

level of collaboration with other archaeological and/or educational entities. The metrics were designed after careful consideration of the current public archaeology models proposed by Colwell (2016) and Atalay (2012). Colwell's Collaborative Continuum and Atalay's Community-Based Participatory Research models are more inclusive and diverse in their scope than Grima's Multi-Perspective Model. All three models will be discussed in this thesis. Lastly, the metrics used are not meant to be rigid or to be used for "grading" each program on any sort of scale, but rather to highlight the methods required to create and sustain effective public archaeology. Each public archaeology program should be individualized to fit its specific audience, leaving participants with a greater respect or connection to the past, depending on where they fit within a given narrative. It is hoped that this thesis will inspire more to get involved in public archaeology and help to showcase that it can be achieved at any level.

CREATING EFFECTIVE AND SUSTAINABLE PUBLIC
ARCHAEOLOGY: AN ANALYTICAL ROADMAP

by

Breanna Leigh Henderson

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park, in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Masters of Cultural and
Heritage Resources
Management
2023

Advisory Committee:

Professor Matthew Palus, Chair
Dr. Kathryn Lafrenz-Samuels
Marie J. Archambeault, M.A.
Dr. Paul A. Shackel

© Copyright by
Breanna Leigh Henderson
2023

Dedication

To my grandfather, Randall Henderson, who first inspired my love of archaeology.

We love and miss you, Pap.

And to my husband, Chase Barber, who has encouraged me throughout this crazy endeavor. I love you.

Acknowledgements

Writing this has been a journey, and one that would not have been possible without some amazing people (and pets!) who were present along the way.

I would like to thank Matthew Palus for believing in me. Thank you for always being so positive and encouraging! I greatly enjoyed learning from you.

Also, a huge thank you to Marie Archambeault, for also believing in me, and for her guidance and quick response to several panicked emails. I loved your class and am so glad you agreed to serve on my thesis committee.

I would also like to thank the other members of my cohort for being kind, encouraging, and some of the coolest people I have ever met. Special thanks goes out to Emily Bales, Ken Gergely, and Cody Haisley for keeping me sane.

Even though they can't read, I would like to acknowledge the joy my two cats and two dogs have given me. They have no idea how loved and special they are.

A big thank you to my grandparents and my dad for instilling in me a love of learning and adventure, and for teaching me that I can do anything I set my mind to.

Another huge thank you to my friends who stuck with me during this wild adventure, and who encouraged me to keep going.

Last, and far from least, I owe a ton of gratitude to Chase Barber, my wonderful spouse, who has been so supportive throughout this entire process. Words cannot describe how much having you by my side has meant to me and how I couldn't have done this, and so much else, without you and your unwavering belief in me, even when I don't believe in myself. I cannot wait to see what adventures we go on now that graduate school is over. I love you.

Table of Contents

Dedication.....	ii
Acknowledgements.....	iii
Table of Contents.....	iv
List of Tables.....	v
List of Figures.....	v
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	7
Chapter 2: Thoughts, Attitudes, and Trends on the Role of the Public in Archaeology	15
Chapter 3: Historical Background.....	26
Chapter 4: Methods & Metrics.....	33
Chapter 5: Results.....	48
The Estate Little Princess Archaeology Project (ELPAP).....	49
Archaeology in the Community (AITC).....	62
Nome Archaeology Camp.....	70
Sugarland Ethno-History Project (SEHP).....	76
Texas Archeological Stewardship Network (TASN).....	80
Project Archaeology (PA).....	85
Summary of Results.....	87
Chapter 6: Analysis.....	89
Summarized methods.....	89
Estate Little Princess Archaeology Project (ELPAP).....	90
Archaeology in the Community (AITC).....	95
Nome Archaeology Camp.....	100
Sugarland Ethno-History Project.....	103
Texas Archeological Stewardship Network (TASN).....	107
Project Archaeology (PA).....	109
Conclusions.....	116
Bibliography.....	120

List of Tables

Table 1: Gardner’s Multiple Intelligences Theory as Applied to Archaeology (adapted from Henson, 2017:42)	10
Table 2: Metrics used for discovering elements that aid in effectiveness and sustainability.	34
Table 3: Colwell’s Collaborative Continuum (Colwell, 2016:117).....	40
Table 4: Summary of elements within Atalay’s CBPR (2012).....	43
Table 5: General data for outreach programs discussed throughout this thesis.....	48
Table 6: Summarized Metrics.....	89
Table 7: Examples of methods for fulfilling the 12 metrics.	117

List of Figures

Figure 1: Students at the ELPAP conducting archaeological investigations (AITC social media, 2022).	58
Figure 2: ELPAP students conducting archaeological laboratory work, (AITC social media, 2022).	60
Figure 3: Educators participating in a variety of AITC training activities.	64
Figure 4: AITC's Young Archaeologists Club members learning a variety of archaeological methods (AITC social media, 2019).....	68
Figure 5: Students re-enact traditional hunting methods at a caribou drive line in 2018 (Richie et al, 2021).....	73

Figure 6: Elders and youth work together at the 2015 Nome Archaeology Camp to catalog artifacts donated to the Carrie M. McLain Memorial Museum (Richie et al, 2021). 75

Figure 7: Restoration efforts taking place at St. Paul Community Church in Sugarland (SEHP Facebook, 2023)..... 79

Figure 8: Texas Archeological Steward, Teddy Lou Stickney, documents petroglyphs at the Paint Rock site in Concho, Texas (ACHP website, 2023: TASN) 83

Figure 9: Educators participate in a Project Archaeology training workshop. 85

Chapter 1: Introduction

What makes an effective, sustainable, and engaging outreach program? There is not a singular answer to this question, but the research contained within this thesis strives to showcase various methods that should be incorporated into public and community archaeology in order to attain a comprehensive, yet flexible curriculum, to be sensitive to issues of the past as well as current issues facing participants, and to provide a wide array of accessibility, if applicable (as not all knowledge is public domain, especially in the case of cultural sensitive traditional properties and practices.) Before delving further into this research question, it is imperative to establish what is meant by public archaeology, community archaeology, and outreach within the confines of this thesis. Community archaeology is specifically targeted to involve and benefit a specific group, in particular descendent communities, and to facilitate the process of decolonizing heritage and placing it back into the hands of those to whom it belongs. Public archaeology is any effort that involves the general public, such as, but not limited to displays at a museum, or meetings that let the public know about an archaeological project that is happening in their area. Outreach is a programmatic effort that is dedicated to expanding knowledge or participation within archaeology and will often be used as a descriptor for the programs within this thesis. These are broad descriptions as an in-depth discussion of community versus public archaeology could be a thesis within itself. Outreach efforts should be enjoyable and applicable to a broad audience, delivering accurate knowledge and leaving participants with a sense of empowerment, accomplishment, and a want to learn more. Archaeology relies on the public's support, yet much of the public is

unsure of what archaeology is and why it is essential. However, as much as we want to share, we also have a duty to educate the public about why cultural resources are significant and their role in protecting them. As Dr. Barbara Little said in her book *Benefits of Public Archaeology*, “It is part of the ethical code of professional archaeologists that the past belongs to everyone, but ethics and values often differ between tribes and professional archaeologists... If the past indeed belongs to everyone, it is also true that not all parts of the past may be freely shared” (2002:5). It is our duty to approach public outreach and public archaeology in a way that is respectful of the beliefs of each group involved, and that can sometimes include not making aspects of a collaborative outreach project available to the public. As will be discussed throughout this thesis, it is imperative to know the participants of a project and to be flexible to their needs.

Public outreach and public archaeology are beneficial components of any project. But given the capitalistic proponents behind cultural resources management, as large developers pay most CRM contracts, should CRM branch out into public archaeology and branch out further into public outreach? It would also go a long way in establishing that archaeologists working in the cultural resources management sector care about the resources within their project areas and that they are often the first step in protecting these resources. Despite the divide between academic and field archaeology, discoveries are made both in the field and in the research sector. Thus, public involvement from all sides benefits archaeology as a whole. Dr. Paul Shackel states,

One cause for the development of a new community-based archaeology program is that a growing number of professionals now accept the fact that archaeology is more than implementing scientific methods to collect and interpret data. While the New Archaeology placed academically trained professionals in positions as gatekeepers of archaeological knowledge, archaeologists are increasingly relying on community input for their projects (Shackel 2004:2).

Furthermore, investigating human behavior can lead us towards a feeling of shared humanity with others and a more empathetic understanding of human experience (Henson, 2017:45-46).

This has relevance for current issues, such as but not limited to:

- Identity: the popularity of family and local history, issues such as immigration.
- Environment: climate change, genetically modified foods, conservation of animals and landscapes.
- Warfare and oppression: our common origins and the futility of war.
- Economics: the benefits (and problems) of heritage tourism. (Henson, 2017:45-46)
- Politics: the importance of cultural sites such as Mount Rushmore, progress at the cost of preservation (Dakota Access Pipeline), the removal of harmful historic imagery, such as racist sports team names and mascots, or Confederate statues.

Alison Wylie (1994:10) writes of the dual capacity of archaeology to "incorporate and reproduce racist, nationalist, and other agendas, and its democratizing power, its capacity to counter 'mythologies' and to support decisive critical reexamination of the assumptions that both inform and are promoted by these agendas." With such

abilities, archaeology is profoundly political, and archaeologists have a responsibility not only to other scholars but also to the public interested in what archaeologists sometimes consider their material (Wylie 1994:13). This tendency to gatekeep knowledge will be discussed further in the next chapter.

Archaeology has something to offer to every type of learner. Every day, we are becoming more aware of how intricate and diverse the human mind is. Don Henson, writing about archaeology and education in the United Kingdom, crafted the following table that correlates Howard Gardner’s multiple intelligences theory, which claims that humans have different and independent ways in which they process data, with tasks within archaeology, see **Table 1** below.

Table 1: Gardner’s Multiple Intelligences Theory as Applied to Archaeology (adapted from Henson, 2017:42)

Learning Styles	Archaeological or heritage Activity
Linguistic	Writing site reports and interpretation panels
Logical-mathematical	Puzzling out the stratigraphy of a the site, undertaking analytical tasks such as lithic refitting
Spatial	Creating site plans, landscape exploration, undertaking field survey
Musical	Using sound within heritage Displays
Kinesthetic	The physicality of excavation, experimental archaeology, developing interactive displays
Naturalist	Interpreting the patterns in data, classifying artifacts, regional site analysis
Interpersonal	Team working, bringing to life the people behind the site
Intrapersonal	Individual research, providing space for reflection on heritage

Howard Gardner, Ph.D., is a John H. and Elisabeth A. Hobbs Research Professor of Cognition and Education at the Harvard Graduate School of Education at Harvard University. His work in early research in psychology and human cognition and human potential led to his development of the six intelligences. Today, after further studies, there are nine intelligences included in his theory, with the possibility of others pending further research (North Illinois University website: Howard Gardner's Multiple Intelligences, 2023).

This thesis is a discussion on how best to achieve public, descendant, and community involvement and collaboration that strives to respect the diverse beliefs and wishes of all involved. To this end, this thesis discusses not only the issues above but also the theory and history behind public archaeology, exploring three past viewpoints of engaging with the public within archaeology: the Ivory Tower model, the Gateway or Deficit model, and the Multiple Perspective model (Grima 2016:2-5), and two current public archaeology models proposed by Colwell (2016) and Atalay (2012). Grima will be explored in **Chapter 3: Background**, and Colwell and Atalay in **Chapter 4: Methods**.

Six outreach programs will be analyzed using twelve metrics to showcase the variety of approaches that can be used to achieve effective and sustainable public outreach. It is hoped that this discussion will inspire more cultural resources management and archaeology groups to consider adding public outreach to their initiatives.

Chapter 5 is a discussion and explanation of the research methods used before delving into a thorough discussion of six very different, yet effective outreach initiatives in **Chapter 6**. Below is brief introduction to each of the programs, which will be explored **further in Chapter 5**:

- The Estate Little Princess Archaeology Project (ELPAP), located on St. Croix, was designed to be a collaborative, interdisciplinary endeavor that includes as many Crucian historic preservation and archaeological local interests as possible. The project is hosted on property owned by the Nature Conservancy. It is a collaboration with the Smithsonian's Slave Wrecks Project, local historic preservation groups, the University of the Virgin Islands, and the University of California system. Administered by members of the Society of Black Archaeologists (SBA), archaeology at the Estate Little Princess Plantation has three central goals: 1) Identify, record, and excavate historical, archaeological features and sites, 2) To teach current archaeological field methods and theory, and 3) Include the local community with the data collection process and empower them to take ownership of their heritage.
- Archaeology in the Community (AITC) is a nonprofit organization founded by Dr. Alexandra Jones in 2009. The AITC partners with educational institutions, cultural institutions, and community organizations to increase local awareness of the benefits of archaeology and history through public events. They also provide archaeology enrichment programs to students, as well as provide professional development to college students pursuing careers in archaeology (AITC website, 2023).

- Nome Archaeology Camp is a field school for high school students in the Bering Straits and Northwest Alaska region that took place in Nome, Alaska from 2015-2019. The National Park Service partnered with Kawerak Inc, the Katirvik Center, the Bering Straits Native Corporation, the Carrie M. McLain Museum, and Alaska Geographic to put on the camp, which uses field trips and hands-on activities to teach students techniques to explore and appreciate the cultural and natural resources of the region. The camp incorporates more than archaeology; it also includes activities focusing on traditional knowledge, museum studies, wildlife biology, and history (NPS, 2021).
- The Sugarland Ethno-History Project (SEHP), which was incorporated as a 501(c)(3) nonprofit in March 2005 by founder and longtime president Gwen Reese, is a volunteer organization that continues to fulfill its mission to preserve the historic Sugarland church; to maintain a vast collection of historical artifacts, images, and documents; to encourage further research into the history of Sugarland and other African American communities in the area; and to share that history with the broader public (SEHP 2021).
- The Texas Archeological Stewardship Network (TASN) founded in 1984, is a group of trained avocational archeologists who work on a volunteer basis, under the direction of the Texas Historical Commission. The stewards play a critical role in bringing public archeology to life in their communities. Each year they devote thousands of hours to a broad range of tasks, such as assisting landowners with recording archeological sites and giving public talks. Their preservation, education, and research efforts are essential to the

Texas Historical Commission's statewide program. The TASN is one of the most innovative and successful programs of its kind in the U.S. and has served as the model for similar programs in other states (THC 2023).

- Project Archaeology (PA) is an educational organization dedicated to expanding students' understanding of scientific and historical investigation, cultural awareness, and the importance of protecting the U.S.' cultural and natural resources. PA educators come in many forms, including, but not limited to: archaeologists, teachers, state park employees, and other concerned parties who want to make archaeology accessible to students and teachers through quality educational materials and professional development.

Next, in **Chapter 6: Analysis**, there will be a discussion of the 12 metrics and how each of the program accomplishes them, or alternatively, why they may not accomplish a particular one.

Lastly, in the **Conclusion**, a final discussion of the analysis results will take place, as well as recommendations for future work, acknowledgments of any limitations within this study, and closing statements.

Chapter 2: Thoughts, Attitudes, and Trends on the Role of the Public in Archaeology

If archaeology is to continue to thrive as a field, then the public must be involved in a greater capacity. However, which methods are the most effective? Moreover, how can we teach participants to view history with a critical eye? This is especially important in a world where a picturesque view of history is often preferable to the truth. As stated by NPR reporter Terry Gross:

In states across the country, laws have been passed or introduced restricting what teachers can discuss in the classroom and what subjects and ideas should be banned from curricula. These restrictions mostly apply to subject matter pertaining to race, sexual orientation, gender identity, and political ideologies and philosophies. Many of these restrictions cover K-12 schools, as well as colleges and universities. Since January 2021, 137 bills restricting what can be taught have been introduced or pre-filed in 35 different states. Over 87 of those bills are from this year [2022]. Restrictive laws have been passed in 10 states (Gross 2022).

This type of legislation robs students, and the public, of learning the full story of history and can perpetuate harmful beliefs and misinterpretations. Throughout this thesis, we will discuss several programs that have been used in public archaeology to promote a more diverse and critical view.

Why involve the public in archaeology?

Archaeology is not simply a study of history but a tool used to discover and develop the stories of peoples and cultures worldwide. Both in the past and present, archaeologists have alienated descendant communities and other involved parties. If archaeology is a study of peoples and cultures, and not merely materials, then descendant communities especially deserve a voice within the archaeological process.

They should be encouraged to share their stories and histories instead of merely being *told* what they are by those outside of their community.

In defense of including the public, Christopher Tilly stated the following:

Excavation has a unique role to play as a theatre where people may be able to produce their own pasts, pasts which are meaningful to them, not as expressions of a mythical heritage. Excavations need to become, much more so than they are today, nexuses of decoding and encoding processes by which people may create meaning from the past. This is to advocate a socially engaged rather than a scientifically detached practice (Tilley 1989:275).

Although this quote still has merit, today we know that excavation is not the sole or even the preferred way to “create meaning” from the past, especially for descendant communities, who may already know the meaning of the past that archaeologists strive to “create.” However, how can archaeology begin to have this open dialogue of what methods are best used if descendant communities are not asked for their input? In order to better understand how archaeology primarily operates within the U.S., and why it is crucial to diversify the field, it is important to understand some key policies; these are summarized in the section below.

A Quick Note on Current Protections for Cultural Resources

Development activities that receive federal funding are subject to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) legislation. These pieces of legislation require federal agencies to consider the effect of undertakings they carry out, license, approve, or fund on

historic properties and provide the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) a reasonable opportunity to comment before making decisions. NEPA requires federal agencies to take the same considerations towards the environment (King 2012). When using the Section 106 process, federal agencies identify historic properties, assess potential effects a project might have, consider alternatives to avoid, minimize, or mitigate any adverse effects, and document their outcome. Agencies are required to take part in the consultation process by discussing and considering the views of numerous parties, including State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPOs) and/or Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPOs), Native American Tribes, Native Hawaiian Organizations, and many others, while also providing opportunities for public input. The ACHP (King 2012:32) is an independent federal agency established by the NHPA, which oversees the implementation of the Section 106 process, issues its regulations ([36 CFR Part 800](#)), and may participate in consultation to resolve adverse effects on historic properties (King 2012:32.) It is to be noted that although this legislation is the beginning of attempts to improve archaeology's relations with indigenous groups, there is still a long way to go. Indigenous voices still often go unheard, and not all tribes are given a seat at the table. Currently, only federally recognized tribes are required to be a part of Section 106 and repatriation processes. That means that tribes who are not federally recognized do not get a say in what happens to the materials or the interpretations of their cultures and histories.

Using the NEPA process, agencies evaluate their proposed actions' potential environmental and related socioeconomic effects. This is done through an

Environmental Assessment or an Environmental Impact Statement. NEPA is often described as an “umbrella” law as its analysis incorporates a broad range of federal laws, regulations, and executive orders. As with Section 106, agencies acting under NEPA are required to provide opportunities for public review and comment. NEPA established the President's Council on Environmental Quality ([CEQ](#)) to oversee NEPA implementation. CEQ has issued regulations ([40 CFR Parts 1500-1508](#)) to aid the NEPA implementation process (ACHP website). However, the NHPA is meant to protect cultural resources under federal control from federal actions. Undertakings at levels below this, such as state or city, are regulated differently and vary from state to state, as well as agency to agency. Perhaps with a stronger public understanding of archaeology, concerned citizens could aid in the protection of at risk resources in their areas that may not be subject to the protections provided for in the NHPA.

Throughout its history, the territory of the past has also gone through marked phases of closure and openness (Catapoti, 2013:277). A spatial metaphor that perfectly describes the current situation concerning cultural resources versus the enshrinement of private ownership and capitalistic progress in the U.S. can be drawn from the work of literary critic Fredric Jameson. Jameson states:

We are here in the presence of something like a mutation . . . in space itself. My implication is that we ourselves, the human subjects who happen into this space, have not kept pace with that evolution; there has been a mutation in the object, unaccompanied as yet by any equivalent mutation in the subject; we do not yet possess the perceptual equipment to match this new hyperspace. (1998:10–11).

Furthermore, John Kantner had this to say on the state of archaeology: “Archaeology is entering a transitional phase of disciplinary development. Intellectual fragmentation, institutional neglect, diminishing funding sources, and irrelevant curricula. All are

problems that our relatively young discipline is facing” (Kantner 2004:2). He advises that we “seriously consider what our discipline is doing and what it hopes to achieve,” (Kantner, 2004:2). Today, the world is connected in unprecedented ways electronically. Information channels are wide open, and people are able to engage with other countries and cultures in a more easily accessible way than in previous decades. We are living in uncharted territory, and it will take some time to figure out how to navigate these new waters. To this end, humanity is in a constant pendulum of progress versus regression, and one can hope that this dark time for social change, scientific knowledge, and civil rights within the U.S. is merely a swing into the side of regression, that will lead to a flourishing progressive state once more. We must bring a more inclusive and diverse view into archaeology and anthropology if we are to thrive as a field. Below are examples of two models that can contribute to the lack of descendant and public involvement in archaeology.

