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Archaeological public outreach to children can be enhanced through collaboration with school educators. While archaeologists have begun to collaborate with local and descendant communities, they have been slow to engage in work with educators in the same manner. The Fort St. Joseph Archaeological Project provides the context for me to explore some of the current issues in public archaeology and the politics of education. My study was conducted to better understand the needs of both children and teachers. In my work with the archaeological summer camp for middle school students I seek to conceptualize how the camp enhances their educational experience and how they understand their own formal schooling. My goal in working with educators is to better understand their classroom and educational philosophies as they relate to collaborative projects. I argue that it is important to teach through archaeology rather than about it so that archaeology is a tool for critical thinking with the ultimate goal of empowering people to create their own knowledge and to engage in the world around them.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This thesis will explore archaeologists’ responsibility towards education, specifically of children, and argue that this can be enhanced through collaboration with other interested parties such as school educators. I look at trends in archaeological public outreach to situate the trajectory of archaeology and education. Archaeological public outreach has taken many forms over the past few decades and these efforts have evolved within the discipline (see Little 2002; Skeates et al. 2012; McGimsey 1972; McManamon 1991; Shackel and Chambers 2004). Only recently, and largely due to the activism of marginalized groups, have archaeologists stopped to consider the beneficiaries of this type of work. This concern has prompted widespread changes in the way public outreach is conducted. In its earliest form, archaeologists were the prime beneficiaries of the public work they engaged in, but increased activism and partnerships with descendant and local communities have helped to extend the benefits to others outside the discipline (see Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2008; Derry and Malloy 2003; Little and Shackel 2007; Nassaney and Levine 2009; Silliman 2008a).

Trends in public outreach have shifted from merely presenting the results of research to engaging descendant and local communities in all steps of the process. Archaeologists are increasingly viewing public groups as collaborators in an equal partnership (Nassaney 2012a). While archaeologists have reformed their practices to collaborate with non-specialists they have been slow to engage in work with educators in the same manner. Archaeologists tend to view teachers as part of the audience rather than
as potential partners in collaborative projects (Jeppson and Brauer 2007). More often than not archaeologists attempt to do the job of teachers; they create lesson plans intended for classroom use (for example Schermer 1992; Whiting 1991). This may be symptomatic of a culture which consistently undervalues teachers—archaeologists internalize this message and privilege their own profession (Jeppson 2010, 2012). Archaeologists may often participate in educational programming for children, but they do not have the same specialized educational training that teachers receive. Likewise, many educators have never taken a class in anthropology or archaeology, even if it is a subject they teach in their classrooms (Krass 2000). Archaeologists have much to offer education, but they need to be receptive to the needs of educators and view them as equal partners. With the combined expertise of educators and archeologists there is the potential to create programs that are beneficial to children’s educational development.

Despite the ubiquity of public archaeology for several decades, archaeologists like Scott McLaughlin (2009) have noted that the public still seems to have little understanding of the utility of archaeology. It is towards this goal that I frame my understanding and usage of public archaeology. Though I am fascinated by archaeology’s ability to gain insight into the past, I recognize that that is not its only use. As a professional archaeologist I am concerned with the protection of sites, integrity of data and future of the discipline, but I understand that these may not be the primary concerns of others. Nor do I think these are unworthy goals, but I feel that the public is more willing to be involved and engaged if they, too, benefit. Most of all, I believe that archaeology is important for everyone, not as a field of study, but as a tool for critical thought. The skills that we develop as archaeologists can be applied to all fields of study.
and in everyday life. In working with children my primary goal is always to aid in their
growth and development. Archaeology can contribute greatly to that development by
helping students to understand issues from multiple perspectives, to evaluate arguments,
and to ultimately reach a conclusion on their own.

The Fort St. Joseph Archaeological Project (hereafter “the project”) will provide
the context for me to explore some of the current issues in public archaeology and
education. The project is dedicated to studying and interpreting the material remains of
colonial Fort St. Joseph (FSJ). The project is also devoted to doing public archaeology
derived from specific community needs. The partnership which has developed between
archaeologists and students of Western Michigan University and the City of Niles is one
of mutual benefit. Public outreach and education are main tenants of the project which
are achieved through public lectures, an archaeological summer camp program, and an
annual open house. Through these (latter two) venues FSJ archaeologists interact with
children, adults, and educators in order to teach them about archaeology and engage them
in the process. Children of various ages are part of the communities which the project
engages with. The project’s focus on public outreach and education necessitates that
archaeologists reflect on why and how they work with children. The ultimate beneficiary
of archaeological outreach should be the public, and in terms of children, their
educational development is a crucial issue that should be considered in program design.
Archaeology can be done with children as simply a fun activity, or a diversion (Krass
2000), but its potential as a tool for education goes much further. My goal is to explore
the ways in which the project conducts outreach to school teachers and children. I employ
an ethnographic approach from my unique position as a researcher, archaeologist, and
staff member of the project. I aim to provide an evaluation of the summer camp programs and the open house activities to explore ways for the project to grow and to be more responsive to the continued and changing needs of both students and educators.

I will begin in chapter two by providing a brief review of several topics which serve to situate my study: public archaeology, collaborative practices in archaeology, and outreach to children and educators. Since its inception in 1998, the project has grown in concert with developments in these fields and will continue to do so. I also consider the trajectory of archaeological outreach to educators and with children. Here, I explore how archaeology is frequently underutilized and is seen primarily as a fun, attention grabbing activity for children. When this occurs, the potential for archaeology to be used as a tool for critical thinking goes unrealized.

In chapter three, I provide a brief introduction to the project. I discuss its development as a public archaeology project and its many vested stakeholders. I then consider the ways in which children and educators are involved in the project through the summer camp program and the open house. This chapter is intended to provide a background summary of the various outreach activities.

The next two chapters provide the details of my ethnographic archaeological work. For my study, I selected several outreach programs conducted by the project to pilot new instructional methods and partnerships, and for analysis of the themes discussed above. The 2012 archaeological summer camps for middle school students and educators provide the basis of my data obtained through interviews, surveys, and participant observation. In chapter four, I detail my experience working with children, including members of the Pokagon Youth Council and campers involved with the FSJ
archaeology camp for middle school students. In this chapter, I look at how to incorporate analytical activities into archaeology programs with children in order to provide a fun, engaging, and educational experience. Through my ethnographic work with children in the camp program I address questions of how children understand their own education as well as their experience in the program. Chapter five takes up the issue of working with educators. I primarily draw on pre- and post-course surveys as well as follow-up interviews in order to understand what teachers know about archaeology and how they might utilize it to meet curricular goals. I also explore some of the challenges that educators face due to increasing regulation and national standardized testing movements. Through this work I hope to illuminate some avenues where collaboration is possible.

Chapter six is a discussion of the field of education. I argue that it is vital for archaeologists to understand the intense political debates surrounding education and consider their role in it. Though this chapter is not a comprehensive review of all of the literature on this subject, it is intended to serve as an introduction to several of the main ideas. The need for archaeological outreach to school children is presented against a backdrop of the politics of education in curriculum design and accountability. I draw on the work of educational researchers to explore how trends in educational legislation have translated into diminishing educational benefits for students (Au 2009). Developments such as high stakes accountability and standardized assessments are analyzed within a critical framework of the factory model of education where students are seen as products rather than individuals (Giroux 2012). I look at the teaching practices that have developed in concert with standardized education and posit the values of archaeology in addressing some of these concerns.
Chapter seven will serve as a conclusion, but also a beginning. Here I discuss project feedback and make recommendations for future directions. Unlike typical archaeological research projects which have a finite end, public archaeology projects must continually evolve and practitioners must regularly evaluate their programs and adjust them to suit the needs of the groups they are responsible to. I explore the possibilities for future outreach, for collaboration, and for the inclusion of interpretive activities for children which will help the project transcend the boundary of simply educating about archaeology to empowering others through its practice.
CHAPTER II

PUBLIC ARCHAEOLOGY, COLLABORATION, AND EDUCATIONAL OUTREACH

Efforts to conduct public archaeology are not new, and have been a component of archaeological projects for many years (for example Little 2002; McGimsey 1972; Skeates et al. 2012). However, the goals of these efforts have changed, bringing into focus new ideas and the use of new terms including public archaeology, community archaeology, indigenous archaeology, collaborative archaeology, activist archaeology, and ethnographic archaeology (Atalay 2012; Bruchac 2010; Castañeda and Matthews 2010; Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2008; Derry and Malloy 2003; Ferguson 1996; Kerber 2003, 2006; Little 2002; Little and Shackel 2007; McManamon 1991; McNiven and Russell 2005; Nicholas 2010; Phillips and Allen 2010; Shackel and Chambers 2004; Silliman 2008a; Skeates et al. 2012; Smith and Wobst 2005; Stone and Molyneaux 1994; Stottman 2010; Swidler et al. 1997; Watkins 2000, 2003). These are all united by a common theme of archaeologists working for the benefit of the public (however defined), and/or with collaborators outside of the profession. The practitioners of public archaeology seek to answer questions such as: “who comprises this public?” “what is the benefit?” and, “do all benefit in equal ways?” These questions explore the complex relationship between archaeologists and multiple outside groups with varied interests and seek to understand and rectify the differential of power between them.

Public archaeology has been transformed over the past three decades from the goal of stewardship of archaeological resources, to presenting information and results to the public, and finally, towards creating long-term partnerships with members of the
public as a means of community empowerment and decolonization (Nassaney 2012b). Though there are many publics for archaeology (McManamon 1991), teachers have received considerable attention from archaeologists since they are primarily responsible for children’s formal education (Jeppson 2010; Jeppson and Brauer 2003; Smardz and Smith 2000; Whiting 1997; Zimmerman et al. 1994). The ways in which outreach is conducted towards teachers is also beginning to change modeling other changes in the discipline of archaeology from simply educating about to working with educators in collaborative ways. This chapter will examine the rise of public archaeology, the changes in archaeological theory which led to more collaborative practices, and also examine outreach practices towards educators. I address the issues raised by Jeppson (2010, 2012) that while archaeologists are comfortable doing public archaeology and collaborating with descendant and local community groups, most outreach to teachers is not conducted in a truly collaborative way.

The Rise and Development of Public Archaeology in Archaeological Practice

Over time public archaeology has been defined in many ways, changing in concert with new thinking from within the discipline (see Nassaney 2012b). Today, many public archaeology projects strive to go beyond merely disseminating the results of scholarly study where the public audience passively absorbs the information, and seek to involve outside groups in decision making and the interpretative process. The original goals of public archaeology, however, were different than those of today.
The public has long been fascinated with archaeology, however, it has not always been made accessible to them. The idea of public archaeology began in the 1970s and has since grown. The origins of public archaeology are found with Charles R. McGimsey who, in 1972, defined the term in relation to the responsibility of archaeologists to preserve the past for the public good (McGimsey 1972; see also Nassaney 2012b). The idea was that archaeologists performed a public service by preserving sites, pieces of history, which would have otherwise been destroyed or forgotten.

Public archaeology developed in tandem with Cultural Resource Management (CRM) and conservation laws such as the 1966 National Historic Preservation Act and the 1971 National Environmental Policy Act (among others: Kehoe 2012; Nassaney 2012b). These laws helped give rise to the branch of CRM which sought to preserve both natural and archaeological resources and archaeologists assumed the role of stewards of the past (McGimsey 1972; McGuire 1992). Although it is now common for archaeological projects to host outreach events for the community, to make information available, and sometimes even to invite members of the public to join in the research design and excavation of sites, this was not the original intent of public archaeology. The focus lay in preservation and conservation of archaeological resources for the benefit of the public and the future, often without any consideration of the people themselves. Objects, not people, took precedence, sometimes in conflict with the values of descendant communities, particularly Native Americans (Zimmerman 1998). Zimmerman (1998:77) argued that the combination of archaeology as positivist science and the preservation ethic lead to the belief that archaeologists were the only ones who cared about the past. As seen by the many archaeologists who engage in work with the public, this is simply
not true. It has led to a false privileging of archaeologists as authorities of the past and preserves, rather than challenges, the colonialist legacy of archaeology.

In 1991, Francis P. McManamon argued that it was time for archaeologists to heed the call and educate the public about archaeology. He believed that this would lead to a better public understanding of what archaeologists actually do. Through this understanding of archaeology, the public would be more aware of the archaeological resources beneath their feet, and this would lead to better preservation efforts. Like the earliest conceptions of protecting the past for the benefit of the public, the end goal of teaching about archaeology was to enhance efforts at site preservation. In this scenario the public has no active role to play, cannot participate in the construction of knowledge, and the power relations between the archaeologist and the public are preserved (Franklin and Moe 2012).

There has been apprehension among archaeologists that working with the public will leave sites vulnerable: their locations will be exposed, and some people may attempt to loot or conduct excavations on their own. In working with educators some archaeologists have feared that over zealous and over confident teachers might decide to lead their students on an archaeological excavation of their own, destroying resources in the process (Hawkins 2000; Jeppson and Brauer 2003). This “nightmare scenario” is a rarity (Jeppson and Brauer 2003:77).

Public outreach is often criticized for its failure to go beyond educating the public about archaeology, and indeed it must go beyond merely educating. The recognition that educating is a necessary first step towards future involvement and collaboration is also warranted. Franklin and Moe (2012:571) argue, however, that the public must be
“archaeologically literate” in order to truly become stakeholders. This complicates the matter of public archaeology, as it recognizes that the public often has very little knowledge of what archaeologists actually do and why. Therefore, there will always be some teaching necessary as education is a first step towards future involvement and collaboration. Before archaeologists can involve publics in stages of work, such as research design, the public needs some conception of what tools archaeology has to offer.

Archeology has much to offer the public, and if archaeology is used to meet the needs of the public, an appreciation of history and of historic preservation will soon follow (Jeppson and Brauer 2007). Of course, there are many “publics” for archaeology, as McManamon (1991) aptly noted, and often those publics do not agree on the goals for research. As part of the process of public outreach archaeologists must take seriously the concerns of many invested groups and must navigate through differing opinions to find a common goal. Thus, it has now become part of the collaborative process to navigate through issues on which many groups are invested, but have differing opinions.

Collaboration: Archaeologists Partnering with Descendant and Local Communities

Archaeology is deeply intertwined with the process of colonialism; the roots of the discipline stretch back to the colonial founding of the Nation and archaeology has been used to denigrate Native peoples (as well as other minority groups) and to reinforce existing social structures and relations of power (Nassaney 2012b). There has been an increasing realization that archaeologists need to strive beyond simply educating the public about their work (usually in the form of disseminating results), and involve
communities from the very beginnings of research design through the end of the project and to work with them as partners and equals (Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2008). Collaboration in archaeology originated from political activism on the part of American Indians and African-Americans during the 1960s and 1970s and in general is taken to mean archaeologists working with Native American descendant communities in meaningful ways which challenge the colonial roots of the discipline (Atalay 2006, 2012; Colwell-Chanthaphonh et al. 2010; Nassaney 2012a).

Though the ideas about indigenous archaeology have roots in the political movements of the 1960’s-70’s the discipline/sub-field is little more than a decade old (Colwell-Chanthaphonh et al. 2010:229). Archaeology was developed by the western world and relies on a western scientific perspective. Early processual archaeology developed largely based on a western positivist tradition and sought to define overarching laws of human behavior (Atalay 2006; Trigger 2006). This has often been without any consideration of the worldviews of the peoples who were being written about (Atalay 2006). Indigenous archaeology seeks to acknowledge the colonialist roots of the discipline, move beyond dichotomies of “good/bad, colonizer/colonized and perpetrator/victim” (Ataly 2006:281), and take multiple perspectives and ways of knowing, as well as lines of evidence, into account when interpreting the past.

