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Many recent issues of the SAA Archaeological Record have featured particular themes spanning the pros and cons of consulting artifact collectors to drones in archaeology. We plan to continue this tradition later this year and in 2018. However, as we develop these special issues we also regularly receive submitted manuscripts on a diverse array of topics. My goal is to see those papers published in the timeliest manner possible. However, it can take some time for us to have enough individual submissions to make an issue. May 2016 is one of those and I thank our contributors for their patience.

Despite the fact that this does not represent a forum or special issue, public archaeology is a common theme. McCurdy and Gonlin introduce the new teaching web page from the SAA Committee on Curriculum. This offers a significant new resource for those of us who teach archaeology regardless of level. Raad demonstrates that archaeology can be effectively taught in a very hands-on way at the high school level. Indeed, she and her students illustrate that good research can be conducted on high school campuses. Clark provides a different case study in hands-on learning considering some of the challenges and prospects for teaching archaeological science with first year college students. Mehta opens a discussion of Community Service Learning (CSL) for college level education in archaeology. There is great potential here for our discipline given broad interest in CSL by college administrators and educators around the country. Whitley provides sage advice for those wanting to engage with publics across wider media (i.e. TED talks and YouTube). Simms and Riel-Salvatore discuss a different kind of public archaeology in their article on the ethnoarchaeology of Occupy Denver. Finally, Knoll and colleagues provide a “twelve-step” program for curating old collections.

I encourage everyone to read Kathryn Kamp’s reflections on archaeological education and volunteering in our Volunteer Profile column. Then, of course, this is the May issue and we have the SAA Report of the Board of Directors, the 2017 Call for Nominations, minutes of the 81st SAA Business Meeting, and the 2016 Awards. Finally, I want to thank my outgoing Assistant Editor, Kristen Barnett, who has played a significant role in helping to develop and edit the SAA Archaeological Record over the past three years. In turn, I welcome UM doctoral candidate in theoretical and computational archaeology, Cheyenne Laue, into the Assistant Editor position beginning in July 2016.
I always tell my undergraduate students that archaeology is a team sport, so they need to learn to work together reliably and cooperatively. Part of the reason that archaeology is so much fun is the people you meet along the way. Archaeology, as a discipline, relies on volunteers who review grants, edit journals, mentor students and other rising professionals, do programming for scout troops, school groups, and community organizations, act as site stewards, work in a wide variety of organizations both professional and avocational, and a raft of other things.

There are many ways you can serve the archaeological profession as a volunteer and each of them provides its own professional and personal rewards. Volunteering for SAA committees is one way to meet other professionals, get a better sense of what the archaeological community is up to, and accomplish something for the profession. All the volunteer opportunities are team efforts that require diverse skills and perspectives.

For example, the SAA Committee on Curriculum, which I currently chair, is not a one-person operation, but a rotating group of 10 professionals, consulting with one another and collaborating on segments of the task at hand. Currently we are working to establish a Curriculum Resources Pages that will provide both syllabi for a wide range of courses and innovative class exercises all ready to go for that busy day (See http://www.saa.org/AbouttheSociety/EducationandOutreach/CommitteeResources/tabid/1523/Default.aspx and the article by McCurdy and Golbin in this issue for more information). Previously, the committee did a project surveying syllabi that culminated in a series of articles on the Principles for Teaching Archaeology in the Twenty-First Century written by Curriculum Committee members that were published in The SAA Archaeological Record. (See http://www.saa.org/AbouttheSociety/EducationandOutreach/Principles/tabid/1524/Default.aspx for a complete listing and links to the articles.) In addition, the committee usually sponsors some type of themed symposium. Last year’s, organized by Ben Carter, and this year’s, headed by Justin Williams, both focused on sharing effective and tested class exercises.

Much of the work of the SAA is done by volunteers working in a wide range of committees and task forces. For a long time the workings of the SAA were a mystery to me. I paid my dues, went to the annual meeting, gave a paper, ate, saw friends, ate, exchanged gossip, ate (perhaps you are seeing a theme here, sadly occasioned by a paucity of interesting restaurants in the small town where I live). Somehow, for a long time I was convinced that I had little to offer the SAA. While I was very active and politically involved at my home institution, Grinnell College, and while I did things like review articles and serve on grant panels, I believed that it was only more important and well-connected individuals who were active in the SAA at the national level. Why would the SAA be willing to let someone like me, a relatively unknown individual teaching in a small liberal arts school participate?

It was only after I was asked to run for the SAA Board and by some miracle was elected that I actually become involved in the society. What a mistake! My advice is to start volunteering for the SAA and for other archaeological organizations early in your career. This is good career advice for networking and is also lots of fun. In the fall when the call for volunteers comes out be sure to answer it. If you are not picked the first time for the committee you desire, don’t be discouraged. It may actually be a good thing—too many qualified volunteers. Just re-apply next year. This is especially true for students whose perspectives are important to the long-term growth and development of the SAA, and most committees have spots especially reserved for students.
All of us who teach archaeology have faced similar quandaries, regardless of whether we are new instructors or seasoned professors. How can my students be actively engaged in course content? How do I know whether an activity will work well in class? How much time does it take? How much material can I cover in a course, and how should it be paced? What resources are there for my classes? What has worked well for others who teach this course?

A large part of what archaeologists do is teach, and in recognition of one of our major occupations, the SAA has convened for many years a Committee on Curriculum (CC). The committee is charged with “implementing the principles outlined in Teaching Archaeology in the Twenty-First Century [see SAA Bulletin 17(1)] and making recommendations as to how identified needs might be included in undergraduate and graduate curricula in archaeology.” The committee is composed of a chair and at least 10 members who are drawn from various sectors of the Society, at least two of whom are students.

Given the goals of the CC, the committee developed the Curriculum Resource Page as a centralized place to share activities and syllabi that have proved useful in higher education classrooms. One of the primary motivations for the creation of this pedagogical source relates to the old adage about “reinventing the wheel.” There are innumerable fantastic activities and well-structured syllabi already developed by archaeologists. Open access to such materials is of great benefit to all of us who teach archaeology in various capacities. Sharing these resources through the online archive not only will lessen the load of fellow professors, but will also provide inspiration for incorporating active teaching techniques in many classrooms and in different modes of instruction, whether courses are taught face-to-face, as hybrid, or entirely online. We also envision this archive as particularly useful for new instructors, some of whom may be graduate students; newly hired tenure-track professors; adjuncts who may not have as wide a network to draw upon as full-time faculty; and veterans of teaching who want to try something new. Of great importance is that the CC members encourage archaeologists to use these resources as a way to stimulate active participation and engagement in their classrooms, workshops, demonstrations, or talks with various sectors of the public. Archaeology is an active subdiscipline of anthropology. It seems appropriate that the dissemination of archaeological knowledge should be active and invigorating as well.

The members of the CC collaborated to realize this online resource. Dr. Kathryn Kamp, the committee chair, and Dr. Larkin Hood spearheaded the effort to organize materials and submission information. They worked with the SAA website manager to publish the webpage; in particular, Cheng Zhang was instrumental in setting up the site. Several committee members submitted activities and syllabi to test our submission system and provided the first set of excellent and engaging activities that we want to share with the community of archaeological educators. Currently, the activities are divided into two categories: (1) Archaeological Methods and Concepts; and (2) Archaeological Stewardship. Additional categories will be created as more submissions warrant further categorization. Syllabi are organized by topic.

How to Contribute
To submit an activity or syllabus, first access the main SAA website (http://www.saa.org/) and click on “Post-Secondary” under the heading of “EDUCATORS” in the right-hand menu box. This page contains links to download the submission forms for activities and syllabi (Figure 1). Use the QR code (Figure 2) provided here to access directly or the URL provided at the end of the article. We ask you to provide details regarding the intention, objectives, and general nature of the activity or syllabus. Additional details include ideal class size and course level. For activity submissions, it is essential to include instructions from which another educator can effectively conduct the exercise and to describe any additional materials that may be required. To complete the submission form, include the activity or syllabus document in a single PDF. For copyright purposes, it is also necessary that you sign each submission form you send to us.
Examples of Materials

Below, we highlight a variety of activities and syllabi submitted by committee members and other initial contributors to provide you with examples of materials on this website. All of the activities and syllabi described below are available for download now and ready to be used in your courses this semester.

Exercises and Activities

The following activities are included in the Archaeological Methods and Concepts category.

**Atlatl Experimental Archaeology**

*Submitted by Leah McCurdy (University of Texas at San Antonio)*

This activity allows students to practice experimental archaeology, derive a dataset, and apply data visualization and interpretation. Students perform trials of atlatl throwing outside on a prepared field with measured sidelines and record each trial on a worksheet. This information is compiled and used to practice graph-making and quantitative interpretation in a subsequent class. This activity requires atlatls, measuring tapes, and an area in which to conduct the throwing trials. IRB approval may be required by your institution.

**Hunter-Gatherer Settlers Game**

*Submitted by Justin Patrick Williams (Washington State University)*

This modified *Settlers of Catan* board game allows students to experience several mobility styles as a way to better understand hunter-gatherers. Students simulate a logistical mobility pattern and discuss the distinctiveness of a residential style. They also explore storage and its alternatives. This activity requires the *Settlers of Catan* board game, which can be purchased at many major retailers. The activity document on the website provides detailed instructions on how to modify the game and how to manage student groups. This activity is ideal for classes of approximately 30 students or fewer.

**Store Typology**

*Submitted by Leah McCurdy (University of Texas at San Antonio)*

This activity is an individual assignment completed outside of class. Students visit a local store and choose a set of "finds" as iterations of an object category (e.g., different types of plates found at home stores; some students get creative, choosing piñatas or greeting cards). Students describe their finds in detail and then create a typology. The students reflect on which feature of their finds was most important as they created their typology and describe how this organization relates to archaeological artifact analysis. Students take a photograph of themselves with their finds as proof that they conducted the assignment in person (Figure 3).

**The Resource Game**

*Submitted by Crystal Dozier (Texas A&M University)*

Start collecting your spare pennies to use in this engaging game! Students simulate resource movement, sharing, private property development, as well as in-group/out-group formation and competition within the contexts of Foraging groups, Agriculture Independent Families, and Agriculture In-Groups. The activity document provides details about the set-up and rules of the game, including the need for at least seven pennies per student, as well as follow-up discussion questions. An accompanying handout and PowerPoint slides are also included.

The following activities are included in the Archaeological Stewardship category.

**Archaeology in Your Own Backyard**

*Submitted by Nan Golin (Bellevue College)*

Many students are familiar with famous archaeological sites throughout the world and often show up on the first day of class.
asking about the Great Pyramids in Giza, for example. This exercise invites students to learn about the sites and remains that exist where they live. Through research and writing, students explore the archaeological record in their own backyard in connection with International Archaeology Day. Students are required to consult academic sources and provide citations for their research. This activity can be assigned for online as well as in-person courses and involve any number of students.

Stakeholder Meeting Simulation
Submitted by Kelly L. Jenks (New Mexico State University)
The activity involves a hypothetical scenario in which multiple stakeholders are asked to weigh in on a proposal to allow hydraulic fracturing in an area rich with cultural resources. Extensive details regarding the meeting topic are provided. Students are assigned the roles of distinct stakeholders and given time to research their roles before contributing to the meeting. The exercise was designed to complement the “public archaeology” component of an introductory archaeology class with 24 students. It can be easily modified to suit more advanced courses and to emphasize specific themes. The meetings can take place over several days to accommodate classes with more students.

World Heritage in Danger
Submitted by Nan Goulin (Bellevue College)
One of the primary principles of archaeological ethics recognizes that the archaeological record is a non-renewable resource that is under threat from many different sources and that we are responsible for its protection. This exercise helps students raise awareness of the urgency of protecting the past and highlights the need to approach sites from a sustainable viewpoint. Students research and discuss a threatened site from the UNESCO World Heritage list (see Figure 4). In smaller class sizes, students can be assigned to each endangered site, and in large classes, students can choose a site of interest.

Syllabi

Introduction to Archaeology
Submitted by Leah McCurdy (University of Texas at San Antonio)
This syllabus offers a broad and experiential introduction to the field. This course focuses on participation in hands-on activities (sponsored by an on-campus archaeological lab facility) including field-based survey, mock surface collection, mock excavation, and experiments, as well as lab-based artifact and bone analysis. Students also develop their own research projects centered on an aspect of local heritage. In lieu of exams, this course involves seminar assessments, or full class discussions concerning a research article. Students’ seminar preparation, contributions, and participation are graded via detailed rubrics. This syllabus also includes quantitative literacy components, as part of a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP).

Great Discoveries in World Archaeology
Submitted by Nan Goulin (Bellevue College)
This syllabus is for an introductory course in world prehistory that highlights well-known archaeological sites (inspired by a course by Patricia McAnany). There are many standard textbooks on the subject, and the course can be organized in a variety of ways. In this particular case, prehistory is covered chronologically and then geographically, from the Upper Paleolithic through later civilizations in the Old World and then the New World. Critical cultural transformations, such as the agricultural revolution, are an inherent part of course content. Weekly discussions and frequent quizzes keep students on track for learning materials.
Archeology of Conflict and Violence
Submitted by Susan Alt (Indiana University)
This upper-level course is a seminar on the topic of violence. The syllabus alerts students to come to class prepared to discuss readings on a sensitive topic. The nature of violence and its role in human evolution are approached from an anthropological perspective. Students are required to write weekly essays, complete assignments, and take a mid-term and final exam. Numerous readings are listed to provide us with explicit materials pertaining to this subject.

Childhood and Archaeology
Submitted by Kathryn Kamp (Grinnell College)
This syllabus is designed for an engaging upper-level undergraduate course on the special topic of childhood studies. Course requirements include preparing for and participating in discussions, data collection activities (including cross-cultural study, product reviews of child-raising guides, toys, other childhood items, as well as parent interviews), and an independent research project based on one of the initial data collection activities. The syllabus includes a detailed session and reading schedule concerning socialization, childhood stages, material culture of childhood, parenting, place studies, and approaches to the meaning of children.

Experimental Archaeology and Ethnoarchaeology
Submitted by Kathryn Kamp and John Whittaker (Grinnell College)
This syllabus outlines an upper-level undergraduate seminar course that focuses on the foundations of ethnoarchaeology and experimental archaeology, as well as independent student experience in designing and implementing an experimental project. In the reading-focused first half of the course, students analyze and present articles, covering topics such as middle-range theory, artifact studies, social organization, and formation processes. In the second half, students prepare, conduct, and present their independent projects. The syllabus document contains a detailed schedule with readings and project instructions, as well as sessions for conferences between each student and the instructor.

Practicum in Anthropology: Professionalism Seminar
Submitted by Payson Sheets (University of Colorado, Boulder)
This course is designed for graduate students in anthropology who either are submitting grant proposals for their dissertation research or are writing journal articles for publication. Weekly meetings keep students on track, providing feedback from peers and the professor alike. The culmination of the course is the completion of a grant proposal or manuscript for journal submission.

Call for Submissions (or How You Can Join the Fun!)
We hope this short introduction to the CC website has encouraged you to check out this resource and contribute to it. We anticipate that many educators will benefit from its existence, but its success depends on you! By contributing syllabi and activities to the website, each of us contributes positively to a learning network. The website is, by definition, a work in progress, as it evolves with subsequent additions of materials. It takes a minimum of time and effort to contribute to a resource that is for the good of our subdiscipline. Many of us are fortunate to have resourceful colleagues from whom we gain creative ideas. But there are many archaeologists who work in isolation at various institutions around the world. This website provides tested materials for the lone archaeologist. Further, for those who need to refresh their courses, this resource provides innovative ways to do so. We very much look forward to receiving your materials and enhancing the classroom experience for innumerable students!

We encourage you to visit the webpage using the URL or QR code: http://www.saa.org/AbouttheSociety/EducationandOutreach/CurriculumCommitteeResources/tabid/1523/Default.aspx

Acknowledgments. We would like to thank Dr. Kathryn Kamp for her excellent feedback on this article and for her support of curriculum matters. Many of the committee members and others contributed materials in a timely fashion. We acknowledge each contributor alongside their activity or syllabus above. Thank you to all current and future contributors. Special thanks to Patty Civilleri for her photo of Chan Chan, Peru, and Justin Patrick Williams for creating the QR code.
INTRODUCTION TO ARCHAEOLOGY
A HANDS-ON AND AUTHENTIC HIGH SCHOOL ELECTIVE COURSE

Danielle R. Raad

Danielle R. Raad (raad@mit.edu) is a science teacher at Arlington High School, Arlington, Massachusetts, and Research Affiliate at the Center for Materials Research in Archaeology and Ethnology (CMRAE), Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

This school year I began a new elective course called Introduction to Archaeology at Arlington High School, the public Massachusetts secondary school where I teach. Junior and senior students interested in learning more about archaeology can sign up for limited spots in this semester-long elective course offered out of the Science Department. This allows for a focus on archaeological materials, artifact analysis, and field techniques—different than would have been the case had the course been offered out of the History and Social Sciences Department.

My pedagogy emphasizes project-based, cooperative learning and disciplinary literacy. We don’t sit around and talk about what archaeologists do; nor do we discuss major discoveries in the history of archaeology. Rather, my high school students conduct their own small-scale archaeological excavation on school grounds, analyze and publish their results, and engage in high-level research and discussions. For example, they are not tested on the concept of stratigraphy, but instead have to document and describe stratigraphic layers in their research, making conclusions about uncovered artifacts based on the layer in which they were found.

Here I describe my experiences with the first cohort of students in the course, in order to provide a model through which other secondary educators may implement such an immersive and non-traditional archaeology elective course.

Authentic Excavation Experience
The primary focus of the course is the hands-on experience that students have: getting dirty by going outside, excavating on the front lawn of the high school, and managing their own archaeological project. I was grateful to have been awarded an Innovations in Education Grant by the Arlington Education Foundation to start up the course, and thereby was able to purchase enough excavation supplies for the entire class of 25 students. The project resonated with donors in the town, who have been eager to hear the results of our excavation. Fostering connections with the community not only has led to a source of funding, but also has sparked within the town an interest in the archaeological work of the students. I recommend looking for grant opportunities offered by local organizations interested in supporting novel educational experiences.

We chose a location on school grounds where two buildings once stood in the mid-twentieth century. This was a convenient area, just steps from the front entrance of the school and easily accessible in the middle of the school day, with a high likelihood of being an abundant source of material culture. Students worked in teams, excavating together and then publishing their results as a group. The class was divided into five groups of five students each, and each group worked in their own test pit. The groups chose where they wanted to dig, avoiding proximity to sprinkler heads, pedestrian paths, and trees. (This also proved to them that I hadn’t planted any artifacts!) Students worked with the same groups for the entire quarter, coming up with a team name and growing close in their collaboration.

