G. took the time to connect me with dozens of his colleagues, making my transition into the organization much more fruitful. Even though peer mentoring is woven into one's job performance record, the fact that people like Ms. F. and Mr. G. took the time to listen to and enable a junior colleague has made a great deal of difference. Thanks to them, I am leading projects to better support our collective research goals.

Managing Others

Archaeology can provide many formal and informal opportunities for career guidance and nurturing. Principal investigators, project directors, lab directors, office directors, and crew chiefs represent the formal supervisory CRM hierarchy, for example, while (peer) mentoring can flourish informally among people with a technical, regional, or temporal specialty (e.g., faunal, U.S. Southwest, Late Classic) or administrative responsibility (e.g., native, environmental, and cultural monitors) on site. Supervising projects in and out of the U.S., I most often found myself as the older graduate student, training younger graduates and undergraduates in excavation management and feature recognition. Some of my favorite experiences involve teaching survey, GIS, and remote sensing to students and Egyptian antiquities inspectors, partly because it challenged them to think beyond the square and the site. Watching two inspectors run the prism and total station for a topographic survey is very satisfying. Peer mentoring kicks in when Egyptian colleagues teach me the Arabic terms for parts of the total station or how to distinguish a particularly elusive mudbrick wall from 10 YR 4/3 silty clay fill and brick tumble. They'd simply seen more of them.

In one of my grad school jobs, I supervised six grad students. Most of the time, this worked well. I followed Mr. B’s example, delegating chunks of responsibility to students to give them ownership and let them leave their own mark. Not every outcome was ideal. Once I asked a woman to design a component of our database, and although she did well with a challenging task, she became emotionally attached to the outcome. I found it challenging to critique and improve the work she'd done without upsetting her, so I assigned her to something else. She ended up leaving. Looking back with 20/20 hindsight, I focused too much on her oversights to the detriment of celebrating her successes. It would have been more effective to focus first on what she did right and then to couch my critiques in the form of questions about what she believed were the challenging points. What techniques do effective archaeological supervisors use to accomplish research goals while mentoring an employee or student respectfully? How could these benefit from a peer mentoring approach?

Your Future in Mentoring

In this piece, I tried to outline a few of the qualities I have observed in past mentors, as gleaned from personal experience. The most supportive mentors are often distinguished by the greater amount of time they spend with you; they generally listen more, read more closely, introduce you to potential colleagues, and provide targeted feedback. They also empower you with opportunities that will allow you to grow, if only because they understand that your improvements will elicit a multiplier effect. Less supportive mentors will rarely have time for you, will delegate reluctantly, and will likely focus on your missteps rather than on your successes.

Mentoring in a way that affirms a protégé's or colleague's voice, passes along lessons learned, and provides chances for growth is a challenge that each one of us will face, whatever our career. Respecting the process of maturation within a new discipline or job role, with its inevitable mistakes and false starts, is a healthy way to nurture lifelong learning and an attitude of paying it forward. When I started as a nascent Egyptologist years ago, I made a commitment and grew a plan with a mentor interested in my intellectual well-being. As I assumed more responsibilities in the field and office, thanks to others' trust, I found that good role models in our field who are interested in creating the leaders of tomorrow are rare finds indeed. By "leaders," I don't mean merely cranking out the next generation of professors or principal investigators; focusing so narrowly would do a disservice to many whose paths and ambitions ultimately lead elsewhere. Instead, let's consider current, paid professionals in our field to be training the next generation of archaeologically minded "citizen scholars," to borrow a phrase from my alma mater. These citizen scholars embody the skills taught in any educational realm—critical thinking, resourcefulness, and creative curiosity, for example. However, they also carry with them a vested interest in learning from and preserving the material record of our shared past, an idea unique and precious to our field, one worth spreading around to ensure its longevity.

To some it may appear that I’ve offered platitudes and vainglory but few practical hints. To finish off, let’s get a bit more practical, and here I am speaking explicitly to students considering careers in archaeology. If you’re thinking about grad school now, please take the time to reflect on the people with whom you would like to work and to envision what you’ll be doing after you’re done. Read job descriptions on chronicle-
get an idea *now* of what supervisors for academic, private, or public archaeology positions will be seeking when you apply later. *Visualize the end before you begin.* I would heartily recommend *not* going to grad school simply to find your way or stall for time, because you may become lost and spend many years and thousands of dollars in an attempt to orient yourself. If this is your concern, it makes more sense to instead pursue a professional opportunity while building skills and financial independence. Consider pursuing archaeology on the side, rather than incurring additional loan debt while casting around for the direction of your life’s compass. As for those contemplating public or private jobs in archaeology, keep in mind that when you are considering a company (or school), you are choosing your future mentors as much as they are choosing you. Do your homework by checking out a company’s or a professor’s scholarship and asking current employees or students for their opinions. People are generally effusive in their praise about supportive mentors; silence speaks just as loudly.