Past Attitudes Towards Public Archaeology

Unfortunately, Public Archaeology is often treated as a subdiscipline of archaeology, rather than a duty of all archaeologists. In the past, there were primarily three viewpoints of engaging with the public within archaeology: the Ivory Tower model, the Gateway or Deficit model, and the Multiple Perspective model, prosed by Reuben Grima. (2016:2-5). Grima is a senior lecturer in the Department of Conservation and Built Heritage at the University of Malta. In **Chapter 4: Methods**, the models proposed by Colwell (2016) and Atalay (2012) will be discussed as more inclusive and collaborative than Grima’s Multiple Perspective model. However,

continuing with this discussion of Grima, within the Ivory Tower model, the archaeologists see themselves as:

The ‘insiders’ and ‘specialists’, immersed in archaeological evidence and in the knowledge that is the key to its understanding. Privileged access to the evidence, be it during an excavation or in a museum vault, is considered inseparable from the professional credentials of the archaeologist, which not only legitimize those privileges, but also reinforce them by cumulatively widening the divide between the specialists’ knowledge and experience, and that of the wider public. The divide is rendered more acute and more complex in colonial or other adversarial contexts when it follows, and in turn reinforces, the fracture lines of ethnic or political affiliation. The divide may be widened further by using impenetrably jargon-rich discourse, to reach a point where it becomes very difficult for the uninitiated to follow the debate, and it may be safely declared that the wider public is not really interested in the past (Grima 2016:2).

Sadly, most are familiar with this model, as even today, archaeology reports and papers are hidden behind locked files and firewalls. Next, is the Gateway or Deficit model, which is a factor in the current trend of archaeology as an entertainment commodity (discussed further below). In the Gateway or Deficit model,

Archaeological practice takes on the role of gateway, theatre, and spectacle. It implies that archaeologists will select from, water down, and filter the body of specialist archaeological knowledge available to them, to make it suitable for public consumption. The corollary to this assumption is that popular knowledge of the past may only ever represent a subset and a fraction of specialist knowledge, to which it has nothing to add (Grima 2016:3).

As argued by Merriman, the ultimate assumption in such a model is that the public has an intrinsic deficit in its ability to understand the past, and it may therefore be described as a ‘deficit model’ (Merriman, 2004:5–6). While these two models are not entirely realistic, they do illustrate some uncomfortable truths concerning how archaeologists view themselves in relation to the public. As pointed out by Grima:

The very notion that public archaeology is the concern of a subgroup within the archaeologists' professional community runs the risk of immediately absolving the rest of that community of some key responsibilities. The moment it becomes the specific responsibility of the 'public archaeologist' to grapple with the complex of challenges and issues that characterize public engagement with archaeology, other archaeologists are freed to scuttle back to their ivory tower to continue their research, or at most to hand down suitably condensed narratives for the consumption of the uninitiated masses (Grima 2016:5).

These two models are the public archaeology that we as a professional community should seek to avoid if we wish to foster a diverse and inclusive environment.

Scholars have questioned archaeology's history of advancing imperialist, colonialist, and racist objectives (Hamilakas & Duke 2007:1131–1140). These critics argue that archaeologists need to recognize that the discipline is about living individuals and communities whose lives and heritage suffer from the abuse of capitalist power dynamics and that they must adopt a political ethic. Archaeology is a product of capitalism that originated in early-nineteenth-century Europe as a practice that served the interest of bourgeois nationalism (Trigger, 1984:4). Today, archaeology is most often practiced in capitalist settings, such as the CRM industry. Fast capitalism has not been kind to archaeology (McGuire, 2008:28). The capitalistic search for profit transforms archaeological knowledge, heritage, and education into commodities to be produced at the lowest cost for sale in a competitive market (McGuire, 2014:1138).

As further elaborated by Hamilakas and Duke:

The commodification of archaeology in capitalism manifests itself in many ways, from the use of archaeological knowledge to sell Las Vegas casinos, to the conversion of museums and ancient monuments from public teaching tools into entertainment

theme parks, to the creation of an archaeological underclass in cultural resource management (2007:10).

Furthermore, as stated by Catapoti, “Even if we accept that such projects indeed allow the wider public to achieve a higher degree of inter-activity with (or accessibility to) the past, their primary aim remains the further expansion and control of their commercial clientele” (2013:272). As important as it is to understand internal attitudes toward public archaeology, it is also essential to understand the public’s understanding of archaeology. In 1999, a survey by Harris Interactive, on behalf of the Society of American Archaeology and other professional archaeology groups, questioned the public’s perception of archaeology. A random sample, which included 1,016 adults from across 48 states, were asked several different questions (Ramos & Duganna, 2000:5). All questions were explicitly related to archaeology, archaeological data, and site preservation (Ramos & Duganne, 2000:3-30).

When participants were asked: What comes to mind when you hear the word “archaeology”? Twenty-two percent thought of someone digging (simply digging), 12% of the sample thought of history, heritage, and antiquity, 10% of the sample thought of someone digging specifically for dinosaur bones, 9% of the sample thought of someone digging for bones (just bones in general) and only 8% of the sample thought of ancient cultures and civilizations (Ramos & Duganne, 2000:11).

When respondents were asked: What do archaeologists do? Thirteen percent of the sample said that they dig, 12% said that archaeologists search for, find and uncover

remains, and 3% said that they study, document, and analyze remains (Ramos & Duganne, 2000:12). Twenty-five percent of the sample said that archaeologists analyze and research the past to discover past human life ways (Ramos & Duganne, 2000:12). In conjunction with this, respondents were asked: What do you think archaeologists study? When “aided” with potential answers, 99% of the respondents agreed that archaeologists study ancient civilizations, 98% of the sample agreed that they study the past, and 94% agreed that they study pottery. Other answers included: native people and/or native societies (93%), fossils (92%), dinosaurs (85%), rocks or stones (83%), the nineteenth-century and the twentieth century (83%), and shipwrecks (77%) (Ramos & Duganne, 2000:15). Although answers varied by levels of education and specific interests in archaeology, this study shows that most people have heard about archaeology and have some sense of the work archaeologists do (Ramos & Duganne, 2000:3-30). However, those with lower levels of archaeological exposure and lower levels of specific interest continue to believe that archaeologists study dinosaurs and dig up dinosaur bones (Ramos & Duganne, 2000:11). To correct this mistaken belief, (an example of Grima’s deficit model (2016:3) at work), it is essential to understand where the public obtains their understanding of archaeology, and how they learn about archaeology, archaeological excavation, and site preservation. A newer poll, conducted by Ipsos in 2023, in partnership with the SAA, American Institute of Archaeology (AIA), the National Parks Service (NPS), and the Peabody Institute of Archaeology, sought to answer this, as well to continue to gauge public interest in archaeology. The 2023 poll concluded that Americans primarily learn about archaeology through television (49%), museums (47%), classrooms and

textbooks (47%), movies (30%), and other print media (21%) (Ipsos, 2023:13). Additionally, public responses continued to show a trend of public support for archaeology with 88% of participants responding that archaeology is important. However, 47% of participants still believe that archaeologists excavate dinosaurs, and only 46% felt that archaeology studies and preserves indigenous heritage, while 66% answered that archaeologists study past cultures, and while this is true, many of the peoples and cultures studied by archaeology and anthropology are still alive today. (Ipsos, 2023:12) Archaeologists have a responsibility to the public and descendant communities to work towards repairing these mistaken beliefs and to ensure that ethical work is being conducted in all areas of archaeology. Archaeology, being a subdiscipline of anthropology, engages with living animate and inanimate entities, not dead communities, people, and things. Thus, we hold responsibilities toward present-day people and to the material traces that may come from the past but continue to live in the present, including the material traces of past people (Tarlow, 2006:191). The goal of diversifying participation within archaeology opens opportunities to use the “Multiple Perspective Model” mentioned above. Within this model, archaeologists are members of, rather than distinct and apart from, the wider community (Grima 2016: 6). The programs discussed within this thesis all use varied means to encourage learning via the “Multiple Perspective Model,” and while these programs are not an exhaustive list, they provide excellent examples.

Although public outreach tries to curtail the public’s misconceptions, accessible programs are far and few between. In many areas I have worked in CRM, it is astounding how many people had no idea that archaeology exists in their own

(figurative or literal) backyard. Thus, any outreach effort must consider the public's perceptions of archaeology so that we can shift those perceptions to be closer to the truth. However, where did these perceptions come from? The next chapter will explore public archaeology's history.

Chapter 3: Historical Background

The history of public archaeology in the U.S. began with the goal of reducing vandalism and looting of sites by educating the public (Wernecke, 2017:5). Over time, this has entailed the creation of programs by science and history educators for schoolchildren and classrooms as well as field programs, such as Passport in Time (U.S. Forest Service: <https://www.passportintime.com/>) or Project Archaeology (Bureau of Land Management: <https://projectarchaeology.org/>). The aim of these projects was, and still is, to involve the public in preserving heritage. The first archaeological preserve was created in 1892 by President Harrison to protect Casa Grande Pueblo ruins (AIA 2006). Then in 1906, Theodore Roosevelt began founding what would become the National Parks Service and signed “The Antiquities Act,” which was supported by the early Archaeological Institute of America and underlined congressional support for setting aside lands for science and preservation in the public's interest and guided the creation of national monuments while protecting archaeological sites and natural areas (AIA 2006; Barrie 1998; Everhart 1983; Waldbauer & Hutt 2006; Wirth 1980:42-43; Stine 2014:1). Next, in 1916 Congress passed the Organic Act, which further formed the fledgling National Parks Service (NPS). It was created to stop the looting and destruction of archaeological sites, primarily Southwestern Pueblo dwellings, and six park properties were protected primarily for their cultural resources (AIA 2006; Barrie 1998; Everhart 1983; NPS 2014b; Rettie 1995:47). The NPS was meant to be a regulatory authority whose primary job is overseeing U.S. monuments and national parks, and whose mission would be "to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife

therein ... as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations" (NPS, 2011:1). The Historic Sites Act of 1935 established that it was U.S. policy to preserve historic sites for public use, greatly expanding NPS's jurisdiction while at the same time creating the National Landmarks program (summarized from Barrie 1998; Carnett 1991; King 2008; Neumann et al. 2010). The Secretary of the Interior used the act as a means to employ the NPS to collect data, survey, investigate, and then seek to acquire properties in the name of the U.S., but property owners had to consent. However, after World War II, NPS director Conrad Wirth realized park visitation was up while the quality of facilities was down, in line with decreased congressional allocations. He asked Congress for a ten-year commitment to refurbishing, rebuilding, and revitalizing the NPS. This was dubbed "Mission 66" (honoring the park service's golden anniversary), and led directly to the hiring of more staff, including archaeologists, and improved maintenance of archaeological sites (Wirth, 1980:41). As a part of this revitalization, naturalist Freeman Tilden worked to improve the NPS' stagnant interpretive programs, using his six principles of interpretation:

- 1) "The chief aim of Interpretation is not instruction, but provocation.
- 2) Any interpretation that does not somehow relate what is being displayed or described to something within the personality or experience of the visitor will be sterile.
- 3) Information does not equal interpretation, but all interpretation contains information.
- 4) Interpretation is an art which combines many arts regardless of subject material. Any art is to some degree teachable.
- 5) Interpretation should aim to present a whole rather than a part.
- 6) Interpretation for children must be designed specifically for children, and not simply a dilution of programs and information for adults" (Tilden, 2007:34-35).

Tilden's book, *"Interpreting Our Heritage,"* is not meant to serve as a how-to for building any one type of public program. Instead, it is meant to provide a set of principles and an overarching view of the interactions between three groups: those who produce research, those who deliver programs, and those who take part in the interpretive experience (Horrocks, 2019:1).

Next, in 1966, the National Historic Sites Act (NHPA) was enacted as a response to the loss of cultural resources that was happening across the country as a part of post WWII revitalization efforts, (NPS website, 2023: The NHPA Act of 1966). The NHPA expanded the duties of the NPS to include the creation of a National Register of Historic Places, the ACHP, and other cooperative and administrative duties leading to the promulgation of numerous additions to the code of federal regulations ("CFRs"), plus special publications such as the National Register bulletin series (summarized from Birnbaum 1994; Carnett 1991; King 2008; Neumann et al. 2010). This all-important act states that the "historical and cultural foundations of the nation should be preserved as a living part of our community life and development in order to give a sense of orientation" to U.S. citizens (National Historic Preservation Act Section 1) (b)(2); see Advisory Council on Historic Preservation 2009).

As such, it directs the NPS to construct a scaffold of cultural resource rules and consulting relationships with tribal, state, county, and other preservation groups. It is important to note that tribal consultation was not required until the 1992 amendments to NHPA, and that the above protections only apply to federally funded projects or federal lands.

The full definition of the expanded services terrestrial and marine authority is stated in Public Law 91-383 (Wirth, 1980:41). The addition of cultural resource management (CRM) duties pertaining to the parks, all federal lands, and projects requiring federal permitting or funding has dramatically increased the scope of archaeology in the Department of the Interior (McManamon, 1996:17-18). The chief archaeologist's role is to advise the Secretary of the Department of the Interior on archaeological matters and to oversee the NPS's diverse park and CRM archaeology programs. The structural relationship between parks and cultural resource branches is occasionally adjusted (Everhart 1983:34; King et al. 1977:67; Wirth 1980:41).

Over time, archaeologists' duties grew with the passage of additional laws related to, for instance, environmental review (National Environmental Protection Act of 1970), protection of archaeological resources on federal lands (Archaeological Resource Protection Act of 1979; Executive Orders 11593, 13007, and 13175), and repatriation of sacred remains to North American tribes (American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978, Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990; Carnett 1991; King 2008; King et al. 1977; NPS 2014b, 2014c; Neumann et al. 2010; Sprinkle 2011). Today, NPS archaeologists work in diverse roles, designing guidelines, interpreting cultural resource laws, and managing cultural resource programs; in curating, advocating, and advising regional centers such as the Southeastern Archaeological Center (SEAC); and in actual parks and national landmarks (summarized from Birnbaum 1994; King 2008; McManamon 1996; NPS 2013).

Despite increased park archaeology, the justification for the park's archaeologists has not been well articulated to the public, contributing to the notion that all archaeological discoveries have already been made and suggesting a need for improved outreach and public support. The NPS has lost at least 62 properties due to vandalism, erosion, neglect (due to lack of action or funds), and state-level political actions (Rettie 1995:244-249). Dirk Spennemann (2011) sees a growing lack of interest in heritage as one culprit in that "we have failed to express ... that the past has relevance to the present . . . in a continually changing world" (Spennemann 2011:7).

David Lowenthal (2005:30) further elaborates that the notion of stewardship "for all time" is a hard sell to modern consumers of objects that have built-in obsolescence. This is also a part of the current curation crisis; how can we care for artifacts "in perpetuity" when the funding to do so is not available today, let alone in the future? The NPS's current strategy plans to garner increased public support for park stewardship by expanding the diversity of their park types and their interpretative programs (including archaeology) by bringing in urban residents through special programs (Albright & Cahn 1985; NPS 2011). Outreach efforts illustrate that the excitement of hands-on archaeology is extremely popular, especially if research questions are relevant to visitors (Shackel & Chambers, 2004:71-81). However, despite these efforts, it seems that the objectives, scope, and methodology of public archaeology are still not understood, nor applied, equally among archaeologists, even with public archaeology's steady growth as a discipline since the 1970s (Matsuda 2004:66).

The term 'public archaeology' first occurred in the U.S. (Schadla-Hall 1999:147) when Charles R. McGimsey (a Harvard graduate and founder of the Arkansas Archaeological Society) published his book, "Public Archeology," in 1972. Within the book, he calls for the preservation of cultural heritage for the sake of the "public right to knowledge" (McGimsey 1972:5). Soon after its publication, the term "public archaeology" caught on, and today the field has gained some recognition in the U.S. and Britain, as a discipline within archaeology. During the 1960s and 70s, archaeology was undergoing a revitalization, during which increased specialization and creation of subdisciplines proliferated, and yet the emergence of public archaeology had different implications. Unlike other subdisciplines, which were expanded domains of archaeological study as usual, public archaeology was a product of introspection within archaeology to redefine the discipline within broader social horizons. This differed from the traditional view of archaeology as the study of the past through material culture, as public archaeology was, and is, unique in that it examines the relationship between archaeology and present society. Furthermore, it acknowledges that archaeological studies are not detached from cultural, economic, and political aspects of present society, and that the power relations within society inevitably influence the methods and objectives of archaeological activities, and vice versa.

Archaeology can no longer remain solely in the academic realm, separate from the interests of modern society, especially given that most of CRM work is funded by the government. All archaeological activity inevitably contains and entails a value judgment, which, by definition, is never wholly objective and should therefore be

considered from a sociological point of view. This realization gave archaeologists a push to engage not only with fellow anthropologists, but also with the public, in all its forms (Matsuda 2004:67). Through this work, some of the most important publics that emerged were groups who claimed to be direct descendants of the precontact peoples whom archaeologists study. By the end of the 1990s, a significant branch of archaeological practice had shifted toward new theories and methods for directly and meaningfully engaging descendant communities (Colwell, 2016:1). The gradual progress of a more active role for descendant communities within archaeology has shifted the way museums, national parks, and other venues present culture. It has also contributed to community-based participatory research development, tribal cultural and heritage management programs, social justice, and the advancement of the CRM industry. Descendant communities have facilitated the transformation of archaeology into a science that is driven by an ethical engagement with key publics who are invested in the interpretation and management of the material past (Colwell, 2016:1).

Chapter 4: Methods & Metrics

The previous chapters have discussed the theory and history behind public archaeology, and the following chapters will seek to uncover how to design public archaeology programs that are effective, sustainable, and engaging. The research materials for this thesis were gathered in a multitude of ways; primarily through targeted searches through public (Google, Facebook, Instagram, and YouTube) and academic databases (JSTOR, WorldCat, and classroom discussion). Non-academic methods were used to determine what resources concerning these programs are available to the public, as most of the public are not logging into, nor have access to, JSTOR, WorldCat, and many other data sources that are locked behind paywalls and subscriptions. Additionally, given the localization, and thus lack of national renown for most public archaeology programs, four of these programs were previously known to the author due to previous classwork, only Nome Archaeology Camp and Project Archaeology were discovered purely through Google searches. However, who can say if an average person would be able to have found them on Google; this search was weighted because the author knew what terms to add into it. One can imagine how difficult it would be for members of the public to become aware of these programs unless they are taking place within their community, or they know the specific terms to plug into a search engine. Beyond searching databases, the author also looked for data on each program on their webpages, the webpages of any partnerships, and the social media accounts for both the programs and their partners (if available) and was often able to find additional resources through links and posts

within these resources. It is worth noting that the author attempted contact with leadership for each program, but was largely unsuccessful in this endeavor.

As stated, the programs discussed were chosen for various reasons, with the primary reason being that they each possess unique ways to accomplish their goals, showcasing that there is no one “right way” to provide public archaeology. Each of their methods will be analyzed and discussed using the following metrics, outlined below in **Table 2.**

Table 2: Metrics used for discovering elements that aid in effectiveness and sustainability.