Students learned and practiced proper archaeological protocol. Each day involved a mini-lesson on topics such as how to use a trowel or plumb bob and what information to record for each found artifact. They measured out a 1 x 1-m square using chaining pins and construction line and broke ground with shovels. Once the grass was removed, they transitioned to using trowels and dust pans to slowly move through the dirt. When an object was found, it was drawn in location, and its depth was measured and recorded using a plumb bob. All information was recorded in students’ lab notebooks as well as on the plastic bag the object was put in. At the end of each class period, students cleaned up all of their materials and brought them back inside. We went outside during every day that we could, up to four 50-minute periods and one 80-minute period per week, until the first snow in November prompted us to backfill.

Some students in each group acted as specialists, reflecting roles along lines of expertise represented in full-scale archaeological excavations. For example, each group had a Mapper, who drew a
to-scale bird’s eye view map of our archaeological site, detailing the locations of the five test pits. Another student in each group was the Stratigrapher. These students participated in mini-lessons with me on how to document different soil layers according to color, grain size, and angularity. They also conferred among themselves, attempting to match up layers in different pits and to identify unique lenses. The Stratigraphers then went back and shared their findings with the rest of their team. This intra- and inter-group communication was complemented by whole-class instruction and activities on stratigraphy and the law of superposition back in the classroom on rainy days.

This excavation was true project-based learning in a cooperative group setting. Much of the learning occurred informally, as I would circulate among the groups, help them out, and talk to them about what they were discovering. At least once a week, I would sit down with each group and have a “group meeting,” where each student shared how they were feeling about the excavation, what was going well, what wasn’t, and what they needed from the group. Overall, in the first season of excavations, my students found and documented 260 artifacts, including plastics, brick, shards of glass, corroded metal, and ceramic sherds. Our favorite finds include a butchered cow tibia, sherds of ceramics with glazed designs, and rusted nails (Figure 1). All artifacts have been carefully organized and labeled by students, and while the majority are in storage at the school, some artifacts will continue to be used as teaching tools and others will form a little exhibit in a display case in the science hallway.

I hope to eventually move off-site and apply for a state permit to excavate a location of Colonial, and perhaps Revolutionary, War significance. If successful, future archaeology students would have the potential to uncover, interpret, and display artifacts from Arlington’s Colonial and Native American history. If this becomes possible, the publication of our findings will become even more essential.
Field Report Publication

The hard work of my students during the excavation culminated in the publication of research reports. Each group was responsible for collaborating together and producing one field report in the format of a journal article, which documented their original research. The production of these field reports represents a disciplinary literacy approach to the study of archaeology at the high school level. Students are not just reading and writing about the subject; they are actually doing archaeology and being archaeologists by following all of the steps in the research process: identifying driving questions and a site, excavating, analyzing results, and publishing.

The process of writing the field reports was an authentic endeavor that involved thinking deeply about the artifacts we uncovered and collaborating with peers to produce, for many students, the longest piece of written work in their high school careers. We examined actual field reports from the Journal of Field Archaeology, analyzing their structure, tone, syntax, and diction. Students modeled their own report on these articles, coming up with titles such as, “Excavations at Arlington High School: Preliminary Report on Fall 2015 Investigations.”

Each of the five students was in charge of learning the conventions of and composing a different section of the report. This division of labor put responsibility on individual students by holding them accountable for a specific aspect of the group product. They also had to write an abstract and acknowledgments section, and each student edited the work of the others in the group. All figures and tables had to be numbered, captioned, and referenced appropriately in the text. These class periods were vibrant and productive work sessions, with students sitting around a lab bench, each on a laptop with the same shared Google Doc open, and with bags of artifacts scattered around.

My students were held to a high standard, almost at the level of a real peer-reviewed journal, and they learned about archaeology by genuinely doing archaeology at all levels while working on their analytical writing skills at the same time. Students were immensely proud of their field reports, and I combined all five articles into a 75-page bound volume, calling it The Journal of Amateur Field Archaeology, vol. 1, no. 1 (Figure 2). I even added a table of contents and a “Letter from the Editor.” Our school library now carries a copy of the journal on the newsstand for all to read! Students and staff alike pause to read portions of our journal in the library, and I also distributed a digital copy to parents. Future semesters of the Archaeology course will compose the next editions of The Journal of Amateur Field Archaeology, citing work from previous cohorts. This journal, completely composed of student work, is a vehicle for disseminating information to our school and town community about both local history and archaeological method. In the long term, I hope to combine the work of my students into a comprehensive publication to be submitted to a peer-reviewed journal.

Materials Analysts and Regional Specialists

The excavation and publication of the field report formed the core of the curriculum during the fall. In the winter months, we had class time devoted to the study of archaeological themes. As topics were largely driven by student interest, this part of the curriculum could look vastly different year by year. This past semester, the students in the course chose to study animal domestication, subsistence strategies, and urbanization.

During our unit on animal domestication, which students were particularly excited about, small groups became experts on the domestication of different animals. They read high-level research articles published on PLOS ONE, an online peer-reviewed journal article that is open access and therefore freely available for all students to access from school or home. I required them to choose some advanced articles to read and annotate, even if they became completely lost in the details of...
The curriculum of the course centered around the themes of archaeological materials and ancient cultures. I implemented a “Material of the Month” format. For example, September was Stone Month, and other months in the semester covered bone, pottery, metal, and glass. Each month, we learned about what kinds of objects we can make from each material, how these objects were made, and what they can tell us about the people who made them, emphasizing a materials science approach to archaeology. Where possible, I provided students with artifacts to touch and interact with. I was able to bring in some lithics, stone beads, and bone tools from the Neolithic site of el-Hemmeh in Jordan, where I have conducted my own graduate research. Students practiced careful observation, considering one single artifact for an entire class period, recording detailed observations, writing questions they had about the object and the culture from which it came, and attempting to make inferences.

Early in the year, students each chose one ancient culture in which they became experts over the course of the semester. I compiled a list of 50 cultures from around the world, representing all inhabited continents. Students composed fact sheets for two randomly assigned cultures, and then had an opportunity to peruse all of the fact sheets produced by the class and rank their top choices. In most cases, students were intrigued by the culture they started researching and chose to delve deeper and further explore relatively unfamiliar ancient cultures, such as the Zapotec, Lapita, Etruscans, and Harappa.

Students engaged in a semester-long research project, viewing the culture through the lens of their archaeological traces. As our study of archaeological materials and themes progressed, they wrote response papers on various aspects of the culture. For example, during Stone Month, students researched and composed a paper on the use of stone in their culture, focusing on either architecture, sculpture, tools, or personal ornamentation. During Pottery Month, students chose a ceramic object from an online museum collection. Based on research on the use of ceramics by the culture, they provided interpretations and inferences about their chosen ceramic object.

The cumulative final project for the course was a synthesis of everything they learned about their chosen culture, exhibiting the extent to which they had truly become regional specialists. Students edited their portfolio of written work, integrated it into one comprehensive research paper, and presented their findings to the rest of the class. The last component of these projects was a creative piece that had to demonstrate their understanding of one aspect of the culture. Some examples of projects included a three-dimensional model of a Mayan temple, a replica of an Egyptian necklace, a narrative piece about daily life from the perspective of a Khmer woman, and a drawing in the style of the Inca.

On two occasions, archaeology doctoral students from Harvard University, members of Harvard Archaeology Outreach, came into my classroom to lead workshops. During Bone Month, Max Price brought with him archaeological and modern bone specimens and talked to students about taphonomy and aging deer mandibles. During Pottery Month, Lexy Hartford and Kate Rose brought ceramic sherds from the American Southwest and engaged students in a sorting and seriation activity, concluding with a residue analysis case study from their own research. Archaeology students at local universities can be a great resource for teachers, once relationships are established. Graduate students may have access to archaeological materials and can be enthusiastic about sharing their work with younger students.

Nearby art or archaeological museums have a wealth of amazing exhibits and artifacts. A well-structured museum visit during which students must pick and consider only a handful of objects from the perspective of their material, production methods, and context can further the goals of an archaeology course.

I took my students to the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology at Harvard, where they drew, observed, posed questions on, and made inferences about two ceramic objects of their choosing. We also went to the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston, where we had the opportunity to talk to conservators and museum scientists working in their labs, and learned about restoration, conservation, scientific studies on museum artifacts, and possible career paths.

The Next Generation of Stewards

I have also asked students in the course to delve into relevant and complex issues in a unit on stewardship. I launched this unit by using a lesson plan entitled “To Dig or Not to Dig: The Copper Wells Controversy,” published in Archaeology and Public Education (SAA 1995). Through role-playing a town meeting, students tackled the complex issues surrounding a potential salvage archaeology project. Students began to see the myriad reasons why various people in a community would either support or reject an excavation. Guided by the essential question “who owns the past?” we watched the film Silent Witness: Protecting American Indian Archaeological Heritage (Lysne 1999), grappling
with the outcomes of the low-level but detrimental habit of picking up potsherds and arrowheads in North America, and discussed NAGPRA and the responsibility of museums to repatriate cultural items. We then transitioned to the outright destruction of archaeological heritage on a large scale. I began by putting a photograph released by ISIS of an explosion going off, blowing up the Temple of Baalshamin in Palmyra (BBC News 2015). I gave students no information about this photo, and instead facilitated students in coming up with open questions about the image. We spent the rest of the week reading and discussing news articles on ISIS demolishing a UNESCO World Heritage Site, the Taliban dismantling the Bamiyan Buddhas, and the widespread looting of graves in Egypt discovered by remote sensing, to name a few. Each small student group read and analyzed one article, crafting open questions to guide a discussion on the ethical issues raised by their article. During the next class, a jigsaw protocol was carried out where groups were reshuffled such that each new group had one student representing a different article. Students took turns summarizing their article, posing their guiding questions, and leading the new group in a lively discussion pertaining to stewardship.

Lastly, we considered the question “are museums ethical?” by analyzing the many ways museums obtain objects in their collections. I compiled photos and descriptions of a set of real objects in museum collections, including the Rosetta stone, a purchased Ottoman dish, an excavated Mayan ocarina, and the Etruscan Terracotta warrior exposed as a forgery at the Metropolitan Museum of Art. Based on the purposefully vague descriptions of how the objects ended up in the students’ hypothetical museums, they had to rank the eight objects along a spectrum from “belongs in my museum” to “doesn’t belong in my museum.” The rankings from the student groups ended up being dissimilar, and they had to argue for their placement. The activities and lessons in the stewardship unit challenged students to think critically and construct a set of ethical rules that not only archaeologists, but all responsible citizens, should abide by.

Archaeology and Secondary Education

It’s about time that the study of archaeology permeate secondary public education in its own right, not just as a unit in a sixth grade social studies class, with passing mention in high school, or through signing up for expensive summer field schools, valuable as those experiences can be. Archaeology is a multidisciplinary field drawing on and developing overarching skills, such as following the scientific method, engaging in research, written and verbal communication, critical thinking, and advocacy. The excavation, field report publication, and research projects that I’ve described have developed procedural skills rather than solely declarative knowledge. Through project-based and cooperative learning in an authentic and collaborative environment, where a project is undertaken and documents must be published as a team, students also refine constructive interpersonal skills.

I have taught only one academic year of Introduction to Archaeology, and I already have new ideas and plans to refine my curriculum even further. I hope that this is the beginning of a comprehensive authentic curriculum of archaeology at the secondary level, and I hope to inspire other educators to start similar programs. Student interest in archaeology is there, evidenced by the number of pre-registrations I had in my course and the amount of students we had to turn away, but the opportunities to engage with the field in a deep and authentic way have been missing. The huge response from students probably suggests that they have already been yearning for this kind of experience.

Archaeology actively synthesizes every one of the artificially discrete high school subjects into a comprehensive, interdisciplinary field. Secondary students need to be exposed to the variety of potential college majors and career paths outside of the traditional five-course model. Archaeology presents an opportunity for students to see their other courses in new ways and from different angles. Even if students do not pursue archaeology further, it’s important that they’ve considered their responsibilities as human beings to think critically, treat other cultures with respect, and advocate for the ethical preservation of the past.
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Students in introductory archaeology classes rarely encounter the types of materials science that are revolutionizing the field. With funding from an NSF Course, Curriculum, and Laboratory Improvement Grant (#736977), the University of Denver (DU) aimed to integrate authentic research into the natural and social science undergraduate curriculum through the use of a portable X-ray fluorescence (PXRF) instrument. Students in introductory archaeology courses have employed a PXRF to geosource archaeological obsidians from North America. This article overviews the four-year project, outlining its goals and results while highlighting issues of instrumentation, accuracy, and pedagogy.

Project Overview

The ability to analyze materials is a skill that cross-cuts disciplinary boundaries. This project brought together DU faculty from four different disciplines (Anthropology, Chemistry, Ecology, and Geography) to work together in integrating PXRF research projects into undergraduate courses. Its primary goal was to enhance the classroom learning environment of undergraduate students by involving them in authentic research. Projects were designed to strengthen a community of learners doing classroom-based research projects. PXRF would seem ideally suited for these goals by being both nondestructive and rapid. However, instrumentation issues must always be kept in mind so that student projects do not lose their analytical power.

With the NSF grant, DU purchased an InnovX, Alpha Series portable X-ray fluorescence spectrometer (PXRF). This instrument was chosen primarily for its light element package, needed for the planned uses in ecology courses. We also purchased a test stand, something that made it significantly easier for students to operate the instrument safely. The instrument came calibrated for use with soils, which worked fine for most of the courses using the instrument. However, the factory calibration was not accurate for obsidian, the primary material we hoped to analyze for archaeology courses. This became abundantly clear when results from the DU instrument were compared to those from the Thermo/ARL Quant'X EDXRF at the Geoarchaeology XRF Laboratory housed in the Department of Anthropology at the University of California, Berkeley. Seven powdered geological standards (RGM-1, W-2, GSP-2, NBS 278, BHVO-2, AGV-2, and STM-2) were used to calibrate the instrument for five of the primary elements used for accurate sourcing of most North American obsidians: Rb, Sr, Y, Zr, Nb. As with most portables, the Ba readings on our instrument were not reliable enough to use for sourcing, so that element was neither calibrated nor used for analysis.

Class Projects

The ambitious nature of the project became clear as the use of the PXRF was integrated into the introductory course, Fundamentals of Archaeology (Anth 1300). This class is often the only, or at least the first, archaeology course that students will take at our university. Thus, a key challenge was finding level-appropriate references on geosourcing and the physics behind X-ray fluorescence. Another was creating a laboratory and analysis protocol for PXRF study of obsidian that could be appropriately and consistently followed by students. Finally, data had to be compiled on the obsidian sources likely to be encountered by the students. (Examples of the assignments given to students, the lab protocol, and student reports are available at http://portfolio.du.edu/bclark.)

Identifying artifacts for the students to analyze was initially relatively easy. DU maintains a Museum of Anthropology (DUMA), which holds regional archaeological collections. Early in the first term when the obsidian project was to take place, DUMA was contacted by Chaz Evans, then an MA student from Colorado State University. Evans was interested in obtaining permission to geosource some DUMA obsidian artifacts from the Arkansas River basin in Colorado. So, rather than send these directly to an obsidian lab, the Anth 1300 students provided preliminary sourcing. This allowed students to make a direct contribution to the discipline. Evans joined the class as a guest lecturer, the students were assigned his MA proposal as course reading, and their final report was addressed to Evans as their...
client. Thus the project goal of having students do authentic research was reached with a real immediacy.

In the spring of 2010, the student research project was further refined. At the Society for American Archaeology meetings that year, I met with Dr. Arthur Joyce of the University of Colorado and Dr. Jeffrey Ferguson of the Archaeometry Lab and Research Reactor Center of the University of Missouri (MURR). Dr. Joyce is currently working in Oaxaca, Mexico, in the Rio Verde region. Dr. Joyce provided obsidian artifacts from his excavations for analysis and also served as a guest lecturer for the class. Dr. Ferguson shared samples and reactor data results of obsidian sources likely to have been used by prehistoric inhabitants of the region. Students in the Fall 2010 class analyzed new collections from the Rio Verde, derived from excavations just the summer before. Lithic technology in the region was the focus of this research by Dr. Joyce’s student David Williams, who served as a guest lecturer that term.

Due in part to concerns that students were having trouble sourcing the Rio Verde obsidians, students in the Fall 2011 term were once again given Colorado artifacts to source. These were primarily projectile points derived from a collection at a small community museum managed by the Pioneer Historical Society of Bent County. The artifacts had recently been typographically analyzed by Roche Lindsay, affiliated with the University of Colorado, Colorado Springs. Lindsay served as a guest lecturer for the course, providing background about regional trade patterns evident through his research on the projectile points, ceramics, and other trade goods.

Results

From the standpoint of pedagogy, the project has been largely successful. One of the goals for the use of the PXRF was to introduce more quantitative reasoning into archaeology coursework. Students primarily geosourced their materials using rare element chemistry (expressed in ppm), rather than using spectral data. This approach was chosen in part because of the desire to engage students in quantitative reasoning, but also because of critiques regarding the verifiability of sourcing using spectral data (Shackley 2010). To understand the PXRF results (and their inherent variability) students needed to grasp the concept of standard deviation. This is also a skill students should have when assessing radiocarbon dates. Thus, the discussion of statistics and sampling became more robust throughout the course, not just during the portion devoted to obsidian analysis.

Course evaluations suggest that some students struggled with the science behind the obsidian project (one called it “stressful”), but more often they identified the obsidian project as a highlight of the course. Independent assessment (through individual interviews and focus group discussions) supports the course evaluations. Students were excited about using innovative technology and doing real research. They were particularly pleased to be contributing to the work of real archaeologists or, in the case of the local museum, better understanding for the public. An article about the results of the Fall 2011 analysis, written by a student in the class, was published in the Pioneer Historical Society newsletter (Emrick 2012).

When viewed as an intervention in geosourcing obsidian, the project has had more mixed results. All of the artifacts analyzed by DU students during the grant period were sent to independent laboratories to assess sourcing validity. Artifacts from sites in Colorado were sent to the Geoarchaeology XRF lab (now in Albuquerque), and those from Oaxaca were sent to MURR. The student success rate was decidedly mixed. Of the 34 artifacts sourced over four courses, students were able to definitively correctly source 19 (56 percent). Another four artifacts (12 percent) either were sourced correctly by some of the groups (in the cases in which multiple lab groups analyzed the same samples) or were sourced to nearby, related sources (in the case of the Jemez Mountain sources). In six instances (18 percent), they were not able to identify any source, although the artifacts derived from sources for which they had data. Finally, there were five cases (15 percent) in which students identified an incorrect source. For a project with a primary goal of having students do “authentic research,” these results are decidedly less than optimal.