To truly be able to mentor and be mentored by your peers, you must bring something to the table. If I could advise each of you generally on your career path, I would highly suggest investing in your own (online) IT and statistical literacy, particularly insofar as it will help you to build an online brand. Better yet, build a cadre of colleagues with overlapping skillsets and create a visible presence on the Web together. A Bachelor’s degree in History and Master’s and Ph.D. degrees in Near Eastern Archaeology are not what secured the opportunities I have had, though the credentials and social network I developed out of these degrees opened many doors. I would argue that it was the computer skills I have cultivated since my parents bought me an Apple IIc as a kid that have made me versatile. When you are completing that next report or project, consider ways to make it web- and tech-enabled. To be more specific, look into open-source software like d3.js, QGIS, Boundless Geo, Python, R, Zotero, or Weka. Hack your own low-cost archaeological innovation: a high dynamic range camera setup, a Helikite (Verhoeven et al. 2009), or a Raspberry Pi supercomputer. I have seen only three or four archaeology-related Kickstarters in the last two years—what an opportunity! Keeping tech skills in your back pocket will allow you to be flexible and to make career moves when $13 per hour plus per diem can no longer support your field habits. Plus, it makes you more a more attractive hire to companies and colleges running field or lab projects. Your best bet is to form a team effort in which all the members can complement each other’s strengths. At the very least, together you will have something more impressive to show at the next SAA meeting, and the impacts will be longer lasting.

In the end, the school/work archaeology bubble that you inhabit is not the be-all and end-all of your existence. I enjoy dreaming about data recovery projects in the Nile Delta that investigate the habitus of Classical and medieval Egypt just as much as the next person. Yet the time that I spent teaching elementary school classes after graduation was rewarding enough to make me think twice about going to grad school. I never imagined myself in public service five years ago, yet thanks to the nudging of a peer mentor, I now find great satisfaction in what I do. Despite the fact that CRM is a billion-dollar industry that supports many careers (Doelle and Altschul 2009) and that some professors may wish their students to remain eternally devoted to archaeology, many will—and should—continue to find life outside of archaeology. Missing opportunities to mentor archaeologically minded citizen scholars does our field a disservice if only because it fails to instill our core values in a larger portion of the population. To all who have the good fortune to practice archaeology today, be open to what may come, so that when your next mentor or protégé appears, you will be ready.
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Mentoring is often viewed as a strong component of being successful in one’s career path. Mentoring relationships in archaeology are frequently viewed as existing almost exclusively between an academic advisor and a graduate student. However, mentoring relationships can exist in many professional contexts among individuals with different skills and experience. This is particularly true in archaeology, where there are many avenues to career development (e.g., publishing, running field projects, working in a research lab, policy development, and various sectors of government). Furthermore, the majority of students will likely obtain jobs outside of academia—a fact that many recognize, but that most graduate programs seem to de-emphasize when guiding students into career options. With the decreasing emphasis on apprenticeship for a specific skill (e.g., lithic analysis) in graduate programs, there is an increasing demand for job candidates to be proficient in a number of archaeological skills (e.g., surveying, artifact and imagery analysis, report writing, use of geographic information systems (GIS)). This demand, coupled with an increased selection of “alternative” career paths, makes it all the more important to cultivate a variety of mentor/mentee relationships. Yet these mentoring opportunities frequently go unrealized. Archaeology as a field stands to strongly benefit from an increased understanding of the versatility of mentoring contexts and mentor/mentee perspectives, as well as from an increased willingness to engage in mentoring. Here, I highlight a selection of mentoring opportunities available in archaeology, including, but not limited to, advisor/student relationships. I emphasize the characteristics of good mentors that can be put into practice in both traditional and “alternative” career paths. Additionally, I consider increasing our awareness of mentoring perspectives from both the mentor and mentee viewpoints. I argue that the benefits of positive mentoring will (a) allow us to better prepare students for the increasingly diverse careers and contexts in which their skills are applicable and (b) enable mentors to help new employees and peers thrive in contexts outside of academia.

Mentors in Archaeology

I received an email from a former professor while boarding a long holiday flight. The email was concise but frank, and it was highly critical of some research in which I was engaged. Ironically, on the way to the airport, a colleague and I had been discussing some of the deficiencies of this very research project but had not arrived at their solution. We had surmised that my former professor would be very disappointed in the scope of the research, precisely for the reasons that appeared in my inbox minutes later. Although surprised at receiving direct, unsolicited criticism, I had plenty of time to process the comments while trapped on the interminably long flight.

It was during this processing that I realized that I had a true mentor—someone with no immediate stake in my performance and who would not be held directly accountable for my work, but who cared enough to provide unsolicited feedback and to critique and guide my work. This is what I had hoped for in a mentor. I didn’t just want someone who could answer questions when I was unsure of the next step in a publication or give advice on a potential job opportunity. I also wanted someone who would push me to do my best work, someone who could provide positive external guidance—even when that guidance was extremely critical—long after our academic association had ended.

Of course, not all mentees look for unsolicited critique from someone with whom they no longer have regular interaction. What qualities, then, do we look for in a mentor, and how do we identify a suitable one, especially now that archaeologists are pursuing an increasingly diverse range of careers? Hypothetically, our academic advisors, particularly in graduate school, should be the primary mentors with whom we form long-term mentoring relationships. These are the women and men who won the academic positions, run their own projects, are awarded large grants, publish articles in major journals, and somehow manage to teach as well. They have
succeeded in academic archaeology and are well-versed enough to be able to help you find your career path.