Collaborative archaeology has the potential to help to decolonize the practice, but in order to do so archaeologists must “continue to explore ways to create an ethical and socially just practice of archaeological research” (Atalay 2006:284). That is, archaeologists must be willing to go beyond merely recognizing and criticizing (or worse,
trying to justify) the flaws of the past, but must envision and actively work towards creating new future directions (Atalay 2006).

Such steps towards decolonization have indeed begun (see Atalay 2006:289). Largely due to Native American political activism, changes have started to affect the way archaeologist’s practice. In 1990, the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act was passed and the National Museum of the American Indian was created. Efforts were made to train indigenous peoples in archaeology and archaeologists all over the world began collaborative projects with, instead of about, the people they studied (see among others Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2008; Kerber 2006; Silliman 2008a).

However, as Nassaney (2012a) and Atalay (2006) argue, the model of collaborative archaeology has relevance beyond its application to Native Americans and should be extended to include local communities, descendant communities, interested public groups, stakeholders, and other non-specialists. Each collaborative partnership has the potential to introduce new perspectives and broaden the possibilities for interpretation of the past (Silliman 2010).

Sonya Atalay (2012) presents the methodology of community-based participatory research (CBPR) as one way to achieve these goals. She argues that Indigenous knowledge can and should be combined with Western science in order to create mutually beneficial partnerships and multi-voiced interpretations of the past. This framework represents some of the newest ideas in doing archaeological public outreach and demonstrates a long evolution from the colonial roots of the discipline. Recent volumes on public archaeological practices detail projects which involve Native Americans, First
Nations peoples, indigenous people around the world, African-Americans, working class, descendant, and local communities, most frequently groups who have been marginalized throughout history (Colwell-Chanthaphohn and Ferguson 2008; Little 2002; Little and Shackel 2007; Nassaney and Levine 2009; Shackel and Chambers 2004; Silliman 2008a; Stottman 2010).

It is interesting then, as archeologists begin to embrace collaboration with many groups, from local to descendant to indigenous communities, that they do not make the same effort to involve educators (Jeppson 2010; 2012). There is some literature which deals with outreach to educators and takes up the issues of education (Jameson Jr. and Baugher 2007; Metcalf 2002; Moe 2002; Smardz and Smith 2000), but it is far less frequent and sometimes with a different tone. Jeppson (2012) suggests that this is symptomatic of a cultural context which devalues the knowledge and expertise of formal educators. Archaeology outreach to educators and schools is too often framed towards presenting archaeology as a field of study or telling teachers what and how to teach without asking them about their classroom needs and collaborating on program design.

Archaeological Outreach to Children and Educators

There are many groups of professionals invested in children’s education—teacher educators, historians, history teachers, education policy makers, and state and local education departments—who hopefully share some common goals (VanSledright 2011). Noticeably absent from this list are archaeologists and non-professionals (or professionals in other fields) who play a large role in children’s education such as parents and cultural
group leaders. The way archaeology is taught in schools frequently focuses on its methods and subject matter rather than using it as a tool. Jeppson (2010) argues that although archaeologists are likely to see the benefits of outreach to school teachers, this value is not intrinsic; archaeologists must consider what their outreach programs are geared to do and how those fit the goals of teachers to ultimately benefit students. Indeed, as Larry Zimmerman et al. (1994) have noted in their own Archaeology Day program for middle school students in Vermillion, South Dakota, teacher interest and enthusiasm wanes when the goals of archaeologists are not in concert with those of teachers. An essential point to take from this is that archaeologists must work with teachers, and cannot simply provide them with lessons that offer no directly discernable benefit. There are, of course, benefits to incorporating anthropology and archaeology into educational programs to children. I will expand on some of these with the recognition that these values must be demonstrated in order to make archaeology education outreach programs successful.

Teachers are often interested in archaeology, though they may have misconceptions about what it is and see it primarily as a fun activity for students (Krass 2000). In order to understand how teachers use archaeology, it is necessary to consider how they have learned about it and what those messages were. In her research into teacher’s backgrounds Dorothy Krass (2000) found that few, if any, teachers had ever taken anthropology in the course of their college education. Furthermore, she discovered that teachers mainly see archaeology as a way to grab students attention, but they were unaware of how it has been used to understand other cultures and oppressed groups
within our own society. The teachers in her study also did not draw connections between archaeology and the development of critical thinking skills.

Mass media remains the largest source of information about archaeology for the general public. The popular media illustrates a one-sided picture of archaeological work; it generally focuses on major discoveries made around the world (indeed, mostly abroad) and most exclude any mention of the analytical work that archaeologists do (Krass 2000). Scholarly and professional press for educators fares slightly better with the majority of the articles published involving lesson plans and descriptions of analysis focused activities (Krass 2000). It is also important to consider our own role in the media portrayal of archaeology (Krass 2000). When journalists visit the site for a story, do we show them flashy artifacts? Or do we explain how what we are finding will contribute to the interpretation process? Though we do not have control over what information the journalist ultimately decides to print, I suspect the answer trends towards the former.

Archaeologists, then, have viewed teachers as a receptive audience for archaeology and as a way of reaching children. When engaging in outreach to teachers archaeologists have tended to place themselves in a privileged position above educators, endeavoring to create lesson plans themselves based on what they believe will work in the classroom rather than taking a collaborative approach (Jeppson 2010). There are two common themes that run through archaeological outreach: excavation/artifacts and preservation. Archaeology is often seen as simply digging and this distorted view masks the true analytical work that is also involved (Novinger and Wurst 2011). The focus on preservation creates a biased and self-interested portrayal of archaeology for the public. Many archaeologists have conducted public outreach with the hopes that their audience
will be discouraged from looting and help preserve sites. However, as Novinger and Wurst (2011:261) argue when archaeologists do involve the public they only allow them to participate in the fieldwork, rather than the theoretical and interpretative aspects. This allows archaeologists to maintain a position of power and authority.

While reading through the literature on public outreach and education in archaeology it seems that preservation is (at least one) underlying goal for such work (see Smardz and Smith 2000). One classroom activity suggests creating an archaeological site and demonstrating how various natural and cultural processes impact it. Artifacts are removed as people wander or “hike” through the area. The final act is an archaeologist discovering the site and attempting to draw conclusions from the remaining artifacts. The students in the class are encouraged to point out that the conclusions are wrong, because there is data missing. As an afterthought to this activity, it is suggested to also talk about decay and other processes that disturb archaeological sites (Ellick 2000). While this “afterthought” might actually make an interesting lesson on site formation processes, it is overshadowed by the looting behavior.

Another example recommends explicitly presenting the public with a preservation message. In addition to giving information about the site’s history and artifacts, Ellick (2007) recommends a paragraph urging people to leave any artifacts they find in place and to contact an archaeologist (through the yellow pages, no less) to let them know about the potential site. Archaeologists do have an ethical responsibility to preserve and protect sites and it is apparent that this concern motivates archaeologists and sets the tone for outreach. Preservation, however, should not be the primary reason for conducting public outreach.
There are four common formats through which archaeologists interact with students: classroom visits or talks, excavation or simulated excavation, incidental encounters such as archaeology days or open houses, and by creating lesson plans for teachers to use (Schermer 1992; Smardz and Smith 2002; Whiting 1997). The most common themes of this type of outreach are learning about archaeology/archeology as a career and a focus on artifacts and/or excavation. There is nothing inherently wrong with this; it often fills a specific need, such a teacher’s request or a kid’s booth at an event. Archaeology can and should strive to go beyond this and its interpretive principles can be interwoven with the aforementioned types of outreach to create a presentation which goes beyond merely a fun activity.

Many students are introduced to archaeology through a classroom visit; this brief amount of time allows for only a quick lesson. It is difficult to present more than a few quick concepts about the discipline in these situations, though it is in a time-limited situation that students most frequently encounter archaeology. Presenters tend to rely on oral presentation and showing, or passing around, a few artifacts as examples of things they find through excavation (Ellick 2000). This type of presentation does allow students the sensory experience of handling artifacts, but falls short of any critical engagement with them. An artifact in itself is void of meaning—it is only through its context and its relation to other artifacts and features that the material has interpretive value. When archaeologists place the focus on singular artifacts they do not convey how these artifacts can be used to learn about the past.

The “archaeology day” booth or similar event presents a different issue than the classroom visit. This is an informal education space where archaeologists have an even
more limited amount of time to interact with children than in the classroom visit situation. Attendance at these events is voluntary (more so for the parents than the children), so the audience likely has interest in the subject, the demographics, however, are diverse. Families will want to engage in differing amounts of contact with the archaeologist—some preferring to ask many questions, while others simply want to look at the information—and each group will come and go according to their own schedule (Ellick 2007). These particular challenges make analysis based activities difficult to execute and program design tends to trend towards arts, crafts, and games related to the culture being studied, but may bear little resemblance to archaeological practice. The hands-on approach is fun for the kids, but it is unclear what they learn from the experience.

Site tours, excavations, and simulated excavations are commonly used to introduce students to archaeology. It is, again, a hands-on experience that appeals to students who work closely with archaeologists to understand how they uncover artifacts. The Ontario Heritage Trust is one organization that provides students the opportunity to “touch the past” by participating in archaeological excavation (Doroszenko 2007:272); the program is well received by both students and teachers and helps the kids connect with community history. In this example, it is noted that school groups are only allowed to dig in areas of fill and if features are uncovered, they are moved to a different area of the site. While it is great that students are encouraged to get involved, it is clear that they are not trusted to participate in the “important” work. Ideally, enough staff should be available so that the students are not excluded from this valuable portion of the work. It seems like a missed opportunity to deny students the chance to learn about the
importance of features in site interpretation. In other examples, simulated archaeological
sites are crafted for students. Simulated sites compound the problems, often relying on
simplistic stratigraphy and features which portrays archaeology as easy and
straightforward. Additionally, excavations, whether real or simulated, often do not
involve student in the pre- or post-research phases and provide an incomplete picture of
archaeology (Hawkins 2000).

This is not to say that digging with children (or the public more generally) is not a
beneficial activity. However, if coupled with interpretation and analysis it becomes more
accurate and more powerful. For example, at the Ellis School (an independent all-girls
school in Pittsburgh) a simulated archaeological site was created to be used as part of a
five-week unit on archaeology. The lessons spanned the school curriculum; students
learned about archaeology and the Anasazi in history class, in art they made replicas of
some of the artifacts, and they learned science concepts such a measuring, mapping, and
the scientific method throughout the process. The dig was not the focus of the activity; it
was merely one day within the larger study. The students participated in the pre-
excavation research process, the excavation, fieldwork, and also the analysis culminating
in a site report (Chiarulli et al. 2000). Through this activity students were introduced to
archaeology, but they were also required to use critical thinking skills in order to analyze
and interpret their findings.

Finally, archaeologists sometimes usurp the role of educators by providing them
with resource guides and lesson plans (Hawkins 2000). There are some teachers who may
appreciate lesson plans and others who may be willing to pursue the resource guides for
help in developing their own classroom activities. In Louisiana, for example a Classroom
Archaeology guide was made available and included self-contained lessons and activities. Teachers have used and appreciated the material for over 15 years, but they have also contacted archaeologists for more information about specific topics (Hawkins 2000). The creation of archaeology lessons and guides is a starting point; it provides a brief introduction to archaeological topics and a selection of activities, but it is not specifically tailored for individual classrooms. It may also serve to open up a dialogue between interested teachers and archaeologists enabling collaborative work to create lessons which are appropriate for that specific group of students and to fulfill particular classrooms needs.

There is value in all of these approaches, but they may not be enough to address some of the real concerns in education. The power of archaeology to develop critical thinking skills is often not realized, and history is taught almost exclusively based on documentary records to the exclusion of prehistory and other frequently marginalized groups, both topics of archaeological interest (McLaughlin 2009). Through a cursory examination of history texts used in K-12 schools, Wurst and Novinger (2011) found that topics of archaeological inquiry are often excluded or condensed into a short page or two at the beginning of the book before moving on to the Greek and Roman civilizations. When archaeological topics are dealt with, the information is not derived from archaeological knowledge. VanSledright (2011) makes an important critique of how history is taught in secondary schools, but falls short of questioning what is being taught (with regards to curricular content and skills). Kevin Bartoy (2012) drawing on the work of Hein (1998), suggests the theories of education fall to two extreme ends of a spectrum—the idea that students are empty containers waiting to be filled with
information and that students are active in constructing their own knowledge. Archaeology lends itself towards the latter. He also argues that learning should be “hands-on, minds-on” (Bartoy 2012: 554), not just physically engaging, but mentally engaging. Hands-on activities are beneficial for students, but are valuable only if they go beyond fun and towards learning. As Bartoy (2012) argues, it is important to teach through archaeology rather than about it. In this situation, archaeology is not the main goal: it is a tool for critical thinking with the ultimate goal of empowering people to create their own knowledge and to engage in the world around them. Archaeology activities that transcend simply hands-on to both hands-on and minds-on become empowering tools for students (Bartoy 2012).

Uniting Archaeology and Education Towards Common Goals

The practice of archaeology can be empowering for individuals and communities. More and more excavations and field school programs are being conducted in collaboration with local community groups (Derry and Malloy 2003; Nassaney 2012b; Nassaney and Levine 2009; Stottman 2010). The authors of Archaeology and Community Service Learning (Nassaney and Levine 2009) argue that by educating people through archaeological service learning projects they may help people become more invested in their local communities. Field schools are the primary means of training students in archaeological field methods, however, relatively few of these students will actually go on to become archaeologists. This suggests a broader purpose for archaeological field schools is for students to become actively engaged citizens (Nassaney 2009). This idea
can be extended to the field of archaeology as a whole. The experience of doing archaeology and using archaeology can valuable, whether or not the goal is to create future archaeologists. These values are in concert with the values of educators in terms of preparing their students to engage with and think critically about the world around them (Au 2009; Giroux 2012).

Archaeologists may not be nearly as liberal and progressive as is sometimes assumed (Jeppson 2012). One example of this is the lack of action taken by archaeologists in regard to the culture wars, particularly in regards to social studies education. There is potential for archaeology to make a positive contribution to formal education, yet there has been a lack of true engagement between archaeologists and educators and this is a disservice to “promoting a more inclusive democracy” (Jeppson 2012: 582). Yet, as social studies curriculum and the National Standards Movement were debated and enacted, archaeologists largely remained silent. These debates are explicitly political—ensuring a traditional approach to social studies education is a core principle of right-wing conservatives (Jeppson 2012). Additionally, calls for increased standardized testing in schools turns education into a rote exercise rather than a platform for critical engagement (Au 2009). Historical archaeology can provide a counterpoint to the traditional telling of history because it favors a broad view of history and seeks to understand the subaltern existence (i.e., women, children, minorities, poor, among others) and questions the imbalance of power normalized through social relationships. Yet, archaeologists have largely remained on the sidelines, preferring not to engage in these battles (Jeppson 2012).
Even as public outreach becomes a de-facto extension of archaeology, Jeppson (2012:589) argues that most archaeologists overlook the role of formal education in society and are unaware of the debate surrounding what students will be taught in school. For the most part K-12 teachers use archaeology as entertainment and its benefits are not fully realized (McLaughlin 2009). Problems in educational practices are widespread, but archaeologists often lack an understanding of the issues at the heart of this debate. What archaeologists have to offer is valuable: the methodological tools of a discipline which relies on critical thinking and interpretation and a framework of emancipatory community interaction to address social needs.