Project Name	The Estate Little Princess Archaeology Project (ELPAP)	Archaeology in the Community (AIRC)	Nome Archaeology Camp	Sugarland Ethno-History Project (SEHP)	Texas Archeological Stewardship Network (TASN)	Project Archaeology (PA)
(1) Partners	The Society of Black Archaeologists, Diving with a Purpose, the University of California system of colleges, the Smithsonian's Slave Wrecks Project, local historic preservation groups, the University of the Virgin Islands, The Nature Conservancy, Hands-On Preservation Experience, Crucian Heritage and Nature Tourism	AIRC Giving Society, Archaeology Society of Maryland, Mid-Potomac Chapter Inc, Dovetail Cultural Resource Group, St. Croix Archaeological Society, The Society of Black Archaeologists, American Society of Overseas Research, New South Associates, Argosy Foundation, Humanities DC, Southeastern Archaeologic	Alaska Geographic, Bering Straits Native Corporation, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Carrie M. McLane Memorial Museum, City of Nome, Katirvik Cultural Center, Kawerak, Inc., Murie Science and Learning Center, National Park Service, Norton Sound Economic Development Center, Shared	History Associates Incorporated, Howard University, Heritage Montgomery, diverse volunteer group, The Ottery Group, Archaeological Society of Maryland: Mid-Potomac Chapter, Montgomery College, Maryland Humanities,	The Texas Archeological Society, the Council of Texas Archeologists, and The Friends of the THC.	The Bureau of Land Management (BLM), (appears to provide curriculum writing assistance.) Montana State University (upcoming stewardship program)

Project Name	The Estate Little Princess Archaeology Project (ELPAP)	Archaeology in the Community (AITC)	Nome Archaeology Camp	Sugarland Ethno-History Project (SEHP)	Texas Archeological Stewardship Network (TASN)	Project Archaeology (PA)
		al Conference; DC Department of Parks and Recreation, DC Public School After-School Program, Montpelier Foundation	Beringian Heritage Program, and University of Alaska Fairbanks-Northwest Campus.			
(2) Flexible Design (Y/N?)	Design is unique to its location, but its design techniques could be applied to other programs.	Yes.	Design is unique to its location.	The design is unique to its location but could be modified for other areas.	Yes.	Yes.
(3) Adequately explains the archaeological process? Uses multiple methods?	Yes/Yes.	Yes/Yes.	Yes/Yes.	Yes/Yes.	Yes/Yes.	Yes/Yes.
(4) Activities for a variety of learning styles?	Yes.	Yes.	Yes.	Yes.	Yes.	Yes.
(5) Culturally sensitive? Help for underprivileged students?	Yes/Yes.	Yes/Yes.	Yes/Yes.	Yes/N/A.	Yes/No.	Yes/Varies.
(6) Objective portrayal of history, if applicable?	Yes.	Yes.	Yes.	Yes.	Yes.	Yes.
(7) Provides participants with a set of buildable skills?	Yes.	Yes.	Yes.	Yes.	Yes.	Yes.

Project Name	The Estate Little Princess Archaeology Project (ELPAP)	Archaeology in the Community (AIRC)	Nome Archaeology Camp	Sugarland Ethno-History Project (SEHP)	Texas Archeological Stewardship Network (TASN)	Project Archaeology (PA)
(8) Targets a specific community ?	Yes. African Americans and Crucian descendant communities.	Yes, African Americans, Latin-Americans, and under privileged students.	Yes, indigenous students residing in Alaska.	Yes, and no. The efforts are supported by Sugarland descendants, but the site, book, and curriculum are for any population.	No, overall programs are not targeted.	No.
(9) Virtual Learning components ?	No.	Yes.	No.	Not currently.	Yes.	Varies.
(10) Publicly available curriculum ? Free?	No.	Yes/Yes.	No.	No.	Yes/Yes.	Yes/No.
(11) Active social media presence?	No.	Yes.	No.	Yes.	Through THC and Friends of THC website, Facebook,	Chapter dependent.
(12) Media Coverage (Y/N?) & media types	Yes, journal articles, books, newspapers, interviews, and YouTube.	Yes, articles, televised interviews, YouTube, and podcasts.	Yes, blog posts, news articles, and YouTube.	Yes, blog posts, magazines, and newspaper articles.	Yes, articles, websites, and newsletters.	Limited data available due to regionality of chapters

These metrics are not rigid, as each public archaeology program should be individualized to fit its specific audience, leaving participants with a greater respect or connection to the past, depending on where they fit within a given narrative During the early development of this thesis, the metrics began as these simple questions: “Does the program adequately explain the archaeological process? Is the program culturally sensitive, and is it targeted towards a specific community (And is this community a descendant community)? Does it portray events objectively, if applicable? Does the program leave participants with a set of buildable skills, and

what sort of skills are they? Does the program have activities that are applicable to multiple learning styles?”, and then these questions were expanded into the twelve metrics seen above (see **Table 2**).

Before going further, it is imperative that definitions of the metrics be established.

For the purposes of this analysis, **Metric 1**, or partners, is defined as a sponsor, donating party, grant provider, or any other individual or group who is involved with or aids a program, but is not directly in charge of it. **Metric 1** was chosen to showcase that effective and sustainable public archaeology can be achieved no matter how large or modest a budget one has. **Metric 2** is defined as the program being willing to meet its participants needs, and this flexibility of design is expanded upon in **Metrics 3-10**. **Metric 3** explores if a program is teaching what the archaeological process is, (i.e. scientific stewardship vs. Indiana Jones/looting), and if so, are participants learning multiple methods? Are they being purely taught excavation or are other skills being taught such as, but not limited to, reading landscapes, laboratory work, gathering oral history, etc.? Essentially, **Metric 3** is an exploration in how well-rounded of an education on the process and responsibilities of archaeology the participants are receiving. **Metric 4** is an acknowledgement that people process information differently from one another and that one particular type of learning is not applicable to all participants. How archaeology can meet the needs of different learning styles was previously explored in the introduction through Gardner’s Multiple Intelligences Theory (see **Table 1**). **Metric 5** advocates for the decolonization of archaeology and is also a challenge to end the gatekeeping within the field. Are these programs culturally sensitive? Or are they still using outdated terms and ideas? Are they

inclusive of the participants' cultures? Are they making entry to the program as accessible as possible, or is it beyond the means of most to attend? **Metric 6** asks if the program is giving as objective a narrative of events as possible, or are they overly romanticizing, or alternatively demonizing, one side of the story? **Metric 7** asks if participants are given skills that they can carry with them, and build upon, throughout life and/or within archaeology should they choose to continue pursuing it, or are the skills learned only applicable to the program? **Metric 8** explores if a program is targeted towards a particular community, such as a descendant community, or elementary school students, or the elderly, and so on. In essence, **Metric 8** is used to define the program's audience. **Metric 9** asks if the program has publicly available virtual learning components. As discussed later in this chapter, the global pandemic was an eye-opening experience in terms of accessibility. If one cannot go to a cultural resource or a public archaeology camp, that should not exclude them from participating in public archaeology. **Metric 10** was created via this same thought process. During the global pandemic, it was discovered that many students only had internet access through their parents' cellphones. Thirty minutes away from Huntsville, Alabama, where the communications center for the International Space Station, a world class laboratory, is located, crews (the author led the CRM crew who participated in these efforts) were racing to run fiber optic lines so that students could go to school. If one does not have internet at home, then publicly available curricula that could be printed off at a library and taken home are an imperfect solution. And if said curricula are free, then it prevents a paywall or credit rating from barring participants. **Metric 11** looks at the amount of publicity, or non-social media

materials, that a program is featured in. These media can be, but not limited to, forms such as newspaper articles, televised interviews, or lectures posted on YouTube that are not published to the program's channel. **Metric 12** looks at what social media exposure the programs are giving themselves. Many use social media to research a program or a facility.

The above metrics were also designed with the ideas of Colwell (2016) and Atalay (2012), pertaining to the decolonization of archaeology, in mind. Chip Colwell and Sonya Atalay advocate for a more collaborative and community focused public archaeology than Grima's Multi-Perspective model (Grima 2016:2-5) and are at the forefront of current theories surrounding the execution of public archaeology. Colwell states in his 2016 article that public archaeology means employing active, meaningful engagement to serve a community's goals (Merriman 2004, from Colwell, 2016:115). It has become a form of applied archaeology focused on the living meanings and values of the past (Brighton 2011, Komara & Barton 2014, Shackel & Chambers 2004, from Colwell, 2016:115). Collaboration is dynamic and fluid; it is not one set of practices. Instead, collaboration lies on a continuum, which was originally conceived as a spectrum of three modes of practice: resistance, participation, and collaboration (Colwell, Chanthaphonh & Ferguson 2008, pp. 10–14). Colwell discusses a revised version of this that expands the continuum to include colonial control on one end of the spectrum and community control on the other (**Table 3**). This ideology brings awareness to how some archaeological projects and practices are colonial in nature (Dommelen 1997, Nicholas & Hollowell 2007) and may form in resistance to the needs and values of communities (Burke et al. 2008) or involve one-

directional participation (Rowley 2002), or efforts are “collaborative,” providing equal benefits to and involvement of all parties (Dowdall & Parrish 2003, Duin et al. 2015, Gumerman et al. 2012), as opposed to fully empowering communities to speak for themselves and control heritage on their own terms (Brugge & Missaghian 2006, Welch et al. 2006). Colwell states that by responding to community needs, collaborative methods can help communities recover from traumatic events, such as an earthquake (Praetzellis et al. 2007) or an epidemic (Schmidt 2010), and respond to vitally important social issues, such as race relations (Brown 2015, Jennings 2015) or even climate change (Newland 2015). Community-based work is often focused on social justice and redressing history (McDavid 2002, Mullins 2007); it embraces activism (McGuire 2008), and lastly it strives for peace, justice, healthy communities, and environmental harmony (Little 2009). Colwell’s Continuum is summarized within the table below.

Table 3: Colwell’s Collaborative Continuum (Colwell, 2016:117)

Colonial →	Resistance →	Participation →	Collaboration →	Indigenous Control →
Goals are set solely by archaeologists	Goals develop in opposition	Goals develop independently	Goals develop jointly	Goals are set by the tribe
Information is extracted and removed from the community	Information is secreted	Information is disclosed	Information flows freely	Information is proprietary and controlled by the tribe
Descendants are involved as laborers	No stakeholder involvement	Limited stakeholder involvement	Full stakeholder involvement	Archaeologists are employees or consultants for the tribe
No voice for descendants	Little voice for descendants	Some voice for descendants	Full voice of descendants	Full voice of descendants is privileged
Acquiescence is enforced by the state	No support is given/obtained	Support is solicited	Support is tacit	Support is authorized by the tribe

Colonial →	Resistance →	Participation →	Collaboration →	Indigenous Control →
Needs for science are optimized	Needs of others are not considered	Needs of most parties are mostly met	Needs of all parties are realized	Goals are set by the tribe

Atalay (2012) has also advocated for archaeologists to collaborate and decolonize archaeology by using a method she refers to as community-based participatory research (or CBPR) (Atalay 2007, 2010). It is notable that Atalay is an Indigenous archaeologist (Anishinaabe-Ojibwe) whose work crosses “disciplinary boundaries, incorporating aspects of cultural anthropology, archaeology, critical heritage studies, and Native American and Indigenous Studies,” (UMass Amherst website, 2023: Sonya Atalay). Her CBPR approach is inspired by earlier community-based efforts (Marshall 2002, Moser et al. 2002, Sen 2002, Stanish & Jusimba 2000, summarized with Atalay, 2012:1-20) but expands these practices by inviting archaeologists to directly confront the problems of archaeology’s relevance to diverse publics, to identify and work with its myriad audiences, and to expand its benefits more widely (Atalay, 2012:5). CBPR “provides a method for a community and an archaeologist to work together to pursue a research design that benefits them both as equal partners” (Atalay, 2012:5). Additionally, one should create programming that appeals to a wide range of learning styles, as discussed previously in defining **Metric 4**. Reviewing Gardner’s multiple intelligences theory in relation to archaeology, which was discussed during the introduction, public archaeology is in a unique position to provide this.

Archaeologists must consider how people learn to develop better public outreach initiatives that can reach students of all ages and levels of archaeological exposure. However, lessons in educational theory are typically not included in the academic and professional development required to become an archaeologist. The Committee on Developments in the Science of Learning's general cognitive learning theory leads with the concept that "Students come to the classroom with preconceptions about how the world works" (Bransford et al. 2000:14-15). (Students, in this case, can refer to someone of any age, not just children.) If the educator does not engage a student's initial understanding, the student may fail to grasp the new concepts and information being taught, or they may learn the concepts for purposes of a test (in this example, the "test" could be participating in archaeology once, but failing to carry forward its goals of stewardship or cultural respect and sensitivity) but afterward revert to their preconceptions outside the classroom (Bransford et al. 2000:14-15). This is why the metrics chosen ask if an outreach initiative properly explains the archaeological process and provides learning opportunities for multiple learning styles. Another aspect of teaching is to present students with learning situations that direct them to think about the world and the meanings of its history and experiences in an objective manner that does not paint any participants as "good or bad," as discussed in defining **Metric 6**. Archaeology can provide activities, hands-on learning, and opportunities to experiment and learn about specific experiences that may differ from your own (Hein, 1991:1-10), exploring **Metrics 4-6**. Furthermore, the understanding of concepts and experiences also allows easier transfer of concepts to other situations (Bransford et al. 2000:51). One hopes that students will leave with the skillset necessary to transfer

from one problem to another within a program, from one program to another, from programs to everyday life, such as in the workplace, social settings, etc. This is a type of buildable skillset, as discussed in defining **Metric 7**. Knowledge and skill transfer improves if educators teach students to become aware of themselves as learners who can actively monitor their own learning strategies and resources (Bransford et al. 2000:67). This also includes the notion that students bring knowledge to the classroom to construct new understandings of previous knowledge, whether the previous knowledge comes from a previous academic experience or the learner’s social roles connected to race, class, gender, or cultural and ethnic affiliations. Educators should thus consider a community-centered approach when designing a program. Atalay (2012:10-20) uses the term community-based to refer to several aspects of the community within her Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR) model. Themes of this model are defined in below in **Table 4**.

Table 4: Summary of elements within Atalay’s CBPR (2012).

Themes within Community-Based Participatory Research	
1.	Community works in partnership with researchers to set standards and protocol for research
2.	Research goals integrate community needs and perspectives alongside those of archaeologists
3.	Community members are compensated for their time and work at levels consistent with other paid research consultants
4.	Community has the right to determine how to share and/or disseminate the results of research
5.	Community has the right to determine the process of research on sensitive topics
6.	Collaboration is envisioned as a long-term commitment
7.	Research methods are developed in accordance with community perspectives and values
8.	Research contributes to the capacity of a community to manage its cultural resources

Atalay has more recently shared that during her experiences in repatriation and community-based archaeology research, she also identified practices that were described by community members who are involved in such work as being healing or connected with increased well-being. These practices tended to fit into three broad categories in which participants:

- 1) were directly involved in doing the work of repatriation, reclaiming, or community-based archaeology/heritage work (writing claims, NAGPRA grants, preparing human remains and cultural items for reburial, reinstating traditional protocols or traditional knowledge practices, identifying and reclaiming songs and language, archaeological fieldwork, community mapping of sacred sites, etc.); or,
- 2) shared their experiences and stories of doing such practices with others in public or community spaces; or,
- 3) heard stories and experiences shared by others who had been directly involved in acts of repatriation, reclaiming, and/or community-based archaeology (Atalay, 2019:81).

It is important that educators be aware of their audience so that they can provide meaningful experiences. Different communities define the social norms and expectations of students. When an educator pays attention to the communities with which their students are associated, they can incorporate the values and expectations within those communities. When students feel comfortable in their environment, they are given the ability to be better learners. Students who build a sense of comfort with asking questions, rather than knowing the answers, can create new ideas that build on the contributions of other members in the classroom who might know the correct answer to a question (Bransford et al. 2000:25). A community-centered approach allows students to perform metacognition, and reflect on the learning process, ultimately leading the students to know when they need more information to further their own learning. The ability to collaborate with others, whether at work or within

society, also provides skills students need in the real world in order to peacefully and effectively collaborate , this was included in the design of **Metric 7**. This thesis features several programs which involve invoking this sense of community to aid learning and program sustainability. As will be discussed within the next chapter, the Estate Little Princess Archaeology Project achieved this particularly well within a specific community, as discussed in defining **Metric 8**. As stated above, public archaeology must have a built-in flexibility; thus, not every program will be targeted towards a specific community, and vice versa, not all archaeology is public and should be kept within its specific community, if that is what its members desire. As discussed above, **Metrics 9 and 10** were chosen to measure how accessible a program is outside of its primary location, if applicable. Several of the programs explored here are place-based but possess designs which could be adapted to fit other locations. Furthermore, while more vulnerable populations must be protected, that does not mean that they should be excluded. Thus, whether a program had a virtual learning component or publicly available curricula or activities was examined. It must be acknowledged that within this thesis, accessibility is limited to virtual and other distance learning options. However, it is worth noting that the accessibility of national parks, and other such areas, are not always ADA compliant. It appears that the NPS has been working harder to remedy this since 2021 (National Park Foundation website, 2021: Expanding Accessibility in National Parks). It will be exciting to see how public outreach evolves as areas, such as National Parks, become more inclusive. Additionally, another type of accessibility issue is that not everyone is fortunate enough to live near, or have the resources available to travel to, an archaeological or

cultural resource or program. While virtual and adaptable learning formats are not a complete solution to either of these issues, they do provide a means to make programs more widely available and accessible. Furthermore, most public outreach takes place on a very local scale, and thus media coverage is limited. This leaves researchers in the awkward situation of primarily having only having thoughts and feelings of the educators and other program creators to rely on when looking into how these programs operate and are received. Thus, to achieve as well-rounded a view as possible, the programs chosen are featured in multiple media outlets, as discussed in defining **Metrics 11**. As a part of this, **Metric 12** was used to determine if programs had a social media account, and if so, how active the account was. This is due to the role social media plays in exposure. Social media presence can be crucial, as parents and guardians will use a program's social media account to research it prior to agreeing to let their children participate. According to a research study conducted in 2015 by Pew Research, 75% of online parents use Facebook and 25% use Instagram (Dugan et al., 2015:5). Further studies have shown that social media usage by parents has increased since the global pandemic, and a study published by the CDC in 2023 discovered that over half of the parents surveyed engage with YouTube, Facebook, and Instagram daily, with Facebook being the leading social media platform for daily interaction (Waring et al., 2023:2). Thus, if a program wishes to gain more exposure and to reach a wider platform, it is imperative that they include an active social media presence in their repertoire.

As mentioned previously, these programs were chosen due to their diverse execution of the goals outlined in the criteria. Each of the programs selected are unique in their

execution; they range in scope from “one-off” workshops to statewide archaeological stewardship programs. This range was chosen to show that it is possible for different methods, targeted communities, and/or budget levels, to achieve effective, sustainable, and engaging public archaeology. This will be discussed further in the next chapters, which focus on the results of the research phase and then a discussion of how and why each of the programs achieves, or does not achieve, the metrics from Error! Reference source not found., as well as improvements that could be made in each one.

The next chapter, **Chapter 5: Results**, contains a thorough discussion and explanation of each program, to enhance the readers’ understanding of each one and its undertakings. This background knowledge is necessary before moving onto the analysis in **Chapter 6**.

Chapter 5: Results

To fully understand the findings of this thesis, it is essential first to understand the programs discussed and how they each execute their goals. Thus, in turn, each program’s background, teaching process, and other vital factors will be discussed here. After this overview, the next chapter will analyze each program and discuss how they achieve their goals, as well as their sustainability. To aid with ease of comprehension of this chapter, a table summarizing key features of each program has been provided for reference, see **Table 5** below. Each program is varied in its execution, and the below table allows the reader to access central data points immediately.