In practice, these de facto relationships do not always result in fruitful mentoring. This is in part our fault, as mentors, for not taking the time to fully engage each student, regularly discuss their goals, and invest in helping them achieve those goals. But mentoring relationships can also falter when mentees fail to clearly identify what they want out of the relationship or to put in the effort we think they should. Sometimes these failures are simply a function of personality conflicts, perhaps enhanced by the university setting, where peer-competition for advisor attention can be high.

But mentoring relationships can and should exist beyond a structured academic context, and our expectations for good mentoring should build on those we hope to gain from the traditional academic relationship. As mentees, we look for someone to give us guidance, whether that guidance involves where to submit an article, how to negotiate a job salary, how to engage in capacity building, or how to make a recommendation for the National Register of Historic Places. In an informal poll among peers, colleagues, and students, the top expectations looked for in a mentor were the following: experience, willingness to engage and provide exposure to new practices, field experiences, and techniques, networking potential, and the ability to offer valid critiques. As career opportunities increasingly move out of the classroom, several of these expectations rise in importance. I briefly address some of these before discussing better practices for engaging mentees.

**Experience and Willingness to Engage**

By far, the most frequently mentioned characteristic desired in a mentor is experience—whether that means knowledge of the archaeology of a particular region, skill in advocating for better cultural and environmental laws, experience serving as a Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, or expertise in running a laboratory. Any individual with experience in a specific area has the opportunity to mentor others with less experience, particularly new employees, and to contribute to their growth.

I have spent time both in academia and in the cultural resources management (CRM) world. I have heard my CRM colleagues use the phrase “walking into the ground” time and again when referring to breaking in new field technicians or to convincing a field technician that he or she is ill-suited to field archaeology. Occasionally, first-time crew members quickly realize that fieldwork is not what they had anticipated or that they are unsuited to the rigors of fieldwork, and this can be a challenge for field supervisors during the remainder of the session. This is the moment to engage in mentoring, despite our frustrations. The punishment mentality will not get the job completed any faster or result in the offending field technician doing a better job. Our projects are only as good as the effort and skills we put into them, and that requires investing in those for whom this was a way to make money during the summer or whose paths may unintentionally lead to CRM. While this is a short-term situation for us, they’ve just added field experience to their resume and are headed in our colleagues’ direction for their next short-term assignment. Rather than just providing these individuals with a grueling walk, we have the opportunity to improve their skills, and possibly their attitudes, for their next employer.

Short-term mentoring is not limited to field contexts. Performing a records search, creating accurate maps and graphics, identifying the legal location of a site, writing a technical report, running statistical analyses, or building a complex environmental systems model are not necessarily skills that are taught in the classroom. Depending on the work context, however, they can be everyday procedures. Engaging in short-term mentoring opportunities—assessing a new employee’s skills, discussing their interests, exposing them to new methods or techniques, and helping them to network to find employment options that build on their skills or interests—can only improve the field of archaeology, without diverting much time from our own work-related obligations. We can effectively mentor short-term employees, students, or individuals with whom we have little direct daily contact by providing them with skills or knowledge in their pursuit of a more permanent career. Ultimately, this may turn into a fruitful, long-term mentoring relationship. This leads directly into my final mentoring quality: developing opportunities for better engagement in archaeology.

**Exposure to Archaeological Practice**

Archaeology is a discipline that frequently draws on technology or methods from other disciplines. What once was considered specialized knowledge, such GIS analysis, is becoming more commonplace. In my own work, I try to bring new undergraduate and graduate students into my field projects and to expose them to as many aspects of fieldwork as possible. This includes basic, traditional archaeological skills, as well as all of the steps of a near-surface remote sensing survey (e.g., instrument calibration, data collection, and data processing). Exposure to a variety of methods and techniques helps mentees to focus on what aspects of archaeo-
logical and anthropological research they most enjoy, and it encourages their growth within the discipline.

I also try to incorporate participants from outside of the university pool. Exposure to archaeology is not about archaeology in and of itself; rather, it is about exposing the broader public to many of the aspects and products encompassed within archaeological research. These include but are not limited to research design and methods, conservation, types of cultural and environmental resources, cross-cultural awareness, and the value of studying the past. Last summer a middle school student and a former member of armed forces participated in my field project (Figure 1). The former was an “at risk youth” with a challenging personal background. She had no exposure to the world outside her hometown and no driving aspirations for her future; she did, however, have a willingness to try something new. The latter was a middle-aged man who had just finished a lengthy period of service and had recently taken classes at a regional community college to find a new career path to support his family. Both spent a lot of time discussing their interests and their goals with several members of the crew, who in turn offered suggestions about the educational, financial, and employment resources available to achieve those ends.

In my mind, this is one key aspect of mentoring: engaging individuals from any background or point in their life and working with them to understand their goals. While this discussion is couched within an archaeological framework, mentoring is not equivalent to producing more practitioners. Mentoring is actively engaging others to promote their success, however they define “success.” When we do this outside of typical academic relationships with people of different ages, backgrounds, and experience levels, then we are improving the quality of archaeology as a discipline and can promote more opportunities for archaeologists in “non-traditional” career paths.