Each summer in Niles, Michigan students and staff involved in Western Michigan University’s (WMU) archaeological field school at Fort St. Joseph (FSJ) have the opportunity to work at an archaeological site under the framework of community service learning. There, they engage with groups in a collaborative project to serve community needs. They also work closely with middle school students, adults, and educators through the Fort St. Joseph Archaeological Project’s summer camp programs. In the next chapter, I examine the development of the project as a public archaeological project and its current level of engagement in educational outreach in light of the above critiques.
CHAPTER III

PUBLIC ARCHAEOLOGY AT FORT ST. JOSEPH

At its core, the Fort St. Joseph Archaeological Project is a public archaeology project. It is only by the request and pleasure of the Niles community that WMU archaeologists excavate at the site each year. From its very inception the project has served the public. The outreach efforts conducted by the project go beyond merely disseminating results to the Niles and larger communities, but seek to involve various groups of people in meaningful ways (Nassaney 2011). This chapter is intended to serve as an introduction to the project and provide contextual information about the history of the site and public outreach. It will be necessary to understand how the project started and how it has grown in order to envision directions for the future.

The project began in 1997 when a local group, Support the Fort, Inc. (STF) contacted Dr. Michael Nassaney of Western Michigan University and asked him for help in locating colonial Fort St. Joseph. The non-profit STF is a group dedicated to recovering and preserving the fort as well as educating local citizens about its history (Nassaney 2004, 2011, 2012b). One of the primary long-term objectives of STF is to reconstruct the Fort, but of course, it first needed to be located and studied. The fort’s exact location was lost after its final abandonment in 1781; accurate descriptions of the fort as well as maps are lacking, leaving archaeology as one way to collect the data to eventually be able to reconstruct something of accurate size, arrangement, and appearance (Nassaney 2004).
In 1998, Dr. Michael Nassaney led a team of archaeologists and local volunteers in a survey to locate Fort St. Joseph. Shovel test pits (STPs) were conducted in areas that documentary sources indicated likely for the fort’s location and in the area commemorated in Niles with a large boulder marking the fort’s supposed location. Some animal bones and 18th century artifacts were found, but the results were inconclusive until a local collector brought an assemblage of artifacts to the archaeologists’ attention and reported where they had been found. More STPs led to the recovery of a sizable collection of French and English colonial artifacts (Nassaney et al. 2003). To evaluate the integrity of the finds, archaeologists returned to the site in 2002. A geophysical survey detected numerous anomalies and subsurface excavations revealed evidence of undisturbed features and 18th century deposits associated with the long lost fort. Since then archaeologists have continued to work at the site through Western Michigan University’s (WMU) annual archaeological field school in 2004 and each year after 2006.

Residents of Niles continue to be excited about the archaeological excavations at Fort St. Joseph and the project has continued to grow. New partnerships have been formed and more and more local community groups are involved. Beyond Support the Fort, groups such as the Fort St. Joseph Historical Association, the Fort St. Joseph Museum, the City of Niles, and the Pokagon Band of Potawatomi Indians of Michigan and Indiana have partnered with WMU in the study and excavation of the fort. In 2008, WMU entered into a 10-year agreement with the City of Niles to continue excavation and recovery. Additionally, the city established the Fort St. Joseph Archaeology Advisory Committee to oversee the excavation and operation of the project. Members of the Board include local citizens, city officials, WMU faculty and staff, members of the Pokagon, as
The History of Fort St. Joseph

Fort St. Joseph is located along the St. Joseph River in present day Niles, in southwest Michigan. Beginning in the 1670’s Frenchmen engaged in explorations of the pays d’en haut (Upper Country) searching primarily for river routes to the Pacific and the Gulf of Mexico. The Jesuits were granted a tract of land along the St. Joseph River in the 1680s where they established a mission among local Miami and Potawatomi. This was a strategic location near the St. Joseph-Kankakee River portage which linked the St. Joseph to points south. In 1691 Fort St. Joseph was erected at the site of the Jesuit mission and would serve as a center for religious, military, and commercial activity for most of the following century (Nassaney, Cremin, and Lynch 2004; Nassaney et al. 2003).

The fort served multiple purposes during its 90 year occupation; primarily as a trading post where the French engaged in the fur trade and exchanged goods with allied Native groups. This was both an economic activity and a means of solidifying kinship alliances with the Potawatomi and Miami (Nassaney, Cremin, and Lynch 2004; Nassaney et al., 2003, see also White 1991). Fort St. Joseph ranked fourth among posts in New France in terms of volume of furs traded (Nassaney et al., 2003: 109). The fort never saw major military action. In 1755, with the commencement of Seven Years War, political relations became strained; the fort was largely abandoned and only a few families remaining to continue trade. The British then occupied the fort in 1761, but were chased
out following Pontiac’s Rebellion in 1763. After that time the fort was never re-
garrisoned though it remained under British control and trade still occurred. With the
support of the Spanish governor at St. Louis a small contingent of French and Indians
launched a successful attack in 1781 and claimed Fort St. Joseph for Spain. The fort was
largely abandoned although traders continued to frequent the area into the early 19th
century. The fort never returned to its former prominence and its exact location was lost
to history (Nassaney et al. 2003).

Despite the importance of Fort St. Joseph in the 18th century fur trade and the
multitude of surviving documents which refer to it, few complete descriptions or accurate
location maps exist. Previous efforts to locate the fort were unsuccessful, though historian
Joseph L. Peyser had used documentary sources to narrow the search. Archaeology,
however, remained the sole means for pinpointing its position on the modern landscape.
Beyond the scholarly community, local history groups were also interested in finding
Fort St. Joseph and hoped to ultimately be able to reconstruct the 18th century trading
post. Western Michigan University’s partnerships with local community groups began
when they were invited to search for the fort in 1997.

Public Outreach as Community Service Learning

The project is conducted through the context of community service learning
(CSL) program. Community service learning has “all the hallmarks of participatory
action research in which archaeologists collaborate with community groups as equal
partners in project design, data collection, and analysis; disseminate project outcomes
particularly at local levels; and deconstruct the hierarchical researcher-subject relation” (Nassaney 2009:11). Community service learning is different from volunteerism in that it is focused on “doing things with others rather than for others” and the community participates in the teaching and learning process (Shackel 2009:217, emphasis in original). At Fort St. Joseph the community is highly involved in the project and various stakeholders are able to voice their opinions and help shape the goals of the project through the Archaeology Advisory Committee. The public is encouraged to participate in the excavation process through both the archaeology summer camps and volunteerism. They can also attend lectures and the annual open house sponsored by the project to learn more.

Each summer WMU holds its annual field school at Fort St. Joseph. This is a course in CSL, not simply archaeological techniques. Dr. Michael Nassaney has three main community service learning goals for students who take part in the field school (2012b:418). First, students will provide a service to the community which is based on the real needs of that community. Second, students should be empowered and participate in their own education. Each student brings a unique perspective and talents to the project and they make contributions to different project needs. For example, students with strong organization skills may be asked to be in charge of managing equipment and the site trailer. A student who shines in communication will be selected to give site tours. A student with prior zooarchaeological experience will be consulted to identify bones found through the excavations. All students are tasked with helping to interpret the site and they are asked to give their own assessments of their units based on what they have recovered and have learned about the site. As Nassaney (2009; 2012b) notes community service
learning empowers students. Each has something to offer and, in many cases, the students become teachers themselves as they communicate what they have learned to volunteers, campers, and other students. One anonymous field school student commented in her journal that “It is something along the lines of the student becoming the teacher, and it was honestly incredible. I did not realize just how much I had actually learned…” about her experience at FSJ. Additionally, the students form relationships with various community members whom they live with and interact with during the season.

Finally, students are encouraged to reflect on the nature of the service and the learning. The process of reflection is necessary to CSL projects in that it allows students to better understand what they have learned and what they have contributed to the community (McLaughlin 2009). Reflective journals are kept by all students and they are encouraged to share their thoughts with their partners and the group without fear of judgment.

CSL is an important part of allowing students and communities to form partnerships and become active agents in social justice and change. As Shackel (2009) notes, the historical context of an archaeological site can and should be used to create connections to contemporary socio-political issues. Participants of CSL begin to recognize how society is structured and how social conditions are reproduced and this realization allows them to seek change. Through the practice of CSL students and staff of the project have learned to work with collaborators to fulfill community needs. Children make up a portion of any community and their education is a primary concern. Children are unique in that they are often not consulted or listened to in regards to their own educational needs (Osler 2010). Through working with children at Fort St. Joseph in a
CSL environment it is my hope that their needs and perspectives will be better understood.

Involving Children in Fort St. Joseph Archaeology

Children make up a significant portion of the audience of the project’s outreach and education efforts. Throughout the project’s existence it has sought to educate children about Fort St. Joseph and introduce and excite them about the possibilities of archaeology. To this end the project hosts an archaeological summer camp for students entering 6-9th grades, has a special children’s booth set up during the annual open house, and includes children on tours of the archeological site.

The archaeological summer camp was first offered in 2004 (an expansion of a similar program offered in 2002); it was organized by WMU graduate student Kelly Hagenmaier as part of her final internship project (Hagenmaier 2005). The idea behind the camp was to get young students interested in archaeology and for them to learn about Fort St. Joseph, often part of their local history. The overarching goal of her program was to introduce people to archaeology and to get them involved. In order to become more deeply involved it is first necessary to have an understanding about what archaeology is and how it is used to interpret the past (Franklin and Moe 2012; Reeves 2004).

Additionally, the organizers hoped that the camp program would strengthen its ties to the Niles community, increase visibility and museum visitation, and bring in funds to support the project. In terms of curriculum, Hagenmaier (2005) wanted the program to go beyond merely teaching field techniques and to communicate larger issues such as why
archaeology is done and how archaeologists draw conclusions from their data. The program’s objectives have largely remained the same, although some of the specific activities Kelly designed have been dropped from the syllabus and replaced with more traditional lab activities such as washing and sorting artifacts.

The day camp is run over the course of a week and is co-sponsored by the Fort St. Joseph Museum. Currently, there are three week-long camp programs offered by the project: one for lifelong learners (adults aged sixteen and above), one for middle school students (entering grades six-nine), and one for educators (earning Continuing Education or graduate credit). During the middle school camp week parents drop their students off at Niles City Hall at 9 am and pick them up from the excavation site at 3 pm after a day full of activities and learning. The campers who attend are generally students who enjoy history and are curious about archaeology; they are self-selected (although maybe a few have been pushed into participation by their parents) as demonstrated through the personal statement they must write as part of the application process.

The daily format of the camp includes morning lessons conducted by the project’s public education coordinator at City Hall, lunch with the field school students on site, and an afternoon of excavation and screening. Morning classes typically take place in lecture format, interspersed with videos and discussion. During the first morning of camp students are introduced to archaeology. Their classroom time focuses on learning the history of Fort St. Joseph and the field procedures and vocabulary needed to work on the site. This orientation gives students a better idea of what to expect when they arrive at the excavation site later that day. Other morning lessons center on the fur trade and the Native American presence at Fort St. Joseph. Activities include time to discuss their
experiences in the field, a tour of Niles (including the Fort St. Joseph Museum, Father Claude Allouez’s cross, and the boulder commemorating the Fort) and an introduction to laboratory processing of artifacts through washing and sorting. While these are all essential aspects of archaeology, what is lacking is any sustained focus on the interpretive methods employed by archaeologists. This was one area I hoped to address in my work by designing and piloting classroom activities with the students.

Once on site the children are integrated into the current excavations. By this point in the season the field school students have been working at the site for several weeks, and they are prepared and even eager to teach what they have learned about archaeological excavation to the new campers. Campers are assigned several units under the direct supervision the public education coordinator and sometimes one of the project interns. Campers also work in units with WMU field school students and they rotate between excavating their own units and working with field school students throughout the week. The expectations of campers are like those of the WMU students: they learn excavation techniques, how to wet-screen, and how to identify artifacts. They also participate in the recording process of making observations and drawing maps. Campers are generally excited about the work they are doing and many choose to return in subsequent summers.

The children’s activities at the open house are targeted to a very different demographic group than the summer camp. These children are less likely to have a previous interest in archaeology. Many of them are simply brought to the open house by their parents, in search of family-friendly summer activities. Although there is no age requirement to participate in the open house activities, the children that do tend to be
younger: preschool and elementary school aged. The activities available vary from year to year, depending on who organized the event, though there are some constants. In recent years “Junior Archaeology” coloring pages, crossword puzzles, and crafts have made up the core of the activities offered.

“Junior Archaeology,” is popular and fun for kids. They use a mini screening station to sift through dirt and find “artifacts,” they are then encouraged to wash and identify their finds and draw a sketch. This is a very brief introduction to some of what archaeologists do through the course of their work. It is easy to set up and execute in an open house setting where kids come and go on their own schedules and may only have a few minutes to spend. The major point children take from this activity is that archaeologists are interested in materials made and used by people, not dinosaur bones. Though this may seem self-evident to those of us intimately familiar with archaeology, it is often new information for a child. Beyond that, this activity places the focus on artifacts without interpreting them and does not really impart any other educational benefit for children.

Crafts are popular with kids of all ages while the coloring pages tend to appeal to the youngest children. Older children and sometimes adults gravitate towards the crossword puzzles. These activities are typically designed to fit in with the theme of the open house. For example, in 2011, the theme was the fur trade. The coloring pages depicted animals that were hunted for furs, allowing the archaeologists manning the booth to start a discussion with the children about what parts of animals might be used for and what kind of archaeological signature would be left behind. The crossword puzzle gave clues centered on hunting and trade as well as general archaeological knowledge.
The crafts consisted of making leather pouches and beading—examples of some of the items that were exchanged between French traders and Natives on the frontier. All of these activities are well suited to an open house, however, they miss the biggest benefit that archaeology has to offer children, that is, its ability to tap into critical thinking skills and that use artifacts to interpret the past.

A final venue for children to experience Fort St. Joseph is through tours of the site. Interested individuals and families can either show up at the site or contact the public outreach coordinator to arrange for a special site tour. During a tour the group is introduced to Fort St. Joseph with a little background history and they are escorted around the site. On the site field school students are encouraged to interpret the current understanding of the unit they are working on. This often includes a discussion on how they excavate the site and what they are finding, but may also include a synthesis of the interpretation of the particular area or feature they are excavating and how that contributes to the larger understanding of Fort St. Joseph.

The Fort St. Joseph Archaeology Camp for Educators

Since 2006, the project has offered a week-long camp program for educators. It is similar to camp program for life-long learners (all adults) and middle school students, but recognizes that teachers are a unique audience because of their engagement with children through the school system. Participants in this program can apply for Continuing Education Unit (CEU) credits which are necessary in order to maintain a teaching certificate.
The teachers enrolled in this program spend a week working with the staff and field school students at the excavation site. Their day runs from 9 am to 3 pm with the morning spent in the classroom with the public education coordinator and the afternoon spent working in the field alongside WMU field school students. The syllabus does not significantly deviate from that of the middle school camp discussed above. The archaeology camp for educators takes place during the final full week of the WMU field school, just before the open house. In the past few years Dr. Terrance Martin, a zooarchaeologist from the Illinois State Museum and FSJ faunal analyst, has participated in the open house. He typically arrives mid-week and conducts a bone lab for the field school students and the educators.