Table 5: General data for outreach programs discussed throughout this thesis

Project Name	The Estate Little Princess Archaeology Project (ELPAP)	Archaeology in the Community (AITC)	Nome Archaeology Camp	Sugarland Ethno-History Project (SEHP)	Texas Archeological Stewardship Network (TASN)	Project Archaeology (PA)
Leaders	Ayana Omilade Flewellen, Alexandra Jones, Alicia Odewale, Justin P. Dunnavant, and William White, III	Dr. Alexandra Jones	Jillian Richie, Hannah Atkinson, and Justin Jung.	Gwen Reese (founder, now deceased), Suzanne Johnson, Elauin (Lonnie) Hebron, Narleen Garder, Michelle Brown, Jeff Sypeck, Caroline Taylor,	Texas Historical Commission	Samantha Kirkley, Jeanne Moe, Courtney Agenten
Partners	The Society of Black Archaeologists, Diving with a Purpose, the University of California system of colleges, the Smithsonian's Slave Wrecks Project, local historic preservation groups, the University	AITC Giving Society, Archaeology Society of Maryland, Mid-Potomac Chapter Inc, Dovetail Cultural Resource Group, St. Croix	Alaska Geographic, Bering Straits Native Corporation, Bureau of Indian Affairs,	History Associates Incorporated, Howard University, Heritage Montgomery, diverse volunteer group,	Friends of the Texas Historical Commission	Montana State University and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), provides

	of the Virgin Islands, The Nature Conservancy, Hands-On Preservation Experience, Crucian Heritage and Nature Tourism	Archaeological Society, The Society of Black Archaeologists, American Society of Overseas Research, New South Associates, Argosy Foundation, Humanities DC, Southeastern Archaeological Conference; DC Department of Parks and Recreation, DC Public School After-School Program, Montpelier Foundation	Carrie M. McLane Memorial Museum, City of Nome, Katirvik Cultural Center, Kawerak, Inc., Murie Science and Learning Center, National Park Service, Norton Sound Economic Development Center, Shared Beringian Heritage Program, and University of Alaska Fairbanks-Northwest Campus	The Ottery Group, Archaeological Society of Maryland: Mid-Potomac Chapter, Montgomery College, Maryland Humanities		curriculum writing assistance. Smithsonian National Museum of Natural History
Ages Targeted	Middle school-Adult	Primarily K-6 th grade, but with opportunities for other age groups	9 th -12 th grade	18+	18+	3 rd -12 th grade
Location	St. Croix	Washington DC	Nome, Alaska	Sugarland, Maryland	Texas, state-wide	U.S., nation-wide
Years in Operation	2017-present	2006-present	2015-2019	1995-present	1984-present	1990-present

The Estate Little Princess Archaeology Project (ELPAP)

Archaeological work at the Estate Little Princess, located on the island of St. Croix in the U.S. Virgin Islands, began in 2016 as a concept when Jay Haigler, who is a board member of Diving With a Purpose, contacted the Society of Black Archaeologists (SBA), about a possible collaboration with the Slave Wrecks Project (SWP) via a

joint community collaborative maritime and terrestrial archaeology project on St. Croix. Diving With a Purpose is a non-profit organization dedicated to oceanic conservation and the preservation of marine heritage sites, specifically those pertaining to the African Diaspora. This idea transformed into a multi-year project where five archaeologists, all of whom are of African descent, came together under the umbrella of the Society of Black Archaeologists to develop and implement a community-focused and collaborative archaeological project. The Estate Little Princess Archaeological Project (ELPAP) is a project with Black archaeologists at the helm dedicated to training Black graduate and undergraduate students and students attending middle and high school in archaeological theory and method. A program like this, run by Black archaeologists designed to train Black students, is scarce. However, programs of this nature address the systemic lack of racial diversity in archaeology by establishing new pathways for historically underrepresented students to break into the field (Flewellen et al., 2021:148).

Since 2016, the ELPAP has partnered with over a dozen organizations and cultural institutions and trained over 40 local youth between the ages of 11-16, as well as nine undergraduates from Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) across the country, two of whom have now been accepted into renowned graduate school programs for Anthropology and History. Additionally, while cultivating local youth and undergraduate archaeology scholars, the program is a successful training site for graduate students. Acting as a place where they can gain supervisory field experience and essential support as they prepare to lead their own archaeology projects. So far, four graduate students, outside of the nine mentioned HBCU students, have used their

connections to ELPAP to strengthen their teaching and research (Flewellen et al., 2021:148). The ELPAP has expanded on inclusive archaeology projects from the 1990s on the mainland U.S. where teams of mid-career and senior Black scholars in the field undertook projects that brought with them training opportunities for junior Black scholars to gain a foothold in the field. Two of these projects include the Rich Neck Plantation and the New York African Burial Ground Project (NYABG) (Flewellen et al., 2021:149). Franklin's 1998 paper, "Why Are There so Few Black American Archaeologists?" discusses, and numerous oral histories collected from archaeologists of African descent gathered by the SBA have confirmed this nearly a decade later [Flewellen et al., 2021: 149 (Battle-Baptiste 2012a, 2012b; Brunache, 2014; Jones, 2014)], that representation in the field and mentorship provide pathways for Black people to access and navigate the field of archaeology (Flewellen et al., 2021:149). Flewellen and the SBA's work is imperative; archaeology needs more representation from diverse, and in general broader, communities.

Despite recent success in protecting African American cultural heritage, CRM archaeology consistently fails to satisfactorily interpret African diasporic sites with local significance due to the lack of consultation with local African American communities or representation of Black archaeologists in CRM. Research studies across the U.S. have shown that the process CRM archaeologists use to evaluate African American sites frequently overlooks the significance of African diasporic sites to local Black communities [Flewellen et al., 2021: 15 (Babiarz, 2011; Barile, 2004)]. CRM archaeologists also recommend the preservation of European American sites more often than African American ones [Flewellen et al., 2021:150 (Barile,

2004)]. Due to many factors, including a lack of Black archaeologists in CRM, CRM archaeology tends to recommend preservation of sites associated with European-descended people, which often have larger, more robust artifact deposits, over African American sites, which tend to have more diffuse artifact scatters.

For example, a project discussed by the Texas Department of Transportation is Tom Cook's blacksmith shop. Cook's shop had far fewer artifacts than the white hotel across the street. Despite this, Tom Cook was a very significant figure in history, in addition to being a freedman, preacher, and a Texas guard volunteer, he was the only black businessman in Denton, which was a frontier town. If you needed your horse shod, or your wagon fixed, he was the only person around for miles who could do so. All of this was documented in archival research, but the artifact scatter representing his shop was very thin compared to the hotel. It was almost destroyed, being deemed insignificant during survey (TXDOT, 2023:1).

Even if African American communities are consulted about their heritage sites, there are few protocols in historic preservation laws to address the intangible cultural aspects of African diasporic sites, even though it is usually the intangible connection to these sites that provide African American communities with the strongest connection (Flewellen et al., 2021:150). St. Croix is an excellent example of why individuals within archaeology need to be able to recognize these intangible pieces of heritage. On the island, there is greater emphasis among Crucian heritage preservationists on protecting sites associated with a legacy of resistance and expressions of sacred culture that are traditionally marked by the presence of Baobab, Kapok or Jumbie, Crucian Mahogany, or Tamarind trees that all comprise a special

category of spirit trees based on their African origins and association with the spirit world [Flewellen et al., 2021:151 (Highfield, 2018)].

However, in following the patterns of CRM on the mainland U.S., legal protections from government sources are extended mainly to sites with standing sugar mills and other spaces of colonial occupation. In contrast, the same protection is not extended to sites associated with extensive archival holdings, standing spirit trees or unmarked graves, or spaces with oral histories associated with independent Black markets, Free Black homesteads, Maroon villages, spaces for dancing and retelling Caruso songs, and sites burned down during historic anti-slavery or anti-labor rebellions, or coastal spaces that marked the first steps of enslaved Afro-Caribbean ancestors into a new world, which would all arguably hold greater importance within the Crucian community than the protection of a sugar mill [Flewellen et al., 2021:151 (Bastian, 2003; Dunnivant et al., 2018; Flewellan, 2019; Highfield, 2018; Norton & Espenshade, 2007; Odewale, 2016)].

Local communities can use these same laws to preserve heritage sites independently; however, the process is complicated and depends on qualified professionals with experience and education to be accepted by state historic preservation offices (King, 2013).

Along with placing Afro-Crucian heritage back into the hands of the descendant communities on St. Croix, The ELPAP also “seeks answers to thought-provoking questions about the past while daring to push against disciplinary values of independence over interdependence, fast over slow archaeology, and institutional needs over community needs” (Flewellen et al., 2021:153). Furthermore, the ELPAP

is the brainchild of the SBA. The SBA was established in 2011 to create a strong network of archaeologists who advocate for and ensure the proper treatment of African and African diaspora material culture, promote more people of African descent into archaeology, ensure community collaborations, raise and address concerns related to African peoples worldwide, and highlights the past and present achievements and contributions people of African descent have made to the field of archaeology (Flewellan et al., 2021:154). ELPAP was designed with the mission and the vision of the SBA at its forefront, specifically, the organization's desire to center community-engaged research and increase the number of archaeologists of African descent in the field. The project provides a space for archaeologists of African descent to collaborate on project design, field, and lab methods, and writing projects, such as reports. Work at the Estate has provided a means for the documentation, excavation, and subsequent conservation of a unique heritage site and its artifacts, all of which are related to the experiences of enslaved and later free Africans who lived and labored under Danish colonial rule (Flewellan et al., 2021:154).

Work at the site has provided middle and high school youth, undergraduates, graduate students, as well as junior and mid-career scholars various opportunities to engage in archaeological work and carve out spaces for themselves within a field known for its lack of racial diversity (Flewellan et al., 2021:154).

Once it was decided that the Estate (it is unclear why the Estate was chosen over other sites) was the best site for pursuing this archaeological outreach project, Dunnavant and Flewellan began to outline a project design based on the desires expressed during community meetings hosted by the SWP to train local students in

cultural stewardship through archaeology. Additionally, the desires of the SWP and the SBA were politically aligned, focusing on localized capacity building and community interest in highlighting the experiences of people of African descent. The two envisioned a project rooted in education and training, and together they enlisted SBA members as co-designers. Although Dunnivant and Flewellen had experience in the nuances of plantation, household, and Caribbean archaeology, they realized a project of this scope would require additional talent.

They contacted Alexandra Jones, Alicia Odewale, William White, and Antoinette Jackson. Alexandra Jones is the founder and CEO of Archaeology in the Community (AITC), a non-profit organization dedicated to K-12 educational programming centered on archaeological theory and methods. Collaboration with AITC provided the means for a sustainable youth training component to the project (discussed in-depth below). Alicia Odewale, at the time, had worked on St. Croix for five years, having completed her dissertation on material remains recovered from the National Park Service site Fort Christiansvaern (Flewellen et al., 2021:156). Odewale provided regional expertise and lab methods as the project progressed. William White, who has managed and operated dozens of cultural resource management projects on the US mainland since 2005, added significant expertise to field methods at the site. Jackson, known for her work collecting oral histories for the National Park Service, conducted a one-day oral history workshop for students who participated in the youth

archaeology field school during the inaugural 2017 field season (Flewellen et al., 2021:156).

Throughout the design process, the ELPAP leadership has taken great care to involve the community and address their concerns and desires. During one of these initial community meetings, the desire to have educational programming centered on training local people was expressed (Flewellen et al., 2021:162). This was also a crucial goal of the ELAP leadership, who know that access to quality education in archaeology requires funding; most universities charge a fee to apply to their programs. Additionally, archaeological field schools are often explicitly required for those interested in pursuing jobs within the field. The cost of participating in these field schools provides a great barrier to entry, especially for students from low and moderate-income backgrounds. A survey of the field school opportunities offered in collaboration with the Institute for Field Research (ifrglobal.org, 2020) revealed an average of \$4,322.26 for students to attend during the summer of 2020, not including the cost of airfare. In order to offset the cost, students are often dependent upon outside grants and fellowships or can only participate in the limited field opportunities that can pay their students. Even local field schools offered through the IFR can cost around \$3,000 for students. Based on this knowledge, the ELPAP is committed to offering Crucian children a free youth training program each year. Since 2017 the program has provided a free five-week field school for undergraduates attending HBCUs.

These two programs provide access to quality education while demonstrating community archaeology's utility and purpose (Flewellen et al., 2021:163). The youth

field school is designed for students ages 11-17 who traditionally do not have access to programs of this kind and is offered at no cost to the parent. Students from both the Christiansted and Frederiksted branches of the Caribbean Center for Boys and Girls of the Virgin Islands (CCBGVI) were selected to ensure that students from across the island could participate in the week-long youth archaeology training program. The Caribbean Centers for Boys & Girls of the Virgin Islands, founded in 1973, is a non-profit, privately-funded 501(c)(3) organization whose mission is to provide a caring learning environment dedicated to enriching the educational, social-emotional and cultural opportunities of youth and families (CCBGVI website, 2023: homepage).

The curriculum was designed and implemented by Jones. She developed the curriculum to align with the St. Croix public school system's high school science curriculum. The students were given two and a half days of lectures that covered the history of enslavement in the Virgin Islands, the basics of archaeological excavation, and artifact analysis methods. The students then applied the lessons they learned in the field and the lab during the remaining two days of the program (Flewellen et al., 2021:163). The students also participated in a career workshop and an oral history workshop. Before the students left on the final day, they each participated in a video interview where they were asked questions that asked them to contextualize all the

concepts they learned over the week and then explain why archaeology is important to St. Croix (Flewellen et al., 2021:163).



Figure 1: Students at the ELPAP conducting archaeological investigations (AITC social media, 2022).

The ELPAP project was and is a fluid project which is constantly evolving based on community needs. The week after the 2017 program ended, Jones and Flewellen had lunch with a community member. During their conversation, the community member asked: “After the students complete the program, then what?” The students had no opportunities to use the archaeological skills they acquired during the program, as there are very few job opportunities in the field on the island, outside of the limited opportunities for youth provided through the National Park Service, like the Greening

Youth Foundation internships and the Youth Conservation Corps (Flewellen et al., 2021:163). This represented a unique challenge the team had not initially planned for in developing the youth program. Changes were made to the youth training to address this concern for the 2018 field season. Furthering efforts to make the program sustainable, a new professional development component was added to the program in the form of internships, and the curriculum was changed to incorporate new archaeological techniques. Two students from the summer 2017 field school were invited back as paid interns for the summer 2018 field season. They worked alongside Jones and assisted in training new student participants. To expand the knowledge base of these interns, two new lessons were added to the training. This allowed the interns to earn income and build their resumes, and an opportunity to develop their continued interest in the science of archaeology by learning new skills (Flewellen et al., 2021:163-165). Further changes were made to the 2019 youth training based on concerns that the students would be applying for college and/or additional academic programs and would need certificates to verify participation in extracurricular activities. For the 2019 field school, fourteen students were selected to participate in the week-long training program, and four returning students from summer 2017 and 2018 field schools were invited back as paid interns. Similar to the previous year, new lessons were added to teach the returning interns new archaeological skills. On the last day of the program, students participated in a career exploration workshop, wherein the ELPAP staff archaeologists talked about education, career paths, passions, and their meanings of what archaeology is. This workshop was undertaken in part due to the understanding that representation matters. It has been proven that

youth need to see people that look like themselves in leadership roles in science to be able to visualize themselves in these fields [Flewellen et al., 2021: 165 (Indian University 2019; Rainey et al., 2018)].



Figure 2: ELPAP students conducting archaeological laboratory work, (AITC social media, 2022).

In addition, students received a certificate of completion and a one-year student membership to the St. Croix Archaeological Society, paid for by Archaeology in the Community. As a bonus to the program, students could participate in a focus group discussion on the island's history from their perspective, facilitated by the Slave Wrecks Project. This allowed them to influence a future exhibition at Fort Christiansvaern curated by the SWP (Flewellen et al., 2021:165). Based on the success of the 2017 youth training program, there was a desire and opportunity to

offer training for university students. J. Cameron Monroe and Dunnavant secured a UC-HBCU grant for the 2018 field season, which provided funding for students from Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) to participate in archaeological field schools in St. Croix and Haiti. This grant was later extended for an additional three years, with Dunnavant, Flewellen, and White acting as co-Principal Investigators. (Sadly, due to unforeseen political situations in Haiti in the summer of 2018, the program shifted entirely to St. Croix.)

During the program, students received a week of intensive training in basic archaeological methods at the Universities of California Santa Cruz and Berkeley and four weeks of excavation, analysis, and mapping experience in St. Croix. The UC-HBCU component is vital because it attempts to increase African Americans' capacity in the U.S. to gain the technical training needed to work in the CRM industry. As mentioned in the discussion of the youth program, an archaeological field school is essential for all professional archaeologists, so providing this opportunity for African American students is foundational to increasing diversity in archaeology. As of 2019, the program trained nine HBCU students, with one program alum successfully entering a Ph.D. program in archaeology.

The program has undergone various changes based on student and faculty feedback each year. Students are allowed to explore their research interests alongside faculty and engage in aspects of archaeological fieldwork that are often relegated solely to coordinators. These included communicating with government officials to build an understanding of the permitting process, conducting archival research, and assisting with museum exhibition interpretation in collaboration with partners of the SWP. For

both levels of training, the intended goal is not for all participants to become archaeologists but rather to provide them with the experiences needed to become better cultural and natural heritage stewards in whatever careers they pursue (Flewellen et al., 2021:166).

Archaeology in the Community (AITC)

Archaeology in the Community (AITC) began in 2006 when Dr. Alexandra Jones noticed that many of the children in her Washington, D.C. neighborhood had never heard of archaeology, let alone met an archaeologist. As a trained archaeologist and educator, Dr. Jones was inspired by her unique position to engage young people within her community and teach them the importance of archaeology. Students in her community had the special opportunity to learn about their families' histories and their community's past from an archaeologist who lived around the block and served as an active community member.

In tandem with writing her Ph.D. thesis at UC Berkeley, Dr. Jones created and implemented several customizable programs to teach archaeology in alignment with local school curricula. Upon graduation, Dr. Jones continued to develop programs and partnerships, bringing them back to her hometown of Washington, D.C. The program gained momentum across DC, Maryland, and Virginia, and in 2009, Archaeology in the Community became a chartered 501(c)3 nonprofit. Since its founding, AITC has served thousands of students of all ages, customizing curricula to suit the group's needs best and expanding into new media to ensure the public can engage with archaeology (AITC Website, 2023: About AITC). Dr. Jones' ongoing work with AITC

has been partly inspired by studies conducted by the National Research Council (NRC). In 2011, the NRC stated that “There is mounting evidence that structured, non-school science programs can feed or stimulate the science-specific interests of adults and children, may positively influence academic achievement for students and may expand participants’ sense of future science career options” (National Research Council 2011: 2–3). The NRC has identified six strands of science-related learning outcomes supported by informal (i.e., non-school) education environments:

- Strand 1: Experience excitement, interest, and motivation to learn about phenomena in the natural and physical world.
- Strand 2: Come to generate, understand, remember, and use concepts, explanations, arguments, models, and facts related to science.
- Strand 3: Manipulate, test, explore, predict, question, observe and make sense of the natural and physical world.
- Strand 4: Reflect on science as a way of knowing; on processes, concepts, and institutions of science; and on their process of learning about phenomena,
- Strand 5: Participate in scientific activities and learning practices with others, using scientific language and tools.
- Strand 6: Think about themselves as science learners and develop an identity as someone who knows about uses and sometimes contributes to science.

(National Research Council 2011:4).

Much like with Gardner’s Multiple Intelligences, Dr. Jones saw that archaeology is uniquely positioned to fit within all six of the NRC’s strands. In her 2022 article, she shares that as a discipline, archaeology allows educators an opportunity to reach all

learning styles by providing students with opportunities to complete various tasks in the archaeological research process while in pursuit of intellectual and analytical knowledge about culture (Jones, 2022:290). Furthermore, she states that “archaeology involves the senses in a way that many other fields of study do not” (Jones, 2022:290). By allowing students to touch, see, hear, and reenact or recreate elements of the past, it allows them to make real-world connections that would not be possible with lectures or readings alone, and they are also able to make connections between themselves and the topic of study (Jones, 2022:290). One of AITC’s goals is to educate youth about the fundamentals of archaeological methods, thus producing archaeologically literate citizens. AITC teaches younger generations the importance of archaeology as a tool for understanding and interpreting our histories. Outreach programs like the AITC help create citizens who understand and believe in the importance of preserving cultural heritage, even if they are not employed in cultural or heritage management (Jones, 2022:297). AITC provides hands-on learning, professional development, and community events. Since its founding, AITC has partnered with the DC Department of Parks and Recreation and the DC Public School After-School program. It has also conducted several programs with DC Charter Schools and Private Schools (Jones, 2022:297).

During the creation process for AITC, Jones’ own identity aided in her understanding of the need for outreach programs and what those programs should look like. Jones had the following to say on her unique position to found AITC:

I am an African American woman and native Washingtonian. I grew up in this urban environment, attended schools in the District of Columbia, and was trained as an educator in the region. I am acutely aware of intersectionality and how it impacts the Washington, DC, region, especially youth. I, along with the volunteer staff at AITC, have made it our focus to create unique programs that positively impact the youth of the Washington, DC, Metropolitan Area. Though AITC works with the wider DC community, most participants in AITC programs are African American and Latinx youth (Jones, 2022:297).



Figure 4: Educators participating a variety of AITC training activities (AITC website, 2023).