Statistical analysis was performed on the DU sourcing data to assess the most critical factors contributing to success or failure. For this analysis, all artifacts were coded by asking the question, “Were they correctly sourced?” Those correctly sourced were coded as Yes. Those that were sourced correctly by some groups or to an associated source in the same region were coded as Partial. Those either sourced absolutely incorrectly or wrongly sourced as coming from unknown sources were coded No.

Most studies of the effects of size and surface configuration on the quality of XRF data have been performed with benchtop instruments, and many suggest that size is a particularly important factor (e.g., Lundblad et. al 2008). The data for PXRF are mixed, with some studies indicating that accuracy with portable instruments is more negatively impacted by rough artifact surfaces (Liritzis and Zacharia 2011). However, at least one experiment suggests that the impact of artifact morphology can be quite minimal, although only if artifacts are matched to geological reference samples analyzed on the same instrument (Frahm 2012).

A statistical analysis of our success rate compared to overall artifact size, artifact type (our proxy for shape), and weight did not...
reveal any significant patterns in the data. Maximum artifact thickness did seem to have a stronger pattern than any other metric variable. The maximum thickness of correctly sourced artifacts was just over 5 mm, as compared to around 2 mm for incorrectly sourced and 2.7 mm for partially sourced artifacts (Figure 1). Although overall aerial size does not seem to matter, size relative to the PXRF window does (a finding similar to that suggested by Davis et. al 2011). Correctly and partially sourced artifacts averaged just over 90 percent window coverage, while incorrectly sourced artifacts averaged 65 percent coverage (Figure 2).

Overall, students were much more successful sourcing the artifacts from Colorado than those from Oaxaca. Although the thickness of the artifacts comes into play here (as many of the Oaxacan pieces were blades), a more important factor might be the quality of the reference data. Although we were able to create reference tables based on items from each of the common Oaxacan sources, we were not able to find published minimum and maximum ppm for those sources. Thus, the students were often comparing their samples to chemistry derived only from the source samples to which we had physical access, often just three samples. It is unlikely that this low number of samples could produce a rare element profile that captures the inherent variability within any obsidian flow (c.f. Shackley 2005).

This factor, the depth of the geosource sample pool, was statistically the most robust in predicting student success in correctly sourcing obsidian artifacts. As Figure 3 indicates, graphing results against source sample diversity produced a strong linear pattern. Those that were incorrectly sourced derived from sources where we had data from an average of only three source samples. Those that were partially correct derived from data from an average of 14 samples, while those that were correctly sourced derived from an average of 24.5 samples.

Conclusion

PXRF instrumentation has become even more accessible (both in terms of cost and the ease of calibration) since DU embarked on this project. Most institutions considering such a purchase primarily have faculty research in mind. However, the pedagogical promise of the PXRF should also be a consideration. Students can be engaged in the future of the field through PXRF studies if faculty are willing to do their homework. Some questions to ask before embarking on a student project in geosourcing obsidian: Do I have the resources to test my calibration? What artifacts do I have access to? Are they large enough to cover (or nearly cover) the analytical window? And most importantly, how rich are the data on potential sources? As our four-year study suggests, one of the most important criteria when making the decision to undertake such a project with undergraduate students is access to good quality data about the sources from which the artifacts are likely to derive.

Figure 1. Sourcing success, plotted by average artifact thickness. Graph by Katherine Mayo.

Figure 2. Sourcing success, plotted by coverage of instrument analytical window. Graph by Katherine Mayo.
Acknowledgments. This project would not have been possible without the guidance of Dr. M. Steven Shackley. Many of the artifacts correctly sourced by DU students derived from the Jemez Mountain sources, which Shackley analyzed (2005). I also send my students to his website to better understand both the science of XRF and the nature of obsidian (http://www.swxrf-lab.net/). The statistical analysis incorporated into this article was performed by Katherine Mayo, a recent graduate of the University of Denver.
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Com m unity service learning (CSL) is a model of teaching that explicitly links community service and field-based learning with classroom lessons and course objectives (Dewey 1963; Kolb 1984; Nassaney and Levine 2009; Taylor 2002). As a pedagogy, CSL has its advocates and its critics (Butin 2006; King 2004; Nassaney 2009). The proponents of CSL argue that the pedagogy enhances student experiences while also teaching civic responsibility and providing an explicit linkage between the classroom and communities (Cone and Harris 1996; Marullo and Edwards 2000; Pearson 1999:98). Critics claim that CSL is often poorly implemented and that, as a pedagogical tool, it is often biased towards practices emphasizing liberal political viewpoints (Butin 2006; King 2004). Despite these critiques, however, CSL has expanded rapidly in higher education settings over the past two decades (Butin 2006:473; see Nassaney and Levine 2009).

In this article, I describe my own experiences with CSL and why it matters to me. I believe that CSL is an important pedagogical tool for a holistic and civic-minded university education and that CSL projects can easily be integrated into archaeology, which by its very nature is engaged with descendant communities and local stakeholders (see Baugher 2007 and Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2008). In this article, I provide several specific examples of how I have used CSL in the classroom in the past and offer recommendations for archaeologists and other social scientists who want to incorporate CSL into their own research and teaching. I hope that my story of service learning will help others to learn more about the CSL pedagogical model and how to apply it in the classroom and in the field. The CSL model is valuable because it is an essential tool for teaching civic-mindedness and the importance of equality and fairness for all communities (see McKay and Rozee 2004). This is an important lesson if we are to teach our students how to be community organizers, educators, and professionals who respect the rights of all humans and if we, as college educators, are to have a hand in building a just and equitable future.

Philosophies of CSL

The philosophies of John Dewey (1963) and David Kolb (1984) suggest that all genuine knowledge comes from experience and that each element of any experience must be subjectively internalized, observed, and judged to form the basis on which knowledge is created (Taylor 2002:126). Proponents of CSL use Dewey’s philosophies of experience to suggest that knowledge should be triangulated between teacher, student, and community. Indeed, this is one of the fundamental tenets of CSL, that through action or ‘doing’—namely, working with community partners on projects that are mutually beneficial—students use classroom concepts to interpret their work with the community and thereby formulate their own understandings of the world in which they live.

In practice, educators who utilize CSL do so in a variety of courses, ranging from anthropology and sociology to a variety of STEM disciplines (Baugher 2007; Homsey et al 2012; McKay and Rozee 2004; Thacker 2009). CSL is not necessarily discipline-based, but, rather, a fundamental component of learning with an emphasis on communities in need as the center of inquiry (see Butin 2006:492). Any field or classroom can incorporate CSL into its course content, but this must be done strategically and with the needs of the community partner in mind. The most appropriate use of CSL is one in which both students and community partners benefit from the relationship, and that relationship is frequently reevaluated. As is the case with any other pedagogical method, a reappraisal of CSL goals and perspectives should be a necessary part of course design, especially to assess student performance, retention of knowledge, and service outcomes (Butin 2006; King 2004).

Reflection and reciprocity are two fundamental features of CSL. Reflection is the primary means by which students think deeply about work they have done in a course and one of the best ways for educators to evaluate student experiences (Reckner and Duke 2009). Reflection should be guided by questions (made
relevant by the teacher) that require students to think deeply about how they have added to knowledge and to communities (Taylor 2002:128). In my own experience, the most effective way to facilitate reflection is through a formal classroom group discussion and then a short reflection essay that requires students to follow a prompt but also gives them room to think deeply.

The reciprocity component of service learning requires meeting the needs and interests of the community the course is working with. In an ideal world, these forms of reciprocity not only will have pedagogical value, but also will add value to a community or its resources (see Marullo and Edwards 2000:747–748). Through these two pathways, it is possible for students and educators to collaboratively contribute to communities, create civic-minded citizens, and help transform universities into agents of social justice (Marullo and Edwards 2000).

Reflections on My Own Past
My journey into CSL began at an early age; I was raised in Charlotte, North Carolina, and my high school required volunteer work as a prerequisite for graduation. As a result, I became involved in various volunteer activities, from helping out in hospitals and soup kitchens to volunteering at libraries and local festivals. Volunteering taught me the value of reaching out in the community and offering my skills to communities in need. Volunteer work by itself, however, is not service learning. What is distinctive about service learning is the educational experience that students, community partners, and educators obtain through the collaboration (see Cone and Harris 1996). CSL as a philosophy is dialectic and embedded within the content of a course, with outcomes relevant to the pedagogical mission of the classroom, school, and community. CSL makes the purposes of community collaboration explicit (something that was never done for me in high school, when volunteerism was presented as nothing more than a graduation requirement). Consequently, and in the context of my own teaching, I define CSL as “teaching the relationship between classroom-based knowledge and community-based projects.”

Volunteerism brought me to CSL, and I consider myself fortunate for the experiences in my youth. As I developed my archaeological fieldwork in the Mississippi Delta, a roughly triangular piece of floodplain between Vicksburg, Mississippi, and Memphis, Tennessee, it became apparent to me that I had more to offer the region than archaeology, and that the region had much more to offer to me as well (see Kronick et al. 2012:23). Poverty and insufficient educational opportunities characterize this agrarian landscape, and after spending several summers working at archaeological sites in the Delta, I wanted to contribute more to the local community than simply spending money at the local grocery stores and bars. Lacking a framework for how to serve others, I reached out to Tulane University’s Center for Public Service (CPS). Through a semester-long seminar at CPS, I was able to establish relationships with two different community partners for two different courses. Having access to a center like Tulane’s CPS made designing and integrating CSL into my courses a much simpler process. The center lends logistical support inside and outside of the classroom and provides an easier way to institutionalize the service elements of my course. Both I and my students are fortunate in this regard because, without the help of CPS, organizing these kinds of service courses would be quite difficult, and they would likely be far less common at Tulane.

Woodlands
At Tulane, I teach Introduction to Environmental Studies with a primarily Louisiana-focused pedagogy. I teach about the development of the modern Mississippi River levee system, anthropogenic forcing of coastal subsidence, sea level rise, and the erosion and loss of Louisiana’s fertile coastal marshes. In the context of this course, I decided that my students should participate in some kind of service project that connects them to the landscapes they study. Tulane mostly recruits from other parts of the country and, in general, the majority of my students are not from coastal Louisiana. One day while driving to school, I heard the director of the Woodlands Conservancy, a non-profit organization, on the local NPR affiliate station. Her radio address was directly aimed at soliciting volunteers to help with research and conservation efforts, including bird banding, forest inventory, and invasive species mitigation. The property they manage is the last stand of bottomland hardwood forest between New Orleans and the Gulf of Mexico. Thanks to sea-level rise, coastal subsidence, and marshland erosion, the gulf is getting ever closer to the city, and the last bit of protection New Orleans has is protected by the Woodlands Conservancy. I called the director later that day and, after a few coffees and conversations, I found myself with a community partner. What was missing was the service. I found myself asking, “What exactly could we as a class provide for her and the Woodlands?”

Luckily, another team of scholars had already initiated a CSL project at the Woodlands, and I was able to join up with them. Sean Anderson and his students at California State University Channel Islands, John Lambrinos from Oregon State, and Tom Huggins at the University of California Los Angeles, all part of an ecological survey team, had started a tree inventory and invasive species documentation project at the Woodlands. Much like archaeological survey, tree and invasive species survey entails walking transects through the woods—albeit while looking up at trees, instead of looking down at the ground and digging shovel tests. As part of the pedagogical structure of the service project, I paired my students with the students from California
and Oregon, who were all older and dedicated environmental science majors. Although all the students received instruction from the “professors” during the service days, the most important instruction and guidance came from older students interacting with my freshmen and sophomores. In this way, all of the students were instrumental in building and adding to their own knowledge base, with experience and interaction being the guiding principles here (Cone and Harris 1996). In guided reflection and discussion, many of my students noted that they enjoyed interacting with passionate and motivated senior-level students and that they would like to be as passionate about something one day.

Conducting ecological survey is not necessarily a part of my academic wheelhouse (although I am catching on). Consequently, developing relationships with collaborators and scientists who are skilled at such work was absolutely necessary. Perhaps this is an obvious point, but developing relationships with community partners with whom you can be comfortable is fairly important. As such, they can also become your friends, and my relationship with Sean, Tom, and John, as well as the director of the Woodlands, has been incredibly enjoyable and rewarding. In addition, our work will help to preserve a forest that is instrumental to the long-term health and resilience of New Orleans. Our work will have an impact for generations, and my students will always be able to look back on the contributions they made.

**Carson**

Carson is located in the north Mississippi Delta, a place characterized by extreme poverty and a lack of access to good education. Some might dispute that final point, and certainly there are many dedicated individuals struggling to provide a good education for the citizens of Mississippi. Nevertheless, these opportunities are hard to find and not available to everyone. I have struggled with how I feel about working in a place without giving back in some way, shape, or form. I recognize my position of privilege. I cannot do anything about that, but I continue to bring students to the field every summer and we march forward with our service learning and collaborations.

The road to collaboration and service is complex and not often without ambivalence and mixed feelings (King 2004). I can’t say it is easy, but it is rewarding. After making the decision to work with community members in Clarksdale, the challenge was to find someone with whom to collaborate. Much like my experience finding a community partner for my environmental studies class, finding a community partner for the Tulane archaeological field school was also a serendipitous process. We work with the Griot Youth Program, which is a non-profit dedicated to providing after-school programming and arts education to underprivileged youth. However, unlike the work we do at the Woodlands, our service partnership at Carson and in Clarksdale with the Griot Youth Program is inchoate and amorphous, consisting of activities that tack back and forth between fieldwork, arts education, and supporting their efforts to provide an adequate education to the underserved youth of the Delta. While our work does serve a community need, in many ways, it is not directly relevant to archaeology. At Woodlands, our work is directly relevant to the content of the course, but at Carson and during the field school, we collaborate in activities that are not necessarily archaeological but that still directly benefit local stakeholders. Establishing the proper service relationship is difficult, especially considering the specialized nature of an archaeological field program (however, see Nassaney and Levine 2009).

In seeking a community partner, I wanted to assist in any arena I could and, although our work with the Griot Youth Program is not directly related to archaeology, I believe it is valuable for my students to engage in this kind of service learning. The experience of volunteering is itself important, and it expands their knowledge of and familiarity with other people and places. Students from the Griot Youth Program came to Carson to participate in a collaborative field day, during which my students worked with them in various excavation contexts to teach them about the archaeological heritage of the site and region. While it was important for Griot Youth students to learn a little archaeology and for my students to learn how to talk about archaeology, the bigger idea here was just to get two completely different sets of individuals interacting and working together on a shared goal. The collaborative field day was a moderate success, and I plan to rethink how to do this in the future. Frankly, it is difficult to get high school students who know very little about native prehistory to enjoy and engage in excavations on a 100-degree day. Some of the Griot kids had a great time, and I think it was a good first venture into this kind of service work. In the end, I think many of my students enjoyed the experience and developed the interest and motivation to become civic participants in the Mississippi Delta community (see Marullo and Edwards 2000:754 for a discussion on social justice and service learning).

Later in the summer, we helped the Griot students with their academic programming: we attended their summer talent concert and helped with a day camp focused on arts education and the construction of garden boxes. In addition to teaching the arts, Griot also teaches sustainable farming and permaculture techniques. In the summer of 2014, we helped to build these garden boxes, and the Griot program has used them for a variety of projects since then. While some of my students participated in building boxes, others helped with an arts camp for younger, middle school-aged children. Activities included painting, dancing, and arts instruction. While none of these activities were necessarily archaeological, I know that my students and I enjoyed the experience of working in and with our adopted community.
One of the best outcomes of this service work was a benefit concert organized a few months later by one of my students, Jackson Hardy, a musician and liberal arts major at Tulane. Motivated by his own interest in the service experience and the arts education component of Griot, Jackson came to me a few months after the field school wanting to organize a fundraiser for the program. I could not have been prouder! Jackson and I worked together for several months on organizing a fundraising event, although the event was mostly his responsibility. About six months after he came to me with the initial idea, we hosted a benefit concert in New Orleans, with four live bands, a comedian, and some performances by the Griot Youth Program blues band. This was one outcome that I never could have predicted, and it resulted in our successfully raising a large sum of money to support Griot Youth programming. The learning that is encapsulated within CSL is meant to engage students and force them to think about how they can use their education and resources to help others in the community (Cone and Harris 1996; Maurillo and Edwards 2000). In this sense, I can definitely say that the CSL component of my archaeological field school was a success, and I plan to continue to use CSL for a long time to come.

Conclusion
Clarksdale is my community, and New Orleans is my community. As an archaeologist and researcher, I live and work within local communities, with local people, and with local stakeholders (individuals who have a vested interest in their landscape). While we can begin to feel woven into these communities over time, service learning makes this exchange purposeful and explicit (see Baugher 2007; Nassaney 2009). Service learning also makes students responsible agents in their own learning and in developing their own engaged learning experiences, following a model first conceptualized by John Dewey and David Kolb (Cone and Harris 1996; Dewey 1963; Kolb 1984). These benefits are significant, and I think that service learning does a lot to create civic-minded students who understand the responsibilities of their education (Maurillo and Edwards 2000).

My specific advice to those interested in CSL is that they should reach out to communities in and around where they work and look to non-profits, afterschool groups, project incubators, and university organizations for guidance. While there is no programmatic pathway to CSL, there are a significant number of individuals and groups out there who can help scholars to identify communities in need. After identifying a community, find out what they need and reflect on how you and your students, as individuals and as a class, can provide a service and make a difference. This can involve doing manual labor, disseminating knowledge, offering technical support, or providing educational opportunities. CSL does not set limits on what activities can be undertaken, but rather provides a framework for innovation and collaboration outside of the classroom. Finally, my best advice is not to be shy or daunted by reaching out to an unknown group of people. The worst they can say is that they are uninterested, and the potential rewards for both students and communities far exceed any of the early logistical difficulties.

By incorporating work with communities in need into my courses, I am teaching my students that they have the ability and potential to contribute to people and communities that may need their help. Through our work at Woodlands and our collaborations with the Griot Youth Program, we study the environment and archaeology, while engaging in CSL through a variety of activities. These activities have made my students active in their own learning by encouraging them to become researchers and teachers themselves. They see problems and issues in a community and, in the context of the course and through their own creativity (and my guidance), they develop and enact solutions. I hope that, through this experience, they end up choosing careers that will allow them to make a difference in the lives of others and to become individuals who value the rights of all people, regardless of their status or wealth. I believe in using knowledge to help people and communities, and I think CSL is the right pedagogical model to train students to become educators, activists, innovators, and involved members of their community. I want my students to value social justice, equality, and fairness, and I look to CSL to realize this ideal.
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How do archaeologists—people who, after all, get Ph.D.s for digging holes in the ground—use the media to reach the public? In 2013, I received an email offering an opportunity to do just that, but not involving traditional (TV and film) broadcast media. As the March 2015 issue (volume 15, number 2) of The SAA Archaeological Record emphasized, traditional media will always be important. But this email suggested an alternative: presenting a TEDx talk (one of the local versions of the better known international TED organization). This would allow me to access “platform-agnostic media distribution” (as it is sometimes called), a rapidly developing substitute for traditional media outlets. The call came at a good time. I had recently published a book directed at a wider readership than the profession alone (Whitley 2009). I was seriously contemplating the larger relevance of my archaeological research. And I wanted to more widely promote the existential (rather than purely research) messages of my book. This was a chance to put some of my developing ideas into motion.