The goals of this program are for teachers to learn about Fort St. Joseph as an historic and archaeological site in the local community. They are also instructed in how to conduct fieldwork and how to work with artifacts in the lab. Additionally, the program is designed to provide teachers with enough information and resources to incorporate archaeology into their lesson plans.

Current and Future Directions

When I became the public outreach coordinator at Fort St. Joseph in 2012, I focused on the task of re-envisioning some of these educational opportunities. In particular, in addition to teaching students about Fort St. Joseph and archaeology, I wanted to offer students with an extra-curricular program that supplemented their formal schooling and provided educational benefits. In my work I have tried to move to yet
another step in public outreach— that is making sure that the benefits have a broader application than the project or the archeology. I focused on children, in particular, and looked at various ways to use archaeology to aid in educational development. The project’s continued growth and support will depend on the strength of its public programs. My study, conducted through participant-observation and surveys, is an attempt to better understand the needs of both children and teachers who choose to participate in the project and address ways in which it can collaborate with teachers in order to provide educational opportunities to students.
In this chapter I detail my work as a participant-observer and a staff member of the project where I worked with children in three main venues. First, is the archaeological summer camp for middle school students where I sought to conceptualize how the camp enhances their educational experience and how they understand their own formal schooling. I participated as both program designer/instructor for this group of students and worked alongside them as they participated in excavations at the site. I hoped to understand how these children understood their education and the educational process and well as contextualize their experiences in the programs. I used my own observations as well as interviews with the children to gauge how well various activities worked and what benefits the children drew from them.

Second, I discuss the children’s activities at the annual Fort St. Joseph open house. Here, I consider how to engage children with archaeological concepts during brief encounters. I had the opportunity to redesign the children’s booth with the goals of having children engage with various open house activities and use critical thinking skills. I situate this against the more traditional, excavation-orientated approach to the children’s booth that the project has employed in the past.

Finally, I explore one area that the project can pursue in order to build new relationships in the community. I worked with the Pokagon Youth Council to pilot an afternoon program to introduce young high school students to archaeological methods,
and to try and draw connections to their heritage. I explore some of the achievements of this program as well as some of the difficulties inherent in building partnerships.

Participant Observation at the Middle School Camp

In 2012, I worked with the nine students as they excavated at the site and conducted a morning lesson of laboratory activities.\textsuperscript{2} During the middle school camp week I was able to join in the excavations with the students, both as an instructor and a unit partner, and talk to them about their experience in the program and their feelings towards their own education. The campers were a self-selected group of participants since the program is designed to attract kids who are interested in history. Most of the campers demonstrated that they wanted to partake in the program, were excited by field work, and were happy to come each day. I did not ask the exact same questions of all the students, most of whom I spoke with in groups of two, but each conversation followed similar themes and was allowed to flow organically according to the students’ interest.

Throughout this section I seek to bring the voices of the students into focus. Education is hugely important for children, but they are not often given a say in decisions that are made about their own schooling and learning opportunities. Adults, who claim to know best, make these decisions for them and consequently can render the needs and perspectives of children invisible (Osler 2010). I thought it was important for the students

\textsuperscript{2} Only eight students participated on my study. One continuously forgot to have his parent sign his consent form; he was very disappointed and talked with me anyway, but his responses are not included in my analysis.
to be able to share their views, and in turn, reflect on their educational experiences. This feedback can then be considered and implemented into future program design.

Most of the middle school campers attended because they have always been interested in history. The sixth grade history curriculum in Michigan focuses on ancient empires: China, Rome, Greece, and Egypt; these topics excited them about archaeology. This was also noted by students of the Stevens and Smith project in Lancaster, Pennsylvania where college student presenters asked if the elementary school children could think of any archaeological sites (Levine and Delle 2009). The children responded with answers which included pyramids, Stonehenge, and Aztec temples. They were shocked to learn that Thaddeus Stevens and Lydia Hamilton Smith’s house site was just a few blocks from their school. Likewise, the FSJ students were genuinely interested in learning about how archaeologists come to understand what happened in the past, and how much of their local history was currently being unearthed. One even commented that at school he has to hide how much he likes history from other students; otherwise they will think he is weird. At archaeology camp, however, he was free to explore and share his interest with other like-minded peers.

Reflections on the Camp Experience

Among the first things I talked with the campers about was how they became interested in archaeology, and why they wanted to attend the camp program. Most of the students revealed that they always had an interest in history or archaeology; this was frequently given as the answer to both questions. Some of the students had heard about the camp from a friend who had attended in previous summers, and one, Frank, had been cajoled into attending with another camper. Brian revealed that there were a lot of bottles
and trash near old homes where he lived in Niles. The community he lived in likely played a role in Brian’s interest in the summer camp. Aside from two students, Alex and Brian, none of the kids knew exactly how they had heard about the camp. Alex recalled that he had found a brochure while on a field trip and brought it home with him. He thought it sounded cool and he had applied. Brian’s mom found the information and had passed it along to him. The rest of the students probably came across the camp in similar ways – it was not something they had come across themselves, but that a friend or a family member, who knew of their interests, had suggested they apply.

I found that most of the students expressed an interest in history or archaeology and I wanted to better understand if that had come from personal experience or from their formal schooling. The answers to this question were split. Joe watched a lot of programs on the Discovery channel which got him interested in archaeology, whereas Brian had been exposed to archaeology during school, where he learned about many ancient empires. He commented that he wished they learned more about Michigan. Attending the summer camp gave him the opportunity to do work right in his own town which was exciting for him. Frank recalled that he had enjoyed studying the ancient empires while in the sixth grade (he liked the “coming to America stuff” a lot less). Rome was particularly fascinating for him because of the contributions it had made to modern society. Frank did not have a lot of exposure to archaeology through his history class; he recalled the textbook mentioned archaeologists briefly, but his teacher did not draw connections between the work they did, and how the artifacts they recovered, were instrumental in the creation of knowledge about the topic. Likewise, Jessica had learned about ancient Rome, Greece, and Egypt in school. She knew that archaeologists were responsible for finding
things like King Tut’s tomb and the associated collection of artifacts. She liked to envision finding something like that herself.

The students’ understanding of archaeology came primarily from learning about high profile archaeological sites in school or on television. The singular focus on ancient or classical archaeological sites, often well known temples and pyramids which contain treasures of great monetary value, distorts the reality of archaeological practice. Artifacts are valuable to archaeologists because they are data used to understand the past, not because they have monetary worth. These misrepresentations of archaeology are problematic, but there are some positive aspects as well. Archaeologists can recognize that any Hollywood portrayal is going to differ from the reality and they should never accept or justify unethical practices. These students, however, were motivated to learn about the real practice of archaeology because of their prior exposure to high profile archaeological sites. Media representations of archaeology may inspire people to learn more; this is a good thing. It then becomes the archaeologist’s responsibility to correct misconceptions, while still providing an engaging and interesting experience. Although the finds at Fort St. Joseph are more likely to be fragments of bone and pieces of lead shot, rather than ancient treasures, this did not put a damper on the students’ excitement to be unearthing materials from the past.

While I worked with the campers on the site I asked them to reflect on the experiences they were having. Were they enjoying it? What, in particular, did they like? Was there anything they did not enjoy? The term that came up most often was “fun”; the students liked the experiences they had in the camp and were enjoying themselves. The camp is run as an extracurricular activity, and it is important that children have enjoyable
experiences. This is not, of course, paramount to learning. I wanted the students to elaborate on their responses so I asked them why thought camp was fun and what their favorite part had been.

Now, students had to consider what elements had led to their characterization of “fun.” What specifically appealed to them about the experience? I talked to Brian and Joe together about their time in the program. Joe commented that he was getting more interested in archaeology as he learned more and participated in the excavations. Brian was enthusiastic in his response, “I actually learned something!” Joe concurred that he liked the digging, but he really liked that he was learning about a new topic. Frank, perhaps the student who enjoyed digging the least, responded that he “liked to learn how to do this stuff”; he was interested in understanding how the process was done, even if he did not really want to do it himself. Perhaps “fun” in their previous answers did not wholly equate to learning, but students were able to recognize that they were learning through the archaeology camp experience, and it was an experience that they enjoyed. Learning did not have to be boring, nor achieved through lecture and memorization, but could be an active and fun process.

The middle school students particularly enjoyed doing the hands-on portion of camp: the excavation. This is consistent with their desire to do more activities in school, and not passively listen to lectures. For archaeologists, then, it seems easy to teach by doing archaeology. While this method appeals to students, it also places the focus on the element of discovery, certainly inherent to archaeology, but not paramount to interpretation. By shifting the focus to include analytical lab activities, such as looking for patterns in artifact assemblages, interpreting sites, as well as identifying objects and
thinking about how they were used, archaeologists can help tap into students’ critical thinking skills, while still providing a hands-on experience.

One student, Frank, commented that his favorite activity had been using a faunal study collection to identify animal remains from the site and better understand the diet of its occupants. He enjoyed this task because it enabled him to figure out what kinds of animals the fort’s inhabitants consumed, and what parts of the animals they used. Sure, it would have been easy to simply tell the class that white tailed deer was the dietary staple, making up a majority of the animal remains found. Instead, students were asked to figure that out for themselves. What was likely to be a quickly forgotten fact, now became an experience for the student to remember, historical knowledge that he was empowered to create.

The students preferred the activities to the morning lectures, though when asked to reflect on what they had learned during the week they were quick to cite field techniques of digging or screening; tangible, measureable things. Inquiry, interpretation, and critical thinking are far less tangible. They are not measurable by a standardized test, and it is hard to prove that development has occurred, particularly in a short period of time. Yet this development does occur, and is encouraged by teachers’ uses of innovative lessons in the classroom and through extra-curricular activities. To this end, I created a series of interpretive lab activities to include in the morning portion of camp. I wanted the students to have the opportunity to build on what they had learned through their classes and excavation and to move to the next step in the archaeological process: analysis and interpretation.
Piloting Activities with Middle School Students

Most mornings, campers focused on the history and background of Fort St. Joseph during their classroom time, which primarily involved lecture and discussion. This summer, a morning of interpretive activities was included towards the end of the week that aimed to employ the principles of site interpretation, change over time, faunal analysis, and stratigraphy. For each activity students worked with artifacts from the site and were engaged in the work that archaeologists actually perform. They worked to identify and record artifacts, and were then asked to derive interpretations from their observations. It was easy to see how the campers used the information they had learned, and their experiences in the field, in order to identify different materials and use them to come up with their interpretations.

Bone Lab

One of the activities that the middle school campers completed was a faunal “bone lab” designed to introduce them to how archaeologists study animal remains and how their study is used to understand people in the past. My bone lab activity was based on the one conducted by Dr. Terrance Martin. Each summer Dr. Martin brings his faunal study collection, as well reference materials, to the FSJ archaeological field school, and instructs students in how to identify the faunal remains they have discovered over the course of the summer. I mimicked this activity using bones previously identified by Dr. Martin, and recent discoveries identified using his reference materials. As with the site as a whole, the majority of the bones I used were white tailed deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*). The bones were all labeled with inventory numbers prior to the activity so they could be
removed from their bags and handled by students without fear of losing provenience information.

To prepare for this activity it was important that the students have some familiarity with the site and its context. This was achieved through classroom lessons and fieldwork. At this point in the week, the campers had already spent several afternoons working on the site and were familiar with how to recognize the types of artifacts, including bone, commonly found. They had learned about the French colonial context of the site and understood it as a place of ethnic interaction. Students then received two different bones and a *Bone Lab Activity Form* (appendix A) to complete for each. In order to identify the bones, reference material was provided from Miles Gilbert’s *Mammalian Osteology*, which illustrates bones in sufficient detail. Because I wanted the activity to be primarily hands-on, I also utilized a white tailed deer skeleton from Western Michigan University’s faunal collection. A study collection is frequently used in archaeology (for bones and many other types of artifacts) to train students in the identification of different materials. This was laid out and allowed students the tactile experience of comparing their unknown fragments to whole known types.

The *Bone Lab Activity Form* was designed to facilitate the identification process by asking students to examine the features of the bones. Students had to record information about where the bone came from (site, provenience), then describe its attributes in words, and finally, sketch the artifact. In doing this, students were asked to carefully observe the bone, making note of what they saw. In order to sketch the artifact, students had to pay close attention to its detail, and be on the lookout for signs of human activity such as cut marks or evidence of butchering.

---

3 For a list of the bones used for this activity from the FSJ site consult appendix B.
After learning all that they could from studying the physical bone, students were set upon the task of identifying what animal it came from and what bone it was. To do this, they consulted the reference pages and the skeletal material. Most students largely ignored the printed material, instead, preferring to compare their bone to the deer skeleton. Since they had already completed a thorough examination of their bone’s features, they knew to try and match these attributes. Students looked for attributes such as the shape of the bone, the distal and proximal ends, and presence or absence of a foramen. While running the activity I helped guide the students to discover the answers for themselves. Without telling them which bone was the correct match, I might point out differences between the two bones or suggest that they examine a certain feature more closely to see if they could find a better match. In most cases the students were able to find the correct bone after only a few tries. If they successfully identified both of their bones they traded with another student and continued the activity.

Some of the students really enjoyed figuring out as many different bones as possible, while others spent more time making observations and drawing detailed sketches. In both instances the campers were closely studying the bones and their various attributes. Allowing them to draw, compare bones through the study collection, and look at books provided different ways for students to engage in the activity according to their specific learning styles and talents.

Fort St. Joseph Chimera Site

This activity was based on one designed by Dr. LouAnn Wurst, which I manipulated to suit the materials I had available. I used artifacts from the Fort St. Joseph collection, which is housed at the Fort St. Joseph Museum. I arranged different units to
represent both the various activities (religious, domestic, trade), which occurred at the Fort, as well as the multiple ethnic groups who called the area home. In this activity students were asked to look for patterns and interpret an archaeological site by analyzing separate “units,” or assemblages of artifacts, from a fictitious site based on Fort St. Joseph. The students considered each artifact in their assemblage and participated in identifying and cataloging it based on the knowledge they had acquired over the week.

I also included the project’s lexicon (appendix C) and the *Chimera Site Map and Unit Notes* sheet (appendix D).\(^4\) I wanted the students to get a feel for how archaeologists impose typological systems on their collections in order to organize their data in preparation for analysis. By this point in the week, the students had already spent several days excavating at the Fort and Lyne sites, thus, they were familiar with many of the artifacts that are typically encountered. I did add some of the more interesting finds of the project, such as Jesuit rings, crosses, and the cilice. I was surprised that the students knew what the cilice was right away, but found out that this had been covered during a discussion of religious life at Fort St. Joseph. Due to the short time available for the activity, I only had students look at one or two units; it took them a while to catalog. Instead of each coming up with their own interpretation of the site, the students returned to a group setting, and shared their understanding of their unit with the class. Then, as a whole, we discussed possible interpretations for the site.