AITC runs a four-week-long program in which students learn basic archaeological terminology, laboratory and excavation methods, and how to research and write a

report based on excavation findings. The following programming examples and data points are from Jones' account of the 2011 AITC program. The first component of the 2011 program consisted of teaching students basic terminology. Additionally, at the beginning of the program, a pre-evaluation survey was given to all students. The pre-evaluation survey produced the following results: 76% of the students did not know the meaning of archaeology, 75% did not know the meaning of artifacts, and only 19% could name an archaeologist. The first two lessons with the students taught terms such as culture, archaeology, material culture, and stratigraphy. By the end of the first week, all students grasped the terms and could apply them to present-day context. The next component of the program was devoted to archaeological methods. The students spent a week learning the importance of permission, notes, photographs, mapping, careful excavation, artifact recovery, and labeling. The students were also given several different site scenarios and asked, "Can you dig it, or do you need permission?" By the end of the week, the students knew all sites require permission; they could also explain different surveying techniques and how to properly conduct a full excavation of a unit, from taking initial photographs to backfilling. Archaeological methods do not stop in the field: During the third week, the students were taught how to conduct research. This consisted of teaching the students how to use books and computers to research information about artifacts and people. In addition to research skills, the AITC program included a workshop on ethics and interpretation. This workshop focused on difficulties archaeologists experience interpreting other people's cultural past; it touched on gender, religion, ethnicity, and class. The third component of the program was excavation. Each student was asked to

bring a small object from home that they felt represented them. On the morning of the excavation, two excavation pits were constructed, using two different types of soil (representing naturally occurring stratigraphy), and within each layer, artifacts were placed. The students spent a whole day excavating the pits using proper excavation techniques. At the end of the day, all artifacts were bagged and labeled, cameras were returned, and paperwork was checked. The last component of the program was devoted to researching and writing reports. The students were given background information about the mock sites, and they began analyzing the artifacts. The information gained was used to date the stratigraphic layers and interpret what had occurred at their sites during the two occupation periods. The students wrote reports in which they dated each occupation period, explained what they felt took place at the site, and how they came to these conclusions based on their artifact analysis. On the last day of the program, students completed a post-evaluation survey to measure their understanding compared to the beginning of the program. The survey indicated that 83% of students could define archaeology, 79% gave an accurate definition of an artifact, and 81% could name an archaeologist other than the facilitator. Furthermore, in the comments section, a few students expressed interest in becoming an archaeologist when they grew up (Jones, 2022:299).



Figure 5: AITC's Young Archaeologists Club members learning a variety of archaeological methods (AITC social media, 2019).

Through the pre- and post-evaluations, AITC could see the impact of the curriculum and how it encourages a new generation's interest in archaeology and science (Jones, 2022:299). AITC also considered that their programming had the potential to affect the entire community, not just its youth. The volunteers (primarily teachers) who helped with the projects had to learn the basics of archaeology and sit in on mini-

archaeology lessons in order to answer any questions that might arise. Furthermore, an essential component of being effective educators was to ensure open and effective communication with the parents of the students. To accomplish this, all of AITC's parent information packets were printed in both Spanish and English. In addition, parental involvement in the project grew because when the students went home, and they shared their experiences while also obtaining help with their archaeology homework. The parents were invited to come on the day of the excavation and help, provided they had read the information sheet given to the students on proper archaeological methods. Other teachers in the school became interested and wanted to learn more. Some asked about how to incorporate archaeology into their classwork (Jones, 2022: 300). Furthermore, AITC strives to understand the basic needs of its students and their community. In Washington DC, approximately 33% of the schools are Title 1, which means over 40% of the student population in the city's schools qualifies for reduced or free lunch (Title 1 n.d.). Understanding that many of their students may only receive two meals a day, AITC provided heavy snacks for the students. The excavation day activity was hosted on a Saturday and provided a light breakfast and a bar-b-que lunch for students and all volunteers (teachers, parents, and archaeologists). This was to ensure that the students were focused, engaged, and excited about the science-filled day without having to worry about their basic needs being met (Jones, 2022:300). As a closing note, Dr. Jones had this to say about AITC and archaeology as a field:

Education is a form of power and in order to access quality education it requires capital. Looking back at my childhood and the childhoods of the youth I serve, I see the tangible manifestations of this statement.

AITC's goal is to make science and archaeology education accessible to all (no matter your class, ethnicity, religion, or gender). In order to ensure we are truly for all people, 100% of our youth programs are free to the public we serve (2022:301).

Furthermore, AITC programs are advertised on the radio, social media, newspapers, blogs, and community boards on local TV stations to ensure maximum exposure to all members of the public. As a closing statement to the overview of AITC, no one explains its purpose and impact better than Dr. Jones:

Archaeology as a discipline has a history of asserting its desire to contribute to issues of social justice, and at times has proclaimed archaeology has the power to change the world. These are worthy aspirations but not often pitched at a scale which truly affects change. Archaeology is historically a discipline comprised of people from the upper and middle classes, and the majority of archaeologists practicing are European-American. Creating scientific literacy among students who have endured multiple intersecting disadvantages may not be glamorous, but it is indeed revolutionary. AITC will take more than a few years to mature, but through archaeology, this organization is giving students a toolkit to evaluate, examine and push against the limitations society attempts to impose on them (2022:302).

Nome Archaeology Camp

Nome Archaeology Camp was a field school for high school students in the Bering Straits and Northwest Alaska which took place from 2015-2019. This program appears to have also been put on hiatus due to the global pandemic of 2020-2022. The National Park Service partnered with the Kawerak, the Katirvik Center, Bering Straits Native Corporation, the Carrie M. McLain Museum, and Alaska Geographic to put on the camp, which used field trips and hands-on activities to teach students to explore and appreciate the cultural and natural resources of their region. However, the camp

explored concepts beyond Western archaeology; local and regional experts helped to incorporate traditional knowledge, museum studies, wildlife biology, and history (NPS website: Nome Archaeology Camp page). During the week-long program, students explored Northwest Alaska's rich cultural heritage from a base camp near Salmon Lake, a popular camping, fishing, and hunting spot roughly 40 miles from Nome. From this base camp, students gained experience in archaeological survey and mapping, practiced soil probing to obtain radiocarbon samples, studied museum curation at the Carrie M. McLain Museum, visited the historic Pilgrim Hotsprings, and turned their mess hall into a classroom for several guest speakers. Elders and social scientists from the Kawerak Nation visited the camp to conduct an oral history workshop. Matt Ganley of Bering Straits Native Corporation shared his expertise on prehistoric caribou hunting techniques. Amy Russell of the Kawerak Cultural Center discussed career paths in cultural preservation (NPS website: Nome Archaeology Camp page). The Nome Archaeology Camp was created by local cultural resource specialists driven to create opportunities for the local community to address heritage preservation concerns. The camp leaders felt that the Bering Strait's cultural heritage is best understood through multidisciplinary methods and sources. Thus, with this multifaceted approach in mind, Nome Archaeology Camp was planned and continuously evolved. From hands-on activities and experiments in archaeology and museum studies, to re-indigenizing methods of anthropology and community-based research, the camp's outcomes were determined by the place and the people connected to it. By empowering the next generation of Bering Strait cultural heritage stewards, the camp served the enabling legislation for Bering Land Bridge National

Preserve: “to provide archaeological and paleontological study, in cooperation with Native Alaskans” (ANILCA 1980). At their base camp at Salmon Lake, students were first taught to recognize human impacts on the environment. The Salmon Lake area is a popular place for local recreation and subsistence; it also contains the spawning grounds for the northernmost run of sockeye salmon in the U.S.. Modern, historic, and ancient material culture dot the tundra, providing a long record of land usage and an interactive learning opportunity for camp students. Students are guided by professional archaeologists and equipped with handheld GPS devices, measuring tapes, cameras, and field notebooks, to conduct an archaeological survey at a small village site. A unique aspect of the Nome Archaeology Camp that is different from other archaeological camps or field schools is that it is not centered on excavation. After identifying and recording visible features, students were taught to use a minimally invasive soil probe to assess subsurface remains. During the 2015 camp season, students used the probe to collect a small piece of charcoal from the center of a large circular depression, which marked the remains of a semi-subterranean house. The sample was prepared for radiocarbon dating, sent to a laboratory for professional analysis, and determined to be nearly 1,000 years old. The students and staff held a discussion of the site and its past land use in connection to its current land use. The staff then explained that destructive methods such as excavation are not required to learn more about the past (Richie et al., 2021:22). In addition to learning archaeological techniques, students were also given the opportunity to reenact traditional knowledge practices, such as a caribou drive line. A caribou drive line consists of stacks of rocks or inuksuk (stacked rock or cairn used by indigenous

peoples of the Arctic region of North America) positioned into two gradually converging rows. These lines help funnel caribou into a corral where they can be harvested. Students identified the drive line just beyond the village site using archaeological survey techniques. Then they reenacted a community hunt described in Lewis Binford's *A Corporate Caribou Hunt* (Richie et al., 2021:23).

Using the drive line as their stage and an ethnographic text as their script, students took turns going through the roles of both the precontact community and the caribou. It was noted that a favorite character to play was the rhythmic driver, who was a human mimicking a caribou to guide the herd to the waiting hunters by “move[ing] their upper torsos in a circular, up and down motion, and dip[ping] their heads as they lower their bodies” (Binford 1991:38).



Figure 6: Students at Nome Archaeology Camp reenact a caribou hunt (NPS website, 2018).

In all iterations of the camp, students also learned from the experiences and wisdom of elders and local experts. These honored guests described their upbringings and long-told family tales from the region, shared their knowledge about the uses and names of traditional plants, and discussed the intersection of oral history and science (Richie et al., 2021:24). One example of this was a story told by Elder Guy Martin, a Nome local, during the 2016 camp. The story focused on an instance in which oral history played a vital role in relocating a long-lost stone monument and confirming the monument's continuing cultural importance (Oquilluk & Bland, 1973; Ganley, 2009). Martin also shared this story in an interview with the *Arctic Sounder*, stating, "When scientists give a timeline, and Elders give a timeline with their stories and when they mesh, they complement each other, and there's a period of veracity, a period of truth, which is gratifying to the memory of our elders and a complement to the scientific community" (Grove, 2016). After listening to and recording oral histories, students contemplated their roles in continuing these traditions, such as by asking questions, respecting elders, and, most importantly, sharing the stories (Richie et al., 2021:24). The camp also presented unique opportunities for students to learn from community cultural heritage preservation experts due to the partnership of the camp with Nome's Carrie M. McLain Memorial Museum and the Katirvik Cultural Center. The Carrie M. McLain Memorial Museum underwent a significant upgrade during the 2016 Nome Archaeology Camp. In 2016, the museum's 15,000 historical and cultural objects, 12,000 photographic prints and negatives, and several hundred boxes of historical documents were transported to a new facility in Nome's Richard Foster building, where they could be better housed and exhibited (Phillips-Chan,

2020). Students from the camp were able to enjoy behind-the-scenes insights as the collections moved to the new building. Students also helped catalog and 3D scan a collection of ethnohistoric artifacts from Nome. Then, when the new museum opened, students toured curatorial facilities and exhibits.



Figure 8: Elders and youth work together at the 2015 Nome Archaeology Camp to catalog artifacts donated to the Carrie M. McLain Memorial Museum (Richie et al, 2021).

Next to the museum is the Katirvik Cultural Center (Katirvik in Iñupiaq, Siberian Yupik, and Central Yup'ik is literally as “Gathering Place), which is a facility designed to celebrate and share indigenous knowledge and culture from the Bering Strait region. Students used the space as a place of learning and gathering. This included interacting with exhibits, learning traditional drumming and dancing,

enjoying indigenous foods, and participating in thoughtful discussions (Richie et al., 2021: 24). For their final project, students summarized their experiences through presentations on the subjects explored during camp. Presenters were also encouraged to include a direct action. Students advocated for public schools to include courses in Alaska studies, Native drumming, Alaska Native arts, and indigenous language classes. They supported a growing effort to use traditional place names and argued that state and federal regulations should enable locals to collect traditional foods (Richie et al., 2021: 25). Results, experiences, and action items from the Nome Archaeology Camp have been shared in classrooms, professional conferences, local newspapers, social media posts, newsletters, and in many conversations across Alaska and beyond, which will be discussed further in the next chapter. Students leave camp with academic credit through the University of Alaska Fairbanks - Northwest Campus, competency in basic field science techniques, and an expanded understanding of the history and culture of the Bering Strait region. The camp leaders hope that after their time in camp, the future generation of Bering Strait stewards will feel empowered to ask questions and participate in cultural preservation efforts in the region they call home (Richie et al., 2021: 25).

Sugarland Ethno-History Project (SEHP)

Inspiration for the Sugarland Ethno-History Project began in 1995, when Gwen Hebron Reese visited what was left of Sugarland, the Maryland town in Montgomery County where she was born in 1941 (Foster, 2021:1). As she walked the grounds of the St. Paul Community Church, she noted that,

“The church had been closed, and it was just sitting there. The door was nailed shut, and the cemetery was being neglected. I thought about all my ancestors and how hard they worked to build this place. I felt that I needed to do something to correct the situation. I started thinking about who they were. That culminated with curiosity, and that filled me with purpose” (Foster, 2021:1).

Founded in 1871 by formerly enslaved people, Sugarland was once a booming town with its own general store, school, and post office. However, it was eventually abandoned by all but three (3) of the seventy (70) families who lived there (Foster, 2021:1). Currently, only St. Paul Community Church, its cemetery, and a few houses remain. Determined not to let her birthplace fade from memory, Reese began documenting her ancestors and the town they built. Soon after that visit in 1995, she established the Sugarland Ethno-History Project, a non-profit that is headquartered in the now reopened 1894 St. Paul Community Church (Foster, 2021:1). When Ms. Reese began researching her ancestors; she reached out to family, friends and former neighbors for information, artifacts, and anything else that could help her uncover and preserve Sugarland’s past. Reese shared in a 2021 interview that “As I got more curious, I started talking to people. I recorded a few conversations, and one thing led to another. Doors opened that I never thought would open” (Foster, 2021:1). Then, in 1996, Howard University students joined in the effort, recording interviews with elderly people who had once lived in Sugarland. Many shared stories about strict supervisors on Maryland plantations and lethal Civil War battles (Foster, 2021:1). Susan Johnson, now president of the SEHP, is Ms. Reese’s cousin and also the great-granddaughter of Phillip Johnson, one of the founders of Sugarland, joined Reese’s efforts in 2006 when she heard that her cousin was looking for photographs. Ms.

Johnson had 100 vintage photographs, which she and Ms. Reese digitally scanned, saving them from destruction. Several of those photos are displayed on the walls of a replica cabin in the Smithsonian's National Museum of African American History and Culture in Washington, D.C (Foster, 2021:1).

By the late 2010s, Ms. Reese and Ms. Johnson realized they had enough material to publish a book. To do so, they collaborated with Jeff Sypeck, a local writer. One of the book's most valuable sources of information was the church ledger, which Sypeck transcribed for much of the book. The ledger entries contained many stories about disputes, sermons, people's lives, etc., providing a window into Sugarland's past. "I was stunned at every turn by how personal it was and how many great stories they have to tell. They don't just have names [in the ledger]; they have personalities and stories," Sypeck said on the subject of using the ledger to bring the story of Sugarland to life (Foster, 2021:1). He was also impressed with the sheer amount of historic materials the two had managed to preserve, which consisted of more than 1,000 artifacts, such as Bibles, school textbooks, and furniture (Foster, 2021:1).

Each time the group met to discuss the book, Sypeck would ask questions about a particular family or detail but did not fully expect answers. "But then they would turn up with a primary source for me. I just couldn't believe it. After a while, they would see my [surprised] face, and they would laugh," Sypeck has said on the subject (Foster, 2021:1). The book, titled "*I Have Started for Canaan: The Story of the African American Town of Sugarland*," was published in 2020, with the help of a grant from Heritage Montgomery, another nonprofit (Foster, 2021:1). Along with preserving the stories and the history of Sugarland via their book, the SEHP has also

partnered with History Associates Incorporated (HAI) to create the SEHP Dorsey Archaeology Project to excavate and preserve artifacts from the home site of former Sugarland residents Basil and Nancy Dorsey (HAI website, 2023: The Sugarland Ethno-History Project). The SEHP Dorsey Archaeology Project has also spawned a K-12 curriculum module titled “The Basil & Nancy Dorsey House Archaeology Curriculum Model,” which was written by Tara L. Tetrault, M.A.A., a professor at Montgomery College and an education archaeologist (Tetrault, 2021:4). Along with archaeological and preservation efforts, the SEHP also maintains a vast collection of artifacts, photographs, and documents for anyone conducting historical or genealogical research. They also host public tours and events like Montgomery County Heritage Days (SEHP website, 2021: News & Events).



Figure 9: Restoration efforts taking place at St. Paul Community Church in Sugarland (SEHP Facebook, 2023).

Texas Archeological Stewardship Network (TASN)

The Texas Archeological Stewardship Network (TASN), which was founded in 1984, is a program of the Texas Historical Commission's Archeology Division. The "Stewards" are volunteers whose preservation, education, and research efforts are essential to the THC's statewide archeological program (THC website, 2023:TASN). Working alongside THC Regional Archeologists, members of the TASN serve a vital role in bringing public archaeology to life in their communities. The TASN is one of the most innovative and successful programs of its kind in the nation; it serves as a model for similar organizations in other states and, in 2010, was named an official Preserve America Steward (www.preserveamerica.gov/stewards/), a national designation program that recognizes volunteer programs that are committed to the preservation of the nation's historic heritage (TASN Handbook, 2018:3). The TASN seeks to preserve, educate, and contribute to knowledge of Texas' archaeological heritage, with a particular focus on sites on private lands not currently protected under state or federal preservation laws. The network consists of experienced and capable avocational archeologists who work on a strictly volunteer basis to assist the THC in achieving these goals. 95% of the land in Texas is private property, and the stewards play an essential role in recording and preserving sites that would otherwise not be accessible. The stewards, as private landowners and private citizens are more able to make connections with other private landowners, as they are local and not government-affiliated, unlike the THC Regional archeologists. This opens doors for Stewards that are firmly shut for the THC's staff members.

The primary goals of the TASN are listed below (TASN Handbook, 2018:5)(THC Brochure, 2023:1-3) :

1. Stewards identify and record new archeological sites and place the data in the state inventory, providing a permanent record of Texas' past. These records are also helpful to other researchers and are useful in identifying sites that may be threatened by planned development.

2. Stewards monitor archeological site preserves, conservation easement sites, State Antiquities Landmarks (SAL), National Register sites, and sites on public lands protected by law. Any observed disturbances or threats of disturbance are reported to the proper authorities. Stewards may also monitor sites on private land at the landowner's request.

3. Seek protective designation and easements for important sites on private property for SAL designation, which extends the protection of the Antiquities Code of Texas to those sites - giving the THC review authority over the long-term protection of that site. The designation carries forward with the deed in perpetuity, should the land be sold.

4. Although most steward assistance is given to the general public, professional archaeologists conducting state or federally mandated cultural resource surveys also call upon stewards to share their knowledge of local archeological resources.

5. Stewards also record private artifact collections and assist with curation of artifacts.

6. Stewards contribute to THC publications, such as the TASN Newsletter, as well as completing and submitting semi-annual reports.

7. Stewards may be called upon to undertake the emergency recovery of data from sites threatened with imminent destruction, such as a site that is eroding in a creek bed.

8. Stewards promote awareness of archeology by giving talks to local preservation groups, schools, and civic groups and assisting regional museums with their archeological exhibits. Stewards also participate in or plan activities for Texas Archeology Month (TAM), held every October.

9. Stewards serve as a local resource on archeological matters, to both the THC and regional archaeological societies.

Another unique aspect of this program is that stewards are highly trained avocational archaeologists with a skill and knowledge set that far exceeds the qualifications of even professional archaeologists at times. Additionally, the stewards receive support and training from THC archaeologists, who provide twice annual training workshops and are available 24/7 to assist and guide their work. The stewards are vetted by the THC Regional archaeologists and must sign a code of ethics, which if violated can result in an individual's expulsion from the TASN (TASN Handbook, 2018:1-30).



Figure 10: Texas Archeological Steward, Teddy Lou Stickney, documents petroglyphs at the Paint Rock site in Concho, Texas (ACHP website, 2023: TASN)

Programs like the TASN are crucial in a state like Texas, wherein most cultural resources are on private land. Along with assisting the THC's full-time staff archaeologists with terrestrial archaeology, the TASN expanded in 2001 to include Marine Archeological Stewards (ACHP website, 2023: Texas Archeological Stewardship Network). These volunteer marine stewards conduct dive reconnaissance and site monitoring, and the program also has a student-internship program in which students assist in research and database management (NOAA website, 2023: Wreck of the City of Waco). Beyond recording, preserving, and protecting the estimated 2 million plus sites in Texas (TASN Handbook, 2018:3), the stewards are also under the

umbrella of the Friends of the Texas Historical Commission, who have established and maintained multiple forms of public outreach.

The TASN is an invaluable resource for protecting and preserving cultural resources and for educating and exposing the public to the fantastic histories and cultures that may be in their own backyards. Programs like TASN appear to be on the rise, so much so that in 2021, the first National Site Stewardship Workshop took place. The workshop was meant to be held in person at the Nevada State Museum, but due to the global pandemic was changed into a webinar. Archaeologists and volunteer site stewards representing 12 different organizations from across the U.S. took part in presentations and panel discussions about improving and expanding public participation in protecting archaeological and historical resources (Partners for Archaeological Site Stewardship website, 2023: First National Site Stewardship Workshop). The workshop was streamed live for the public and also recorded and uploaded at the following URL: <https://www.sitestewardship.org/presentations.html>

Project Archaeology (PA)



Figure 11: Educators participate in a Project Archaeology training workshop (used with permission of Gail Lundeen).