**Exposure to Alternative Career Paths**

Our archaeological skills can lead to a wide variety of jobs, but our academic mentors often seem unaware that these possible alternative careers exist. A good friend and colleague served as an excellent mentor to me in this situation. He knew of my skills and interests, and he presented an opportunity for me to explore them in a research setting in which I never knew archaeology would be applicable. Through his own interests and skills in similar “unusual” means of archaeological inquiry, he had identified his own excellent career option, essentially through his own efforts. Something he said to me resonated strongly. No one had mentored him when he expressed interest in an alternative career path; as a result, he had to find these opportunities on his own and, through trial-and-error, identify a career he loves and excels at. Because his personal experience stemmed from a lack of mentoring, he tries not to let others with similar research interests go un-mentored.

This friend introduced me to an internship at the Department of Defense. I was surprised to learn that I had skills applicable to this internship, and to be immersed in a collaborative environment with coworkers whose backgrounds covered a range of academic disciplines. I was assigned a mentor—finally, someone whose function was to provide mentorship in an incredibly new (and daunting) environment! Unfortunately, my assigned mentor and I did not hit it off. This was largely due to our inability to communicate with one another, something that I view as key to a mentoring relationship. I left the office every day feeling frustrated that I was not achieving my full potential in a group effort. He was likely equally frustrated.

Within this unfamiliar environment, two colleagues adopted me. They went out of their way to engage with me and turned out to be excellent mentors. These individuals utilized their experience to help me navigate the system and to expose me to new ideas, skills, and people. I was able to channel my previous frustration into collaborative research activities through positive mentoring with unexpected mentors. My interactions both with the friend who suggested this path and with these two individuals emphasized the value of
both short-term and long-term mentoring, of promoting positive mentoring relationships, and of moving beyond a non-productive mentoring relationship. These are the lessons I have tried to apply in my own role as a mentor.

My own example also underscores that opportunities beyond academia and CRM exist and that through positive mentoring, we can identify relevant and exciting “alternative” careers that build on our archaeological abilities. There are many spheres in which an archaeological background can lead to employment—and happy—graduates. As we better recognize how applicable our skills are within many different employment contexts, we should also realize that our opportunities for exposure increase. With increased exposure comes an obligation to become at least passingly familiar with such options, so that we can better mentor our own mentees into internships or career paths that fall outside of these boundaries but that have just as much impact as post-secondary education or cultural resource management.

Broadening Mentee and Mentor Perspectives

Occasionally, despite the best intentions, mentors fail to consider the viewpoint of their mentees. For example, when several of my female peers expressed their concerns about finding academic jobs to their male mentors/advisors, their concerns were dismissed as “something that does not happen anymore.” These women were frustrated that their concerns were so easily dismissed and that they lacked other mentors who could better help them to prepare for the obstacles they perceived ahead. This is certainly not the only example of failing to engage a mentee’s viewpoint, but it does provide a starting point for how to expand one’s mentoring perspective.

Several of my colleagues are heavily involved in how to provide quality mentoring to underrepresented groups, how to actively foster interest in and access to research opportunities among Native American and First Nations youth, and how to recognize a failing mentoring relationship. These broader topics are unified by this question: how do we become effective mentors to mentees whose backgrounds may lead to very different needs or concerns from those we identify in ourselves? Broadening our mentorship to include underrepresented individuals (in terms of age, gender identification, ethnicity, etc.) means also being cognizant of, and receptive to, the needs and concerns of our mentees. Engaging in a mentee’s viewpoint involves clear discussions of their goals and their perceived obstacles to those goals, identifying how to overcome those obstacles, and actively seeking out opportunities beyond our traditionally narrow career paths. By actively expanding our mentoring practices and viewpoints, we stand to significantly strengthen archaeological practice and our field of practitioners.

Conclusion

My intentions in this piece were (1) to identify key qualities of good mentoring; (2) to improve long-term and short-term mentoring practices with an emphasis on alternative career paths; and (3) to emphasize the importance of broadening our perspectives to become effective mentors to those with diverse backgrounds, life situations, and career concerns with which we cannot directly relate. A willingness to engage with others through your own experience and expertise is critical to positive mentoring. Equally important is recognizing that not all mentoring relationships are productive. In such circumstances, it may be better to guide the individual to another mentor or employment option that would better serve their interests.

Academic jobs are scarce and CRM is not for everyone. Yet archaeologists have widely applicable research skills. We examine complex adaptive systems, environmental changes, food productivity, and social relationships, all over the long-term. We work collaboratively with multiple interest groups and advocate for very real modern-day environmental and cultural concerns. Our work is relevant to many public and private sectors, many of which are rarely advertised as legitimate career options post-degree. As mentors, we can identify individuals well-suited to these options and guide them into opportunities that may be only tangentially related to practical archaeology, but that can lead to very fulfilling careers.

Perhaps most important to this discussion is that we should broaden our perspectives on who to engage as a mentee and on how best to understand their point of view. Increased diversity in our membership (age, sex, ethnicity, and gender identification, to name a few) must lead to an increased ability to understand the perspective of others and—importantly—a decreased tendency to dismiss the concerns or interests of others as invalid or inapplicable. Positive mentoring must exist outside of academic contexts. Good mentoring in archaeology leads to productive collaborations and better products. Mentoring diversifies and strengthens our membership, which can only improve archaeological practice, archaeological theory, and our contributions to modern understandings of culture, environments, and the complex interactions between them.
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Nomination/Submission Materials Required: Submission materials required differ between paper and poster entries. Please review the category of your submission below.