Equally important, I learned some key lessons about communicating with non-archaeologists, regardless of the media involved. I learned these lessons in part because I was assigned a professional coach and reading material and I completed practice rehearsals, all of which occurred despite protests that I’d been lecturing for over three decades and would need no such help. Humbling lesson #1: academics are often poor public speakers because we assume that all public presentations are like academic lectures. Traditional lectures are efficient ways to broadcast information to other academics; they are poor ways to inform the public. If we want to effectively broadcast our messages, we have to accommodate our audience’s informational interests, needs, and capabilities, not maximize our own efficiency.

There was obviously more for me to learn about reaching the public. In the hopes of aiding our communication with non-archaeologists and effectively using alternative media platforms, here are some of the lessons that I learned.

Keep It Short
My TEDx talk (Whitley 2013) was filmed for eventual YouTube distribution. I quickly learned that on YouTube we are competing for the public’s attention; their attention span is very short; they are more likely to gamble on watching a short rather than long video; and our competition is immense. I was asked to speak for 10 minutes or less. How do you summarize a book and follow-up research paper in 10 minutes? Trust me here: it is not easy. I negotiated my time slot up to 12 minutes. And then I wrote and repeatedly rewrote my presentation until I reached that mark. It took two weeks but, during that process, it forced me to hone the clarity of my presentation. Learning to do that is valuable in any context, and the required brevity ultimately improved my talk.

Tell a Story
A number of archaeologists have (for good reason) emphasized the importance of storytelling in communicating our messages (e.g., Pluciennik 1999; Praetzellis 2014), and storytelling is a keystone of the TED approach. People relate to the characters involved; they empathize with the emotions expressed; and they participate vicariously in the adventure. Perhaps most importantly, they remember stories much better than facts and figures. My archaeological generation (at least) will never forget Kent Flannery’s The Early Mesoamerican Village (1976). And not because of the research it highlighted (as important as that was), but because of the fictional narrative of the Real Mesoamerican Archaeologist, the Skeptical Graduate Student, and the Great Synthesizer, which was woven around the research chapters.

Not all of us have Flannery’s narrative talents, of course. But we can all express our research in storytelling form and, I wager, this will improve with practice. Here’s a way to start: think of yourself not as a witness to or observer of research or scientific information, but as a participant in its discovery. Then you will be telling a story rather than describing an intellectual process.
Practice, Practice, and Then Practice Some More

The shorter the presentation, the more time required to prepare: every word matters in a short talk, and it takes time to perfect a flawless delivery. Remember as well that a talk is a performance: your performance, not a PowerPoint presentation. While a picture may be worth a thousand words in some contexts, the extra thousand words provided by the slide may be detrimental when brevity is the goal. And as useful as PowerPoint presentations can be, they are more commonly a crutch, masking poor delivery and disorganization. Use them and other illustrative aids judiciously, if at all. Practice your delivery instead.

Presentation Style Matters

I like to tell jokes. I start most of my talks with a few, which jointly serves to warm up my voice and (hopefully) the audience. TED talks, in contrast, follow a particular presentation style. This style omits an introductory salutation, including opening jokes, so that the audience can focus on the ideas rather than the speaker. It provides no lectern. It involves no use of notes. It minimizes bodily movement, like walking up and down a stage. But it is very well-suited for video recording and viewing.

I am uncertain whether the almost-choreographed TED presentation style is the most effective or not (I like to tell jokes; I like speakers that tell jokes). But it forces the speaker to get to the point quickly, while minimizing distractions. And whether or not you adopt all the specific details of the TED presentation style, it provides a good starting model. Watch some TED talks on the Internet, paying attention less to content than delivery and narrative structure. Even better, a number of public speaking instructional books are available that promote the TED style. Some of these provide the opportunity to watch selected talks, with critiques of those presentations from public speaking professionals. This was one way that I prepared for my presentation.

How do you avoid starting a talk without an opening greeting of some kind, since that is the pattern you may have followed for decades? Here’s the trick used by TV reporters: Say it in your head, mentally, and only let your voice kick-in when you get to the actual start of your presentation.

Learn to Say No

I receive a call about once a year from some assistant to an assistant director, asking me to appear on the Ancient Aliens (or a similar) TV show. My answer is always the same: No. I won’t lend my archaeological credentials to programs that, at best, promote very fringe ideas about the past and whose only interest in my appearance is to create the illusion of a balanced presentation. These offers are easy to dodge because the programs are so notorious, but they raise a larger issue about the media that warrants discussion, especially in light of the emphasis on traditional broadcast media in the March 2015 issue of The SAA Archaeological Record. This is that, as archaeologists, we have no control over how our footage or interview may be used, or abused, by a director or a science writer. We are their raw material; how they employ this material may not always be in our (or our discipline’s) best interests.

This is not a lesson I learned from my TEDx talk, but it is pertinent to it. Despite its length and style restrictions, I controlled my content in that presentation. But I have learned, unfortunately the hard way, to carefully vet requests from the media exactly because, in most cases, I have no such control. While there are no horrific stories resulting from my media experiences (almost certainly because I carefully interview requestors), the substance of my contribution has occasionally been altered in ways that, strictly, are not correct and that bother me for that reason. Don’t be glamourized by the media; we are typically used to deliver someone else’s message and, while often that’s fine, sometimes it’s a disservice to our research and to the archaeological record.

We Can Do This Ourselves

The previous point leads to my final one. The only way we can control our message is if we make it ourselves. There certainly are and have been excellent traditional archaeology programs in the media (Time Team America being one of them), and the SAA leadership won the last round over the National Geographic Channel Digger series. But there is every reason to assume that, in the future, archaeology will continue to be misrepresented. Indeed, as long as Rupert Murdoch’s News Corporation/Fox News continues to own the National Geographic Channel, we should assume there will be future conflicts even with that channel itself.

Controlling and making our own media presentations is, then, the best way to address this problem. Technology and technological knowledge are not production barriers; distribution is as simple as a few clicks on a computer mouse; and a five- or ten-minute video requires no significant financial commitment.

As any quick look at YouTube will demonstrate, further, what we used to call broadcast or cinema quality video footage is not needed to reach a large audience effectively. Most (maybe all) DSLR cameras now have the capability to record action and sound, using decent, if not excellent, lenses. Some at the higher end of the cost spectrum provide near-cinema quality recordings. Major camera dealers offer video-oriented packages that combine low-end DSLRs with appropriate lens and attachment boom mikes. With widely available and easy to use video editing software like Mac iMovie® and Windows Movie Maker®, almost
any of us can edit and produce simple videos. (One trick: trade-off the quality of your live recording with the limits of your editing skills. The better the live recording, the less editing needed.)

Perhaps the most important lesson from my TEDx talk and its distribution on YouTube, then, is that even archaeologists sometimes need to look to the future, in this case the future of media, rather than just the past. We no longer need the traditional broadcast media alone to reach the public, and we may be better off when we create our own message. How effective was my experience in this regard? You can decide that for yourself. (If you take the time, you will notice that I moved my jokes from the start to the middle of my talk.) But I do have some statistics: my 2009 book sold about 5,000 copies in a half-dozen years; my YouTube video had twice that many views in 18 months. Though few people remember facts, these numbers seem like a reasonable measure of success to me.
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Do you have your own “cabinet of curiosities?” Office drawers, laboratories, and garages with archaeological collections that should have been curated years ago but, for a host of reasons, were not? A box or two of old notebooks, maps, and photos from your first excavation projects? Perhaps the prospect of bringing those collections up to curation standards has become so overwhelming that you, once again, put it off for another year as you prepare to retire or think about closing your CRM company. With each passing year of improper storage, these “orphaned” collections are increasingly vulnerable to destruction and deterioration from pests, poor environmental control, natural and man-made disasters, theft, and the aftermath of our own mortality. Inadequate care destroys irreplaceable information about the human past and impedes the construction of scientific knowledge. Twelve years ago, Childs and Sullivan (2004:4) called for an “attitude adjustment” when they identified a double standard in archaeological practice; namely, we value collecting over curating and artifacts over associated records. In fact, the collections you hold are, in a very real way, the raw material for future generations of archaeological scholarship. They are the only records of the work we have accomplished. If they are not made available to the public and other researchers, no one else will have the opportunity to see things as you saw them or to investigate them in new ways. When collections are properly curated, they exist in overlapping spheres of scholarly pursuits, public education and programming, advocacy, conservation, and the preservation of cultural heritage.

We conducted an informal, anonymous poll asking why archaeologists were not curating their collections in a timely manner. The responses inevitably circled back to two main issues: lack of time and lack of money. For some well-meaning archaeologists, circumstances beyond their control (e.g., they “inherited” collections from a former employee or colleague) left them in a quagmire that they have little time or few resources to fix. For others, the cost of excavation exceeded expectations, so funds that were budgeted for curation were instead used to complete the project. Several believed that the issue would simply work itself out when they retired, although they had no plan for how that would get accomplished. While this was not mentioned explicitly, there is clearly confusion over who is financially responsible for curating collections and who is responsible for ensuring that curation happens (see Collins et al. 2010). The problem is systemic; the responsibility for ensuring curation lies not only with the individuals or companies who recovered the artifacts and created the associated records, but also with the agencies that issue archaeological permits and are responsible for enforcing curation compliance.

This article was developed at the request of the Society for American Archaeology (SAA) Board of Directors to the Committee on Museums, Collections, and Curation. Our goal is to address the issue of uncurated collections in the possession of archaeologists and CRM companies and to provide guidance for preparing and submitting those collections to an appropriate repository. There are several kinds of repositories to consider, including museums, academic repositories, tribal museums and cultural centers, historic societies, government repositories, and archives (Sullivan and Childs 2003). Collections comprise all material generated from archaeological activity: artifacts, eco-facts, and associated records (the curation of foreign collections and Native American human remains is a complex issue that is better addressed elsewhere). Associated records include, but are not limited to, field notes, maps, photos, laboratory analysis, and site reports. They can be in paper or digital format. If you are or were an archaeologist with collections, or if you have or had oversight for a federal or state action that resulted in an
archaeological collection, then you are responsible for ensuring that the collections are properly curated. In the following sections, we briefly discuss laws and regulations, ethical considerations, and advantages associated with proper curation in an appropriate repository. Our main focus is to provide practical instruction on how to get started—to get those collections out of your office drawers, laboratories, and garages and into a repository where they can be cared for, researched, exhibited, and appreciated by current and future generations.

**Stewardship Rather than Ownership**

Although it may seem that ownership of archaeological collections transfers to the original researcher or CRM company responsible for their excavation, this is rarely the case (Sullivan and Childs 2003:31). Long gone are the days when individual archaeologists could claim excavated archaeological materials or documents created through the study of archaeological resources as their own property that might be kept indefinitely. While the SAA Principles of Ethics permit “primary access to original materials and documents for a limited and reasonable time” (Principle No. 5: Intellectual Property), the Register of Professional Archaeologists (RPA) Standards of Research Performance limits this interval to 10 years following completion of a field project (Section VI. Appropriate Dissemination of Research). Rather than focusing on ownership, professional archaeologists should focus on stewardship and responsibility for the long-term care of the collections they create, as this is the first and primary ethic promoted by the SAA. This fundamental principle requires archaeologists to “work actively for the preservation of, and long term access to, archaeological collections, records, and reports” (Principle No. 1: Stewardship; Principle No. 7: Records and Preservation).

Similarly, the Archaeological Institute of America (AIA) compels archaeologists to “provide for adequate and accessible long-term storage and curatorial facilities for all archaeological materials, records, and archives” (AIA Code of Professional Standards: Responsibilities to the Archaeological Record) and the RPA Standards of Research Performance demand that “[s]pecimens and research records resulting from a project must be deposited at an institution with permanent curatorial facilities, unless otherwise required by law” (Section V. Specimen and Research Record Storage). Thus, three national professional archaeological organizations indicate that the irreplaceable material record of our shared human past must be regarded, and cared for, as a public good. This tenet is upheld by federal laws (e.g., Antiquities Act of 1906, National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974, and Archaeological Resources Protection Act [ARPA] of 1979); implementing federal regulations like the Curation of Federally Owned and Administered Archaeological Collections (36 CFR 79) and the Preservation of American Antiquities (43 CFR 3); and many state laws. All seek to preserve archaeological artifacts, specimens, and records to ensure their future access and use.

True ownership of archaeological collections is complex and often falls to federal and state agencies, repositories, tribes, universities, and private landowners, depending principally on ownership of the land from which the collection was originally excavated (Sonderman 2004:111; Sullivan and Childs 2003:31). Federal laws and regulations (e.g., ARPA and 36 CFR 79) stipulate ownership of objects excavated from federal and tribal lands, mandate federal agencies’ fiscal responsibility for the long-term preservation of archaeological collections, and require availability of collections for scientific, educational, and religious uses. Indeed, public accountability and access constitute a central concern in federal guidelines for 36 CFR 79 and a key professional responsibility for all archaeologists (see SAA Principal 2: Accountability). Although state and municipal laws and policies tend to mirror federal regulations, they sometimes provide greater specificity regarding the preservation and protection of archaeological collections. Fortunately, in the case of long-overdue curation, existing federal regulations do not set compliance deadlines and a federal or state agency’s fiscal responsibility for collections does not expire.

**Advantages of Curating Archaeological Collections**

**Research Use of Curated Collections**

Your commitment to the proper curation of archaeological materials and documentation amassed throughout your career is crucial to the future of the discipline. A central principle for conservation of in situ archaeological deposits requires that researchers utilize existing collections, when possible, to address research goals. Unlike the in situ archaeological record, the long-term integrity and utility of curated collections is “enhanced rather than diminished by responsible use ... [and] study of these collections and records is additive, with research by successive generations of scholars increasing the utility of these portions of the archaeological record for future analysis” (Barker 2003:71). The SAA Principle of Records and Preservation encourages archaeologists “to make responsible use of collections, records, and reports in their research as one means of preserving the in situ archaeological record” (Principle 7). Your decision to fulfill these professional and ethical obligations is an essential part of future archaeological investigations, which depend on existing collections for background research, regional and thematic synthetic works, and materials analyses, among other research goals.

There is no doubt that curated collections possess a great wealth of information. The carefully collected, well-documented, and
properly curated collections in your possession will continue to contribute to scientific advancements. Advanced methodological techniques have propelled modern archaeological research into realms previously unimaginable (Knoll 2011). These developments have led researchers armed with fresh theoretical perspectives and novel research questions to return to, reanalyze, and reinterpret existing collections (Barker 2003, 2004; Chilton 1999; Voss 2012). Continued scientific research relies on existing archaeological collections as a unique and nonrenewable source of data on past human adaptation, processes of social and technological change, and shifting environmental baselines that are critical for understanding trajectories of modern climate change, warfare, poverty, inequality, and other issues relevant to the world that we live in today. Thus, your professional obligation and commitment to public accountability is about not only preservation of the past, but also engagement with the present and endowment for the future.

Public Use of Curated Collections

Although all archaeologists are obligated to use their specialized knowledge to advocate for, and promote understanding of, the preservation of irreplaceable cultural resources, educators and curators are necessarily at the forefront of this effort (SAA Principle 1: Stewardship; Principle 4: Public Education and Outreach). Public interest can and should be cultivated. Existing collections, particularly those with limited provenience information, maintain immense value for student training, public programming, and educational outreach. Even if your collections are derived from disturbed or dubious contexts, proper curation ensures that they will continue to benefit and educate the public regarding the value of archaeological research. Access to and involvement with actual research and preservation of archaeological materials fosters a sense of ownership and investment in our shared past, which is crucial to the long-term sustainability of our discipline. What we teach in our classrooms, laboratories, and museums today shapes public opinion and policy of tomorrow.

Of the many publics (including taxpayers, lawmakers, and local community members) that professional archaeologists are accountable to, descendant communities maintain a central claim to archaeological collections and the knowledge derived from them as components of their cultural heritage. Even when legal ownership of archaeological collections does not fall to descendant communities, professional ethics require archaeologists to take into account legitimate concerns of groups who claim affiliation (see AAA Code of Ethics III[4]: Research, AIA Code of Ethics II:6: Responsibilities to the Public, and the entirety of the WAC Code of Ethics). Cultural heritage connects indigenous people, places, and natural and built resources with intangibles such as memory, identity, and ways of life. Access to heritage-related collections and documentation may be important in validating claims about customary and traditional subsistence practices, traditional cultural properties, and efforts for federal recognition. Proper curation of archaeological collections facilitates appropriate access to objects and records that contribute to the cultural heritage of descendant communities, protecting both the tangible and intangible integrity of the archaeological record.

Repositories Care and Conservation

Repositories are unique places with a specific mission and goals. They document, preserve, and manage collections; they conserve collections; and they allow access to collections for research and public education. Collection management databases quickly locate artifacts and associated records from millions of catalog entries and facilitate complex connections between collections. Collections preservation involves security systems, integrated pest management, emergency management plans against natural and man-made disasters, temperature and relative humidity control, and constant monitoring of the collections space to ensure that all of these safety and environmental mechanisms are operational. When artifacts or associated records require conservation work, it is the repository that applies for grants and hires professional conservators. Public and off-site access to collections is increasing via a wave of digitization projects that provide educational and research opportunities, while protecting artifacts and associated records from over-handling and potential damage. Perhaps the most widely recognized objective of most repositories is to allow public access to collections for education and enjoyment. As archaeologists, we want the public to be excited about our profession, and there are few better places to accomplish this goal.

More than basic principles of archaeological ethics, Stewardship, Accountability, Public Education, and Preservation promote the interests of the entire archaeological profession and provide guidance that extends beyond legal mandates. Proper curation of the archaeological collections in your possession will convey irrefutable and compounding future benefits to the discipline, public trust, and culture heritage. The benefits of increased access and use include reaching a wider audience, advancing science, promoting research and interpretation, and sharing public resources, all of which enhance the modern practice of archaeology.

Simple Steps to Get Those Collections Curated

Getting started can be the most difficult part of a project. It is our hope that by following our suggestions below and in the flowchart (Figure 1) you will realize that it is not as daunting a process as you may think. Bear in mind that archaeological collections, like children, are both long-term commitments and
labors of love. If you are in a position where your collections, old and new, need to be curated, start by asking yourself the questions below.