Project Archaeology (PA), now a nationwide program in the U.S., began in Utah in 1990 to combat the vandalism and looting of archaeological sites. To meet these goals, the first Project Archaeology curriculum draft included a series of lessons on rock art; what it might mean, why it is crucial to protect it, and the fact that it is often damaged by modern graffiti, chalk tracing, bullet holes, and attempts to remove it from the stone walls (Moe, 2023:1).

Project Archaeology was officially founded as a national education program in 1992 by the U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM) for educators and their students. The version sponsored by the BLM was created for three purposes: to develop an awareness of our nation's diverse and fragile archaeological sites, to instill a sense of personal responsibility for stewardship of these sites, and to enhance scientific and

historical literacy and cultural understanding through the study of archaeology. Since 1992, programs have been established in 40 states; 30 programs remain active and new programs are currently under development across the nation (Moe, 2023:1).

Project Archaeology provides schoolteachers with the tools to incorporate archaeology activities into their lesson plans as they teach math, science, and critical thinking subjects. Teachers can attend professional development workshops through one of 27 state and regional Project Archaeology programs (BLM website, 2023: Project Archaeology). Those interested in locating a program in their state may visit www.projectarchaeology.org/state-programs.

Project Archaeology educators are a diverse network of archaeologists, educators, and citizens actively working to make archaeology education accessible to students and teachers nationwide through high-quality educational materials and professional development (Project Archaeology website, 2023: About Project Archaeology).

Project Archaeology operates primarily through state and regional chapters. The chapters offer local workshops and institutes for educators; experiences for school groups and family learners at archaeological sites, museums, and visitor centers; and continuing support for Project Archaeology teachers (Project Archaeology website, 2023: About Project Archaeology). Project Archaeology curricula are designed so educators have plenty of flexibility while also hitting Common Core Educational Standards. While most of the curricula focus on shelters and structures, the dwellings chosen vary wildly, ranging from rock shelters to shotgun houses to Pueblo villages. Additionally, there are curriculum modules centered around petroglyphs, precontact nutrition, land usage, and art and monuments studies (Project Archaeology website,

2023: Curriculum). Chapters are encouraged to take the curricula and build off their foundation to create their own unique programming. One example of this is the Utah Project Archaeology's Voices of the Ancients Oral History Project, which was created in response to educators' requests for videos of elders to share with their students and supplement what they learn in the curricula. To facilitate creating the oral history project, Southern Utah University (SUU), a partner of the Utah Project Archaeology chapter, applied for and received a grant from the Utah State History Office and Utah Humanities to produce short videos of native voices around Utah. The questions were gathered from students around the U.S. whose teachers had participated in the Voices of the Ancients National Endowment for the Humanities workshops in 2021 (SUU website, 2023: Project Archaeology Videos). For those interested, the videos can be viewed at <https://www.suu.edu/utahprojectarchaeology/videos.html>. Another factor of this built-in flexibility is that Project Archaeology educators can use inexpensive methods to create their teaching supplies, helping keep the cost of attendance low and even free for students (interview with Gail Lundeen, PA educator, 2023).

Summary of Results

Now that the origins, key figures, overall design, and programming and curriculum structures for each program have been thoroughly explored, the next chapter will analyze each program, with the metrics described within **Chapter 4**. This analysis will uncover what facets of these programs help them to achieve effective, sustainable, and diverse programs, with the ability to reach descendent communities or to have as widespread of an effect as possible. These features include partnerships, funding, targeted communities, media coverage, virtual learning presence, public

availability of materials, social media presence, and the analytical criteria discussed previously, which will also be reviewed during the next chapter.

Chapter 6: Analysis

Summarized methods

As discussed in Chapter 4, a multitude of archival and media sources were utilized during research to gather the materials needed to use the 12 analytical metrics (see **Table 2**) to determine how the six programs focused on in this thesis have achieved sustainable and effective public archaeology programs. Below is a discussion of each project in turn and how they accomplish, or do not accomplish, each of the **12 metrics**. As a quick guide, a table with each metric listed, but without the results included, has been added as a condensed version of Error! Reference source not found..

Table 6: Summarized Metrics

Metric 1: Does the program have partnerships?	Metric 2: Does the program have a flexible design?	Metric 3: Does the program adequately explain the archaeological process? Using multiple methods	Metric 4: Are there activities for multiple learning styles?
Metric 5: Is the program culturally sensitive? Is there help for underprivileged students?	Metric 6: Is history portrayed objectively, if applicable?	Metric 7: Do participants learn a set of buildable skills?	Metric 8: Does the program target a specific community?
Metric 9: Are there virtual learning materials available?	Metric 10: Is there a publicly available curriculum? Is it free?	Metric 11: Does the program have an active social media presence on Facebook, Instagram, or Youtube?	Metric 12: Is there media coverage? If so, what media types?

Estate Little Princess Archaeology Project (ELPAP)

With the use of **Metric 1**, it is important to note that funding plays a crucial role in any archaeological endeavor, and outreach is no exception. The Estate Little Prince Archaeology Project (ELPAP) has formed impactful partnerships that help enable the funding necessary to achieve the powerful work that they do. The ELPAP is primarily a collaborative effort of two groups: the Society of Black Archaeologists (SBA) and the Slave Wrecks Project, but much of the leadership of the SBA either lead, or have connections to, other programs and organizations that align with the goals of the ELPAP. The ELPAP and the AITC appear to have benefitted the most from utilizing partnerships. Analyzing the ELPAP through the gathered expertise and experience of its leadership is a part of what makes it so unique, and their flexibility and genuine care for the needs of project participants and the descendant community associated with the Estate Little Princess allow the project to keep growing and evolving. As discussed in the Results chapter, the program evolved from being a field school for local youth to being a work-training program, for underrepresented students ranging from middle school to graduate school, that seeks to create scientists and archaeological stewards by offering them summer jobs in a career they aspire to, alongside professionals who have often gone through the journey that they are just beginning. In this way, the ELPAP does an excellent job of achieving **Metrics 2, 4-8**. A 2018 article by the University of California, Santa Cruz, features university students learning archaeological excavation and laboratory methods. The article goes on to describe how students are taught the process of archaeology, led by Justin Dunnavant, an Assistant Professor in the Department of Anthropology at UCLA.

Students were charged with doing a survey of the Estate Little Princess, which included the remains of four slave cabins, to determine the density of artifacts (McNulty, 2018:1). The St. Croix team first had to clear the land by hand, wielding machetes to remove trees and brush from the site, which is about 2.5 acres in total. Students spent seven hours a day in excavation pits, shoveling dirt, revealing layers, sampling soils, and sifting dirt in search of archaeological remains. They also spent time in the lab, learning analysis and cataloging (McNulty, 2018:1), thus fulfilling **Metrics 3 and 4**, of learning about multiple methods used in the archaeological process, as well as participating in activities applicable to multiple learning styles. Field school experience, as discussed previously, is crucial to a career in archaeology. The UC-HBCU grant for the 2018-2021 field seasons ensured that finances were not an issue for students wanting to apply, as discussed in defining **Metric 8**. This grant assists with funding the ELPAP's efforts to increase diversity within archaeology. By knowing the needs and desires of their participants and the community, ELPAP leadership has made genuine effort to ensure that finances are less of a barring circumstance for those wanting to attend. Out of the six programs discussed within this thesis, the ELPAP has the most outside media coverage, meeting **Metric 11**. An in-depth article written by Lizzie Wade for *Science Magazine* in 2019 goes into detail about the ELPAP's youth and university programs. The article describes Dunnavant's supervision of the units and screens being manned by teenagers, while university students are conducting similar work nearby (Wade, 2019:1). The article explains that while this field school is the first experience with archaeology for most attending, the students quickly became an efficient team.

As two students scrape thin layers of earth into buckets, others sift it through the wire screens and keep a sharp eye out for artifacts. Because the plantation is much too recent for radiocarbon dating, archaeologists will create a timeline by tracing the changing styles of artifacts, including ceramics and buttons. Missing even one tiny object could mean losing a world of priceless information (Wade 2019:1).

Wade goes on to mention that while these efforts require a lot of trust to be placed in students, giving them these experiences is the main goal of the ELPAP (Wade, 2019:1). “Since the late 1970s, archaeologists have been asking questions about black culture and identity formation in the African diaspora, but there hasn't been a rise in actually training people of African descent to ask those questions themselves,” Flewellen shares in the article, (Wade, 2019:1). Archaeology presents a unique opportunity to empower people to share, protect, and preserve their cultures and histories, but the field must find ways to broaden its range of expertise. Public outreach is one of the most impactful ways to do so. In fact, an article in *The Scientist* argues that public outreach is so critical, that a citizen science component should be required when applying for research grants. They argue that this would encourage the greater participation, as stated below:

“A wave of new voices emerging in the public sphere, participating in an educated way in our most important national conversations. Increasing both the frequency of communication and the diversity of voices will build trust and interest in the public, providing renewed understanding and confidence in the work we do and its importance,” (Woodruff, 2021:1).

Work at the ELPAP is accomplishing this. In the *Science Magazine* article, Wade explains that the youth and university programs teach a variety of archaeological and preservation methods; fieldwork, laboratory methods, report writing, and oral history

are all explored, giving students a variety of buildable skills as well as ensuring that all types of learners are covered by the activities and methods offered. The article goes on to describe the extensive history of enslaved African peoples on the island of St. Croix. It finishes on a note about why the work at ELPAP is so powerful: “One way to tell St. Croix's story is tragedy after tragedy. But the archaeologists see it differently: an island and its people equally defined by resilience—and survival,” (Wade, 2019). Additionally, Science’s website featured the ELPAP in a video, viewable at the following URL: <https://www.science.org/content/article/watch-archaeologists-reflect-unearthing-lives-enslaved-africans>, giving those not involved with the program a look into the work it is accomplishing and increasing its public visibility (Cantwell, 2019: Science Magazine: Science Shots). Additionally, Harvard University held a virtual lecture with Flewellen in March 2021: <https://archaeology.harvard.edu/event/towards-archaeology-redress-estate-little-princess-archaeological-field-school-st-croix>, (Harvard University website, 2021). Unfortunately, it appears that this lecture was not recorded for public distribution. Additionally, the ELPAP does not maintain any sort of social media presence (**Metric 12**), virtual learning components (**Metric 9**), or publicly dispersible curriculum (**Metric 10**), limiting its accessibility by the outside world. However, given that this is an initiative created for a specific community, whose heritage has been destroyed or downplayed throughout history, it is understandable that the ELPAP prefer to focus their efforts on reaching a specific connected community rather than accessibility to the general public. However, one improvement the ELPAP could make in this area would be to share their work in more publications. In 2021, ELPAP

leadership did publish one article discussing the ELPAP, but why has there not been discussion since, nor more discussion prior to the pandemic? The methods used for the ELPAP are good examples of public archaeology that follow both Colwell and Atalay's principles and to disperse their design knowledge would be helpful to public archaeology as a community-based participatory research model. Not only has the ELPAP inspired the formation of new programs, such as the Crucian chapter of the Junior Scientists in the Sea Program, it has also inspired the creation of additional programs by local organizations such as Crucian Heritage and Nature Tourism (CHANT). Their project "Invisible Heritage: Identity, Memory & Our Town" is an innovative community revitalization project that is being used to invest in workforce development and historic restoration using creative placemaking as a vehicle for community transformation (CHANT website, 2023: Invisible Heritage webpage). Invisible Heritage targets Frederiksted town and the Free Gut neighborhoods specifically. The project is led by CHANT's Executive Director, Frandelle Gerard and managed by Akua Jackson, Program Manager. Project deliverables are executed through three work areas: community engagement and public art, training and apprenticeship, and acquisitions and construction. Upon completion of this project, historic properties will be occupied by low and moderate-income residents, many of whom will be artists and artisans bringing life to formerly abandoned spaces. In building an accredited training and job experience program for residents, a pipeline for careers in the building arts, historic restoration and preservation, and the decorative arts will be established. With community ownership of the project, new processes for and works of socially engaged public art will be created. The power of

the place will be charged by the historical narrative and the structures and will be activated by the community for positive transformation (CHANT website, 2023: Invisible Heritage webpage). The ELPAP is an example of the empowerment and change that can occur when public outreach is flexible, sustainable, and invested in the needs of its participants and their communities, and unlike the other programs, it appears to be planning its future by training its future leaders: the citizens of St. Croix.

Archaeology in the Community (AIRC)

Examining Archaeology in the Community (AIRC) through **Metric 1**, it is apparent that this program also benefits from having formed partnerships within its community, as well as larger partnerships, such as the Southeastern Archaeological Conference (SEAC). Additionally, AIRC has three levels of corporate partnership: Program Sponsorship, to provide support for existing programs; In-Kind Sponsorship: to provide products or knowledge that help AIRC to maximize their impact on communities and schools, their administrative efficiency and overall potential of the organization; and Event Sponsorship, such as corporations and groups: provide support to major AIRC events (AIRC website, 2023: Corporate Sponsors). These opportunities create not only funding for AIRC to provide free programming and additional services for their students, such as ensuring that meals are provided for, but also provide marketing space to build public awareness of sponsor brands and services, which can be powerful incentives for corporations to support projects like the AIRC. Along with having flexibility to meet the needs of its students (**meeting Metrics 2 and 5**), AIRC is also flexible in its programming design choices, which as

previously discussed is an aspect of meeting **Metric 2**. Their multi-day Young Archaeologist Club, for ages 7-12, is a free program, thus keeping cost from barring underprivileged students (**Metric 5**), that is held both in-person and virtually and allows students to learn about various archaeological methods and aspects of life in the past. AITC's online gallery for the Young Archaeologist Club shows students engaging in activities focused on activities about excavation and stratigraphy, laboratory work such as piecing together broken ceramics, creating rock art, taking field trips to museums, learning about hieroglyphics and flint knapping. For those interested in viewing the online gallery, it can be found here:

<https://www.archaeologyincommunity.com/young-archaeologists-club.html> The variety of activities is diverse in scope and allows for activities that explore multiple aspects of the archaeological process, as well as provides opportunity that appeal to various learning styles, thus meeting **Metrics 3 & 4**. Most of the student programming is targeted at underrepresented and underprivileged elementary aged students, meeting **Metric 8**. However, AITC does provide opportunities for older students through programs like Archaeologist for a Day, which can be tailored to fit various age groups and organizations (AITC website, 2023: Programs for Youth). Additionally, AITC hosts a Mini Archaeology Camp, wherein students meet for nine sessions spread out across four weeks. During the camp students work alongside AITC archaeologists to explore archaeology as a profession and a practice. AITC teaches students how archaeology was developed as a field, techniques used to gather archaeological data, and how data is analyzed to interpret the past. Students participate through lectures, interactive workshops, and a group project, and lessons

and group work are centered on community histories appropriate for student groups, meeting **Metrics 3, 4, and, 6**. (AITC website, 2023: Programs for Youth). Students are taught to uncover a historical narrative through archaeological excavations, research and laboratory analysis, and interpretation, through the use of hands-on activities to facilitate critical thinking, science, history and math skills. The curricula are designed not only to teach age-appropriate skills, but also to inspire the student's imagination (AITC website, 2023: Programs for Youth). This flexibility of thought towards problem-solving and research not only serves students well while participating in AITC, but also in school and throughout their lives, meeting **Metric 7**. Although AITC is primarily aimed at elementary school students, there are some opportunities for adults, such as teachers. Through their partnership with the Montpelier Foundation, a non-profit organization focused on continuing public engagement with American constitutional self-government by bringing to life the home and contributions of James and Dolley Madison, has been able to offer full scholarships to attend a special LEARN Archaeology Expedition Program for grade school teachers, this summer, July 23-July 28th, 2023. Teachers attending the program will have the opportunity to participate in excavations with the Montpelier Archaeology Department staff, and to gain instruction directly from Dr. Alexandra Jones, Executive Director and founder of the AITC, on applying the experiences gained in the field to the classroom (AITC website, 2023: Educators). Another adult program offered stems from AITC's partnership with SEAC. SEAC made a formal announcement of this program on their website, stating that their partnership recognizes the need for archaeological expertise in assisting African Americans in

identifying historic resources in their communities and the need for African American communities to assist archaeologists with their community-specific expertise and knowledge to contribute to a fuller understanding of African American historical experiences (SEAC website, 2023: Announcements). SEAC called for volunteers for AITC in this announcement, complete with a form for volunteers to fill out (SEAC website, 2023: Announcements). AITC has also announced this partnership, and its joint project the African American Historic Resources Project, encouraging stakeholders of African American historical resources to reach out if interested in working with archaeological experts to record and document their sites (AITC website, 2023: African American Historic Resources Project).

AITC does offer virtual learning opportunities, including a YouTube series titled “The Dig,” (AITC website, 2023: In the Community). As mentioned in methods and in defining **Metric 9**, virtual learning opportunities are vital for accessible learning, especially for students who may be too far away, too vulnerable, or otherwise are unable to participate in the AITC. AITC also offers a variety of free online curriculums and lessons plans for educators on their website, accomplishing **Metric 10**. These offerings range from a complete curriculum for 3rd-5th grade students focused on the archaeology conducted at Kalorama Park in Washington D.C. and a complete curriculum for grades 6th-10th on Ancient Nubia, to standalone lesson plans on measuring and mending ceramics, archaeology field survey methods, and exploring the past through photographs, as well as additional content from outside organizations. (AITC website, 2023: Educators). AITC also maintains an active media presence, to reach as wide an audience as possible. As mentioned previously,

all AITC programs are advertised on social media, newspapers, blogs, the radio, and community boards on local TV stations, ensuring maximum exposure to members of the public, as method of accomplishing **Metric 11**. (Jones, 2022:301). Other efforts aiding AITC in accomplishing **Metric 11** include YouTube channels that have shared lectures and interviews given by Dr. Jones, and in doing so have made these programs more accessible for viewers around the globe. In 2018, Howard University published an online article which stated that Jones' estimated she had impacted over 10,000 students at that time (Walker, 2018: Howard University News website). This article took place just before the start of the Young Archaeologist Club, and while no further estimations were found during the research for this thesis, one can only imagine how many more lives Dr. Jones' has impacted in the intervening five years since that interview. AITC maintains active Facebook and Instagram accounts, and a somewhat active YouTube channel, accomplishing **Metric 12**. AITC is a great example of what can be accomplished when a program focuses on flexibility, community engagement, and sustainability. However, there is always room for improvement; for instance, and this applies to all of the programs contained within this analysis, there appears to be no plan for continuous funding, nor plans for perpetuity. The only program that seems to be planning on being continuous once its leadership retires is the ELPAP. The ELPAP is effectively training its future leadership and equipping the people of St. Croix to take over their own heritage.

Nome Archaeology Camp

In examining Nome Archaeology Camp through **Metric 1**, it was found that it is the result of a partnership between multiple organizations: The National Park Service, Kawerak Inc., the Katirvik Center, Bering Straits Native Corporation, the Carrie M. McLain Museum, and Alaska Geographic. This partnership, as with the ELPAP and AITC, is a part of what helped Nome Archaeology Camp to be such a unique outreach experience targeted towards Alaskan high school students, primarily of indigenous descent, thus including **Metric 8** within its design methods. During its four years of operation, Nome Archaeology Camp provided Alaskan high school students with a rich archaeological and cultural learning experience. During their week at camp students participated in a variety of activities provided by all partners of the camp. A particularly unique aspect of this camp, as mentioned in the previous chapter, is that excavation was not used as the primary method of archaeological survey (Richie et al., 2021:22). Students instead used less destructive methods such as soil probing (Richie et al., 2021:22); this variety of activities fulfills both **Metrics 3 and 4**. As their final project for the 2018 camp, students summarized their experiences through a variety of presentations on the topics of culture, sharing knowledge, and archaeology with the overarching themes of community-based participatory research and decolonizing anthropology. Each presentation included direct action that could be taken by the camp's partners, such as petitioning the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) to change the name of Salmon Lake to its original Inupiaq name. Additionally, as a follow up to the camp, students submitted a formal presentation to the Alaska Anthropological Association Annual Meeting that was held

February 29-March 2, 2019 in Nome, Alaska (Kawerak Inc. website, 2018: Nome Archaeology Camp.) Presentations were also uploaded to the YouTube channels for Alaska NPS and Kawerak Inc (YouTube, 2023). The rich culture and history of the Bering Strait region was taught with sensitivity and celebration, meeting **Metrics 5 and 6**. When interviewed about his experience in teaching during the camp, Arthur “Guy” Martin, a member of the Sitnasuak Native Corporation Elders Committee (SNC Venture, 2013:4), shared the following:

We took away good feelings and a good sense of what the organizers are trying to convey to the youth. Science can mix and does mix with Native stories and legends from our ancestors. It shows that they can work hand in hand and in some cases, these stories and legends from our elders are brought forward through science as far as time is concerned and archaeological evidence. As they [the students] grow up they will have in their mind that sharing information nowadays is good. I think it will help the young people as they grow older that they've seen or been exposed to both worlds and in some cases, both worlds can be compatible. It gives them another leg up on life to have two different views and see where they can mesh at times (Oliver, 2016).