For Papers: The paper must be double-spaced, with 1-inch margins and 12-point font. Please do not submit raw data unless they are to be presented as part of the paper itself. An average 15-minute paper is approximately 8 pages long (double-spaced, not including references cited). Any paper longer than this will be docked points. Applicants must submit electronic copies to the Awards Committee Chair of the following two items: (1) a separate title page with name and full contact information; (2) a single PDF of the conference paper containing slide callouts, references cited, and slides with numbered captions. Please remove your name from this PDF. In addition, the applicant must have their paper reviewed by a faculty or supervisory sponsor before it is submitted to the Award Committee Chair. The faculty/supervisory sponsor must send an email to the Award Committee Chair at the time of submission stating that he/she has read and approved the paper being submitted.

For Posters: Applicants must submit electronic copies to the Awards Committee Chair of the following two items: (1) a separate title page with name and full contact information; (2) a single PDF file as an electronic entry. Please remove your name from the poster PDF. In addition, the applicant must have their poster reviewed by a faculty or supervisory sponsor before it is submitted to the Award Committee Chair. The faculty/supervisory sponsor must send an email to the Award Committee Chair at the time of submission stating that he/she has read and approved the poster being submitted.

Nomination/Submission Deadline: March 15, 2015

Douglas C. Kellogg Fund for Geoarchaeological Research

Committee Chair Contact Information: Susan M. Mentzer, Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen, Institute for Archaeological Sciences, Rümelinstr. 23, 72070 Tübingen, Germany; Tel: (+49) 7071 29-77060; Email: susan.mentzer@ifu.uni-tuebingen.de

Award Description: The Douglas C. Kellogg Award provides support for dissertation research, with emphasis on fieldwork and/or laboratory portions of this research, for graduate students in the earth sciences and archaeology. Under the auspices of the SAA’s Geoarchaeology Interest Group, family, friends, and close associates of Douglas C. Kellogg formed a memorial in his honor.

Who Is Eligible to Submit Nominations or Apply for the Award: Recipients of the Kellogg Award will be students who are (1) actively pursuing the Ph.D. degree in earth sciences or archaeology; (2) applying earth science methods to archaeological research and (3) seeking to engage in a career in geoarchaeology.

Nomination/Submission Materials Required: The application should consist of (1) a research proposal no more than three pages in length (excluding references) that describes the research and its potential contributions to American archaeology, (2) a curriculum vita, and (3) two letters of support, including one from the dissertation committee chair that certifies that the student is conducting the proposed research along with the expected date of completion of the degree. Electronic submissions as pdfs sent to the award committee chair are preferred. File names must include the applicant's surname or last name. The award (Douglas C.
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Kellogg Fund for Geoarchaeological Research) must be clearly indicated in the proposal title.

Nomination/Submission Deadline: November 30, 2014

Dienje Kenyon Memorial Fellowship

Committee Chair Contact Information: Frank E. Bayham, California State University, Chico, Dept. of Anthropology, Chico, CA 95929-0400; Tel: (530) 898-4540; Email: fbayham@csuchico.edu

Award Description: In honor of the late Dienje M. E. Kenyon, a fellowship is offered to support the research of women archaeologists in the early stages of their graduate training. An award of $500 will be made to a student pursuing research in zooarchaeology, which was Kenyon’s specialty. To qualify for the award, applicants must be in the early years of an M.A. or Ph.D. graduate degree program focusing on archaeology. Strong preference will be given to students who are in the early stage of research project development and/or data collection, and who are working with faculty members with zooarchaeological expertise.

Who Is Eligible to Submit Nominations or Apply for the Award: Female graduate students in archaeology are eligible to apply, with preference for students who are in the early stage of research project development and/or data collection, and who are working with faculty members with zooarchaeological experience.

Nomination/Submission Materials Required: Any submission for the Dienje Kenyon Fellowship is required to have (1) a statement of proposed research related to zooarchaeology, toward the conduct of which the award would be applied, of no more than 1,500 words, including a brief statement indicating how the award would be spent in support of that research; (2) a curriculum vita; and (3) two letters of support from individuals familiar with the applicant's work and research potential (one of these letters must be from the student's primary advisor, and must indicate the year in which the applicant began graduate studies). The statement of proposed research and curriculum vita should be sent as an email attachment in Microsoft Word to the committee chair. Letters of support should be emailed separately by the people providing them.

Nomination/Submission Deadline: December 15, 2014

Award for Excellence in Latin American and Caribbean Archaeology

Committee Chair Contact Information: Tomas E. Mendizabal, Mirador Del Cangrejo 10A, Calle H El Cangrejo, Panama, PANAMA; Email: tomas_mendizabal@yahoo.com

Award Description: The Award for Excellence in Latin American and Caribbean Archaeology will be presented annually to an individual who has made a lasting and significant contribution to the practice of archaeology and/or to the construction of archaeological knowledge in Latin America or the Caribbean. In selecting the recipient of this award, the committee will pay particular attention to the cultural context in which the nominee works and to the different pathways to creating and promoting excellence in Latin American and Caribbean archaeology. The award is open to individuals at any point in their careers.