The lexicon was the hardest part of the activity for the campers to understand. It is divided into functional categories and the artifact column is located towards the center of the page. Students had to adjust how they thought about the artifacts. A piece of ceramic could no longer be identified as “ceramic” or “faience”; it had to be considered as a

\(^4\) For a list of FSJ artifacts used in this activity consult appendix E.
household object related to food and beverage consumption. Similarly, bone was not simply bone, but categorized as “food remains.” Though the students struggled a little with this at first, it helped them to start understanding the uses of each artifact, rather than simply identifying it as an object.

As a whole, the class discussed their units and synthesized that information to start thinking about how the artifacts led to an interpretation of the site as a whole, rather than disparate units. The assemblages represented the home of a priest or the site of religious activity, another was associated with the military, still another portrayed the multi-ethnic home of a French fur trader and Native wife. When they shared their understanding of their unit, they demonstrated the ability to condense the material and form an interpretation. They were also able to identify lines of evidence when asked how they arrived at their conclusion, citing how various artifacts contributed to their understanding of their unit. For example, Frank noticed that the lead shot was round, not misshapen, and used this observation to infer that it had not been fired or it would have been disfigured on impact. Next, students discussed how the different units made up the site. Instead of just looking at one area, they were able to see how each thread of information led to a more complete understanding of Fort St. Joseph as a multi-purpose and multi-ethnic space.

Seriation

I used a quick seriation activity to illustrate how archaeologists look at changes in artifacts over time. I gave the students sets of beads in small containers. Each container held a differing arrangement of beads based on material, shape, size, and color. The students were asked to rearrange the containers based on similarities and differences
between them. The campers were able to do this very quickly once they understood what they were being asked to do. Once the beads were in order, I asked them to consider what attributes they had relied on to arrange the beads. Almost universally, the students used the material to sort the containers. They placed the ones with the most shell at one end, and the one with the most plastic at the other. I prompted them to consider what other attributes they could have used. One student noticed the colors of beads. I had arranged them so that certain colored plastic beads peaked in popularity in different containers. I also asked them to look at the shapes and sizes of the various beads. At the beginning the sizes and shapes varied widely, in the middle larger beads were preferred with some variation in shape. Towards the end of the row, the beads were all a standardized shape and size. Though the activity was very easy for the students, they did not recognize all of the factors that had went into the arrangement. Subconsciously, this might have affected their thinking, but, they were only able to recognize that color had helped them sort the beads when asked. I also asked them to consider how they knew which end of the line was the oldest and which was the newest; they focused on material for this conclusion because they knew that plastic was a newer material than wood or shell.

Stratigraphy

Building off the idea that archaeologists dig in stratigraphic layers, I created a final activity designed to demonstrate how a site may have several uses over time. I explained that it is very important for archaeologists to know where artifacts are found in relation to one another. The Chimera activity focused on understanding patterns across space, while this one was geared at understanding time. When they are digging archaeologists also rely on soil color and texture as cues that they have entered a new
layer. The premise of this activity was that an archaeologist had an assemblage of artifacts from a single unit of a multi-component site, and although the artifacts were bagged by the layer they were found in, the information relating to which layer was the oldest and newest had been lost. Students received the *Lyne Site Stratigraphy Activity Worksheet* which included soil descriptions and questions to answer (appendix F). Each layer had an associated soil description to aid students in putting them into chronological order. The layers represented differing uses of the site from Native American camps, to colonial trading, to a later farmstead. Additionally, there were plow zone levels where the artifacts had been intermingled. I used artifacts from both the Lyne and Fort sites to illustrate these changes.\(^5\)

Like the Chimera activity, the students looked at each layer separately to create an interpretation of it. Then, they tried to piece the vertical levels of the site back in order. Most of the students found this to be a difficult task. While they were able to vocalize that the oldest objects should be found in the bottom level, they had trouble arranging the layers in order. I had initially hoped to be able to date some of the artifacts within the layers using informational packets, however, this proved to be difficult. Ceramics or a variety of wrought, cut, and wire nails would have been very useful in this endeavor, but these materials are found infrequently at the site. If I were to repeat this activity I would probably not use Fort St. Joseph materials, but find a collection which included a variety of ceramic and nail types which can be easily dated. Alex was the first, and only, camper to put the units in the correct order. He did so by focusing on the changes in the soil description as well as some of the artifacts, like the stone tools, which he knew would be

---

\(^5\) For a list of artifacts used for this activity consult appendix G.
in the oldest layers. He was then able to explain how he had figured out the answer to the other students.

Alex described the experience as “easy and hard.” Some of the artifacts he had recognized right away, such as a lithic flake, which he knew was older than some of the other artifacts. He also noticed a windshield wiper in one of the levels. He knew that this was a much more modern artifact, as neither prehistoric Native Americans nor the multi-ethnic community at Fort St. Joseph, had cars. He was able to place this as the newest level. The rest of the levels he looked at the soil descriptions. Here, he made connections to the field work that he had performed. I asked him about this activity while we were working at the site later that day. He pointed to the different soil zones in the adjacent units, which I had reflected in my soil descriptions. He knew what order the soil zones were typically arranged in at the site, with the mottled darker soil overlaying the more yellow brown subsoil and the dark alluvial fill at the top. Alex’s understanding in the lab was a direct reflection of what he saw at the field site. He was able to demonstrate the ability to make connections between what is observed in the field and how this contributes to the analysis which takes place in the lab.

Connecting to the Classroom: Students’ Reflections on Formal Education

I was interested to find out how the students felt about their formal schooling, and how they saw it as similar or different from the camp program. Ideally, I hoped that participation in the camp would help connect the topics the students learned about in school to the methods used to create that knowledge. For Brian, The experience at camp was beneficial. He had watched videos in history class, mostly about ancient Greece and Rome. He commented that he also wanted to learn more about America and his own
state, but he still enjoyed the class. He demonstrated that he knew archaeologists had contributed to the understanding of the past. I asked him whether or not the teacher ever talked about archaeology. He recalled that “[we] don’t learn about how archaeologists have discovered artifacts or added to the understanding [of Greece and Rome’s history].” He was able to recognize that objects discovered by archaeologists are sources of information about the past. He was also able to recognize that this had not been part of his history class. Coming to archaeology camp broadened what he had learned in school and what he knew about the process of interpreting the past.

Frank really enjoyed learning about “early humans;” he was not so fond of the topics which dealt with colonial contexts. Frank’s conception of early humans was different from how archaeologists would use the term. By early humans, Frank meant people from India, ancient Egypt, China, Greece, and “his favorite,” Rome. His knowledge of human history extended back a few thousand years, which he saw as early humans. He did not mention anything about human evolution. As Wurst and Novinger (2011) have noted, history textbooks, and thus history classes, often rely on written documents and exclude prehistoric topics. This was evident in Frank’s understanding of history. The conversation drifted to why he found these topics so interesting, but, it was clear that the way history had been taught in Frank’s school had influenced the extent of his knowledge.

An important consideration for gauging how much the students enjoyed school was how they learned. Brian and Joe watched many videos in history class and had used the textbook a little bit in the beginning of the year. Instead, they also had discussion and did a few activities. Brain did not miss the textbook; he recalled the text from the year
before had not been very good. Both of the students recognized that while they were interested in history, many of their classmates were not. I asked them if they thought their teacher could do a better job at making history more interesting for the other students. They agreed that she probably could, but, were not sure how. Josh did not particularly like history as a school subject, but, recognized his assessment was based on the way the subject was taught. He characterized his teacher as “strict” and felt that all they did in class was listen to him talk while taking notes.

Jessica’s classroom experience was different. Her teacher connected history to the work of archaeologists when studying the ancient world. Her teacher used “real” books as opposed to the textbook, and involved the students in creative exercises. Her teacher was older; “she’s been teaching longer than my older [16 year old] sister’s been alive,” but Jessica saw that as a good thing. She felt her teacher really knew what she was doing and liked the projects that she designed. Jessica enjoyed the creativity that she was allowed to express in her learning. She had made a model of the Trojan Horse, and of artifacts from King Tut’s tomb, for some of her assignments. These are probably not projects that many archaeologists would advocate. Jessica’s teacher may or may not have had any exposure to archaeology, but she showed a willingness to include it in her curriculum, and to experiment with hands-on activities to engage the students. If this teacher had the opportunity to work with archaeologists in collaborative lesson plan design, she might also be able to focus on linking artifacts to interpretations of the past.

The campers drew connections between the way they learned history in school and the classroom portion of the camp. While most of them were able to cite specific things that they had learned from the lectures, they preferred to dig. They also liked the
lab activities because it let them be more involved in the process. The students showed that they understood their own education. They were able to recognize that they were learning and what specific information, as well as skills, they had learned. They were also astute critics of how they learned best. None of the students enjoyed being lectured at, but they did enjoy excavation and other hands-on techniques. The campers were also able to draw a distinction between subjects that they found interesting and the delivery of those subjects. Despite having to sit through lectures, or read a textbook, which were generally not seen as positive learning tools, the students still professed interest in the subject. Of course, these students were self-selected and their experience may not reflect students across the board in formal education. If teachers’ methods alienate and bore students, they may not discover an interest in a subject or may not see education as important.

Observations at the Open House

During the middle school camp, students participated in a week-long program which they elected to attend because of their interest in the subject matter. The Fort St. Joseph open house presents another opportunity for project archaeologists to engage with children in a very different situation: the open house. The 2012 open house theme was “the Military at Fort St. Joseph” and the event included nearly 100 historical interpreters from the Northwest Territory Alliance. They planned some children’s activities focusing on historic games such as hoops and stilts which entertained the kids in an 18th century manner. I was able to focus my booth on interpretation in archaeology using a rendition of the chimera site activity (discussed above), this time using items I selected from
around my apartment, rather than actual artifacts from the site. I also used the bead
seriation that I had done with the middle school students and retained the coloring pages
and crosswords from previous years.

The previous year’s Bead Barter activity gave students a list of questions to ask the field school students at various stations as they travelled around the site. After they listened to the answer they received a bead, once they had collected beads from all of the station they could return to the children’s booth and string them to make jewelry or a key chain. I liked some of the ideas behind this activity. It gave the kids something to do while they were at the event and taught them about archaeology. I did not like the idea that the kids had to ask pre-determined questions and simply listen to answers. This auditory style of learning is not very effective with children, and they do not tend to remember the information (Ellick 2000). Instead, I designed a scavenger hunt in an attempt to have children talk to the historical interpreters to learn more about artifacts and how they were used. To do this I set up a case of artifacts from past excavations, but did not reveal what they were. All of the artifacts were ones being used by the historical interpreters at the open house. My goal was for the kids to look for the artifacts in use as they explored what the artifacts were and how they were used. Each child received a handout which included illustrations of the items in the case so they could remember what to look for while they explored the site (appendix H). I hoped that being able to see the artifacts and illustrate how they were used would make this an experience for children to remember.

While observing the booth I found that the children were most drawn to the coloring pages, especially the younger children. The field school students seemed to
encourage this activity the most, by asking passing children if they wanted to color. Many of them did talk to the children while they worked and asking them various questions about the animals which would have been used at Fort St. Joseph. The bead seriation activity was popular with some of the younger kids as well. They were able to understand the idea of arranging the bead assemblages in order from oldest to newest. Like the middle school students in the camp program they often did not recognize some of the attributes they had used to create the sequence. This was generally a quick activity which tended to be completed in just a few minutes. This seemed to work well with the children’s attention span, allowing them to complete the task, receive a sticker and move on to the next booth. This seemed to please the parents as well, who were sometimes impatient to keep moving when the kids were engaged in a longer activity.

The scavenger hunt activity achieved moderate success, but did not accomplish the two goals in the ways I had intended. Many of the families who stopped by the booth picked up the sheet and looked at the artifacts in the case; few of them brought it back completed. The kids enjoyed looking at the artifact display. They were able to identify a few of the objects right away, other artifacts were more difficult to indentify.

The outdoor museum table was located in the booth adjacent to the children’s activities. This booth was set up to showcase some of the artifacts found at Fort St. Joseph. One display contained various gun parts recovered by archeologists which related to the open house theme. Another included recent finds which had been discovered over the summer by the field school students. Between these displays were many of the artifacts in the scavenger hunt. Often the children would obtain their worksheet and move on to the next booth where they were able to identify many of the objects. This was not
exactly what I had in mind, but it did allow the students to discover the artifacts located on the site. This meant that the children did not have to go to the historical interpreters to find the artifacts, nor did they get to see how they were used. They did, however, have the chance to identify some of the objects that they were initially unfamiliar with. The Chimera activity presented the biggest conundrum for me. It often took too long for the child to complete the whole activity, but they were able to identify and record several objects and interpret an assemblage. What most perplexed me though, was how the parents responded during this activity.

An Unexpected Problem: Helicopter Parenting

When the children came to the Chimera activity I had them look at an assemblage of artifacts representing a family home. I would ask them which artifacts they could identify and then have them try to figure out what the unfamiliar artifacts were. One artifact seemed to be particularly confusing: the small mesh faucet with threads at the top which I had removed from my sink at home. As the kids looked at it I pointed out various parts and asked if they had seen anything like it before. I was hoping they would notice the threading and relate it other things they had seen to draw the conclusion that it was screwed into something.

Often the child would puzzle over it for a few moments and then, would be interrupted by their parent supplying the answer. I wanted the child to understand how archaeologists piece objects together in their heads and see how they determined the function. Archaeologists do not have the luxury of having all of the pieces and I wanted the children to have the experience of trying to relate smaller parts to a whole. After the
parent gave the child the answer they would often move on and the learning opportunity was lost. The children were denied the chance to figure out what the object was for themselves and I was frustrated when parents did not allow their child to explore and learn.

The term “helicopter parent” has come into vogue to describe a generation of parents who incessantly “hover” over their children. It is usually applied to parents of college-aged children, and increasingly, “children” in graduate school or those in their first professional jobs (Hunt 2008). These parents intervene in their children’s lives and deprive them of the opportunity to learn, grow, and develop into a full-fledged adults capable of caring for themselves and making their own choices. These parents not only do laundry, clean, and cook for their grown children, but they also insert themselves into their children’s education. Professors and academic deans report receiving phone calls from parents who are displeased by their child’s grades, and schoolteachers are faced with parents demanding higher grades for subpar work (Hunt 2008). This trend is continuing, and perhaps worsening. As Judith Hunt (2008) notes, the ease with which people are able to communicate with each other facilitates continued parental involvement in their children’s and adult children’s lives. Not only is the trend growing, but it seems to be starting earlier and earlier; today’s parents report taking comfort in being able, from their office, to watch their child’s every movement via webcam technology. Certainly, this gives the parent some measure of comfort while navigating the difficulties of returning to work and leaving their child in the care of others, but how far is too far? Where does (should or will) this trend stop? And, at what point, does the
over-involved parent ultimately deprive their child of both educational opportunities and life experiences?

The trend of helicopter parenting is reason for concern for many university professionals, and even employers. Helicopter parents tend to be the parents of the “millennial” generation: those born between 1982 and 2002 (Hunt 2008). This concern is certainly not unwarranted. Those who work with the millennial students have noted that their dependence on their parents has an impact on their critical decision-making abilities and the confidence with which they are able to critically think about issues and solve problems. A generation of children has been continually told, “yes,” “you are special,” or “your best is good enough,” without learning what it is like to make a mistake, to fail, or to work harder to achieve satisfactory results (Hunt 2008). Students in these situations are merely pushed through school. Mediocre knowledge, like minimum content standards, are rewarded and true learning and engagement with the process of education is neglected.