That was one of the goals of the camp's organizers, to open doors for local students, whether they pursue archaeology or not.

We want any information that we find out through archaeology to be benefitting the people of the communities here who are the direct descendants of the people who were living on the land in the past," said Hannah Atkinson, an anthropologist with the National Park Service. "That's one of the reasons that we do educational camps is we want young people to grow up with an understanding of the cultural resources in our region and how to responsibly study those resources and get information from them but also respect the archaeological sites and respect everything around them (Oliver, 2016).

The lessons learned at Nome Archaeology Camp are applicable to a wide range of learning styles and leave students with buildable skillsets that they can continue to

use beyond the program, thus meeting **Metric 7**. In addition to the buildable skills obtained at camp, students also leave with academic credit through University of Alaska Fairbanks (Richie et al., 2021:3) and one student was able to use their connections and experience from the Nome Archaeology Camp to obtain a part-time job as a museum assistant at the Carrie M. McLain Museum in Nome (NPS website, 2023: Nome Archaeology Camp.) Information on the costs of this program were not forthcoming, however, by focusing on the indigenous descendant community of the Bering Strait region, Nome Archaeology Camp does help underserved and underprivileged students gain experiences that they otherwise would not otherwise have, meeting **Metric 8**. Additionally, the camp does not have a virtual learning component, a publicly available curriculum, nor a strong media or current social media presence, thus not meeting **Metrics 9-12**. However, this may be because of the impact that the global pandemic has had on public programs, especially given the disproportionate effect that the pandemic had on indigenous populations (O'Neil, 2021: NPR website). While the overall design of the camp could be replicated in other areas, it would not be identical programming due to the unique nature of the resources present in Nome. Nome Archaeology Camp is dependent on its partnerships to continue, as well as its current leadership, which given that the camp has not resumed since the pandemic, this could be an indication that their current leadership may have been impacted. Another improvement that could be implemented is the addition of virtual or printable programming. While this program is targeted specifically towards indigenous high school students living in Alaska, not all of them are in Nome, and it may not be possible for every student who wishes to participate to

travel to Nome. Additionally, as with the ELPAP, it would aid the field of public archaeology, especially efforts being created by indigenous groups, if there were publications or other forms of discussion or coverage available.

Sugarland Ethno-History Project

The Sugarland Ethno-History Project (SEHP) also benefits from local partnerships that aid in the preservation and conservation efforts for this historic community, thus including **Metric 1** within their design. Their partnership with History Associates Incorporated helps to ensure that the archaeology conducted at Sugarland is done with the care and expertise provided by professional supervision. However, these professionals are also teaching volunteers, who are composed of both descendants and members of the general public, the processes used for investigation and preservation, meeting **Metrics 2, 3, 4, and 7**. Its outreach is encompassing in its scope, involving restoration and preservation of original buildings such as the St. Paul Community Church, research methods to discover both written and material remains that help to interpret the story of those who lived there, and even a tourist economy (SEHP website). Using the remaining features such as St. Paul's Community Church and the cemetery, as well as stories and photographs, the SEHP shares an unbiased account of the lives of those who once called Sugarland home, meeting **Metrics 5 and 6**. The care put into the preservation and restoration of Sugarland's stories by its descendants is obvious in every piece of the process. The SEHP differs from the ELPAP, AITC, and Nome Archaeology Camp in that while there exists a curriculum for students that focuses on the lives of the Dorsey family of Sugarland, its primary

focus is community sustained preservation and restoration, incorporating **Metric 8**. Considering **Metrics 9 and 10**, these metrics are areas wherein the SEHP could improve. During the research phase, a publicly available method to acquire the SEHP K-12 curriculum appeared to be unavailable. It is due to the help of a mentor that it can be discussed within this thesis. The Sugarland curriculum is divided into four sections: 1. An introduction, which sets the stage for how the curriculum incorporates Maryland State Department of Education Standards, 2. An introduction to archaeology chapter, which explains what archaeology is and how it is conducted, 3. A background chapter that teaches students about the world the Dorsey family occupied and their stories within that timeframe, 4. A concluding chapter discussing historic preservation and the process of preserving archaeological sites. It is brief, being only 60 pages long, but complete. It leaves students with an understanding of Sugarland, its inhabitants, and their stories, while also teaching them how they can preserve those stories and what methods are employed to do so. It would be an improvement if there were more publicly available methods for those outside of the Montgomery County, Maryland area to learn more about Sugarland. However, despite its localized status, the SEHP does incorporate **Metrics 11 and 12** well relative to its scope in comparison to the ELPAP and AITC. The Monocacy Monocle, a local publication, discussed a public history talk that James “Skip” Etheridge held as a part of speaker series on freed communities around the Poolesville area of Maryland. Etheridge, a descendant of one of the founders of the Sugarland community, began his talk by explaining the importance that Sugarland holds for him. He also discussed “pull[ing] the bandage off; we are going to talk about slavery. We

can't be afraid to speak about it. It is our history. Some people are uncomfortable speaking about this subject [enslaved peoples], as the past has the uncanny ability to disrupt the present. Black people brought life to the economy and the social fabric of the Poolesville community” (O’Connell, 2019:5). Sugarland, and the areas surrounding it, are surrounded by areas where plantations once stood. After the Civil War, many of these properties were sold to freed slaves. People pass through these spaces every day, and they have no idea about the history of those who lived there. The SEHP seeks to remedy that by sending Sugarland’s story out into the world. As an aspect of this, Sugarland has been the host of several public heritage events, such as the Montgomery County Heritage Days and even a bike ride (SEHP Facebook and Instagram pages, 2022-2023). Their book, *I Have Started for Canaan*, provides a detailed account of the lives of those who once inhabited this community, as well as the efforts of the SEHP. It touches not only on how the events of history touched Sugarland but also on the simple day to day aspects of life, such as subsistence farming and sending children to school (SEHP, 2020:1-224). Other media representation includes the Autumn 2020 edition of “Plenty” a local publication in Montgomery County, where Sugarland is located, which published an article by Reese, Johnson, and Spyeck, summarizing the work going on at Sugarland. The article can be read at the following URL: <https://joom.ag/ewGC/p14>. The article includes photographs of Sugarland inhabitants as well as the church ledger from which a lot of the material for *I Have Started for Canaan* was transcribed. Additionally, Christine Rai has created an excellent tour agenda for Sugarland, which can be found here: <https://christinera.com/explorethereserve-week-two-the-historic->

[African American-community-of-sugarland/](#). Rai published this as a part of the Explore the Reserve Project which began during the global pandemic. It highlighted weekly ideas for ways to safely go out and explore Montgomery County's Agricultural Reserve or areas around it (Rai, 2020: Introducing #Explore the Reserve). Montgomery County's 93,000-acre Agricultural Reserve maintains and protects the rural and agricultural legacy of the area (Rai, 2020: Introducing #Explore the Reserve). Formal tours at Sugarland are either scheduled in advance or are a part of public events, so typically no one is constantly present there. So, in a way, although this was not a virtual learning experience, it was a way for people to safely explore the history around them during this time when most cultural and heritage resources were closed. This could have been an interesting method for other areas possessing cultural resources to utilize. As an example, could Nome have created a digitally distributable curriculum wherein students explored and made observations of the natural areas within their vicinity? Perhaps with recorded lectures, or oral history accounts? In the case of the SEHP, true virtual learning options appear to be forthcoming. In 2022, the Poolesville Seniors YouTube channel featured a presentation discussing the SEHP and its archaeological investigation of the Dorsey house, the book, *I Have Started for Canaan*, the K-12 curriculum, and plans for a virtual archaeology exhibit and tour (Poolesville Seniors YouTube channel, 2022). Lastly, the SEHP maintains an active social media presence on Facebook and Instagram, and has been featured on other Youtube channels, including Heritage Montgomery and the Archaeological Society of New Jersey. The SEHP proves that you can start small, and still have a large impact. It will be interesting to see how they

continue to grow in years to come. However, as with ELPAP, AITC, and the Nome Archaeology camp, there does not appear to be any sort of continuous funding, nor plans for perpetuity. However, given that they are a local organization that was started by people who had never pursued this sort of undertaking, perhaps those plans are in the works.

Texas Archeological Stewardship Network (TASN)

The TASN is a part of the THC, who selects and trains the Stewards, they also benefit from funding provided by the Friends of the THC, **Metric 1**. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the Friends of the THC raise funds to support the programs, projects, and activities of the THC that are not directly funded by the legislature (Friends of the THC website, 2023: Support Us).

Although the TASN is flexible in design, as stewards perform a variety of tasks and work within various communities (**Metric 2**), it is rigid in its standards. A major factor in the TASN's creation was to build a task force who could help stop the looting and site destruction that was taking place on private land. As such, although they are avocational archaeologists, they are vetted by the professional archaeologists working for the THC and applications to join can be rejected, and stewards can be expelled if they do not follow state standards and their established code of ethics.

As mentioned previously, the stewards receive training twice per year from the THC, and a part of this training involves staying current with archaeological methods, meeting **Metric 3**. Also, before working on their own, stewards must work under the supervision of another steward for several years. Stewards assist in a wide variety of tasks, such as recording and monitoring sites, leading public outreach activities and

events, and mentoring youth, and even contributing to published materials within the state of Texas (TASN Handbook, 2018:11-13). It is critical that their knowledge base and skillset stay professional and up to date. In teaching the stewards how to do their work, it is important to remember that learning styles are just as meaningful in the education of adults. Thus, having a wide range of activities applicable to various learning styles, as well as physical capabilities, is a must in planning any outreach initiative. This is especially true for a program of this scope and magnitude, if it is to obtain the number of volunteers that it needs, and hopefully more.

With its variety of tasks and training methods, the TASN meets **Metric 4**.

Additionally, given their intensive training, the TASN and their published content is both culturally sensitive and objective, thus meeting **Metrics 5 and 6**, and their training is always evolving, meeting **Metric 7**. The TASN is not targeted towards any specific communities (though one could argue that private landowners in Texas is a community, in a way), so they do not utilize **Metric 8** in their programming.

However, given that this is a state-sanctioned program, it makes sense that it would not be targeted towards a specific group. However, recruitment is one aspect in which the TASN could improve. During the research phase, what few photographs of stewards working that could be found all featured older persons. While this is great in some ways, as the other programs discussed within this thesis target primarily students and younger adults, it is also detrimental to the longevity of the program.

What happens to TASN if there are no stewards to replace those who pass on?

Moving to **Metric 9**, some TASN stewards have contributed to the programming available on Texas Beyond History (TBH), which is a virtual learning database for all

ages (TBH website, 2023). TBH is a collaborative effort between multiple entities and is not solely the work of the stewards. Thus, the stewards do not quite meet **Metric 9**; however, one must ask if that is a part of their purpose. TASN's work primarily takes place on private lands and perhaps public exposure is not permitted by the landowner. Also, TASN does not possess a publicly available curriculum (**Metric 10**) but this is understandable due to their purpose, vetting process, and intensive training. It would be contradictory to their goals to circulate materials that might encourage non-TASN individuals to play at being stewards. However, they do distribute brochures concerning the illegal artifact market and other issues.

Concerning **Metric 11**, the stewards are featured on the social media accounts for the THC and the Friends of the THC, and both organizations maintain active Facebook, Instagram, and YouTube accounts. As with **Metric 9**, the content is not solely that of the stewards, but again, much of their work does take place on private lands and may not be able to be shared with the public. Lastly, when looking at TASN in relation to **Metric 12**, this is another area in which this program, and frankly all of the programs analyzed, could improve; it is difficult to find media related to the TASN if one is not actively seeking it. Furthermore, and this may be related to the regionality of TASN, most of the resources found are published by the THC.

Project Archaeology (PA)

While Project Archaeology (PA) does have the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) as a partner; it appears that they primarily aid with curriculum development. There are multiple PA programs in all 50 states, and during the research phase, it seems that

each regional chapter is typically affiliated with a state or local archaeological society, and sometimes the state park or forestry service, who can help their partnered chapter with funding and spaces beyond schools to hold workshops. Although the main PA website had announced a partnership with the BLM and Montana State University in the form of an archaeological stewardship program, it is unclear if this program has begun (PA website, 2023: Montana Site Stewardship Program). This aside, PA as a whole does not appear to have any sort of widespread partnerships to aid with funding its initiatives. As of 2019, the development leadership for PA had published a marketing plan (PA website, 2019: Marketing Plan), but given that this occurred just before the global pandemic, it is unclear what developments have been made. Thus, there is not a clear incorporation of **Metric 1** within this program. But that is one of its unique features; there is so much regionality and specialization within the curriculum and the ways it can be adapted, that there are infinite possibilities in how PA can be utilized. It can be as general or targeted as needed, one could create programming for students in general, or they could adapt or create programming to reach descendent communities, depending on the goals of their chapter or the needs of their region, thus incorporating **Metric 2**, and possibly **Metric 8**, depending on the direction of a given chapter. While corresponding with Gail Lundeen, a retired teacher who is heavily involved in the Kansas City, Missouri PA program, she shared her feelings on the flexible nature of this program, its uniqueness, and what she has enjoyed most during her time as a PA educator.

Project Archaeology is a national curriculum to teach young people about archaeology - what it is, why it's important, and how to be good stewards of archaeological resources. The materials are flexible and can be adapted to many different situations.

Teachers can use the entire curriculum in their classrooms. Museum docents can use some of the activities as they relate to the exhibits. Park rangers and historic sites personnel can use Project Archaeology materials to interpret archaeological sites at their location. Scout leaders can use activities to complete requirements for badges. Archaeologists can use the themes and activities in Project Archaeology materials when they talk to the public.

I enjoy leading [educator] workshops that present adults with ways in which they can introduce archaeology to young people. It's rewarding to see people get excited about having the tools and information to share archaeology with youth. I especially enjoy the opportunities I have to interact directly with the public to teach them about what archaeologists do, how they interpret artifacts from past cultures, and how they preserve that information for the future (Lundeen, 2023; interview).

Lundeen held a workshop at the Missouri Archaeological Society's (MAS) 2023 annual meeting. During the workshop, she introduced MAS members to a few of the activities she has conducted with students. Her workshop was also a lesson in how public archaeology does not require a massive budget to be sustainable, effective, and fun for students. Being a retired teacher, Lundeen is an expert in getting creative and inexpensive with acquiring teaching resources. In one of the example activities, she passed out plastic bags containing small items that one would find around their home, such as twist ties, cotton swabs, toothpicks, and buttons, and participants were asked to separate these items into categories, as a thought exercise to introduce students to laboratory methods. In another activity, Lundeen had spread out a large sheet of paper with various "artifacts" such as DVDS, books, and toys placed in various areas, and asked participants to investigate to see if they could infer what sort of structure this "site" was and what the ages of those living there might be. These are only two small examples, but it was powerful to see what Lundeen could do with items that are easily, and inexpensively, obtainable. (However, for those who may be concerned

about students not getting a “realistic” archaeological experience, Lundeen did share that the Missouri State Historical Society is in the process of putting together traveling trunks that will tie into PA programming and will be lent out upon request.)

The curricula provide a variety of activities and topics that discuss a variety of archaeological methods with activities applicable to many different learning styles, meeting **Metrics 3 and 4**. The “Investigation Rock Art” module involves students creating rock art with two different hands-on activities (PA website, 2023: Investigating Rock Art). Students also explore how archaeologists study art to understand past cultures. Students observe authentic petroglyphs (either virtually through a database maintained by PA or in person if locally available) and are asked to analyze two interpretations to determine the artist's message using evidence to support their inferences. Then, incorporating a digital component, students design a webpage or smart phone app to support the protection of precontact art (PA website, 2023: Investigating Rock Art).

As mentioned in the previous chapter, there are also modules focused on historical archaeology. One of these, titled “Investigating a Light Station,” helps students to understand the current curation crisis. The module uses a light station in St. Augustine, Florida as its site, and has students learn research methods to examine historic photographs, primary source documents, artifacts, and maps. Through the primary sources, students meet Wilma Daniels, the daughter of a lighthouse keeper who grew up at the light station. Lastly, students “uncover” an archaeological site, classify artifacts, and infer how the geography of Florida shaped the creation of light stations (PA website, 2023: Investigating a Light Station). While analyzing these

modules, as well as others offered by PA, it appears that the language is kept culturally aware, and the history of these sites and their inhabitants is taught in an objective manner, incorporating **Metrics 5 and 6**. Students are taught an array of buildable skills that will serve them throughout their education and beyond, incorporating **Metric 7**.

As mentioned, PA as a whole entity is not targeted to any one community, other than general school-age students; however, given regional variability it can, and probably has, been modified to fit the needs of descendent, or otherwise underrepresented, communities, so it does have the potential to fulfill **Metric 8**. Also, as previously mentioned, some chapters do include virtual learning components, incorporating **Metric 9** in ways such as the oral histories uploaded by Southern Utah University for their local chapter of PA as a part of the university's "Voices of the Ancients Oral History Project (SUU website, 2023: Project Archaeology Videos). It appears that in 2020 the main PA website had announced plans for a virtual learning component as a response to the pandemic, and they published some curricula and activities as free PDFs; however, it was unable to be determined if any further progress has been made (PA website, 2020: Project Archaeology's Response to Covid-19). This is technically a fulfilment of **Metric 10**; however, given that these are excerpts and not entire modules that are publicly available for free, this has been left as a no within the table (see **Table 2**). PA is in a good position to provide virtual and publicly accessible programming and it is disappointing that the program as a whole has not explored this more.

When searching for media resources about this program, it became apparent that due to its localization, media coverage beyond social media or partner websites was unavailable. This is not uncommon in public archaeology; most outreach occurs on a localized level and thus does not draw the same media attention as larger collaborative efforts such as the ELPAP or AITC. Project Archaeology does maintain an active Facebook account for the entire program, wherein local chapters may share their upcoming events (PA Facebook page, 2023). They also once had a presence on Instagram, but their account has not shared any content since mid-2022 (PA Instagram account, 2023). No primary YouTube account was found, but a couple of regional channels were found, such as the one for Arizona Project Archaeology and the Kansas Historical Society (YouTube, 2023). While their Facebook account does fulfill **Metric 11**, this is also an area in which improvements could be made and could also be incorporated into furthering their virtual learning opportunities.

Overall, Project Archaeology is an example of sustainable and effective public archaeology that does not require a large budget to achieve its goals. The flexibility of the program is a crucial part of why it has had the success and longevity that it has. Place-based programs are an excellent way to build excitement and hands-on experiences for students, but not all areas have the resources to access these types of experiences, nor can they always accommodate every type of student. Project Archaeology is a way for these communities and individuals to access these types of educational experiences; however, as stated above, they should improve upon their virtual and publicly accessible options. Perhaps deepening their partnership with the BLM would be an avenue through which this could be accomplished.

Closing Notes

Within this chapter, six public archaeology programs were analyzed using 12 metrics. These metrics were designed (as discussed in **Chapter 4: Methods**) with the methods proposed by Colwell (2016) and Atalay (2012) as vehicles to decolonize archaeology and bring about meaningful collaboration, in mind. In reference to the methodologies proposed by both Colwell and Atalay, the ELPAP, the Nome Archaeology Camp, and the SEHP have all established different, yet effective programs for decolonizing archaeology and cultural heritage and placing it back into the hands of its descendants. AITC lies somewhere on this continuum, as it is designed to diversify archaeology, but is not aimed at a very specific descendant community, and TASN and PA are more generalized programs designed to diversify archaeology on a more generalized scale. The programs chosen for this analysis occupy a wide spectrum to showcase that public archaeology can be as elaborate or economic as needed and still achieve a meaningful impact. Transition to the last, and final part of this work, the results of this analysis will be summarized, contributions to the current knowledge based discussed, and recommendations will be made in the form of a call to action.