Who Is Eligible to Submit Nominations or Apply for Award: Any SAA member may nominate an individual for this award. Awardees must be members of the SAA.

Nomination/Submission Materials Required: Nominators are required to submit (1) a nomination letter; (2) a detailed curriculum vita of the nominee that includes a complete bibliography of local and international research publications; (3) brief description of the academic and/or cultural impact of research, publications and other relevant activities, and (4) two supporting letters, which can be written in English or Spanish. One supporting letter should be from a Latin American or Caribbean archaeologist and one supporting letter should be from a Latin American or Caribbean specialist, regardless of nationality. All nominations and supporting documents are requested in PDF format, to be sent via email to the committee chair.

Nomination/Submission Deadline: January 4, 2015

Lifetime Achievement Award

Committee Chair Contact Information: Barbara Voorhies, University of California, Department of Anthropology, Campus Code: 3210, Santa Barbara, CA 93106-3210; Tel: (805) 969-0628; Email: voorhies@anth.ucsb.edu

Award Description: The Lifetime Achievement Award is presented annually to an archaeologist for specific accomplishments that are truly extraordinary, widely recognized as such, and of positive and lasting quality. Recognition can be granted to an archaeologist of any nationality for activities within any theoretical framework, for work in any part of the world, and for a wide range of areas relating to archaeology, including but not limited to research or service. Given as the Distinguished Service Award between 1975 and 2000, it became the Lifetime Achievement Award and was awarded as such for the first time in 2001.

Who Is Eligible to Submit Nominations or Apply for the Award: Any professional archaeologist may submit nominations for this award. Nominees must be SAA members by the time of their nomination, and the strongest nominees will have made significant contributions to both the organization and to the range of archaeological practice that in which SAA members participate.

Nomination/Submission Materials Required: Nomination letters should include a letter of nomination, outlining the nomi-
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insee’s lifetime accomplishments, as well as a curriculum vitae. Additional letters of support are not required, but the strongest nominations, historically, have included a minimum of five (5) letters of support; some have had more than fifteen (15) letters of support. Nominators are required to collate all nomination materials into one single Adobe Acrobat PDF document to be emailed to the committee chair, Barbara Voorhies.

Nomination/Submission Deadline: January 3, 2015

Fred Plog Memorial Fellowship

Committee Chair Contact Information: Maxine McBirnn, Curator of Archaeology, Museum of Indian Arts and Culture, P.O. Box 2087, Santa Fe, NM 87504-2087; Tel: (505) 476-1260; Email: maxine.mcbrinn@state.nm.us

Award Description: An award of $1,000 is presented in memory of the late Fred Plog to support the research of a graduate student with ABD who is writing a dissertation on the North American Southwest or northern Mexico or on a topic, such as culture change or regional interactions, on which Fred Plog did research. In the case of a tie, the award is split equally between the fellows.

Who Is Eligible to Submit Nominations or Apply for the Award: All student members of SAA in good standing who are ABD by the time the award is made at the Annual Meeting of the SAA are eligible to apply for the award.

Nomination/Submission Materials Required: The application consists of (1) a research proposal no more than three single-space pages long (not including bibliography and tables/figures) that describes the research and its potential contributions to American archaeology, (2) a curriculum vita, and (3) two letters of support, including one from the dissertation chair that indicates the expected date of completion of the dissertation.

Nomination/Submission Deadline: November 1, 2014

Award For Excellence in Public Education

Committee Chair Contact Information: Lynn M. Alex, 5 The Woods NE, Iowa City, IA 52240; Tel: (319) 338-3770; Email: lynn-alex@uiowa.edu

Award Description: This award is designed to recognize and encourage outstanding programs or projects that share archaeological knowledge and issues with the public. The award is conferred on a rotating, three-year cycle of categories among curriculum, community, and media and information technology. The 2015 Award for Excellence in Public Education will be presented in the community category. This category recognizes outstanding programs or products that reflect collaborative initiatives that engage diverse communities. The committee will consider outstanding nominations in other categories for future awards. The committee also recognizes that some programs or projects may be eligible for more than one category. Upon request, the committee will provide suggested examples of programs or projects eligible for the award category in a given year.

Who Is Eligible to Submit Nominations or Apply for the Award: Any member of SAA may submit a nomination file, although awardees are not required to be members of the SAA.

Nomination/Submission Materials Required: Nominators will work with the Chair prior to submission to assemble a nomination file that will include (1) the nomination form (available for download at http://www.saa.org/AbouttheSociety/Awards/tabid/123/Default.aspx); (2) a letter of nomination that identifies the outstanding program or product being nominated and summarizes the accomplishments; (3) supporting evidence of the accomplishments; and (4) endorsements (no more than three).

The nomination letter and narrative should address the following topics:

- **Overview**: Describe the program/product being nominated, including its goals and how it is made available to the public.
- **Creativity**: Discuss the innovative aspects of the program/product.
- **Leadership**: Explain how the program/product serves as an exemplary model of public education related to archaeology.
- **Public Impact**: Document the impact of the program/product on relevant publics beyond the discipline of archaeology (general public, special interest groups, pre-collegiate or non-traditional students, others).
- **Ethics**: Mention ways in which the program/product promotes an understanding of ethical archaeology, such as appropriate presentation of archaeological methods, encouragement of site stewardship, connection and consultation with descendants, and other public involvement.