Trends in education, where students are constantly provided with knowledge to memorize, were reflected in some of my interactions with children during the open house. Parents seemed to accept the idea, that if their children did not immediately know the answer to a question, they should be told the answer by someone with more knowledge. This turns knowledge and information into simply a “thing,” rather than a process. Knowledge is not a set of immutable facts, but rather the building of an understanding and process of asking questions, making inferences, and gradually coming to a conclusion. When education is conducted from a framework that empowers students in the process, they learn more than just a set of facts.
Although Fort St. Joseph Archaeology reaches children within the local community, its boundaries do not extend much further than the community of Niles and the surrounding area. This may not be inherently problematic, but, it can reach a broader audience. The children who attend the camp are generally from the local area and chose to participate in the program, yet there are more children who could stand to benefit. As seen through the experiences of the campers, there are a wide variety of ways history is taught in schools. For many, this may be the only exposure to archaeology that they have. By reaching out, and forming collaborative partnerships with educators, archaeologists can focus on improving the quality of education for more than just a small selective group of kids.

Collaborative Ventures: Initial Efforts and the Possibility of a Fort St. Joseph-Pokagon Partnership

The Pokagon Band of Potawatomi Indians of Michigan and Indiana is based in Dowagiac, Michigan, not far from Fort St. Joseph. The Pokagon are descendants of the Potawatomi people who interacted with the French during the fort’s occupation. A member of the Pokagon Band serves on the Fort St. Joseph Archaeology Advisory Committee convened by the City of Niles in 2008, but as Nassaney (2012a:14) notes they have refrained from establishing a full collaborative relationship with the project, perhaps instead preferring to develop personal relationships. In the spring of 2012 I began to work with to the Pokagon Youth Council in order to explore how archaeology could be used to help their youth learn about their culture. The program that resulted may not have achieved those lofty goals, but represents a step forward in developing relationships between the project and the Pokagon, with similar goals of education in mind.
I first contacted Conrad Church, the Pokagon Youth Cultural Coordinator, as I was initially conceiving this project. I met with members of the Language and Culture staff as well as the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer to discuss the potential for a collaborative project. I did not want to go into the meeting with a list of “here are things I can do for you,” but instead wanted information on some of the goals of their program. I hoped that together we could think about where, and if, archaeology furthered those goals. Though we discussed several different ideas ranging from their summer camp program to the Fort St. Joseph camp, we decided to implement a pilot workshop. Pokagon students would come to visit Western Michigan University’s archaeology lab the following week to participate in a few activities and we would spend some time on campus together. Beyond the introduction to archaeology, the afternoon session was also an opportunity for these early high school students to be on a college campus and, perhaps, become excited about the possibility of attending college themselves. During the morning the students went on a tour of archaeology sites in Niles led by the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer.

The program design was left up to me, which fell short of the symbiotic relationship I was hoping for. I planned four activities to span the afternoon program to introduce students to the fields of anthropology and the lab methods of archaeology. I did not focus on excavation; it is my contention that the analytic and interpretive lab skills are more useful for educational development. My lesson plans were provided to the Youth Cultural Coordinator prior to the session for review and input (appendix I). I received his approval, but no substantial feedback.
Program Design

For the first activity I wanted students to answer the question, “what is anthropology?” In order to consider anthropology as a discipline I utilized the resource of the mural painted on the walls in Moore Hall where the archaeology lab is located (appendix J). The mural is a multisensory experience including visuals, sounds, and touch. It incorporates the four fields of anthropology (cultural, biological, linguistic, and archaeology) as a holistic study of humans. First, we talked a little bit about anthropology and archaeology to assess what the students already knew. They were fairly familiar with archaeology as the process of digging for artifacts. Students were then asked to spend some time exploring the hallway mural to see what they could discover about anthropology.

The second activity related to the question “what do archaeologists do in the lab?” This took the form of a bone lab designed to introduce students to how archaeologists process the materials that they find. Faunal materials were used from the Colony Farm site in Kalamazoo, Michigan. Most were cow and pig bones which still needed to be washed. I set up tubs of water and toothbrushes so that the students could have the hands-on experience of participating in lab work. I also wanted to demonstrate how the artifacts recovered aid archaeologists in analysis. WMU has a faunal study collection which I used for this purpose, setting out cow and pig bones for references. While students worked on washing and identifying the bones we discussed foodways.

The questions “how do archaeologists use the materials they find to interpret the past?” and “what are multiple lines of evidence” were two questions I thought were important to understand archaeology and they formed the basis for the third activity: the
Chimera Site interpretation (appendix K). I wanted students to have the experience of handling and identifying artifacts as well as using them to interpret a site. We began by discussing the spaces in our own homes and what we would expect to find if excavations were conducted 100 years in the future. Students were asked to consider what materials would remain and which would decompose or be passed down to their heirs. For this iteration of the activity, I used artifacts from the Finger Lakes National Forest Archaeology Project, which explores 19th-20th century farmsteads in New York State. These materials were grouped into specific activity areas, noted by separate units on the site map. Students were to analyze each unit in turn, looking for patterns in the artifacts. The goal was to figure out what each unit represented and then to interpret the site as a whole. At the end of the activity students were asked about what other kinds of sources they might consult to learn more about the site.

For the final activity I used artifacts from Fort St. Joseph to try and make connections between the artifacts and the student’s lives (appendix L). I set out artifacts that had been recovered at both Fort St. Joseph and the nearby Lyne site, most of which had to do with Native peoples, trade items, and items of faith such as stone tools, animal bones, beads, tinkling cones, and religious rings and crosses. I asked students if they recognized any of the artifacts or if they used materials similar to the ones they saw. We also considered how the lives of the people in the past may have been different, and in what ways they may have been similar. I was hoping that the students would connect with the artifacts and share with me some aspects of their own personal lives and culture.
Discussion

The students had several hours to spend in the archaeology lab, which equated to approximately 45 minutes per activity. The six students who attended were a little older than I had planned (high school versus middle school aged), but they participated in all of the activities.

The mural exploration was, perhaps, the least successful activity of the afternoon and I felt the students needed a little more direction from myself as the instructor. The early high school aged students did not take the activity wholly seriously. They shouted and drew attention to some of the partially clothed figures and also proceeded to pretend to draw anatomical parts on them. One of the older girls, who already received her GED (General Educational Development tests), seemed frustrated by their level of maturity. Once attention was (re)focused on the goals of the activity the students asked several good questions about the illustrated people. One student asked, “why is her neck so long?” referring to a woman whose neck was stretched with necklaces. This question led to a discussion of bodily adornment and varying conceptions of beauty around the world. The students I worked with were already fairly familiar with archaeology so the mural, particularly the part pertaining to stratigraphy, did not provide much new information for these students. The mural did stimulate one brief and interesting discussion, but beyond that was not a truly engaging experience.

The bone lab was the high point of the archaeology workshop in terms of learning and enjoyment and cultural collaboration. Before we could begin the activity Conrad produced a bottle of cedar oil. All the students were instructed to rub a small bit of the oil onto their hands and through their hair. Pokagons believe that there may be bad spirits
associated with skeletal remains and the oil would protect them. This was a great way for
the students to learn about their own culture (none of them seemed to have participated in
this before) and to see how Native cultural beliefs could be meshed with archaeological
practices. The students showed excitement in being able to identify the various bones and
sought to identify as many as they could. The activity required a lot of moving around
and hands-on participation. Students moved around the room to wash artifacts and to
compare with the different bones available for identification. The large, fairly easily
identifiable bones allowed the students to learn about how archaeologists identify
materials and be active participants in the learning process. During this activity I asked
questions about the kinds of bones that were used and what we could say about the
people whose meals they were to make a connection to how archaeologists use faunal
remains to understand people. This conversation got overshadowed by the movement and
excitement in the room, but it is a valuable portion of the lesson. If I were to repeat this
activity I would have the students finish their work with the bones and then regroup for
the discussion.

Site interpretation is vital to archaeology, as is teaching students to explore
patterns they find in their data. This was the premise of the Chimera Site activity.
Students spent about ten minutes looking at the artifacts in each of the five “units” that I
had assembled. Though I used real artifacts, I arranged them into fictional unit contexts to
represent areas inside a home and in outdoor areas of a farm house. The site map also
depicted several features—burned areas and stone foundations, not represented in the
artifact assemblage, but available to aid in interpretation. The students showed that they
were able to identify many of the artifacts, some which they recognized immediately, and
some which they reasoned based on the item’s characteristics. The students were asked to consider what activity area each unit represented and they were often able to draw logical conclusions based on the artifacts. The unit that represented the porch of the farm home was the most difficult for the students to interpret due to the many small artifacts which were arranged to represent personal items that had been dropped and fallen through the slats. The students were also able to make some inferences about the people who lived at the house, such as they owned a dog, based on the bone found under the porch.

I got some very creative answers when I asked what some of the artifacts had been used for. One student argued that a broken crock had been used by an alcoholic (there were liquor bottles present) in a murder. This opportunity was used to explain how the interpretation of the site must be based on the data and that some interpretations are stronger than others. I asked, if the crock was used as a bludgeoning device, what we might expect to see on it. The student recognized that there might be blood stains on such a weapon, but also concluded that the other piece of the broken crock had been used to commit the crime and was buried in an unexcavated portion of the yard. This delved into some silliness, but it was a good place to bring up the idea that all interpretations are not equal, and they must come from the data available.

I had high hopes for the last activity, but it did not go as well as I wanted. Still, it was a good learning experience. The students did not recognize very many of the artifacts. They were familiar with some that they had learned about in school, but did not have a personal connection. One girl explained that she did some beadwork, and thus, saw the seed beads as resulting from that activity. I think there were two reasons for this being a lackluster activity. First, it was the end of a long day in the middle of the
students’ spring break, and they were tired by this point. Second, most of the students were new to the Pokagon Cultural Program. The program is designed to introduce Pokagon children to some aspects of their tribal heritage. These specific children did not yet have a lot of exposure to these cultural aspects.

Though both the Youth Cultural Coordinator and I felt that the day was an overall success, no further outreach has occurred. After the workshop I had trouble remaining in contact with the group for feedback and to explore other event possibilities. I suggest two reasons for this. In working with others there is always the consideration of time and scheduling. While this kind of outreach was a priority for me (for experience and in completing my thesis), other people have different priorities. It is likely that beginning collaborative projects required too much of a time investment to make a commitment. Also, the interest level in such programs may be low within the Pokagon youth group. Conrad and I had hoped to have 10-15 students participate in the initial workshop, but only six had the interest and time. Through personal communications with Pokagon Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, Mike Zimmerman noted that sometimes the tribe has trouble generating interest in the kids to participate in any kind of cultural or extracurricular activity. Though I had hoped to develop this relationship further, I also did not want to be pushy. I think it is important to reach out and to try and open doors for collaboration, but, these relationships cannot be forced. I remain hopeful that this is an avenue for collaboration which has not been fully explored, and is open to the possibilities of the future.6

6 Since writing the initial draft of this paper I have learned that Conrad has moved to a new position within the Pokagon Tribe and Mike Zimmerman has left the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer position to accept a job out of state. This can be seen as both a set back and a new opportunity for relationship building.
CHAPTER V

WORKING WITH EDUCATORS

Since inception of the educator’s camp program in 2006 approximately 50 educators have attended. My goal in working with educators is to address the concern that teachers are too often viewed as a receptive audience for archaeology rather than seen as true collaborators in archaeological outreach projects (Jeppson 2010; Jeppson and Brauer 2007). In order to better understand this issue I examined the outreach efforts conducted by the Fort St. Joseph Archeological Project in regards to educators. To begin, I conducted an evaluation of the program. My first goal was to contact teachers who had previously attended the camp and ask them about their experiences in the program. Prior to my work, no systematic evaluation of the program had been conducted and there was no procedure in place to solicit feedback from participants. Assessment is a critical part of any outreach project. Without feedback it is impossible to understand how the program was received by participants. I sent out a survey which focused on understanding the strengths and weaknesses of the program and how well it had met the goals of the participants. For teachers participating in the 2012 program I asked them to fill out a pre-course survey (appendix M) about their expectation and then sent a follow-up survey (appendix N) after the week had been completed.

Teachers and students often have an interest in archaeology and it is not uncommon for an archaeologist to be invited to speak to a class (Ellick 2000). These can be self-serving, career-oriented presentations geared to excite students about the subject.

7 Names of all participants in this chapter have been changed to protect their identities.
They fill a singular need. In order to move beyond this superficial outreach it is necessary to understand the needs and goals of classroom teachers. To this end, I hoped to use the participants of the 2012 educator’s camp as a resource to provide insight into the classroom realities in communities which the project serves. In both my evaluation survey of past program participants and my pre-course survey I asked teachers to consider if archaeology was a good fit for their classroom, where it might be included in the curriculum and any impediments they might experience. I hoped that this would allow me to gauge interest in collaborative projects in recognized areas where such efforts could be implemented.

During the educator’s camp I had the opportunity to spend a morning with the participants as well as interact with them on-site during the week. My goal was to talk about curriculum and their classrooms firsthand. I also wanted to introduce them to some of the interpretive work archaeologists do in order to shift the focus away from the excavation and recovery of artifacts. Finally, I wanted to ask the teachers for feedback on the Chimera site activity which I had previously conducted with the middle school camp and the Pokagon Youth Council students. I wanted feedback from their perspective as educators on this type of project.

This group was diverse in many ways, but they shared an interest in archaeology and a willingness to engage with archaeologists. Their experiences illuminated many possibilities for collaborative work, but also the difficulties they face as teachers in an increasing test-oriented schooling industry. This chapter represents the summation of my work with the educators involved with the project.
The 2012 Archaeology Summer Camp for Educators: Pre-Course Assessment

There were seven participants in the 2012 archaeology summer camp for Educators, only five of whom met the requirements to participate in my project. Most of the participants in the program live and work in communities close to Fort St. Joseph and attend because of an interest in local history. They bring with them a range of educational experience, spanning the entire K-12 spectrum, including teachers of social studies and civics, language arts, science, math, and even a guidance counselor and library media specialist. These participants were asked to fill out a survey before attending the camp program to better understand their knowledge and interest in archaeology and their ideas of how archaeology might (or might not) work in their classroom. Because the sample size is quite small and self-selected, patterns noticed may not be representative of larger trends; however, this still provides insight into the potential for collaboration with educators.

Before arriving for the first day of camp the 2012 participants were asked to fill out a short survey for my project. Three survey questions were aimed at gauging how much participants already knew about archaeology and how interested they were in the subject. I hoped to better understand the demographics of this group—what type of teacher is apt to elect to participate in an archaeology program—in order to gain insight into potential collaborators. First, I asked about their reasons for attending the camp program. One response indicated attendance primarily for the Continuing Education Unit (CEU) credits, while the other four acknowledged that, although the CEUs played a role in their decision to attend, they also had an interest in the course’s subject matter. CEU’s
were obviously an important factor in the decision to attend the program, but it was not the only motivating factor. There are many programs eligible for CEUs for teachers to choose from, and each requires the same number of hours of “face time” with the instructor. Participants selected the archaeology camp at FSJ because they wanted to learn about, and participate in, archaeology.