**Land Ownership/Management at the Time of Collection**

First, ask yourself from whose lands did your collections originate? Regulations for federal (36 CFR 79) and state lands dictate where archaeological collections can be curated, whereas the final disposition of artifacts from private and tribal lands are at the discretion of the landowner. If you know the collection came from public lands but are unsure of the authorizing agency, look back to any associated records, including the permit, or old land maps that might provide any leads. If, after due diligence, land ownership cannot be determined, try contacting local public land managing agencies, State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPOs), and local repositories to help you brainstorm solutions. If your project area covered multiple landowners or managers, you should make every effort not to split the collection in order to maintain its research integrity; try to work out a solution that is best for all parties and that keeps the collection intact.

**Selecting a Repository**

Second, where should the collections go? Now that you know where the collections are from, you should have some idea about where they should go. When selecting a repository, consider the following: the location of the repository in relation to the project, the repository’s scope of collections, whether the repository applies standard curation practices, whether the repository is a long-term institution, and whether it curates research collections (Sullivan and Childs 2003). Selecting the right repository will ensure that the collections will be available for future archaeological research. You are probably doing a mental assessment of your collections right now, and maybe you are nodding “yes, the collections are from public lands.” If that is the case, you may already have a curation agreement with a repository or, at a minimum, a notation of the intended reposi-
and negotiations with the private or tribal landowner resulted in a selection. If the collections are from private or tribal lands, you need to determine whether your agreement with the landowner specified a final disposition. This may be in the form of deed of gift, letter, email, or other written documentation. If there is no written documentation, you will need to contact the landowner or heirs to establish their intent. If a repository was not specified and negotiations with the private or tribal landowner resulted in an alternative disposition, then you are obligated to follow that directive. If land ownership cannot be determined now, you will need to contact a repository for assistance. Be sure to research the repository’s Scope of Collections to ensure that the collection meets their criteria.

Keep in mind that not all curation facilities will be willing to take your collection. Many have run out of space to accept new collections, while others will not accept collections that do not fit their Scope of Collections. Examples of the latter include artifacts from the historic period and associated records that are not tied to an artifact collection, as may be the case with foreign research projects. If you have associated site records, maps, manuscripts, oral histories, etc. from non-collaborative activities, you should consider archives and records management divisions from institutions with which you are associated or the appropriate SHPO or Tribal Historic Preservation Office (THPO) for site documents. Once an appropriate repository has been determined, contact that facility to start a conversation about the specifics of your situation. Be prepared to discuss two major aspects of curating a collection: preparation and payment. Because each situation will be unique and each repository will determine what they require from you, we can speak only in general terms here.

Preparing your Collections for Curation

What do you need to do to prepare the collections? Each repository will have different requirements prior to accepting a collection. These requirements often depend on what is in your collection. For this, you will need to communicate directly with a collections manager or other staff. However, there are certain things that you, the archaeologist, can do to make the process more streamlined, both for yourself and for the repository. First, consider the materials in your collection. Some artifacts may need to be culled, rather than repositioned en masse. As the archaeologist, you are in the best position to determine what has the best research value in perpetuity and to ensure that redundant material is sorted out before the collection reaches the repository. Second, perform an itemized inventory of the remaining material; a simple Excel sheet is generally sufficient for this. Think about the provenience information that needs to be conveyed with each artifact, and make sure each category has a data field on the sheet. Artifact classes, counts, material type, artifact condition, cultural period, weight, and size are some of entries you should consider. If you have excavation rather than surface collections, you should also add details like the artifact’s unit, depth, site number, and date of excavation. Essentially, any information that you managed to recover with your materials should stay with them for the entirety of their lifetime. If you don’t provide this information for the repository, it is lost forever. As archaeologists, this is what we strive to prevent: the loss of contextual information. The final thing you should consider as you go through your collection is whether all of these materials are archaeological. It saves the repository a critical step if all non-archaeological materials and unrelated records are removed prior to their acceptance of the collection. If you have any doubts about what should or should not be kept, most repositories will be happy to help you navigate the ins and outs of artifact and records preparation.

Depending on the size or quantity of your collections, curation preparation may seem overwhelming. You may have options here. Some repositories will do the legwork for you, for a fee. There are collections preparation companies available for hire. You can also recruit volunteers or turn it into a stewardship opportunity for local avocational societies or groups (Figure 2). Some colleges and universities use students to do the preparatory work for credit; this has the added benefit of educating archaeology students about post-field work responsibilities and curation ethics. Remember that your collection is not just an assortment of interesting artifacts—it is also field notes, photographs, level forms, and any number of other associated papers in hard copy or digital format. Remember, too, that the digital records must be curated differently from the hard copy. Finally, anticipate paperwork. This may vary by repository, but expect to provide a written document of intent (such as deed of gift, letter, email, or other documentation) if the collection is from private property or a formal repository agreement if it is from public lands. When in doubt, ask the repository what they require or recommend.

The Costs of Curation

What does it cost to curate collections and who should pay for it? Curation fee structures vary between institutions (Childs et al. 2010). Some prefer a one-time repository fee, while others require ongoing payment. However, these are not always set in stone and may be negotiable depending on the nature of the collection; payment issues should be discussed early in your conversations with a repository. Responsibility for securing payment to prepare and curate a collection ultimately falls on the individual researcher, project proponent (e.g., a developer that hires a CRM company to do the archaeology), or agency that initiated the project. While public land agencies may have provided
you with a permit to do research on their lands, and while all subsequent material must be curated in a repository, that does not mean that they are responsible for paying the curation costs. If you determine that you are responsible for securing funds, you will find that there are options to help mitigate the costs of preparing artifacts for curation as well as the long-term curation of the collection (e.g., repository fees). Universities with curation facilities may be able to find funds to allocate towards curation, or the facility may waive the fees if the collecting activity was part of a University-affiliated project. Also, private donors and granting agencies may be approached for funds to help mitigate costs of curation. Ask the repository or land managing agency whether they have any ideas, or whether they can help. They may know of available grants or other means of paying for curation fees.

Final Thoughts

Many introductory textbooks liken archaeologists to detectives who interrogate the archaeological record as a detective would an eyewitness, with the clear distinction that we (archaeologists) actually murder our primary witness. Excavation is inherently destructive; however, thankfully, archaeological materials removed from in situ contexts are not dead, not even close. With proper long-term care, irreplaceable collections remain on life support, retaining their value, waiting to reawaken. Future researchers, educators, descendant communities, and other stakeholders will rely on the collections that you have amassed for the purpose of scientific advancement, public outreach, and culture heritage if they are properly curated. Thus, your primary responsibility as a steward of the archaeological record does not end with the completion of analyses or even publication of results and interpretations. Ensuring appropriate curation of irreplaceable artifacts and associated documentation is a professional responsibility, ethical obligation, and, in many cases, legal requirement.

Getting a collection ready for curation can be a long procedure—one that often isn’t started as soon as it should. That doesn’t mean that the process needs to be difficult. There are a variety of resources available to make this as pain-free as possible, and when it comes down to it, there are many archaeologists out there going through the very same thing. Don’t hesitate to ask for helpful advice from a local repository when you need it.
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ANONYMOUS QUOTES FROM ARCHAEOLOGISTS ON THE CURATION ISSUE

• But, and I’m sure this will be everybody’s answer, the real issue with curation is 1) the cost, which comes at the end of a project, and 2) the effort, which is always more than we like to anticipate and so more expensive than anticipated, and which also usually comes at the end of a project.

• I think the single biggest issue is that PIs and other project leaders frequently wrap up one project, and then are forced to move quickly on to the next project. Certainly in the private CRM arena and equally so in some of the other work place settings (agencies, utilities, etc.), folks are always scrambling to meet deadlines. Once one project is done (i.e., the report is wrapped up and submitted), then the issue of getting the collections properly curated frequently gets pushed onto a “back burner” as the researchers’ attention turns to the next project, the next proposal, or the next overdue report on the stack.

• A lack of consistent collection policy and communication between archaeologists, contractors, museums, and agency management contributes to this problem.

• I don’t have the money to do it myself, and shouldn’t they [my institution] pay for it? If I leave it here when I retire, it will sort itself out.

• I intend to bring my collections to the museum here [at my university]. I haven’t done it yet, but I know that it’s really important that they get there eventually, and I’m going to do that.

• I don’t think I’m responsible for that.

• Since “clearance” for a given undertaking is typically given after the fieldwork is completed, instead of after the report is finished, and since there are always more undertakings that need “clearance” than there are agency archae’s, there is always pressure from agency managers to prioritize the next field project rather than writing up the last field project. It’s the singularly great bane of being an agency archaeologist.

• I inherited a slew of artifacts collected from the previous [agency] archaeologist. I found funding to hire a seasonal to do investigative work to place some artifacts with a site/project/report for one short season. The easy finds were curated. Unfortunately, there are still a few boxes of unidentified artifacts and unwritten reports waiting to find a home. Previous records are in a dismal state and those artifacts that are left require a lot of research time to try and give them context. Some could be very important and will be even more so if they can be connected to a home.
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OCCUPY ARCHAEOLOGY!
TOWARDS AN ACTIVIST ETHNOARCHAEOLOGY OF OCCUPY DENVER

Crystal R. Simms and Julien Riel-Salvatore

Is it a vital interest of the state to have more anthropologists? I don’t think so.

*Florida Governor Rick Scott, Oct. 11, 2011 (Orlando Sentinel)*

Such a sentiment is frequently echoed in the current climate of draconian underfunding of public education and renewed questioning of the value of liberal arts education, specifically of fields like anthropology and archaeology. While there are numerous reasons why exposure to archaeology is in and of itself good for students, such high-profile imbroglios do raise the question of whether we, as a discipline, can help make a difference in how people live today.

In part as a response to these existential questions, archaeological methods are increasingly employed to develop ways of applying archaeology to contemporary issues. Ancient agricultural practices revealed by archaeology, for instance, have been recruited in efforts to develop sustainable management practices (e.g., Erickson and Candler, 1989; Minnis 2008). There also has been a push to use archaeological methods to develop a broadly defined activist archaeology that seeks to effect political change in the contemporary world, by directly confronting and demystifying issues such as homelessness (Zimmerman et al. 2010), clandestine border crossings (de León 2012), and labor organization (Chidester 2010). Other activist initiatives range from the Matilda Joslyn Gage House Archaeological Project, in which the materiality of activism is being researched, to the Hampden Community Project, which has analyzed the evolution of class identity and consciousness in Baltimore (Christensen 2010:23–24; Gadsby and Barnes 2010:56). In addition to activist archaeology, disaster and human rights archaeologies are also among this small set of publically engaged paradigms that engage with the contemporary social sphere. Victim location and identification in the devastating aftermath of Hurricane Katrina and 9/11 proved the necessity of disaster archaeology, while human rights archaeology has provided crucial evidence in international genocide tribunals (Gould 2007:194). Much of the awareness on which this work is based, of course, derives from the demonstration by the *The Garbage Project*, started in 1973, that archaeological methods could be used fruitfully to understand consumer behavior. The project revealed the tendency of personal accounts concerning a household’s production of trash to dramatically depart from the “material reality” found in their dumpsters and trashcans (Rathje 1997 and references therein).

While some may question the benefit of studying these largely social issues archaeologically, we believe that the above-mentioned studies have amply demonstrated that a higher potential of objectivity can be provided by materially focused research to greatly inform issues often dominated by subjective and opinionated discourse. These research initiatives are distinct from other forms of material culture research in their focus on context; it is this intersection that makes them specifically archaeological (and more broadly anthropological) in nature. Here, we present an example of how an activist ethnoarchaeological approach can be a useful tool in characterizing contemporary conflicts obscured by hegemonic discourse. Issues related to the implementation of the research presented here highlight the promise of ethnoarchaeology in studying leaderless movements and provide guidelines about when archaeologists must become involved to make useful contributions.

On September 17, 2011, a group of activists disenchanted with the inequalities that define the American capitalist struggle started pitching tents in New York’s Zuccotti Park; “spreading from city to city, the tactics of Occupy Wall Street (OWS) are to take a central public space, a park or a square, close to where many of the levers of power are centered, and by putting human bodies there convert public space into a political commons, a place for open discussion and debate over what that power is doing and how best to oppose its reach” (Anderson 2012, quoting Harvey 2011). Zuccotti Park was strategically chosen as the
place of origin for this public display of dissent for its location within the financial district of New York: this allowed those who made careers out of economic injustice to witness, firsthand, the effects of capitalism on what has become known as the 99 percent. The occupation of public space by people using objects to mark it as their own for political purposes has inherently material—and contextual—dimensions, which makes it justly approachable from an archaeological perspective. Most strikingly, the Occupy Movement and activist archaeology share kindred objectives in calling for social change. The reevaluation of archaeologists’ responsibility to themselves and the public, fostered in part by the postcolonial critique, also echoes the awakening of the American public to the institutionalized injustices they have been forced to endure and the subsequent occupation of public space by the Occupy Movement.

The Materiality of Occupy Denver

In the wake of OWS, local versions of Occupy rapidly sprung up in cities throughout the U.S. and the rest of the world. In Denver, one of us (CRS) rapidly became involved in the movement and quickly (and repeatedly) witnessed the violence employed by local authorities in their efforts to repress the movement: Peaceful assemblies at Civic Center Park (CCP) were often disrupted by the arrival of police units in riot gear (Figures 1, 2, and 3) that replaced the calm nature of the Occupy Denver (OD) gathering with unease, apprehension, and outright fear. As a result, peaceful assemblies sometimes degenerated into violent mayhem. The tear gas, rubber bullets, and batons felt by the lead author and fellow Occupiers came to embody the state-sanctioned reaction to OD, in addition to the Occupy Movement representing most visibly a transformation of the use of public space in three main ways:

(1) The transformation of public space into an arena for political discourse: Feeling duly alienated from social capital and the means to achieve their personal goals and aspirations, Occupiers took possession of public land to create a democratized landscape defined by open discourse and the intellectual exploration into the possibility of a society in which they could be active participants with a meaningful voice and role.

(2) The transposition of human suffering onto public space: After lifetimes of being silenced by the American Dream that defines the dominant economic discourse, disenfranchised populations brought the material manifestation of socioeconomic injustices to the state’s front lawn.

(3) The geographic concentration of knowledge: By bringing together citizens from many different walks of life, many of whom were victims of the financial collapse, among other sociopolitical injustices, the occupation of public places resulted in a concentration of knowledge on the structural
violence that characterizes American society. This included homeless populations who had extensive experience with structural violence and who regularly resided in the Occupy territories. Public lectures with titles like *The Future of Business on Earth* and free classes on topics like the implications of high-stakes testing in education (Occupy Denver 2011a) represented another manifestation of this concentration and dissemination of knowledge. Seeing the Occupy Movement as a geographic concentration of knowledge echoes the idea that, today as in the past, a major motor of various forms of social reconfiguration is “the concentration of information and access to the social mechanisms that process informa-

**An Activist Ethnoarchaeology of Occupy Denver**

Anderson (2012) asks what the role of anthropology is in understanding the Occupy Movement: How is anthropology an appropriate field to provide explanations on social movements? What perspectives can anthropologists provide that “differ from the sound bites and short clips on the six o’clock news?” Our view is that archaeology provides a unique perspective on how people make, use, and discard material culture, allowing for a more accurate—or at least more complete—view of the changing social landscapes that humans produce and operate within than those provided by the narratives developed by various involved groups. This makes it an interesting perspective from which to analyze the materiality of social phenomena such as the Occupy Movement.

As with OWS in Zuccotti Park, soon after OD was established, authorities attempted to evict protestors from CCP in Denver based on alleged sanitation issues. In New York, then Mayor Mike Bloomberg argued that the activists’ habitation of the park “was coming to pose a health and fire safety hazard to the protestors and to the surrounding community” (Bloomberg 2011). Similarly, Colorado Governor John Hickenlooper stated that OD residents were creating “unsanitary conditions on state land” by littering, loitering, sleeping, and having open fires (Denver Channel 2011). In the case of OD, this stands in sharp contrast to the group’s explicitly stated desire to maintain the park themselves, an offer effectively ignored by public officials (Occupy Denver 2011b).

Given the inherent materiality of “sanitation hazards,” one of us (JRS) suggested that an analysis of OD’s material signature in CCP might provide an interesting way to objectively evaluate the official claims about OD. Since OWS and other occupied areas were being accused of the same violations, the implications of this approach might even have relevance beyond the city limits of Denver. This is how we—the engaged political activist and the sympathetic, but detached observer—came to develop the engaged ethnoarchaeology project described here, whose ultimate goal was to establish whether the issue of sanitation was being inappropriately used to justify evicting OD protestors. Needless to say, the political nature of the issue and the conflicted interpretations proposed by constituencies with asymmetric power relations made the project inherently activist in nature.

The main challenge in using an archaeological approach to independently assess OD’s material signature lay in developing an appropriate methodology. The question of how to derive an expectation about what a “sanitary” park should look like was

---

*Figure 3. Denver Police Department officer wearing riot gear and gas mask holding a baton in CCP during an OD gathering on October 29, 2011.*
especially important. To address this, we worked under the assumption that non-Occupied parks should be considered sanitary (due to the presumption of regular maintenance and cleaning). This would provide a comparative baseline to evaluate the signature of CCP. We thus selected the three nearest parks to CCP as our “control” (Lincoln Park, Sunken Gardens Park, and Cheesman Park). The timeline of the project also posed some challenges. We started the project in January 2012, whereas the population in CCP was largest in October 2011, when the sanitation complaints against OD were first leveled. In order to increase the likelihood that we would deal with numbers of Occupiers in CCP comparable to Fall 2011, we also elected to begin our survey in the spring of 2012, with the hope that CCP would more closely resemble the park’s conditions when the accusations were first voiced.

Data collection also posed unique challenges. We opted to record all information photographically via unsystematic surface surveys, to minimize the need for artifact collection. Collecting objects was seen as inappropriate in that it would have decreased the amount of material on-site, therefore potentially compromising the data of subsequent surveys.

(Insurmountable) Challenges in Data Collection

CCP’s population fluctuated dramatically between October 2011 and June 2012. This variability was reflected in the size, location, behavior, and demographics of the park’s population. For instance, winter conditions forced a dramatic reduction in the size of the OD population during the winter of 2011–2012. The high degree of Occupy activity in October of 2011 shown in Figure 4 contrasts dramatically with the photo of the sparsely inhabited Occupy encampment taken on November 2, 2011. The police were regularly stationed inside the park to enforce a ban on night-time access, forcing the park’s inhabitants on to the unrestricted sidewalk.