The nomination file should include details (including photos or samples, if possible) of the specific program/product and supporting materials that document the results of the specific program/product. This material should clearly demonstrate the case being made in the nomination narrative. For example, supporting materials might document the impact of a specific program in terms of the numbers of the public involved, personnel qualification, the frequency or longevity of programs offered, formal evaluation results, and/or feedback from the audience. Endorsements from secondary nominators are welcomed (please, no more than three). Prior nomination does not exclude consideration of a nominee in subsequent years. Designers of programs or products may nominate their own work. Nominations may include programs or products conducted or created within the last five years.

Electronic submissions are encouraged. If a nomination package is mailed, six (6) copies of the nomination package (including supporting materials) must be submitted.
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**Nomination/Submission Deadline:** January 10, 2015

**Gene S. Stuart Award**

**Committee Chair Contact Information:** Kirk D. French, Department of Anthropology, 120 Carpenter Building, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802; Tel: (814) 865-1142; Email: kirkdfrench@psu.edu

**Award Description:** This award honors outstanding efforts to enhance public understanding of archaeology, in memory of Gene S. Stuart (1930–1993), a writer and managing editor of National Geographic Society books. The award is given to the author of the most interesting and responsible original story or series about any archaeological topic published in a newspaper or magazine. The awardee receives $2,000, in addition to recognition by the SAA.

**Who Is Eligible to Apply or Submit Nominations:** The award is given to single or multiple authored articles, stories, or series of stories published in newspapers or magazines. The emphasis is on publications available to the general public (rather than limited distribution newsletters), and online publications are not excluded. The award honors good writing that brings awareness of archaeology to the public eye. Nominations can be submitted by authors themselves, by magazine/newspaper editors, or by readers. Authors or newspaper editors will work with the committee chair to assemble and submit a nomination file. Awardees may be members or non-members of the SAA.

**Nomination/Submission Materials Required:** Nominators will work with the committee chair to assemble a nomination file that will include the nominated article, which should have been published within the calendar year of 2014. An author/newspaper editor may submit no more than five stories or five articles from a series. Nomination packets may be submitted electronically as PDFs via email to the committee chair. If submitting hard copies, six copies of each entry must be submitted by the author or an editor of the newspaper.

**Nomination/Submission Deadline:** January 10, 2015

**Student Paper Award**

**Committee Chair Contact Information:** Brett A. Houk, Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Social Work, Texas Tech University, Box 41012, Lubbock, TX 79409-1012; Tel: 806-742-2400 (x234); Email: brett.houk@ttu.edu

**Award Description:** This award acknowledges the best student presentation of archaeological research in poster sessions. Student posters will be evaluated as electronic submissions made directly to the Student Poster Award committee.

**Who Is Eligible to Apply or Submit Nominations:** All student members of SAA in good standing whose poster abstract has been accepted by the SAA for the upcoming annual meeting are eligible to participate. All co-authors must be students, and the first author must be a member of the SAA. All co-authors share the award.

**Nomination/Submission Materials Required:** The paper abstract must be accepted by SAA for the upcoming annual meeting. All co-authors must be students, and the first author must be a member of the SAA. The paper must be double-spaced, with 1-inch margins and 12-point font. Please do not submit raw data unless they are to be presented as part of the paper itself. An average 15-minute paper is approximately 8 pages long (double-spaced, not including references cited). Any paper longer than this will be docked points.

The student must submit electronic copies of (1) a separate title page with name and full contact information; (2) the conference paper containing slide call outs and references; and (3) PDFs of all PowerPoint slides, with numbered captions, to be used in the oral presentation. Please do not put your name anywhere besides the cover sheet, so that your paper may be reviewed anonymously by the committee. Please send submissions to the committee chair.

The student must have a faculty or supervisory sponsor review the paper before the student submits it to the Student Paper Award Committee. The faculty/supervisory sponsor must send an email to the submission address at the time of paper submission saying that he/she has read and approved the paper being submitted.

**Nomination/Submission Deadline:** March 1, 2015

**Student Poster Award**

**Committee Chair Contact Information:** Lynn Fisher, Department of Sociology/Anthropology, University of Illinois Springfield, 1 University Plaza, MS UHB 3038, Springfield, IL 62703; Tel: 217-206-7938; Email: lfish1@uis.edu

**Award Description:** This award recognizes an outstanding student conference paper based on original research.

**Who Is Eligible to Submit Nominations or Apply for the Award:** All student members of SAA in good standing whose paper abstracts have been accepted by the SAA for the upcoming annual meeting are eligible to participate. All co-authors must be students, and the first author must be a member of the SAA. All co-authors share the award.

**Nomination/Submission Materials Required:** The paper abstract must be accepted by SAA for the upcoming annual meeting. All co-authors must be students, and the first author must be a member of the SAA. The poster abstract must be accepted by SAA for the upcoming annual meeting. All authors must be students for the poster to be eligible for the award. The poster must be submitted to the Poster Award Committee Chair as an electronic entry.