These teachers came from diverse fields, and somewhat surprisingly, none were directly teachers of social studies—the field typically associated with archaeology (two were elementary school teachers responsible for social studies as well as all other subjects). This demonstrates that perhaps archaeologists can be a little narrow minded when they consider receptive audiences for archaeology. It is not just social studies and history teachers that archaeology appeals to, but teachers of science, administrators (one was a guidance counselor), and other faculty (such as the library media specialist). One of the strengths of archaeology is that it draws on many different disciplines. In schools, an integrated curriculum (opposed to separate lessons for math, science, history, etc.) helps students make broad connections rather than learn compartmentalized information (Suárez-Orozco 2005). Archaeology may be beneficial in schools for this reason; it provides an opportunity for curriculum design to explore the possibilities of an integrated curriculum. By learning through archaeology students will also learn skills in math, science, history, and language arts. There is some evidence that, despite interest, educators do not always see archaeology as broadly applicable across subject areas. This impediment may stem from the teachers’ familiarity with school subjects that are taught in separate blocks. Karen, who works as a library media specialist, commented that she
hoped to use the knowledge she would acquire to help connect with other faculty members who shared her interest.

In order to gauge how much participants already knew about archaeology, they were asked to rate their knowledge of the subject on a scale of 1-5 (with 1 being the lowest and 5 the highest). This type of front-end analysis can provide valuable information and allows the program director to structure the content to best enhance what participants already know and provide new information (McNutt 2000). The responses were varied with two respondents agreeing that they were familiar with archaeology and the other three indicated lower levels of familiarity. Two of the teachers had previously taken a course in archaeology while they were in college (“a long time ago”), and one had exposure to it during a previous CEU program as well as some excavation experience at Fort Michilimackinac. In response to this question Jeff, a 9th grade science teacher, was able to identify specific skills he was familiar with, such as gridded excavation to “establish the location and position of any find” as well as screening to look for artifacts. It is interesting that, as a science teacher, he was most familiar with technical processes and ones used to scientifically control space for analytical purposes. None of the other respondents mentioned knowledge of specific skills, however, this may have been indicative of the assessment format and an open-ended response would have solicited more useful answers.

The next section focused on what participants hoped to gain from the program. The top two answers pertained to learning specific techniques and processes of archaeology and more about the local history (all of the participants lived in, or taught in, either Kalamazoo/Portage or the Niles/Edwardsburg areas). These responses underscored
the perceived purpose of the program. The educators regarded the archaeologists as experts in their field, whose job it was to pass on information which would be beneficial to their own knowledge and careers. This replicates the relationship between teachers and archaeologists frequently found in public outreach to educators where the archaeologist passes knowledge (and sometimes lesson plans) to the teachers. If the educators felt their own expertise could make a contribution to the process of creating knowledge they did not voice that opinion. Jeppson and Brauer (2007) note that teachers are undervalued in society and this is exacerbated when archaeological outreach tells them what they should be teaching and how. Through my work as a participant-observer I did not get the sense that the teachers were not respected as professionals, however, a collaborative relationship was also not apparent.

While the focus of what teachers hoped to learn was placed on factual information and technical skills, there was also another dimension to their responses. Most of the teachers wanted to gain a better understanding of archaeology which focuses on the processes involved, but they also saw archaeology as a means of developing relationships. Linda, an elementary school teacher of 19 years, hoped to learn about “its [archaeology’s] relationship here in our local community,” and Karen, the library media specialist, felt that her interest in archaeology could be used to connect with co-workers and students. Additionally, Jeff, in his 20th year of teaching 9th grade science, was interested in understanding “how information is used to develop an insight into past historical activity.” These responses hint at a deeper understanding of archaeology. Jeff recognized that archaeologists use “information” (it is unclear whether he meant simply artifacts or other lines of evidence as well) to interpret the past. Both Linda and Karen
saw archaeology as a way of connecting with other people and communities. The teachers demonstrated that they believe archaeology has relevance beyond its subject matter. It is through making connections with people and communities through collaboration and community service learning that archaeology becomes emancipatory and empowering.

Benefits to Using Archaeology in the Classroom

In order to create a truly collaborative relationship with educators I believe it is important to understand their classroom realities. As part of the pre-course, front-end assessment I hoped to get a better sense of the educators’ understandings of how archaeology could be used in a classroom setting and what (or if!) they perceived to be the benefits of doing so. I asked this before they attended the program so that I would be able to compare the results to the follow-up survey as well as to the post-course evaluation of previous participants in order to gauge if the camp experience had an effect on their response. Participants were first asked to rate how strongly (1 being the lowest and 5 the highest) they agreed with the statement “I can see archaeology fitting into my curriculum” and were then asked to illuminate on what specific areas they thought would be a good fit. Three of the teachers were uncertain (ranking it a 3) while one chose “agree” and one (the library media specialist) selected “disagree.”

Karen disagreed that archaeology fit into her curriculum because of her role in the library. She does not teach a specific subject, but instead works with the other educators at her high school to teach students how to use library resources and complete special projects. In follow up interviews, Karen indicated that she could see uses for archaeology in the curriculum depending on which class and teacher she was working with.
Although Jeff, Michelle (a middle school guidance counselor) and Linda (a fifth grade teacher) were “uncertain” if archaeology would fit into their curriculums, all were able to provide ideas for its inclusion. Jeff saw primarily scientific uses for archaeology, noting that it uses the scientific method just as he would in his classroom, and he emphasized how archaeologists rely on the analysis of data to support their conclusions. Linda noted specific topics she covers in social studies, such as the Underground Railroad. The middle school campers noted that through their schooling they were most familiar with archaeological sites abroad. The same theme might also apply to this situation—teachers may not always be aware of local archaeological projects which relate to their curricular content. Dr. Nassaney’s work on Underground Railroad sites in Michigan might be a potential area for a collaborative project if she is interested working with archaeology students in the future. Michelle approached the issue of curricular fit in a different manner. As a middle school guidance counselor, rather than a classroom teacher, she is tasked with advising students on course selection, exploring interests, and career planning. She saw archaeology as a viable career option for her students who expressed an interest in history.

Debbie agreed that archaeology could fit into her classroom, though her short answer response did not differ markedly from those who were uncertain. These responses are in line with how many archaeologists have approached educational outreach – to fill particular content areas and as an example of a career path. As a fifth grade teacher Debbie is responsible for teaching U.S. history content. She noted that “colonial America is a large content area of our curriculum.” She had previously participated in excavations at Michilimackinac. That, coupled with her experiences at Fort St. Joseph, likely
heightened her attention to the archaeology of colonial America. In many US History textbooks colonial America is covered from a British perspective (Axtell 1987), therefore her knowledge of two French colonial forts may allow her to diversify the portrayal of colonial history. Archaeologists have worked at sites which represent a complete range of topics in American history many of which focus on areas commonly excluded from textbook narratives. These teachers have a clear understanding that archaeology can be integrated into topical material, but may not recognize its potential to illuminate textbook and historical silences.

Though most of the teachers focused on particular topics where archaeology could be incorporated into their classrooms, Jeff thought about archaeology more broadly. He noted the potential for cross-curricular work citing disciplines such as earth science (topography, water and land resources), and their relation to human activity. He also saw the ability for archaeology to draw connections between the past and the present. Although Jeff hinted at the importance of archaeology towards developing critical thinking skills, with his statement that archaeologists “collect data/evidence in support of a suggested answer to a question about human activity,” he stopped short of actually verbalizing (or writing) that connection.

The teachers in this group demonstrated they believed archaeology would be useful in their classrooms and although they generally had some idea of how to incorporate it they were still somewhat uncertain about how. One reason for this may be because the question was asked before they had participated in the camp program. It may also be indicative of an area where collaboration is possible. Once the specific needs of a classroom teacher are understood it is possible to work with an archaeologist to design a
lesson to meet those needs. A final suggestion is that the teachers were still uncertain about how to incorporate archaeology because they felt there were impediments to doing so.

Perceived Impediments to Incorporating Archaeology in the Classroom

I also wanted to see if there might be difficulties for teachers to incorporate archaeology into their classrooms. Based on my research into the consequences of the standardized testing movement I expected that archaeology might be seen by teachers as an extra topic, useful, but too hard to find time to cover (Au 2007; Townsend 2002). As discussed above, most of the teachers surveyed selected “uncertain” when asked if archaeology fit into their curriculum. All of the teachers, however, were then able to recognize at least one area where archaeology could be used in their classrooms. This presented a bit of a disparity as they had all recognized at least one area where archaeology did fit into their classroom. Participants were not asked to elaborate on why they were “uncertain,” but their answers to the questions about impediments to incorporating archaeology may provide some insight. In an open-ended question teachers were asked what they saw as some of the challenges to including archaeology in their curriculum. Michelle and Karen, because they are not classroom teachers, had different concerns than the others. Michelle based her answer on which specific class or teacher she happened to be working with, while Karen voiced the concern that she liked to be well-versed in career options, but did not have a lot of extra time to devote to doing so.

The use of classroom time was the biggest concern teachers had about fitting in archaeology. Educational researchers have noted that the increase in standardized testing and content expectations since the 1980s has had an effect on teachers’ instructional
practices, and Debbie, Linda, and Jeff confirm this trend (Au 2007). Linda was the most vague, stating that “time is definitely the biggest issue. There is so much other required material it is hard to find any extra time.” She did not specifically mention what her time was primarily devoted to, but Jeff and Debbie were more explicit. Debbie responded: “the required teaching of GLCEs (Grade Level Content Expectations)/CSS (Common Core State Standard), as well as preparing for and administering standardized tests, leaves very little room or time for special projects/interest areas, like archaeology, to enhance and enrich the curriculum.” Her response indicates that she sees archaeology as beneficial in the classroom, but only as an enhancement. Unfortunately, such enhancements are dropped as testing pressures and content requirements increase. She does not consider the potential for archaeology to be used as a method to teach required subjects, but sees it as extraneous content.

Jeff was the most explicit in his critique of the standardized testing movement. He wrote “I think that time constraints are an issue in light of the time need[ed] to address state standards in my instructions. A great deal of time involves rigorous course, district, state testing periods. If its not a focus of state standards in science and assessment, its not a priority/consideration in my content.” I had the opportunity to talk with Jeff later in the week and he was noticeably frustrated with the lack of critical thinking skills in the classroom—he was dismayed at the recently released Texas Republican Party Platform which opposed critical thinking. Jeff’s answers to previous questions indicated that he had a personal interest in archaeology and that he could see many ways in which he could relate archaeology to his science curriculum. Jeff’s personal views were in conflict with the educational practices he used in order to give his students the best chance at passing
their state tests. He also provides an example, as other researchers (Au 2009; Vogler 2005) have seen, of teachers who change their instructional practices in order to improve test scores and meet content requirements. It was clear that Jeff did not feel teaching to the test was a good classroom technique, yet he did so because he felt trapped by testing requirements.

Hands-On Learning and Lesson Planning

The final area I was interested in assessing was teacher willingness to spend time designing lessons that focused on archaeology, or, their receptiveness to using lesson plans provided by the project. I also asked about hands-on learning in their classrooms. Michelle was excluded from this portion of analysis, since she is not involved in lesson planning and does not have classroom interaction with students.

Both Karen and Jeff work in high schools, but Karen was more inclined to see hands-on learning as beneficial to students. Jeff “disagreed” that hands-on learning was an effective teaching approach for his grade and subject, and it was not one he used in his classroom. This is somewhat anomalous given his assertion that archaeologists and scientists use the scientific method. Lab experimentation is one way which the scientific method can be utilized by students to collect and analyze data to answer questions. It is unclear if Jeff does not believe these are valuable teaching techniques, or, he feels that his time is better spent teaching test material rather than having students learn by doing.

Elementary school teachers Linda and Debbie “agreed” and “strongly agreed,” respectively, that a hands-on approach was beneficial to their students. Linda responded that she uses hands on lessons with her students, whereas Debbie selected “uncertain,” which may be understood as a neutral answer choice. Debbie’s previous response that she
has little room in her curriculum for special projects due to content and testing requirements, may explain why, although she feels it is beneficial, she has not been able to implement such practices.

The teachers noted that they spend an average of 5 hours per week on lesson plans, and they were each “uncertain” whether or not they would be willing to spend time researching archaeology and creating lesson plans about it. This is fairly consistent with their responses that they do not have much time to devote to extra topics, and were unsure how to make archaeology work in their curriculum. When asked if they would be likely to use ready-made lesson plans in their classrooms three either “agreed” or “strongly agreed” while one “disagreed.” Jeff’s disagreement may come from his concern that it would take too much time away from tested subjects and reflect a view that, although he is interested in archaeology, he has trouble imagining its use in delivering science content.

Piloting a Classroom Activity: Site Interpretation

The 2012 educators also participated in an interpretive activity focused on looking for spatial patterns in artifact assemblages and drawing conclusions from this information. They were given units to analyze and catalog based on an abbreviated version of the Fort St. Joseph artifact lexicon. Each teacher looked at one unit, and then as a group, brought their individual units together to interpret the site as a whole. The activity was done from the perspective of a preview of how a similar assignment might fare in a classroom setting. The teachers had a generally positive reaction, feeling that it
was targeted in a way that their middle school students would be able to understand, and thought that it would be engaging for students because of its hands-on nature. What the teachers liked best, and thought that archaeology had to contribute, was its ability to stretch beyond the boundaries of the discipline. The skills being taught were not simply how to do archaeology, but how to encourage students to think for themselves. They also liked the interdisciplinary nature of archaeology, which could be used to teach the scientific method, or a variety of math skills used for data analysis. Alternatively, students could be asked to write about their interpretations, thus enhancing their reasoning skills, their ability to articulate an argument, and their general writing ability. Finally, the teachers noted that activities like this would have students working in small cooperative groups towards a viable end goal.

Post-Course Assessment: 2006-2012

Part of my project was to gauge the effectiveness of the Fort St. Joseph archaeology summer camp for educators. In particular, I was interested to find out if participants felt their goals were met through the program, if their knowledge of archaeology had increased, and if they had found ways to incorporate archaeology into their classrooms. Of the educators who attended the camp program between 2006-2012, 31 met the qualifications to participate in my study (others were excluded if they had not taken the camp for credit, were not educators, or were lacking contact information). Each person who attended between 2006 and 2011 was mailed a survey, consent document, and a stamped envelope to facilitate returns. Members of the 2012 camp received a
digital version covered by their original consent form. I received a total of six responses (one from 2012 and five from previous years). Though the sample size was smaller than I had hoped; it still represents a 19% return rate. One additional response was received, but lacked a consent document, and was excluded.

Program and Personal Goals

In order to evaluate the program, consideration of its goals is necessary. In regards to the FSJ archaeology camp for educators it is important to consider both the goals of the program itself and the goals of the participants in order to assess its effectiveness. The current camp program has its roots in the 2004 program initially designed by WMU graduate student Kelly Hagenmaier, though it has since deviated from her initial conception. The session for educators was an expansion to the camp program beginning in 2006.