Conclusions

This thesis has been an exploration of potentially critical factors in the creation of sustainable, effective, and engaging archaeological outreach, with an emphasis on programs targeted at descendent communities, underrepresented populations, and the general public. This is an imperfect discussion as community and public archaeology efforts are often regionalized and thus how much information can be gathered, whether through public or academic channels, is limited. However, the programs chosen accomplish their varied and common goals in a myriad of ways with differing levels of financial and other outside support. This is purposeful as it displays the flexibility necessary within this sort of endeavor, as well as shows that effective community and public archaeology is possible despite how finite resources may be. Each program was analyzed against **12 metrics (Error! Reference source not found.)**; not every program accomplished all 12 and each program has room for improvement, but overall, each provides a good example of approachable methods for conducting archaeological outreach. Two common themes in which all could implement improvements were sustainability and accessibility. Except for the ELPAP, the programs do not appear to have a plan on how to continue once their current leadership retires, or otherwise cannot continue. Additionally, with the exception of the TASN, all of the programs require a continuous seeking of funding; however, this is unfortunately a recurring theme throughout most of archaeology, except CRM, which is currently experiencing a boom as the U.S. updates its aged infrastructure. Accessibility is also an ongoing issue throughout not just archaeology, but many other areas of science and society in general. Accessibility in this context

was limited to virtual and distance learning options; however, in future publications, the author plans to explore methods for better incorporating ADA standards and neurodivergence, such as autism, within the archaeological community. Potential examples of how a program could achieve the **12 metrics** are illustrated in **Table 7** below.

Table 7: Examples of methods for fulfilling the 12 metrics.

<p>Metric 1: Seek partnerships both within and without the archaeological/educational community. Local businesses are often happy to support local projects. Additionally, seek out grants where applicable.</p>	<p>Metric 2: Be flexible enough within the curriculum to accommodate updates as the community needs.</p>	<p>Metric 3: The curriculum should explore multiple avenues of archaeology: excavation vs. non-excavation, laboratory methods, oral histories, etc.</p>
<p>Metric 4: Ensure that the curriculum is applicable to a wide array of learning styles, both on neurotypical and neurodivergent scales.</p>	<p>Metric 5: Understand the cultural sensitivities of materials covered and of the program’s participants. Know your audience’s needs.</p>	<p>Metric 6: Portray the events of history objectively; no glorifying or demonizing one group or another.</p>
<p>Metric 7: Ensure participants leave with a skillset that they can use both in and out of the classroom setting. Preferable this is both technical and/or research skills and as well as a more tolerant mindset.</p>	<p>Metric 8: If the program is geared towards a particular community, it is imperative to understand the needs and wants of that community, i.e. if the community wishes for their knowledge to remain closed, that wish must be respected.</p>	<p>Metric 9: It is imperative that virtual learning components be implemented (unless the program is within a community that wishes to keep their work private, but even then there could be virtual components for community eyes only); this could add to what is already included in the program or it could be a way for participants to refresh and continuously update their knowledge.</p>

<p>Metric 10: If programs could have free online and offline (printable) activities or curriculums, this could go a long way assisting those who wish to participate from a distance (with and without internet if one can get to a library to use a printer). The U.S. Forestry Service has a great example called “Discover the Forest.”</p>	<p>Metric 11: Social media can be a powerful tool to share what programs are doing, as well as a way to garner interest. Programs should have active accounts with engaging content. Facebook, Instagram, and YouTube are being used in this way already in other educational pursuits.</p>	<p>Metric 12: Programs could reach out to local and regional newspapers, but also journals, blogs, and podcasts.</p>
---	--	---

As with the **12 metrics** themselves, the above examples are not meant as an authoritative list, but more as a helpful guide. As society moves towards being more inclusive and diverse, as well as ever more connected via technology, it will be exciting to see how these changes impact archaeology and what impact archaeology will have in return.

The goals of this thesis were to make meaningful contributions to the discussion of how archaeological outreach is conducted, how it can improve, and how it should be more widely implemented. A secondary goal was to use this analysis to showcase how attainable community and public inclusion can be if one approaches it with a flexible mindset. Outreach can be conducted with both large and meager budgets; the ELPAP and AITC are examples of programs that have strong enough budgets to provide for even the basic needs of their participants, whereas Project Archaeology is an example of what can be done at the financial level of even just one determined individual. Lastly, this thesis encourages public archaeology in hopes that it will diversify not only the archaeological community, but also diversify the mindset of those impacted by archaeological outreach and thus promote tolerance and a more

culturally aware society that is better able to respect cultural resources and their fellow human beings.

This work ends with a call to action. Now empowered with the knowledge provided within this work, the author, who is a CRM archaeologist, would like to challenge readers, and/or others in the CRM community, to get involved with some form of public outreach. Whether big or small, effort and participation is what it takes for improvement to occur. While it would be wonderful if all outreach efforts could accomplish ELPAP-level goals, what is most important is that efforts to decolonize and diversify archaeology are taking place at all, and it is something that all archaeologists can, and should, play a role in. Even just talking to those in your community about archaeology can go a long way. When people find out someone is writing a thesis, they tend to ask what the thesis topic is, and most people that the author has spoken to outside of their own ethnic community, have been surprised that someone would care if other communities besides their own are included within archaeology and have admitted that it can be hard to picture themselves as participants or practitioners of archaeology. In a country as diverse as the U.S., this is unacceptable, and it is the responsibility of archaeologists everywhere to work together to change this.

Bibliography

- Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP). 2009. *The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as Amended*. <http://www.achp.gov/nhpa.html>
- Albright, Horace M., and Robert Cahn. 1985. "The Birth of the National Park Service: The Founding Years, 1913-33." Salt Lake City: Howe Brothers.
- Archaeological Institute of America. 2006. "Federal Archaeologist: National Park Service Chief Archaeologist Frank McManamon Discusses His Career and the Antiquities Act." *Archaeology Archive*.
<http://archive.archaeology.org/online/interviews/mcmanamon.html>
- Atalay, Sonya. 2012. "Community-Based Archaeology: Research with, by and for Indigenous and Local Communities." University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.
- Babits, Lawrence E., and Howard, Joshua B. 2009. "Long, Obstinate, and Bloody: The Battle of Guilford Courthouse." Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Barrie, Elizabeth. 1998. "Subdisciplines: Anthropology in the National Park Service." http://www.indiana.edu/proxy-um.researchport.umd.edu/-wanthro/theory_pages/NPS. Accessed May 14th, 2023.
- Binford, L. 1991. "A Corporate Caribou Hunt." *Expedition Magazine*. **33(1)**: 33-43.
- Birnbaum, C. 1994. "Protecting Cultural Landscapes: Planning, Treatment, and Management of Historic Landscapes." *Preservation Briefs*. 36." Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Cultural Resources, Preservation Assistance.
- Burtenshaw, Paul, and Gould, Peter G. 2014. "Archaeology and Economic Development." *Public Archaeology*, 13(1-3), 3-9.

- Carnett, C. 1991. "Legal Background of Archaeological Resources Protection." *U.S. Department of the Interior, Archaeological Assistance Program Technical Brief. 11*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Services.
- Catapoti, D. 2013. "To own or to share? The crisis of the past at the onset of the 21st century." In Relaki, M. and D. Catapoti (eds) *An Archaeology of Land Ownership*. Routledge, Archaeology Series.
- Colwell, Chip. 2006. "Collaborative Archaeologies and Descendant Communities." *Annual Review of Anthropology*. 45:1. 113-127
- Edwards-Ingram, Y. 1997. "Toward True Acts of Inclusion: The "Here" and the "Out There. Concepts in Public Archaeology." *Historical Archaeology*, 31(3), 27–35.
- Flewellen, et al. 2021. "Creating Community and Engaging Community: The Foundations of the Estate Little Princess Archaeology Project in St. Croix, U.S. Virgin Islands." *International Journal of Historical Archaeology*. 1-30.
- Foster, Margaret. 2021. "Unearthing Sugarland's story." *The Beacon*.
<https://www.thebeaconnewspapers.com/unearthing-sugarlands-story/> .
 Accessed on March 8th, 2023.
- Gardner, H. 2013. "Frequently asked questions-Multiple intelligences and related educational topics."
https://howardgardner01.files.wordpress.com/2012/06/faq_march2013.pdf
 Accessed on March 7th, 2023.
- Green, L. F., Green, D. R., & Góes Neves, E. 2003. "Indigenous Knowledge and Archaeological Science: The Challenges of Public Archaeology in the Reserva Uaçá." *Journal of Social Archaeology*, 3 (3): 366–398.
- Grima, Reuben. 2016. "But Isn't All Archaeology 'Public' Archaeology?" *Public Archaeology*, 15(1), 50-58.
- Gross, Terry. 2022. From Slavery to Socialism, New Legislation Restricts What Teachers Can Discuss. *National Public Radio*. Accessed on May 10th, 2022.
<https://www.npr.org/transcripts/1077878538>
- Hamilakis, Y. and Duke, P. 2007. *Archaeology and Capitalism: From Ethics to Politics*. 0-298. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Henson, D. 2017. "Archaeology and Education." In G. Moshenska (Ed.), *Key Concepts in Public Archaeology*. 43–59. UCL Press.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1vxm8r7.8> . Accessed on March 6th, 2023:

- Hein, G. E. 1991. "Constructivist Learning Theory." Paper presented at the CECA (International Committee of Museum Educators) Conference, Jerusalem Israel. 1-10.
- History Associates Incorporated. 2023. "The Sugarland Ethno-History Project." <https://www.historyassociates.com/the-sugarland-ethno-history-project/>. Accessed on March 8th, 2023.
- Horrocks, Alison. 2019. "Reinterpreting Freeman Tilden's Interpreting Our Heritage." *National Council on Public History*. <https://ncph.org/history-at-work/reinterpreting-freeman-tilden/>. Accessed on May 31st, 2023.
- Ipsos. 2023. "American Perception of Archaeology." *Game Changers*. 1-23. <https://www.saa.org/education-outreach/public-outreach/public-perceptions-studies> . Accessed on August 2nd, 2023.
- Kantner, John. 2004. "Editor's Corner." *The SAA Archaeological Record*, 4(2):2.
- Kawerak, Inc. 2018. "Nome Archaeology Camp." <https://kawerak.org/nome-archaeology-camp/> Accessed on March 8th, 2023.
- King, Thomas F. 2012. *Cultural Resource Laws and Practice: An Introductory Guide, 2nd Edition* AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, CA.
- King, Thomas F., Patricia Parker Hickman, and Gary Berg. 1977. "Anthropology in Historic Preservation: Caring for Culture's Clutter." *Studies in Archaeology series*. New York: Academic.
- Levine, Mary A. 1994. "Creating Their Own Niches: Career Styles among Women in Americanist Archaeology between the Wars." *In Women in Archaeology*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 9-40.
- Little, Barbara J. 2007. "What Are We Learning? Who Are We Serving? Publicly Funded Historical Archaeology and Public Scholarship." *Historical Archaeology*, 41(2), 72–79. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25617443>
- Lister, Florence C. 1997. *Pot Luck: Adventures in Archaeology*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

- Lowenthal, David. 2005 Stewarding the Future. *CRM: The Journal of Heritage Stewardship*, 2(2): 20-39.
- Matsuda, Akira. 2004. The Concept of ‘the Public’ and the Aims of Public Archaeology. *Papers from the Institute of Archaeology*, 15.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/307759674_The_Concept_of_%27the_Public%27_and_the_Aims_of_Public_Archaeology. Accessed on June 6, 2023.
- McCoy, Mark, and Thegn, L. 2009. New Developments in the Use of Spatial Technology in Archaeology. *Journal of Archaeological Research*, 17(3): : 263-295.
- McGuire, R. 2008. *Archaeology as Political Action*. University of California Press.
- McGuire, R.H. 2014. “Capitalism in Archaeological Theory”. In: Smith, C. (eds) *Encyclopedia of Global Archaeology*. Springer, New York, NY.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-0465-2_254 Accessed May 16th, 2023.
- McManamon, Francis. 1990. Archaeological Assistance Program: A National Strategy for Federal Archeology. Reproduced from *CRM: The Journal of Heritage Stewardship*, 13(2):21 -22.
- McManamon, Francis, compiler 2009 (2007) Jesse L. Nusbaum-*First National Park Service Archaeologist. Brief Biography-Jesse L. Nusbaum*. Biographical text compiled from Heriot, Ruthanne (1987). *Finding Aide to the Jesse L. Nusbaum Papers, 1921-1958*, [Heriot revised 2004 by David Nathanson], History Collection, National Park Service, Washington, DC: National Park Service. <http://www.nps.gov/archeology/sites/dcaPdfs/BriefBioJNusbaum.pdf> Accessed on June 6th, 2023.
- McNulty, Jennifer. 2018. “Aspiring archaeologists get hands-on experience in Haiti, St. Croix.” UC Santa Cruz. <https://news.ucsc.edu/2018/08/monroe-summer.html> Accessed on March 8th, 2023.
- Merriman, N. 2004. Introduction. In: N. Merriman, ed. *Public Archaeology*. London: Routledge,1–17.

- Morland, Linda. 2019. "Archaeology open house brings the past to life." *The St. Thomas Source*. <https://stthomassource.com/content/2019/07/15/235439/> Accessed on March 8th, 2023.
- National Park Service. 2021. Nome archaeology camp. <https://www.nps.gov/articles/nome-archaeology-camp.htm> Accessed on March 8th, 2023.
- National Park Service, Department of the Interior. 2011. "A Call to Action: Preparing for a Second Century of Stewardship and Engagement—A Call to National Park Service Employees and Partners to Commit to Actions that Advance the Service: Towards a Shared Vision for 2015 and Our Second Century." Released by Director Jonathan B. Jarvis. National Park Service.
- National Center for Preservation Technology and Training. 2013. National Center for Preservation Technology and Training: Teams with Death Valley National Park for Archaeology Mapping Course. <http://NCPTT@NPS.GOV>
- The National Strategy for Federal Archaeology. 1996. Reproduced from *CRM: The Journal of Heritage Stewardship*. 19(6): 17-18. <http://www.nps.gov/archeology/tools/NatStratText.HTM>
- Neumann, Thomas, Robert Sanford, and Karen Harry. 2010. *Cultural Resources Archaeology: An Introduction*. Second edition. New York: Altamira
- North Illinois University. 2023. *Howard Gardner's Multiple Intelligences Theory*. <https://www.niu.edu/citl/resources/guides/instructional-guide/gardners-theory-of-multiple-intelligences.shtml> . Accessed July 5th, 2023.
- O'Connell, Maureen. 2019. "History should not be forgotten." *The Monocacy Monocle*, 15:3, 1-19. https://www.monocacymonocle.com/images/issues_2019/MM_2019-04-26.pdf Accessed on March 8th, 2023.
- Oliver, Shady Grove. 2016. "Students explore at archaeology camp." *The Arctic Sounder*. http://www.thearcticsounder.com/article/1631students_explore_at_archaeology_camp Accessed on March 8th, 2023.

- O'Neil, Eilis. 2021. Unrecognized Tribes Struggle Without Federal Aid During Pandemic. *National Public Radio*.
<https://www.npr.org/2021/04/17/988123599/unrecognized-tribes-struggle-without-federal-aid-during-pandemic>. Accessed June 6th, 2023.
- Rai, Christine. 2020. "Travel: The historic African American community of Sugarland." *Taste Travel Teach*. <https://christinera.com/explorethereserve-week-two-the-historic-African-American-community-of-sugarland/> Accessed on March 8th, 2023.
- Ramos, Maria, and David Duganne. 2000. "Exploring Public Perceptions and Attitudes about Archaeology." Prepared for the *Society for American Archaeology*, Washington, DC, by Harris Interactive, Rochester, NY.
- Reese, Gwen, Johnson, Suzanne, and Sypeck, Jeff. 2020. "Sugarland." *Plenty*. 14-15.
<https://viewer.joomag.com/plenty-magazine-fall-winter-2020/0461595001604938032?short&> Accessed on March 8th, 2023.
- Reeves, Matthew B. 2004. "Asking the "Right" Questions: Archaeologists and Descendant Communities." In *Places in Mind: Public Archaeology as Applied Anthropology*. 71-81. *Critical Perspectives in Identity, Memory, and the Built Environment* series. New York: Routledge, Taylor, and Francis.
- Rettie, Dwight F. 1995. *Our National Park System: Caring for America's Greatest Natural and Historic Treasures*. Illinois: Urbana University of Illinois Press.
- Richie, J., H. Atkinson, J. Junge, and L. Elanna. 2021. "Nome archaeology camp: Using place-based education to inspire the next generation of stewards in the Bering Strait region". *Alaska Park Science*, 20(2), 20-25.
- Shackel, Paul A., and Erve J. Chambers, eds. 2004. *Places in the Mind: Public Archaeology as Applied Anthropology*. *Critical Perspectives in Identity, Memory, and the Built Environment* series. New York: Routledge, Taylor, and Francis.

- Society for Historical Archaeology. 2013. "Response to Eric Cantor and Lamar Smith." *Society for Historical Archaeology: President's Corner*. Accessed on March 7th, 2023. <https://sha.org/blog/2013/10/response-to-eric-cantor-and-lamar-smith/>
- Spennemann, D. 2011. "Preserving the Past for the Future: Contemporary Relevance and Historic Preservation." *CRM: The Journal of Heritage Stewardship*, 8(1-2), 7-22.
- Sprinkle, John, Jr. 2011. "A Careful Inventory and Evaluation: The Origins of Executive Order 11593." *CRM: The Journal of Heritage Stewardship*, 8(1-2), 7-22.
- Stine, L. F., & Stine, R. S. 2014. "Public Archaeology in the National Park Service: A Brief Overview and Case Study." *American Anthropologist*, 116(4), 843–849.. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24476061>. Accessed on May 20th, 2023.
- Sugarland Ethno-History Project. 2021. "About the SEHP." <https://www.sugarlandproject.org/pages/about-sehp>. Accessed on March 8th, 2023.
- Tarlow, S. 2006. "Archaeological ethics and the people of the past." *The Ethics of Archaeology: Philosophical Perspectives on Archaeological Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Tapping into multiple intelligences. (2004). <https://www.thirteen.org/edonline/concept2class/mi/index.html>
Accessed on March 7th, 2023.
- Texas Department of Transportation. 2021. *Historical Archeology: Tom Cook Blacksmith Shop*. <https://www.txdot.gov/content/dam/docs/environmental/archeological-sites/tom-cook-blacksmith-poster.pdf> . Accessed June 6th, 2023.
- Tilden, Freeman. *Interpreting Our Heritage*. Edited by R. Bruce Craig, University of North Carolina Press, 2007. *JSTOR*,

http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5149/9780807889091_tilden. Accessed on May 5th, 2023.

Tilley, Christopher. 1989. Excavation as theatre. *Antiquity*. 63(239), 275-280.

Trigger, B. 2003. *Understanding early civilizations: a comparative study*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

U.C. Berkeley. 2022. Estate Little Princess Archaeology Project. *Archaeological Research Facility*. <http://arf.berkeley.edu/projects/estate-little-princess-archaeology-project>. . Accessed on April 19th, 2022.

The United Nations. 2015. “Sustainable Development Goals kick off with start of new year.” <https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/blog/2015/12/sustainable-development-goals-kick-off-with-start-of-new-year/> Accessed on March 7th, 2023

Waldbauer, R., and Hutt, S. 2006. “The Antiquities Act of 1906 and Its Centennial.” *CRM: The Journal of Heritage Stewardship*. 3(1), 36-48.

Wernecke, D Clark and Williams, Thomas J. 2017. “From Maya Pyramids to Paleoindian Projectile Points: the Importance of Public Outreach in Archaeology.” *Journal of Archaeology and Education*.

Wirth, Conrad L. 1980. *Parks, Politics, and the People*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Wylie, A. 1994. Facts and Fictions: “Writing Archaeology in a Different Voice.” Reprinted in *Archaeological Theory: Progress or Posture?* ed. I. M. Mackenzie. Brookfield, Vt.: Avebury/ Ashgate Publishing Company. 3-18

2013 Southeastern Archaeological Center. National Park Service. <http://www.nps.gov/seac/about/staff.htm>. Accessed May 14th, 2023.

2014a. *Departmental Consulting Archaeologist*. Archaeology Program, National Park Service, <http://www.nps.gov/archeology/sites/dca/HTML> Accessed May 14th, 2023.

2014b. *Frequently Asked Questions*. National Park Service, <http://www.nps.gov/faqs.htm>. Accessed May 14th, 2023.

2014c. *National Park Service Archeology Program: Federal Archeology Program*. National Park Service, <http://www.nps.gov/archeology/sites/FEDARCH.HTM>. Accessed May 14th, 2023.