**Nomination/Submission Deadline:** March 1, 2015
NEWS & NOTES

SAA 80th Annual Meeting
Picture yourself in San Francisco! The SAA 80th Annual Meeting will be held from April 15–19, 2015 at the Hilton San Francisco Union Square. Register at the Hilton San Francisco Union Square for the SAA meeting by January 21, 2015, and your name will be entered into an SAA drawing for an incomparable prize—a one year membership in SAA! Make your room reservation today! There will be two separate drawings—one for the regular/government rate rooms, and one for the student rate rooms. For more details on making hotel reservations, please visit SAAWeb at www.saa.org.

Queer Archaeology Interest Group (QAIG)
We are pleased to announce the formation of the Queer Archaeology Interest Group (QAIG). At its core, QAIG brings together archaeologists interested in sexuality studies and other forms of queer research, highlights the problems experienced by members of our community, and addresses pedagogical issues important to LGBTQI students. The goal of QAIG is to connect people interested in these various forms of research while also creating a safe and inclusive environment for professional networking and student development. As a new interest group, it is important to maintain and expand our membership so that we can best serve the broader goals and mission of the SAA. Look for more about QAIG in the November issue of The SAA Archaeological Record and remember to think about joining us when you renew your membership!

2014 Southeastern Archaeological Conference
The 2014 Southeastern Archaeological Conference (http://www.southeasternarchaeology.org) annual meeting will take place at the Hyatt Regency in Greenville, SC, from November 12 to 16, 2014. Abstract submission deadline is August 1 and registration deadline is October 31. For questions, contact Charles Cobb (cobcr@mailbox.sc.edu).

Position Open: Acquisitions Editor for Kiva, Volumes 81–83
The Arizona Archaeological and Historical Society seeks an acquisitions editor for Kiva: The Journal of Southwestern Anthropology and History. Kiva is the premier Southwest journal publishing articles about archaeology, anthropology, history, and linguistics since 1935. The journal has a circulation of 650 individual and institutional members. The acquisitions editor is an independent contractor who solicits and accepts manuscripts for publication in four issues per year, maintains the journal’s established high standards of professional quality, and works in coordination with a book reviews editor, a production editor, and Maney Publishing using Editorial Manager Software. The acquisitions editor has a working relationship with the Society’s Publications Committee and Board of Directors through a contract covering three volume years and will be compensated $1,750 per issue. There is an option for contract renewal.

Please visit http://www.az-arch-and-hist.org for more information.

March 1, 2015 is the proposed start date. Please send a letter of interest and curricular vitae by November 1, 2014, to:

Jenny Adams, Ph.D., Chair
Kiva Acquisitions Editor Search Committee
3975 N Tucson Blvd.
Tucson, Arizona 85712
(520) 881-2244
jadams@desert.com

Human Relations Area Files (HRAF)
eHRAF Archaeology & World Cultures

*Worldwide coverage of past & present cultures
*In-depth subject indexing for powerful searching
*Cultures organized by regions & subsistence
*Ideal for archaeological & ethnographic studies
*Innovative cross-cultural research & teaching tool

Try the online eHRAF databases for 60 days!
Visit http://hraf.yale.edu
Archaeology is global. The Society for American Archaeology is global. Shouldn’t you be reading about the archaeological advances that cut across geographic boundaries, cultural areas, and employment sectors?

*Advances in Archaeological Practice: A Journal of the Society for American Archaeology* publishes peer-reviewed, problem-oriented research articles on innovations in practice: research on how we do archaeology that includes innovations in approach, technique, method, technology, business models, collaboration, compliance, process, ethics, public engagement, stewardship, training…and much more. Read about the latest advances in archaeology and learn how they can be applied to your work!

As a modern online archaeological journal, *Advances in Archaeological Practice* allows for the inclusion of (free) full-color illustrations, multimedia models, and dynamic digital content in articles. In addition to research articles, the journal has a new “How-To” section with peer-reviewed articles written by recognized experts who will walk you through the steps necessary to correctly and effectively tackle complex problems that you face every day as an archaeologist. As an added bonus, the journal also has a new online discussion forum (www.advancesforum.org) where readers and authors can discuss articles and exchange ideas with one another.

Don’t miss out on the latest innovations in global archaeology! Increase your exposure in the field and submit a manuscript for review and possible publication.

The first two issues of *Advances in Archaeological Practice* can be viewed on a complimentary basis at www.saa.org.
Professional Development the Easy Way!

Visit www.saa.org for detailed information, registration, and schedules for these upcoming courses:

- Archaeological Curation for the 21st Century
- The National Science Foundation Archaeology Program: Insight into the Grant Application and Award Process
- Introduction to Teaching Forensic Archaeology
- New Developments in Technologies for the Measurement of Form and Space in Archaeology: An Introduction for Students
- Proposal Writing in Cultural Resource Management
- An Introduction to the Section 106 Process
- The Conservation and Management of Rock Art: An Integrated Approach
- Introduction to Archaeological Digital Data Management
- Publishing Your First Article in American Antiquity
- Fundamentals of Budgeting for CRM Projects

Check saa.org for course updates and additions!