Further, while the park’s occupation was clearly politically motivated in the fall of 2011, this dimension became less evident over time, with attendant implications for the behavior and principal motivations of the park’s occupants. Another example is that, while intravenous and other drug use and paraphernalia were not observed in 2011, it was fairly common in 2012 (Figure 6). Lastly, the ever-increasing presence of the chronically homeless in the Occupied area over time indicated that demographics were yet another axis of variability that we needed to consider.

Preliminary data collection in February 2012 also highlighted some of the challenges posed by having to interact with the chronically homeless, which by then comprised a large part of the park’s population (cf. Zimmerman et al. 2010). The high frequency of mental illness and drug abuse in that group, among other issues that accompany the erratic constraints of homelessness, frequently made interaction with members of that population difficult.

Beyond the shifting nature of the park’s inhabitants, following the height of OD in the fall of 2011, the movement’s momentum dramatically decreased thereafter, as reflected by a decline in the frequency of General Assemblies (GAs), explicit political activities, marches, and lectures. The active role of those living in the park during GAs waned, eventually causing tensions between those Occupiers who inhabited the park and those who did not.

Realizing a Non-Occupying Movement, a Non-Occupy Occupation, and an Unimplementable Research Design

When our actual survey began in June 2012, CCP’s population was on the upswing. That said, beyond its size, the park’s population proved to be quite dissimilar to that of October–November, 2011.

Figure 4. OD rally in Broadway Street (the Eastern border of CCP) on October 15, 2011.

Figure 5. CCP inhabitants lying covered on the Eastern sidewalk bordering the park on November 2, 2011 (at this time Denver Police Department officers were regularly stationed inside the park to enforce a ban on night-time access, forcing the park’s inhabitants on to the unrestricted sidewalk).
In the face of such a dramatic change in the make-up of the population of the park, we decided at this point to put data collection on hold, since it appeared abundantly clear that the information we would collect in this context would not actually inform us about the disputed characterization of the conditions at CCP in the fall of 2011. While we could have certainly gathered very informative data on the details of the homeless experience in the park in the spring of 2012, the links these would have had to the OD encampment at the apex of its political significance would have been tenuous at best.

Lessons for Future Activist Initiatives

The issues encountered over the course of this project do not appear to be unique to this study but, rather, practical problems associated with fieldwork of this nature. As such, they represent potential challenges that are likely to be encountered by future projects seeking to address social movements such as Occupy. It is crucial to understand that, while not all social phenomena are materially time dependent, due to their generally ephemeral nature, protest movements certainly are. In short, the methods developed in the context of this project would have allowed us to dispassionately examine the issue of sanitation in CCP. However, by the time data collection began, what material data remained had little to no relation with OD. By the time our methodology had been developed, in January 2012, the park’s population was not representative of the population present at the time that allegations of sanitary issues were leveled against OD. Thus, one of the key points our project highlighted is that research on the materiality of social movement requires data collection to be conducted immediately. In other words, activist-minded archaeologists wishing to provide an alternative perspective to the official discourse with the potential for greater objectivity need to have specific but adaptable methods and approaches ready to deploy even before these events unfold.

Another key observation is that activist research initiatives are defined by public engagement. Maintaining personal involvement with the social movement being researched offers two main benefits. First, it allows us to understand the (sometimes conflicting and often changing) motivations of the movement and its members. Second, it provides unique insights into the movement’s evolution, something that can affect the study, as was the case here. More personal participation with the movement would have been beneficial to this study, specifically by attending GAs, because by the time the study began, GA attendance had dramatically decreased relative to the early weeks of OD and few people attending the meetings were habitants of CCP. As such, because this research was concerned with the materiality of those living in the park, attending these meetings...
Once the study began appeared at first to be of little value. However, in retrospect, continued attendance would have provided us more quickly with additional information concerning the changing nature of the movement and its participants, likely highlighting much earlier the park’s transition to a homeless encampment.

Lastly, a correlate of the quick pace at which activist archaeological research on protest movements needs to unfold is found in the dissemination of the information gathered in such contexts. This is shown by this paper, which is being published almost four years after the apex of the Occupy movement. For this research to be as useful as possible, alternative venues for publication need to be found. To be sure, long-term and delayed studies can and should be published in peer-reviewed venues. However, we would argue that it is also important to make observations collected from this type of research available in a near-immediate form, either through online venues such as blogs or regularly updated websites, or through traditional media strategies such as press releases. Of course, these venues lack the gravitas and rigor of traditional peer-reviewed journal articles. However, it also bears emphasizing that a lack of peer review also characterizes, if not defines, press releases and online commentary issued by state and municipal authorities and police forces, which are collected under similarly compressed—if not shorter—time frames as our observations. As such, online dissemination of observations—especially when augmented by additional information documenting the goals and methods of such projects—can provide much needed multivocality to these events as they unfold, especially when they capitalize on the professional and/or academic credentials of the archaeologists publishing them. This multivocality can be further amplified by leaving open-comment sections that allow other actors to provide their perspectives on our observations, which can have the additional benefit of highlighting other dimensions of the materiality of protest movements, which we might want to incorporate in the purview of these projects.

**Conclusion**

Downey (2011) states that “[w]hen apologists for our own current situation offer excuses or tell us that we shouldn’t seek greater justice, equity or governance, because ‘It can’t be any other way but the way it is,’ anthropological research can show that this is not the case.” This is a sentiment that we clearly agree with, and we believe that this study demonstrates that archaeological research can serve as a potential tool for social resistance. For instance, the choice to examine the material dimensions of the issue of sanitation in CCP was fundamentally based on our skepticism about the accusations leveled at OD by various authorities. When an issue is shown to be worthy of scientific analysis, preexisting conceptions about this issue are inherently challenged. This has the additional consequence of denaturalizing the issue, in the sense of questioning the inherent reliability of some viewpoints over others. The simple act of questioning the claims of the Denver authorities serves to foster a critical perspective in the rest of the city’s residents, which may destabilize the naturalized perception of the power of the authorities and also serve to promote deeper civic engagement based on empirically informed critical thinking, leading to a citizenry less likely to blindly accept statements at face value. In light of the ever-increasing reports of authoritative misconduct, as recently witnessed in Ferguson (MO) among many other places in the U.S., we believe that efforts towards denaturalization are more imperative than ever. That said, validating an issue as a legitimate subject of research provides only the potential for denaturalization; this becomes a real possibility only when a project is conducted and its research questions have been addressed.

Our study sought to provide an example of how archaeology can better inform contemporary social issues. While we were ultimately unable to complete it as originally planned, by employing a method focused on the material dimensions of OD, we were nonetheless able to show that OD as traditionally understood was not present in CCP after 2011, which questions the legitimacy and/or relevance of at least some dimensions of the official discourse on the movement. As well, it presents a methodology to usefully study the materiality of leaderless social movements, which requires special consideration to be paid to the timing of data collection (i.e., it needs to take place contemporaneously to the events) and the involvement of the researchers in the social movement being researched, so as to get a more thorough, emic understanding of these movements.

It seems clear to us that activist research can help position archaeology as a field of research that can have publicly relevant impacts on contemporary social issues. While the study presented here is but a small first step in creating a more socially minded discipline, we think that it remains an important contribution. This recently developed dimension of the discipline presented here underscores the need to continue to support it using public funds, especially as public interest and involvement continue to grow. In fact, the irony is not lost on us that the “do more with less” politics of austerity that have led many academic archaeologists to explicitly seek contemporary applications of their work is fostering an intellectual climate that undermines the very foundations on which these policies are based. With social protests taking place across the globe in recent years, activist research efforts such as ours reinforce archaeology’s promise to help address contemporary debates and expand its usefulness and relevance even further beyond academia and commercial archaeology.
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REPORT FROM THE SAA BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Patricia A. Gilman

Patricia A. Gilman is the Secretary of the Society for American Archaeology.

The SAA Board of Directors met on April 6 and April 9, 2016, at the Annual Meeting in Orlando, Florida. SAA President Diane Gifford-Gonzalez chaired the meeting. On April 6, President Diane Gifford-Gonzalez, Secretary Patricia Gilman, Treasurer James Bruseth, Treasurer-elect Deborah Nichols, and Directors S. Terry Childs, Chip Colwell, John Douglass, Rodrigo Liendo, Gordon Rakita, and Daniel Sandweiss were in attendance. SAA Executive Director Tobi Brimsek attended ex officio. Guests included incoming Directors Luis Jaime Castillo Butters and Patricia Garcia-Plotkin, President-elect Susan Chandler, and Secretary-elect Emily McClung de Tapia. President Gifford-Gonzalez, President-elect Chandler, Secretary Gilman, Secretary-elect McClung de Tapia, Treasurer Nichols, Executive Director Brimsek, and Directors Castillo Butters, Colwell, Douglass, Garcia-Plotkin, Rakita, and Sandweiss attended the April 9 meeting.

President Gifford-Gonzalez provided a written report to the Board highlighting SAA accomplishments of the last year. Some of the successful Government Affairs activities were: opposition to the House Military LANDS provision that would have given federal agencies veto over National Register sites on federal land, appointments to the NAGPRA Review Committee, an initial foray into harmonizing federal agency job standards for archaeologists, and a visit with the new National NAGPRA Program Manager. The President also updated specific program activities, discussing National Science Foundation funding of the social sciences, the Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan in southern California (DRECP), the NAGPRA National Review Committee, SAA civil society status at the World Bank, the honorary membership for Khaled al-Asaad, and the upcoming third Conferencia Intercontinental, as well as SAA’s consulting party status for several regionally and nationally important projects, including Amity Pueblo in Arizona and BLM Mancos Shale (around Chaco Canyon) in New Mexico.

Executive Director Tobi Brimsek presented a written report to the Board and added updates to particular program areas including Orlando meeting specifics, comparing those with previous meetings, overflow properties, membership numbers, institutional subscriptions, the proposed Department of Labor overtime rule, the third Conferencia Intercontinental, and SAA’s relationship with the European Association of Archaeologists and a potential joint meeting with them. Executive Director Brimsek also updated the Board on all staff program activities.

Secretary Patricia Gilman reported the results of the election. Susan Chandler is President-elect, Emily McClung de Tapia is Secretary-elect, and Luis Jaime Castillo Butters and Patricia Garcia-Plotkin are Board members. Heather Lapham and Jason Yeager are elected to the Nominating Committee. There were 8,923 ballots distributed, and 1,617 (18.1 percent) of the ballots were returned.

Treasurer James Bruseth reported on the SAA’s current fiscal position and summarized his written report. The Society is in strong financial health with almost $7,800,000 total assets for 2015, an increase of 3.2 percent over 2014. This is in part due to strong membership and meeting registration in San Francisco last year. Our financial liquidity is excellent. The reserves continue to be strong, and they saw a greater than 3 percent increase over the past year. The Investment and Finance Committee reported that the Reserves Fund was at 96.6 percent of annual operating expenses as of December 31, 2015. This is within the 100 ± 5 percent target range for Reserves.

The Board established a Publications Development Fund to support journal editorships. The Board assigned FY 2015 unallocated funds to the Technology Fund for web redesign and for the keywords on the annual submissions web page project, to the HUGS Fund, to the Publications Development Fund, and to the Special Projects Fund for legal expenses and for the ballot of the new ethics principle concerning sexual harassment and violence.

The Board filled vacancies in board liaison assignments to committees, task forces, and interest groups. We approved the short term goals of the “For the Public” Web Pages Task Force. The Board tabled the Rock Art Interest Group Guidelines and
formed a task force to investigate the implications of the SAA formally approving sets of guidelines.

The Board discussed the report of the Amity Pueblo Task Force and met with John Welch, co-chair of the task force, to discuss the status of the Memorandum of Agreement and the timing of any response that the SAA might have.

The Board also discussed the DRECP Task Force report, and the Board established the Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan Land Use Plan Amendment (DRECP-LUPA) Compliance Review Task Force, the charge for which is reviewing specific DRECP undertakings for their compliance with the terms of the 2016 DRECP-LUPA, of which SAA is a consulting party signatory.

The Board approved the SAA Draft Statement on Sexual Harassment and Violence and the SAA Background and Resource Guide for Addressing Sexual Harassment and Violence. The addition of a Principle of Archaeological Ethics No. 9 on safe educational and workplace environments will be put to the membership for a vote in the fall of 2016.

The Board appointed Board Member John Douglass as our representative to the Leaders in Energy and Preservation (LEAP) Board. The Board reappointed María Gutiérrez and Geoffrey Braswell as editors of Latin American Antiquity, and the Board appointed Michelle Hegmon as the SAA Press editor. The Board appointed Micah Hale as Chair of the Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan Land Use Plan Amendment (DRECP-LUPA) Compliance Review Task Force.

The Board held its annual orientation breakfast for committee and interest group chairs as well as task force organizers. The Board met with Donn Grenda, chair of the Government Affairs Committee; Ian Lilley, chair of the International Government Affairs Committee; and David Lindsay, SAA manager, Government Affairs. The discussion focused on the Society’s efforts to advocate for the protection of cultural remains within the Americas and abroad and the activities of these committees.

The Board met with Ricky Lightfoot, chair of the Fundraising Committee, who joined the Board in a discussion of that committee’s plans and goals.

The Board met with Christian Wells, chair of Current Research Online, and discussed the status and growth of that web site.

The Board met with Dru McGill, chair of the Committee on
Ethics, and heard a report on the committee’s plan to evaluate the SAA’s Principles of Archaeological Ethics, to be completed a year from the meeting.

The Board met with Elizabeth Reetz, chair of the Public Education Committee, and Elizabeth Bollwerk, chair of the For Public Archaeology Webpages Task Force for a focused discussion on the short- and long-term plans for the Archaeology for the Public Web pages.


The Board met with Thomas McGovern, chair of the Committee on Climate Change Strategies and Archaeological Resources, to discuss the committee goals and plans.

The Board met with Bonnie Pitblado, chair of the Professional Archaeologists, Avocational Archaeologists, and Responsible Artifact Collectors Relationships Task Force to discuss the task force plans.

The Board met with Lynne Goldstein and Barbara Mills, co-chairs of the Task Force on Gender and Rates of Archaeological Research Grant Submissions to congratulate them on their work to date and to hear their plans for the completion of their charge.

The Board thanked out-going committee and task force chairs, and SAA representatives for their service to the Society: Susan Chandler, Robert Connolly, Patricia Crown, Christopher Doolittle, Susan deFrance, T.J. Ferguson, Patricia Garcia-Plotkin, Heather Lapham, W. Fredrick Limp, Patrick Livingood, Sarah Miller, Eduardo Neves, Charles Stanish, Mary Stiner, and Lynne Sullivan. The Board also thanked Christopher Dore for his service as founder of *Advances in Archaeological Practice*. President Gifford-Gonzalez acknowledged the contributions of outgoing Treasurer James Bruseth and Directors Terry Childs and Rodrigo Liendo and thanked them for their exemplary service and contributions to the Society.

---

**SAA 2017 CALL FOR NOMINATIONS**

The 2017 Nominating Committee of the Society for American Archaeology requests nominations for the following positions:

- **Treasurer-elect (2017–2018)** to succeed to the office of Treasurer (2018–2020)
- **Board of Directors member, Position 1 (2017–2020)**, replacement for current member, Chip Colwell
- **Board of Directors member, Position 2 (2017–2020)**, replacement for current member, Daniel Sandweiss

If SAA is to have effective officers and a representative Board, the membership must be involved in the nomination of candidates. Members are urged to submit nominations and, if they so desire, to discuss possible candidates with the 2017 Nominating Committee Chair Jim Bruseth (jim.bruseth@gmail.com).

Please send all nominations, along with an address and phone number for the nominated individual, to:

Chair, 2017 Nominating Committee  
c/o SAA Executive Director  
111 14th Street, NW Suite 800  
Washington, DC 20005  
Or fax to: 202-789-0284  
Or email to: tobi_brimsek@saa.org

*Please note that nominees must be current members of SAA. Nominations must be received no later than September 1, 2016.*
President Diane Gifford-Gonzalez called the Society for American Archaeology’s 81st Annual Business Meeting to order at 5:13 pm on Friday April 8, 2016, after the Secretary determined that a quorum was present. The President asked that the minutes of last year’s Annual Business Meeting in San Francisco, California, be approved. The motion was moved, seconded, and approved by the members who were present.

President Gifford-Gonzalez thanked the Nominations Committee, chaired by Fred Limp, for its work composing an excellent slate of candidates, and she thanked all who ran, whether elected or not, for their willingness to serve the Society. She also recognized and thanked the outgoing members of the Board of Directors, including Treasurer James Bruseth and Directors Terry Childs and Rodrigo Liendo.

President Gifford-Gonzalez thanked Eduardo Neves (Program Chair), Shaza Wester Davis (Program Assistant), Sarah Miller (Local Advisory Committee Chair) and their committees for a successful Annual Meeting. More than 3,555 members attended the 2016 Annual Meeting.

The President especially recognized the excellent work of Executive Director, Tobi Brimsek, and the SAA staff, including Cheryl Ardovini, Berceste Demiroglu, Liz Haberkorn, Jonathon Koudelka, David Lindsay, Maureen Malloy, Amy Rutledge, and Cheng Zhang.

President Gifford-Gonzalez noted that the SAA has supported several new initiatives including the recent Society for American Archaeology/European Association of Archaeologists joint conference “Connecting Continents: Archaeological Perspectives on Slavery, Trade, and Colonialism” in Curacao. The SAA has launched a pilot project for “Discovering the Archaeologists of the Americas,” which will document the positive economic impacts of archaeology. A major upgrade of SAA’s web site is scheduled for the near future, as is the third Conferencia Intercontinental in Oaxaca, Mexico, in August.

SAA has continued to engage Congress and federal and state agencies face-to-face and in writing on a variety of issues ranging from National Science Foundation research funding to cultural resources protection. President Gifford-Gonzalez noted the unflagging efforts of task forces that have aided SAA’s participation as consulting parties on several Section 106 undertakings. These have included joining tribes and state and federal agencies to mitigate damage to Amity Pueblo in Arizona, assisting the Bureau of Land Management in its Resource Management Plans for oil and gas in northwestern New Mexico, and the huge Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan (DRECP) in southern California. SAA continues as the only archaeological organization on the Board of Leaders in Energy and Preservation (LEAP), formerly known as the Gas and Preservation Partnership.

SAA is hosting a second meeting in Latin America to bring together representatives of development banks with Latin American heritage managers and archaeologists to discuss improving compliance with bank policies and guidelines for heritage protection. President Gifford-Gonzalez particularly thanked Jeffrey Altschul and Barbara Arroyo for their leadership in this endeavor.

The President noted that SAA’s success is the result of the dedication and commitment of its members, particularly those on the more than 60 committees and task forces and members of the 15 interest groups. She recognized the chairs of committees and task forces who are cycling off this year—Susan Clark, Robert Connolly, Patricia Crow, Christopher Doolittle, Susan deFrance, T.J. Ferguson, Patricia Garcia-Plotkin, Heather Lapham, W. Fred Limp, Patrick Livingood, Sarah Miller, Eduardo Neves, Charles Stanish, Mary Stiner, and Lynne Sullivan—and she thanked them for their service to the Society.

President Gifford-Gonzalez particularly noted the service of Christopher Dore who is stepping down as founding editor of Advances in Archaeological Practice. She also recognized María Gutiérrez and Geoffrey Braswell who have accepted a second term as Latin American Antiquity editors.

The SAA Board of Directors has just approved a statement on sexual harassment and violence, developed with assistance from
relevant committee, task force, and interest group chairs and legal counsel. The membership will receive this by email, and a “Detailed Statement on Sexual and Other Harassment and Violence, with Resources for Recourse” will be posted on the SAA website. A new principle of archaeological ethics focused on safe educational and workplace environments will be presented to the Society members for a vote, as is customary.

James Bruseth, Treasurer, reported that the SAA remains in robust financial health, with total assets for the year just past increasing by 3 percent to $7,898,807. Additional revenue beyond that needed to fund the basic functions of the Society from last year’s budget are being allocated to pressing needs such as making improvements to our website, enhancing editorial support for our journals, improving the keyword function on our annual meeting online presentation submission process, and supporting scholarships for historically underrepresented groups who chose to pursue training in archaeology and ultimately careers in archaeology. Despite this robust financial picture, the SAA has many critical needs. To address these needs, the Board is working on other ways to enhance SAA revenues. In combination with the SAA Investment and Finance Committee, the Board is looking closely at the SAA investments and examining ways to optimize the return on those investments, yet maintaining market risk at acceptable levels. And the SAA Fundraising Committee is becoming more active and developing strategies to fully fund two of our important scholarship initiatives involving Native Americans and other historically underrepresented groups.

Patricia Gilman, Secretary, announced the results of the election: Susan Chandler, President-elect, Emily McClung de Tapia, Secretary-elect, Luis Jaime Castillo Butters and Patricia Garcia-Plotkin, Director Positions, and Heather Lapham and Jason Yeager as members of the Nominating Committee. Ballots were distributed to 8,923 members in January 2016, and 1,617 (18.1 percent) were returned.

Executive Director Tobi Brimsek, at her 20th anniversary with SAA, provided a summary of 2015, which included our highest number of membership at 7,900 members, a successful annual meeting with 5,200 attendees, an increase in the online seminar series, and the development of SAA’s communications program. The Executive Director continued to detail successes and activities of staff over the past year, which included an upgrade of the database management system, a presence in the legislative and regulatory areas, both domestically and overseas, and the merging of the publications program with a potential publishing partner. The Executive Director concluded by inviting everyone to join us for the 82nd Annual Meeting in Vancouver next year.

On behalf of the SAA, President Gifford-Gonzalez presented an Honorary Membership to Syrian archaeologist, Khaled al-Asaad, for his protection of the site of Palmyra and for his ultimate dedication to Near Eastern antiquities.

Before she presented the awards, the President acknowledged the hard work of the award committees and of Heather Lapham, chair of the Committee on Awards. She then proceeded to present the awards and scholarships (listed elsewhere in this issue).

At one point, President Gifford-Gonzalez turned the program over to Desireé Martinez, who awarded the Arthur C. Parker and other Native American Scholarships. Christian Wells, representing the Historically Underrepresented Groups Scholarship (HUGS) Committee, followed and presented the Society’s second set of Historically Underrepresented Groups Scholarship (HUGS) Awards. Included among the HUGS awards was an award supported by the Institute for Field Research for field training. The President awarded the first four Cheryl Wase Scholarships to women undergraduates in archaeology from New Mexico and attending college there. She thanked the Wase Scholarship Committee who developed scholarship criteria within Wase Endowment and legal requirements.

President Gifford-Gonzalez presented the SAA Lifetime Achievement Award to Margaret (Meg) W. Conkey for her combination of scholarship and service to the profession.

The President then asked the membership for any new business. One of the members respectfully requested that the SAA reconsider the decision to not sell the SAA mailing list to the Archaeological Conservancy. President Gifford-Gonzalez asked for an email stating the request so that the Board can consider it. She will then put the issue on the agenda for the fall Board meeting.

Dean Snow, chair of the Ceremonial Resolutions Committee, read the ceremonial resolutions. He first thanked the retiring members of the Board of Directors, Treasurer James Bruseth and Directors Terry Childs and Rodrigo Liendo. Chair Snow then thanked the SAA staff and especially Tobi A. Brimsek, the Executive Director, who planned the meeting, and all the volunteers who worked at Registration and other tasks. He continued by acknowledging Eduardo Neves, chair of the Program Committee, Shaza Wester Davis, Program Committee Assistant, and Members of the Program Committee—Leslie Aragon, Jane Eva Baxter, Christopher J. Bae, Sarah E. Baires, Melissa R. Baltus, Kristina Barreto, Rebecca M. Barzilai, Peter Bogucki, Mariano Bonomo, Meghan E. Buchanan, Jose M. Capriles, David M. Carballo, Shadreck Chirikure, Richard Ciolek-Torrelo, John G. Crock, James G. Enloe, William W. FitzHugh, Zachary I. Gilmore, Michael W. Graves, William R. Hildebrandt, John W. Ives, Janet E. Levy, Robert J. Losey, Johannes H. Loubscher,
81st Annual Meeting

Madonna L. Moss, Lorena Paiz Aragon, Myrtle P. Shock, Kathleen Sterling, Henry A. Tantaleán, John H. Walker, Adrian R. Whitaker, David S. Whitley, and Peter J. Whitridge. Chair Snow also thanked Sarah Miller, chair of the Annual Meeting Local Advisory Committee, as well as other committee chairs and members completing their service and the many members who have served the Society on its committees and in other ways.

Chair Snow offered sincere wishes that those members of the Society who are now serving in the armed forces return safely.


A motion to adjourn was presented at 6:38 pm. The motion was seconded, and the meeting was adjourned.

President’s Remarks

Diane Gifford-Gonzalez

I want to thank the Nominating Committee, chaired by Fred Limp, for an outstanding slate of candidates, and to thank all the candidates, both those who were elected and those who were not, for their exemplary willingness to serve the Society. I also wish to acknowledge and thank our outgoing officers and Board members, Jim Bruseth, Treasurer, Terry Childs, Director, and Rodrigo Liendo, Director.

I am very pleased to announce that we had 3,575 registered for the Orlando meeting. The meeting’s success is the result of the hard work of many. We thank Program Chair Eduardo Neves, Program Assistant Shaza Wester, all the 2016 Program Committee members, and Local Arrangements Chair Sarah Miller for their work in making this happen.

Also, the meeting only comes off with the hard work of our local volunteers and our staff members—who also handle the complex business of the Society throughout the year:

Executive Director Tobi Brimsek; manager, Government Affairs David Lindsay; manager, Publications Liz Haberkorn; manager, Information Services Cheng Zhang; manager, Education and Outreach Maureen Malloy; manager, Membership and Marketing Cheryl Ardovini; manager, Communications and Fundraising Amy Rutledge; coordinator, Administrative and Financial Services Jonathon Koudelka, and coordinator, Membership and Meetings Berceste Demiroglu.

As our Treasurer will detail, SAA’s finances remain healthy, despite the volatility of the market over the last year. With prudent shepherding of both our reserves and income from meetings, membership, and other sources, we have been able to support new initiatives including:

1. The joint SAA–European Association of Archaeologists conference held November 2015—“Connecting Continents: Archaeological Perspectives on Slavery, Trade, and Colonialism,” was a great intellectual success and actually made a modest profit for both societies.

2. We have now launched the pilot study to test methodology for a longer-term survey project, “Discovering the Archaeologists of the Americas.” This project aims to parallel a now-completed European survey that revealed many more working archaeologists than had previously been documented, as well as the hitherto unmeasured positive economic impacts of archaeology on the continent. Watch for more information on this!

3. We are also building toward the considerable capital investment needed for a major modernization and upgrade of the SAA website by a reliable vendor. The Board just allocated $90,000 toward this goal. We know from our 2015 Needs Survey and from the Public Education Committee and Public Archaeology Webpage Taskforce Reports, many of you are eagerly awaiting this update. We look forward to working together to design a new, highly functional website.

4. And the third Conferencia Intercontinental will be held this August in Oaxaca, Mexico.

Cambiando canales un momentoito, les invitamos a todos ustedes a la Tercera Conferencia Intercontinental, ubicada esta vez en el Hotel Misión de los Angeles, en el centro histórico de la ciudad de Oaxaca, México, del 3 hasta el 6 de agosto. En los primeros tres días, se presentan cerca de setenta conferencias orales y posters, con tiempo suficiente para discusiones, todos enfocados en tres temas: (1) Intercambio y comunicaciones; (2) El saqueo y tráfico ilícito; (3) Cambio climático y relaciones sociales. Todas las conferencias se realizarán en español. Además, habrá dos días de de visitas a las zonas arqueológicas de Monte Albán, Atzompa, y Mitla y al Mercado Dominical de Tlacolula.

Changing channels back—that was just an advert for the Spanish-language-only Conferencia, its themes and excursions. The Preliminary Program is now accessible on the web page of SAA.
Registration opens April 18. More information can be found on the SAA main page.

Now, with regard to national and international government affairs, over the last year, SAA has continued to engage Congress and Federal agencies on issues ranging from NSF research funding to the legislative frameworks protecting cultural resources.

- Our Task Forces, with their unflagging dedication and ability to read fine print, have facilitated SAA’s participation as consulting parties on several Section 106 undertakings, which included joining tribes, state, and federal agencies to rectify the damage to Amity Pueblo, and assisting the Bureau of Land Management in its Resource Management Plans for northwestern New Mexico, as well as for the massive Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan in southern California.

- SAA continues as the only professional society represented on the Board of Directors of Leaders in Energy and Preservation (LEAP), the organization formerly known as the Gas and Preservation Partnership. There, SAA is speaking for cultural heritage preservation in an energy area, which many of you know was largely exempted from other legal protections by a former administration.

- SAA is serving Latin American cultural heritage management, by hosting a second meeting, entitled “Improving Standards and Practices in Cultural Heritage Management in Latin America: Implementing Safeguards and Capacity Building.” This will bring together again representatives of development banks with Latin American heritage managers and archaeologists to discuss the next steps in improving on-the-ground compliance with recently revised bank policies and guidelines for cultural heritage protection. (Here, I want to thank past President and IGAC Special Advisor Jeff Altschul as well as COA Chair Barbara Arroyo for their continued leadership in this area.)

SAA’s success in all these and other endeavors directly results from the dedication and commitment of its members. We presently have over 60 committees and task forces, and 15 interest groups. This level of voluntarism is a sure sign of the Society’s vitality and its scope. Most of SAA’s success in public outreach, government affairs, cultural heritage preservation, repatriation and Native American relations, and recruitment, education, and support of new generations of archaeologists is the product of their commitment.

The chairs of Committees and Task Forces do much of the heavy lifting involved in SAA’s business. Cycling off this year are: Susan Chandler, Robert Connolly, Patricia Crown, Christopher Doolittle, Susan deFrance, T.J. Ferguson, Patricia Garcia-Plotkin, Heather Lapham, W. Fred Limp, Patrick Livingood, Sarah Miller, Eduardo Neves, Charles Stanish, Mary Stiner, and Lynne Sullivan. The Board thanks them all for their service to the Society.

Stepping down from his post is founding editor of Advances in Archaeological Practice Christopher Dore. We owe him many thanks for his service during this crucial phase in the journal’s history. We thank as well Latin American Antiquity editors María Gutiérrez and Geoffrey Braswell for stepping up to serve a second term as editors of that journal.

Before turning to other reports, I wish to announce that, through the hard work of Board members, in consultation with chairs of relevant committees, task forces, and interest groups, as well as legal counsel, the Board has just approved SAA’s Statement on Sexual Harassment and Violence, to be sent to you by email, along with a “Detailed Statement on Sexual and Other Harassment and Violence, with Resources for Recourse,” to be posted on the website after the meetings.

Moreover, the Board has prepared a draft Principle of Archaeological Ethics on Safe Educational and Workplace Environments that we will be circulating for a member vote, as is customary, after the meetings. These initiatives are all not only in recognition of the urgency for responding to much-publicized failures of professional organizations and institutions to protect their members but also our recognition of our organization’s increasing diversity along many planes.
Award of Honorary Membership by the Board of Directors
KHALED M. AL-ASAAD

Gene S. Stuart Award
TAMARA STEWART

Tamara Stewart, the Southwest Projects Coordinator for the Archaeological Conservancy and Assistant Editor for American Archaeology Magazine, has earned the 2016 Gene S. Stuart Award for her ethically responsible and original story about the rush to recover archaeological materials being exposed by melting ice due to global warming. As the planet warms, many of the artifacts that have been protected by the ice for thousands of years are now being exposed and thus deteriorating quickly. “Archeology in the Ice Patches” presents an engaging story about how archaeologists working in the American West and Canada are trying to preserve the past in this rapidly changing environment. Tamara Stewart has delivered to the public a well-balanced article detailing the pursuit of the past in a way that all archaeologists can respect.

Geoarchaeology Interest Group M.A./M.S. Research Award
KENDAL R. JACKSON

Mr. Kendal R. Jackson has been selected to receive the 2016 Geoarchaeology Interest Group M.A./M.S. Research Award. Mr. Jackson’s impressive ongoing M.A. thesis project focuses on the analysis of pollen from a series of sediment cores collected from mounds on the Crystal River Site (central Gulf Coast of Florida) and nearby marshes. The work has the potential to provide information about the interrelationships between local vegetation communities, sea level changes, and human occupation of the area. The award will firstly help Mr. Jackson obtain a radiocarbon date from one of the cores, and secondly, complete the analysis of supplementary surface soil samples.

Dienje Kenyon Memorial Fellowship
ARIANNE BOILEAU

Ariann Boileau’s research will investigate how community organization and social stratification were transformed by Spanish contact at the Maya site of Lamani through the analysis of zooarchaeological remains spanning the Terminal Postclassic to the Early Colonial Period (A.D. 1450-1650). Using stable isotopes, Ms. Boileau will explore stability and change in resource acquisition strategies, differential access to resources and the expression of power and status by elites while controlling for various taphonomic effects including post-depositional attrition, differential fragmentation, and carnivore ravaging. This research will contribute to a better understanding of the adaptability of indigenous cultures in the face of European conquest while concomitantly illuminating aspects of Spanish/Maya interactions.

Dienje Kenyon Memorial Fellowship Honorable Mention
ASHLEY N. PETRILLO

Ashley Petrillo has developed an engaging research proposal on “The Development of Dairying Economies in the Southern Levant.” This study will focus on the nature of dairying and the use of secondary products from the Chalcolithic Period to the Early Bronze Age (c. 4000-2000 B.C.E.) which is critical to understanding the rise of social complexity. Milk provided a storable and sustainable source of nutrient rich protein and fats (cheese and yogurt) that could be traded and transported. She will select an array of sheep, goat, and cow dentin samples to conduct stable isotope analyses to explore human weaning and management strategies during this important period of devel-
opposing complexity. This award hereby acknowledges the importance of her proposed research and its future success.

Fred Plog Memorial Fellowship
JACOB LULEWICZ

Jacob Lulewicz has earned the Fred Plog Memorial Fellowship for his dissertation research on social networks and the emergence of organizational complexity in Southern Appalachia during the Late Woodland and Mississippian periods. Two distinctive regional political trajectories emerged here amid seven centuries of population growth and sociopolitical change. One, in northern Georgia, was centered on the monumental mound complex at Etowah. The other, in eastern Tennessee, consisted of many moderately sized, local aggregate villages with no clear political, economic, or ritual centralization. Lulewicz’s research takes a multiscale approach in comparing social networks across time and space and in investigating how the social and political positions of settlements within regional networks allowed for the growth of some settlements into politico-ritual centers. The Fellowship will allow him to refine the temporal contexts of emergent political complexity in northern Georgia through AMS dating, and to examine changes in ceramic production via thin-section petrogaphy.

Douglas C. Kellogg Fund for Geoarchaeological Research
JENNIFER KIELHOFER

The recipient of the 2016 Douglas C. Kellogg Fund for Geoarchaeological Research is Jennifer Kielhofer. Ms. Kielhofer is currently completing an interdisciplinary Ph.D. project, entitled “Landscape Evolution and Human Adaptation in Subarctic Lowlands: A Soil-Stratigraphic Framework for Human Colonization of Eastern Beringia.” The exciting work includes field description and laboratory analysis (sedimentology, stable isotopes, micromorphology, and radiocarbon dating) of soils located along altitudinal transects in central Alaska. The analyses have the potential to aid in the reconstruction of Late Pleistocene/Early Holocene landscapes that were encountered by the first human colonists of eastern Beringia. The award will support a portion of the micromorphological study of the soil samples.
Historically Underrepresented Groups Scholarship (HUGS)-Undergraduate
RAGHDA (DIDI) EL-BEHAEDI

Historically Underrepresented Groups Scholarship (HUGS)-Graduate
MILENA CARVALHO

Historically Underrepresented Groups Scholarship (HUGS)-Graduate
DANIELLE HUERTA

Historically Underrepresented Groups Scholarship (HUGS)—Institute for Field Research Scholarship
CECILIA VASQUEZ

Cheryl L. Wase Scholarship Recipient
SAMANTHA ASCOLI

STUDENT PAPER AWARD
NATALIE MUELLER

Natalie Mueller’s paper “Seeds as Artifacts: Investigating the Spread of Agroecological Knowledge in Eastern North American ca. 1000 BE-1400 CE” effectively combines an original theoretical framework embedded in practice theory with rigorous archaeobotanical methods to investigate plant domestication processes in eastern North America. Her innovative hypothesis linking community identities with plant landraces pushes archaeobotanical research into a new theoretical direction. Her paper moves beyond identifying domesticated plants to explore the specific selective practices that led to morphological changes. The paper’s methodological contribution is strengthened by her combination of experimental archaeobotany and classic domestication markers including morphological indicators. Her paper presents clear but variable evidence for knottweed domestication processes that hint at the emergence of different agricultural communities of practice in eastern North America by the Woodland Period.

STUDENT POSTER AWARD
AMY N. FOX

This year’s SAA Student Poster Award is presented to Amy N. Fox of the University of Toronto for her poster “Stone Tools from the Outside: Correlating Handaxe Mass Distribution with 3D Shape.” Fox’s research marks an important step in testing the applicability of nontraditional sensory-representative metrics for lithic studies. Using 3D digital models of lithic handaxes from Wonderwerk Cave, South Africa, Fox assesses the validity of shape-based metrics as a foundation for typological definitions. Importantly, Fox’s study demonstrates how objects of similar mass distribution and balance may be differently shaped, highlighting the multi-finite nature...
of the flintknapping process and cautioning against defining lithic types by shape metrics alone.

**Ethics Bowl**

**UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA**

---

**Dissertation Award**

**GUY DAVID HEPP**

Dr. Guy Hepp has won the 2016 SAA Dissertation Award for his dissertation entitled “La Consentida: Initial Early Formative Period Settlement, Subsistence, and Social Organization on the Pacific Coast of Oaxaca, Mexico,” completed in 2015 in the Department of Anthropology at the University of Colorado at Boulder. This outstanding dissertation investigates the origins of sedentary agricultural villages and the development of social complexity in Mesoamerica. Through careful excavations that he directed at La Consentida and a range of laboratory analyses, Hepp reconstructed the organization of the earliest sedentary community at the site and showed how feasting, communal labor, music, and ritual were all practices by which a complex, hierarchical community was constituted and reproduced. With his sophisticated and nuanced arguments, Hepp’s outstanding dissertation makes significant contributions to our knowledge of the Mesoamerica, while advancing our understanding of the transitions to sedentism, agriculture, and cultural complexity in the New World.

---

**Book Award: Scholarly Category**

**ROBERT L. BETTINGER**

Robert L. Bettinger’s *Orderly Anarchy: Sociopolitical Evolution in Aboriginal California* tackles as its fascinating central problem the persistent success of hunter-gatherer lifeways in California, in particular the flourishing of small atomistic self-interested groups. Treating change as adaptive but never teleological, Bettinger carefully and ingeniously applies ecological and economic models to explore, not just environment and subsistence, but also gendered labor, private property, kinship, and money. Even as this impressively learned book reaches back to build on classics of sociocultural anthropology, it also breaks ground in highlighting the great variability and immense transformations in hunter-gatherer society in California, and inverting conventional models of cultural evolution that prioritize the adoption of agriculture and development of sociopolitical hierarchies. While the theoretical program of this book will not find universal agreement among archaeologists, its masterful execution is an impressive achievement that we are proud to recognize with the scholarly award.

---

**Book Award: Scholarly Category Honorable Mention**

**GUO LONGB LAI**

Guolong Lai’s book *Excavating the Afterlife: The Archaeology of Early Chinese Religion* is an innovative investigation into early Chinese attitudes towards the dead, based not on later documents but on a magnificent corpus of early tombs and their contents. Lai ingeniously synthesizes archaeological evidence on tomb architecture, the iconography of grave goods, and the paleographic sources from the tombs themselves to craft a compelling argument that the violence of the Warring States period fundamentally transformed early Chinese understandings of the dead. Clearly written, comprehensively annotated, and superbly illustrated, this fine book additionally makes a body of spectacular Chinese finds accessible to an English readership, and enhances the contribution of China’s extraordinarily rich archaeological record to the comparative literature on mortuary practice and religion.
MIRANDA ALDHOUSE-GREEN

Miranda Aldhouse-Green’s book, Bog Bodies Uncovered: Solving Europe’s Ancient Mystery, is an absorbing, well-written, and comprehensive account of northern Europe’s perennially intriguing bog bodies. Entertainingly structured like a police procedural, the book takes the reader through setting, modus operandi, forensic evidence, and motive to finally conclude that many of the corpses in these “cold cases” were victims of sacrifice. Aldhouse-Green does not shrink from the often gruesome violence perpetrated on these individuals, both before and after death. Yet her treatment goes far beyond the bodies themselves to thoughtfully discuss many relevant aspects of their social and cosmic worlds, including the possible meaning of bogs and of violence itself. This is an accessible, generously illustrated, informative book that we are pleased to recognize with the popular award.

BARBARA VOORHIES

Barbara Voorhies has earned the SAA’s Award for Excellence in Archaeological Analysis for her contribution to the analysis of the Archaic occupations in the Pacific coast of Mexico and Central America. Dr. Voorhies’ exceptional contribution to Mesoamerican archaeology has included advancements in multi-disciplinary research, ethnoarchaeology of modern coastal shellfishers, and the transition from foraging to farming in the Neotropical lowlands of Mesoamerica. She has produced an outstanding body of publications on the Mesoamerican Archaic, including both theoretical contributions and presentations of highly detail-oriented analyses on site formation, subsistence, early farming, shellfish use, and early gaming. Voorhies has inspired a generation of archaeologists through her training as a mentor and collaborator on international projects. She has also contributed significantly to advancing gender equality in the discipline. Through her research, training, and dissemination of analysis results she has advanced the archaeological understanding of the lifeways of Mesoamerican Archaic.

DR. TOM EMERSON

Tom Emerson is the 2016 recipient of the SAA’s Excellence in Cultural Resource Management Award for his exemplary achievements in research under the CRM banner. Dr. Emerson’s contributions to Midwestern archaeology and especially to our understanding of the prehistory of the Midcontinent stand as models for merging research with the greater goals of preservation and public outreach. Tom’s career milestones have included extended service as Chief Archaeologist of the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency and the phenomenal success of the University of Illinois based Contract Archaeology program, which he has shepherded for over 20 years. In addition to pioneering and refining our understanding of the seminal Cahokia site complex, Dr. Emerson’s intellectual contributions have extended to historic archaeology and to the critical Euroamerican contact period. Tom’s long and distinguished career has recently been highlighted as he became the 2014 recipient of Career Achievement awards from both the Midwest Archaeological Conference and the Illinois Archaeological Survey.

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS MANDATORY CENTER OF EXPERTISE FOR THE CURATION AND MANAGEMENT OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL COLLECTIONS

Accepted by Sonny Trimble

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Mandatory Center of Expertise for the Curation and Management of Archaeological Collections has earned the SAA’s Award for Excellence in Curation, Collections Management, and Collections-based Research and Education for over two decades of their leadership and service to the profession in the curation and management of archaeological collections. Their work to rescue and rehabilitate collections that suffered from lack of appropriate care in substandard facilities, their willingness to develop innovative programs including the Veterans Curation program, and their many partnerships and collaborations with other institutions, provide an enviable model for ensuring the continued benefit of the significant cultural heritage represented by archaeological collections to communities of scholars, affiliated peoples, and the public at large.
Crabtree Award
STEVEN FREERS

Steven Freers is an avocational archaeologist who has spent over 25 years documenting and studying rock art. He is widely recognized as a rock art expert in southern and eastern California and Arizona, notably the Mojave National Preserve, Grand Canyon National Park, Joshua Tree National Park, and Kaibab National Forest. Mr. Freers has published two books, 2013’s widely acclaimed Rock Art of the Grand Canyon Region, and the co-authored volume Fading Images: Indian Pictographs of Western Riverside County. He is the author of seven other published articles and has edited four volumes of American Indian Rock Art. In addition, Steve is accumulating data on painted handprint impressions in rock art and their morphological connection to age and gender. He has worked diligently within the community on the protection and conservation of rock art sites. This has involved countless hours of monitoring and working on treatment and restoration of sites that have been thoughtlessly vandalized. He has consulted and involved members of the Pechanga and San Luis Rey bands of the Luiseño in ongoing protection programs. Steve also is active in public education, teaching rock art classes through the University of California at Riverside. Overall, Steve Freers’s range of efforts and committed engagement with the professional archaeological community and general public on behalf of California and Southwest rock art make him a deserving recipient of the Crabtree Award.

Award for Excellence in Latin American and Caribbean Archaeology
ROBERT D. DRENNAN

Robert “Dick” Drennan has earned the Award for Excellence in Latin American and Caribbean Archaeology in view of his unique and lifetime academic, professional, and personal achievements. He has been extremely influential in the development and professionalization of Latin American archaeology, and his mentorship, friendship, and guidance have served to inspire a generation of archaeologists in the entire region. Dr. Drennan has been a champion for the collection and presentation of archaeological data in ways that both ensure cross-case consistency and allow their use in comparative projects, fostering the use of more rigorous methods across the discipline of archaeology. His unrelenting dedication to professional collaboration and dialogue across Latin America has laid an unprecedented foundation and a solid ethical model that will continue to bear fruit for generations to come.

Lifetime Achievement Award
MARGARET (MEG) W. CONKEY

Meg Conkey has earned the SAA’s Lifetime Achievement Award for her combination of scholarship and service to the profession. Meg’s research, along with that of her collaborators, significantly broadened our approaches to and understanding of people and their diversity in the past. She has shown the importance and possibility of studying gender as a basic dimension of the human experience and has been instrumental in bringing studies of rock art and art in general into the mainstream of research. Meg has helped to change the face of the field through encouragement and recruitment of women and minorities. She served as a national leader in archaeology, including her presidency of the SAA, and the AAA Archaeology Division, as well as through numerous other organizational contributions. This award proudly lauds Meg’s lifetime achievement in archaeology.
The Ceremonial Resolutions Committee offers the following resolutions:

Be it resolved that appreciation and congratulations on a job well done be tendered to the

Retiring OFFICER

   **Treasurer** Jim Bruseth

and the retiring BOARD MEMBERS

   Terry Childs and Rodrigo Liendo

To the Staff, and especially to Tobi A. Brimsek, the Executive Director, who planned the meeting, and to all the volunteers who worked at Registration and other tasks;

To the **Program Committee**, chaired by

   Eduardo G. Neves

Assisted by

   Shaza Wester Davis

and to the **Committee Members of the Program Committee**

Leslie Aragon Lorena Paiz Aragon Christopher J. Bae Sarah E. Baires Melissa R. Baltus Cristiana Barreto Rebecca M. Barzilai Jane Eva Baxter Peter Bogucki Mariano Bonomo Meghan E. Buchanan Jose M. Capriles David. M Carballo Shadreck Chirikure Rochard Ciolek-Torello John G. Crock James G. Enloe


To the **Annual Meeting Local Advisory Committee**, chaired by

   Sarah Miller

And to other **committee chairs and members completing their service** and to the many members who have served the Society on its committees and in other ways;

And sincere wishes that those members of the Society who are now serving in the armed forces return safely.

Will the membership please signal approval of these motions by a general round of applause.

And be it further resolved that thanks again be given to those who inform us of the deaths of colleagues, and finally,

A resolution of sympathy to the families and friends of


   Yvonne Oakes Robert Powers Donna Roper Charles E. Rozaire James Schoenwetter James Sciscenti Stanley A. South Fred Wendorf Kit Wesler Ugo Zoppi

Will the members please rise for a moment of silence in honor of our departed colleagues.

Respectfully submitted,

   Dean Snow

on behalf of the Ceremonial Resolutions Committee

April 8, 2016
WILLIAM A. LONGACRE II
1937–2015

William (Bill) Longacre, renowned archaeologist and former Head of Anthropology at the University of Arizona (UA), died on November 18, 2015, after a brief illness. Raised in Houghton, Michigan, Bill began his university education at Michigan Technological University, and transferred to the University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana, earning a B.A. in Anthropology. He entered the Anthropology Doctoral Program at the University of Chicago in 1959, completing his Ph.D. in 1963. His doctoral research focused on the American Southwest under the auspices of Paul Martin (Field Museum), who led annual field expeditions to Arizona.

Bill was among a cohort of young archaeologists at Chicago, including Lewis Binford, who created the New Archaeology in the 1960s. His Ph.D. dissertation, Archaeology as Anthropology: A Case Study, later published as an article in Science, was a touchstone of this movement. This ground-breaking study reconstructed aspects of prehistoric social organization at Carter Ranch, a small Pueblo III community in eastern Arizona. Longacre’s analysis of variation in ceramic designs, architecture, burials, and other artifacts concluded that Carter Ranch residents practiced matrilocal post-marital residence and formed similarly structured descent groups in the pueblo’s two room blocks.

In 1964, Bill was hired as an assistant professor of anthropology at UA, rising to the rank of professor. He was later appointed as Head, then as the Fred A. Rickter Distinguished Professor, and capped a 40-year career when he retired in 2004. Upon his UA hire in 1964, Longacre assumed supervision of the UA archaeological field school, which had recently relocated to the Grasshopper Ruin on the Fort Apache Indian Reservation. From 1966–1979, Bill directed an intensive NSF-funded field program that integrated teaching with research and trained more than 300 students from across the country; many remember it as transformational.

The Grasshopper field school offered Longacre and his students an opportunity to update existing mapping and excavation methods, to create a computerized database of the archaeological finds, and to collaborate in larger research collectives. Grasshopper was not the only Puebloan ruin excavated at this time, but archaeological fieldwork at the site set new standards in its sampling and analytical methodologies. The Grasshopper archaeological field school produced numerous dissertations in bioarchaeology and archaeology and remains one of the best published archaeological projects in the North American Southwest.

Longacre acknowledged and attended to myriad critiques of New Archaeology’s methods and assumptions. In 1973, he began an ethnoarchaeological study to address some key criticisms of his doctoral research at Carter Ranch. He chose the Kalinga, an upland population in the northern Philippines, to study. While his initial Kalinga research tested Ceramic Sociology assumptions regarding stylistic variability, Longacre’s Kalinga Ethnoarchaeological Project involved generations of UA and Filipino students and a range of accommodating Kalinga hosts over more than two decades. Their publications span a variety of ceramic data—on manufacture, specialization, use life, style, exchange, and discard—and whose analyses furthered our understanding of the systemic and dynamic relationships of people and pottery.

Bill Longacre’s career spanned 50 years; he published nine volumes and authored more than 60 papers, the last to appear in 2017. Published research was, however, just one measure of his success. Another lay in his role as teacher, not only at UA (and in visiting professorships elsewhere), but also for more than 30 years at the University of the Philippines in its Anthropology and Archaeological Studies Program. In all places, Longacre engaged with dozens of undergraduate and graduate students, many of whom completed degrees and entered our professional ranks. Bill also collaborated extensively with his students; 25 former students co-authored or edited more than 30 publications with him.

William Longacre combined many aspects we most admire in our colleagues: a generous and kind demeanor; an abiding interest in learning and sharing his knowledge; and a sense of proportion. His contributions extend across the discipline to the universities where he taught, the students he touched, and to the innumerable friends he made throughout his career.

Michael Graves, James Skibo, and Miriam Stark
Vjera Zlatar Montan died on December 2, 2015, in Antofagasta, Chile. She was born on April 4, 1926, into a family of Croatian immigrants. She completed her schooling at Liceo de Ninas in Antofagasta and later continued with her university education in Zagreb, Croatia, where she earned her bachelor’s degree in 1969 with a thesis on the ancient bronze statues in the Split Archaeological Museum and her Master’s degree in 1981 with work on the ceramography styles of the New Stone Age. She worked with me for many years as a researcher at the Archaeological Institute of the University of Chile and then at the University of Antofagasta. Vjera was an outstanding archaeologist and historian who became known for her work at Caleta Huelen sites at the mouth of the Rio Loa, where perhaps the best known Chinchorro settlement sites are located, and for her study of the archaeological collection from Pica-8. In Croatia, she worked at the sites of Danilo Gornji (Sibenik), Knin, Murter, and Vucedol.

Among her published works are: Caleta Huelen 42: Una aldea temprana en el norte de Chile (co-authored with Lautaro Nuñez and Patricio Nuñez), 1974, Hombre y Cultura, Vol 2, No. 5, Panama; Replanteamiento sobre el problema Caleta Huelen-42, 1983, Chungara 10; Cementerio prehispánico Pica-8, 1984, Universidad de Antofagasta; Cuatro ceramios pre-

colombinos en Zagreb, 1989, Vjesnik Arheoloskog Muzeja u Zagrebu, XXII, Zagreb. Vjera was quite active in preserving historic monuments that were damaged during the Croatian independence movement in 1991.

Besides her important archaeological research, Vjera worked with Hrvoj Ostojic to conduct extensive research on the immigration of Croats to Chile. One of her books, Raíces en la Region of Antofagasta (1994), is about the arrival of the Croats in the Chilean north. Other books include De la Bura a la Camanchaca, Historia de Povlja y de sus emigrantes al Norte de Chile (2002), Los croatas, el salitre, y Tarapacá: historia de la inmigración croata en la Provincia de Tarapacá durante los Siglos XIX y XX. Iquique (two editions: 2001 and 2005). In 2005, Stjepan Mesić, President of Croatia, visiting Chile, decorated Vjera with the “Danica Croata Order” for her achievements. Vjera was a true scientist who contributed greatly to the knowledge of past cultures in northern Chile. She will be greatly missed by colleagues and friends.

Mario A. Rivera
Executive Director
Identity at End of the World Program
Universidad de Magallanes
Punta Arenas, Chile
**CALENDAR**

**MAY 24**  
Online Seminar: Fundamentals of Budgeting for Archaeological Projects

**MAY 27–30**  
The American Rock Art Research Association Annual Rock Art Symposium (www.arara.org)

**AUGUST 3–6**  
SAA Conferencia Intercontinental

**SEPTEMBER 22**  
Online Seminar: Interacting with the Media: Strategies for Pitching and Interviewing

**SEPTEMBER 27**  
Online Seminar: Using R Statistical Computing Language for Archaeological Analysis

**OCTOBER 26**  
Online Seminar: Tribal Consultation Basics

**NOVEMBER 10**  
Online Seminar: Working With Metal Detectorists: Citizen Science at Historic Montpelier and Engaging a New Constituency

**2017**  
**MARCH 29–APRIL 2**  
SAA 82nd Annual Meeting in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

---

**AWARDS, from page 52 ⊳**

**Archaeology Month Poster Awards**

**FIRST PLACE: ALASKA**

**SECOND PLACE: WYOMING**

**THIRD PLACE: FLORIDA**

---

“We don’t know who saw it first, that great jutting stone. We don’t know if it was a man or woman. We don’t know if it was a child, pointing silently and looking to her parents. We don’t know if it was a dog, barking madly in its half-wolf fear of the unknown. We don’t know. But certainly, the first human to lay eyes on it must have paused for more than a moment and wondered what such a pinnacle was doing amidst so much sand.”  
—Robert L. Kelly

¡Nos Vemos en Oaxaca!
CALL FOR SUBMISSIONS

Society for American Archaeology

82nd Annual Meeting
March 29–April 2, 2017 • Vancouver, BC, Canada
Vancouver Convention Centre

The 2017 Call for Submissions is now available on SAAweb: www.saa.org/call

Visit this page to find a letter from SAA’s President, information on submission policies and guidelines, and directions on how you can access the user-friendly, web-based submission system. View, download, and/or print the Call for Submissions today. We hope you consider participating in SAA’s 82nd Annual Meeting!

Questions? Email us at meetings@saa.org or call us at +1 (202) 559-7382.

Submission Deadline: September 8, 2016 at 3pm Eastern Time