Hagenmaier’s original program design was not designed for educators although, her provide the basis for the overall program. Her overarching goal was to give the public the opportunity to participate in, and learn about, archaeology. She broadened the design of the 2002 experimental camp program to also include lab and interpretive activities because “merely teaching excavation techniques is not enough; participants must know why archaeology is done (or not done in the case of preservation), as well as how archaeologists draw conclusions from their findings” (Hagenmaier 2005:39). In addition to field excavations, participants were engaged in several analytical activities including seriation, typology, “Other People’s Garbage,” a faunal workshop, lab work (artifact washing), and vessel reconstruction (Hagenmaier 2005). The goals of the camp remain much the same today. Each participant should come away from the program with a solid
understanding of the history of the Fort and its occupants, be able excavate a unit and identify the artifacts they recover, and have enough information and resources to bring archaeology into their own lessons. What is lacking from the goals of the FSJ camp is the understanding of why archaeology is done and how archaeologists interpret the artifacts that they recover in order to understand what happened in the past.

In the follow-up survey, I asked participants about their reasons for attending the program. Like the 2012 group of educators, this group cited both an interest in archaeology, as well as the availability of CEUs, as their reason for attending the program. One responded with “interest in archaeology” and handwrote “and local history” in addition to her selection. The first survey question dealt with the personal or professional goals of the teachers, who were asked to describe two goals they had before they began the program, and judge whether or not those goals had been met. Unanimously, the first answer choice was to “learn more about history” which was specified as “local history” or “this period” by five of the six respondents. The second most popular answer was to learn about archaeology, or the processes of archaeology, and one teacher hoped to be able to “give context to primary sources.” Three of the teachers said that both of their goals were accomplished, while the other three did not respond to that portion of the question. Richard’s answer about primary sources was intriguing – perhaps he simply meant he wanted to learn about the background of the Fort to use in his lessons. He may have considered archaeological evidence as primary sources, but it is also possible he did not make this connection. Richard also noted that he wanted to “connect students to local area history,” not just to have enough information to teach them about it. The vague answers to this question were likely the result of it being
distributed several years after their participation in the program. From these responses it seems that the goals of the teachers are in concert with the goals of the program in regards to learning about the history of FSJ and how to excavate an archaeological site. I was unable to directly assess whether the program is consistently meeting the goals of the participants as the response rate to this question was unsatisfactorily low.

None of the respondents specifically mentioned that they hoped to understand the processes archaeologists use to interpret the past; however, this should still be an overall goal of the program. After the initial camp program in 2004, Hagenmaier asked for feedback and the survey responses that she received were favorable. The adults particularly enjoyed the hands-on interpretive portions of the course. Despite the positive responses these activities garnered they have since been removed from the syllabus which is left up to the public education coordinator. Lab work still includes washing of artifacts, but interpretive elements were dropped. The bone lab is held by Dr. Terry Martin during the educator’s week (but is not held for lifelong learners or middle school students). It is my contention that interpretation should be included as part of the camp syllabus for all groups. This activity transforms archaeology from merely process, that is digging and screening, to a context where data is analyzed and knowledge is created. Without interpretation, archaeology is nothing. In the brief time I worked with the camps I attempted to (re)introduce analytical activities to their experience. However, I was in the dual roles of public outreach coordinator for the project and participant-observer, responsible for just one morning’s schedule. I recommend that the project seriously consider keeping interpretation in the syllabus in the future.
Program Performance: Strengths and Weaknesses

In order to understand the strengths and weaknesses of the camp program in more depth I asked participants to judge two things they felt the program did well, and two areas where it could use improvement. Two answers dominated the pro-column: experience in the field and historical background, both mentioned by four individuals as areas where the program excelled. This is in concert with the two primary goals that the teachers had before participating in the program. It is nice to know that the camp adequately meets educator’s expectations for their experience. I say this with the recognition that archaeology can be more than simply history and field techniques. The conclusion that the project has met its own, and the goals of teachers, does not preclude the possibility that it can reach loftier goals, even if those have yet to be expressed. The final two areas which received accolades were learning about faunal analysis through the bone lab. Beth, a retired teacher with 40 years of experience in third grade math and science, appreciated the precise measuring and recording to reinforce the scientific process, which she felt can get overlooked in elementary school curriculums.

It is worth noting that one teacher, Karen from 2012, did not rank the field experience as a positive for the program. She elaborated two reasons for this response. First, she felt as though the “alternative site,” the Lyne site, where campers were excavating, was less important and less interesting than the Fort site. Karen’s second reason was her pairing with university field school students. She felt they were not as helpful in teaching her what to do as she would have liked and they complained that they did not really want to be participating in the excavations at all.
I had the opportunity to do follow up work with Karen and asked her more about her experiences in the field. In regards to her first issue, there was a problem getting a permit renewal to excavate at the fort site (it is on a flood plain which requires permission for excavation) which led to changes in the season’s research design and less time spent excavating at the Fort site. Typically students spend a week to a week and half at the Lyne site focusing on an earlier Native-American occupation and excavations are completed there before the camp weeks begin. The site has very clear stratigraphy between the plow zone and sub-soil and a low artifact density; it is commonly (and unfortunately) characterized as a “practice” site. Most years, campers work with the students as well as in their own units; however, in 2012, camper units remained at the Lyne site, but, they did rotate to the fort site to work with the university students as well. Because the curriculum is focused somewhat narrowly on Fort St. Joseph, and the Lyne site tends to be seen as a “practice” site, Karen was disappointed that she did not get to spend as much time at the fort site.

The Lyne site does have archaeological and historical significance in its own right, not as simply a lesser component of the fort site. This is an unfortunate characterization, but likely results from the fact that it receives less attention than Fort St. Joseph in orientation activities, excavation time, and analysis. During orientation the emphasis is placed on Fort St. Joseph and the Lyne site is only mentioned briefly—as a site which will be excavated—but its history tends to be glossed over. No significant analysis of artifacts or interpretation has been undertaken, results have not been published on, and it is not showcased to the public during the open house.
I asked Karen if she might have enjoyed her time at the Lyne site more had the background of the Natives in the area been emphasized. She agreed with this, as she felt the “lectures were enough to get us excited then it was sort of a let-down to be at an alternative site.” She also noted that the fort was more exciting because the artifact density is greater than at the Lyne site. This conversation was an illuminating look into the way the fort and the Lyne site are presented to both campers and field school students. This is an unbalanced and unfair portrayal of the two sites, and maintains an artificial superiority of the colonial Fort (and white Europeans) over the Native American Lyne site. Though this does not specifically relate to program performance it raises a red flag. The staff at Fort St. Joseph are committed to decolonizing the theory and practice of archaeology (Nassaney 2012a), but this incident makes it apparent that there is still work to do. These colonialist perspectives (Trigger 1984) are so ingrained in archaeology, that they went unnoticed even by those who actively work to counter them. This unintentional portrayal of the Lyne site as less important should be addressed in the future to rectify this problem.

Karen’s other concern was that the students she was paired with detracted from her overall experience. This is another issue which should be brought to the attention of both the Public Education Director and field school staff. Had Karen voiced these issues sooner, staff could have spoken with the students about their responsibilities and attitude. Many field school students write in their journals about how much they enjoy working with the campers, and also, sometimes, their frustrations. It is unfortunate that this particular student was not well suited to work with campers and that the issue was not dealt with right away. Karen also noted that the students did not provide her with a lot of
instruction on what to do when she worked with them, “they aren’t educators, they’re kids.” This observation runs counter to the goals of FSJ as a community service learning project, in that the roles between teacher and student are blurred. Many students do feel that this goal is accomplished, as noted in their reflection journals. In this particular instance, those goals were not met. Donna, had the opposite experience, and “appreciated the opportunity to work side-by-side with individuals at the site.” The negative experience Karen had with one field school student is only one incident. This should not be taken to mean that the community service learning project is not doing what it is intended, or that university students should not be allowed to work with campers in the future. It is, however, a call for attention. Future staff should, as Karen suggests, make clear to the university students what the expectations of them are while working with campers, and they should pay closer attention to any problems with those arrangements.

The teachers largely refrained from negatives critiques of the program, but instead listed some areas where improvements could be made, as well as some suggestions for future programming. In general, the critiques fell into two general categories: more resources and more time spent digging/researching. Susan, an eighth grade language arts teacher, wished the project had provided more historical resources to read ahead of time and more orientation to procedures for working with objects. Richard, who teaches high school civics, would have liked more time at the museum to do archival research and look at additional objects. Emily, a newly credentialed high school social studies teacher, suggested spending more time digging to find materials. The responses to this question indicated that the teachers saw the archaeologists as the source of knowledge, and, like Emily’s response demonstrated, placed the focus of archaeology on the objects found.
Beth, by far the teacher with most experience, used her response to suggest possibilities for archaeologists and educators to work together in ways which I have suggested previously. She suggested a brainstorming session between the educators and the archaeologists in order to think about how “their learned information could be used in the classroom.” This is an idea I had for the 2012 educators week, but was never executed due to the camp’s scheduling during the same week as Media Day (publicity event the Thursday before the open house to promote it) and the open house. Beth also suggested a website, which could serve as a database of some of the ideas the brainstorming sessions put forth. Then, other teachers could use the resources provided as suited to their own needs. In doing this, Beth acknowledged that as trained and experienced educators, teachers possess specialized knowledge in lesson planning and on child development and learning. This often tends to get overlooked by archaeologists who approach outreach to teachers by giving them resources and lesson plans. This can be seen as the result of the consistent undervaluation of teachers in the United States and erodes their position as qualified professionals (Jeppson 2010, 2012; Jeppson and Brauer 2007). Archaeologists exacerbate this problem by putting themselves in a position of privilege over teachers and telling them what to teach. Archaeologists may also act as formal and informal educators, but, they do not have the specialized training that teachers do. Likewise, any teacher could pull archaeological sources off the internet and attempt to teach the subject, but it would be better if a trained archaeologist was also involved. By collaborating with teachers both educators and archaeologists come to the table as equals and each contribute their own knowledge and specialization. Suggestions like Beth’s, if
implemented, would begin to build a community of archaeologists and educators, with the potential to create a truly meaningful and educational experience for students.

In sum, the first portion of my survey was intended to receive feedback about the FSJ camp program for educators in order to facilitate evaluation. There were four major conclusions of this work. First, it showed that the goals of teachers are often in alignment with the goals of the program and that teachers felt the program was an overall positive experience. Second, a more in-depth look at these goals reveals that although the program is well received there is still room for improvement. Perhaps the least successful aspect of the camp is in interpretation. It is important that participants in these programs recognize that digging is only a portion of what archaeologists actually do. It is the analysis and interpretation that make archaeology a useful tool in studying the past. Revised activities in the camp syllabus can easily incorporate hands-on learning experience so that the participants experience this facet of archaeological work. Third, the project should revise its orientation and classroom materials to include the Lyne site to increase its visibility and importance. Finally, the project has reached many educators through its camp program, but it has not established a network for continued contact or collaborative projects.

Understanding the Classroom Environment as a Path to Collaboration

As discussed above, collaborative projects between archaeologists and educators must stem from a classroom or curricular need and it is important to understand the environment that the teachers work in. The second portion of my follow-up survey was designed to help me better understand this environment and the teacher’s educational philosophies. Not all educators subscribe to the same philosophies of education or utilize
the same teaching practices in their classroom. These individual decisions are made based on personal strengths, and training and knowledge of current “best practices” in education. I hoped to better understand the classroom environments of the teachers I worked with, and their general educational philosophies. Although critics of educational politics have asserted that the increased reliance on standardized testing has had detrimental effects on instructional practices (Au 2007), none of the teachers I talked to said that they preferred teacher-centered methods such as lecture, memorization, or multiple choice assessment. This does not mean that these methods are never used in these classrooms; however, all of the teachers cited student-centered learning as part of their educational philosophy. The civics teacher, Richard, specifically mentioned that he does not use lecture style teaching methods, because, he prefers student learning to be inquiry-based.

The teaching methods and philosophies practiced by this group of educators was likely to be individualized/differentiated, question/inquiry based, and with a focus on developing critical thinking skills. There was a clear connection between what teachers felt were the goals of good education (having students who are able to think critically about any topic or issue, and relate to the course materials), and the methods they found best for achieving those goals. The teachers saw students as active participants in their own education.

Standardized tests tend to lead to standardized learning, with the assumption that all students learn in the same ways (Price 2003; Au 2009). This by-product of factory-model education is at odds with the experiences of real educators in their own classrooms. Donna, who teaches elementary school, recognized the “all children are
capable of learning,” but, “students need to be engaged as fully as possible in the learning process,” and “that learning will look different with each individual.” She focuses on using differentiated instruction to accommodate different types of learners and cooperative learning to allow students with different strengths to learn from each other. Beth, who also taught at the elementary school level, also concurred that “everyone learns differently.” She saw her responsibility to her students as “find[ing] the best way to do individual instruction.”

Richard and Susan worked with older students in the eight through twelfth grades. Their responses focused more on critical thinking. Susan noted that her teaching methods varied, but did not elaborate on what that meant, although as a language arts teachers she preferred reading and writing assignments to give students space to explore their ideas. Inquiry and question based learning was important to teachers at both elementary and junior/high school levels. Richard’s lessons focused on questioning—he felt that students would best be able to think critically if they knew what questions to ask and where to look for answers. Additionally, Beth emphasized the importance of student questions, and her belief that, “learning occurs when someone asks a question, whether its in the curriculum or not.” If she did not know how to answer a question, she would ask the student for help in finding the answer. This process demonstrates that children can be empowered through learning, and that the teacher is not the source of all information which is then transmitted to the students. This is much the same process that archaeologists use to learn about the past. They constantly ask questions and then actively seek answers by analyzing the data they have collected. This enables them to draw conclusions. The teachers I worked with recognize that questioning is a powerful tool for
students to learn. Though it is not exclusive to archaeology, archaeology can work well in the classroom because of it.

Not one of the teachers I worked with cited a particular topic or curricular content as most important to education. These teachers all saw the purpose of education as well beyond simply the information that students learned. Their responses focused on the processes of learning, such as inquiry, and goals, such as critical thinking, which have relevance in the world beyond formal schooling. In general, the teachers agreed that the FSJ camp program was able to communicate the benefits of using archaeology in their classrooms, and that it gave them knowledge to help with its implementation.

Using Archaeology in the Classroom

The survey did not specifically ask teachers to consider why or how they thought archaeology was beneficial to students learning, but did ask about whether and how they were able to incorporate it. I was interested to see what kind of information teachers took from their experiences, and how they were able to translate that into lesson plans. Emily was a newly certified teacher and did not have classroom experience, but, she would recommend the program to students and try to work it into her curricular design. Though several of the educators noted that archaeology does not fit into their curriculum, and that test-driven educational requirements make fitting in additional topics difficult, nearly all of the respondents were able to find ways to bring archaeological topics and methods into their classrooms. The participants in the 2012 program, though demographically similar to earlier participants, were far more likely to cite time constraints, state requirements, and testing as impediments to using archaeology in the classroom.
After attending the FSJ camp program the other teachers were all able to use archaeology in their classrooms in various ways. Some of the teachers incorporated archaeology in a fairly direct manner, teaching about stratigraphy or the various religious artifacts found at Fort St. Joseph. Most, however, used archaeological themes and methods in lessons with other primary goals. The teacher’s uses typically fell into three categories: to teach topics derived from archaeology, using artifacts as examples and to help students relate to history, and as examples when teaching other subjects. In language arts, Susan asked students to write about artifacts and how those symbolized their lives. Donna and Richard used artifacts and knowledge of Fort St. Joseph as examples in history lessons, and (as Donna teaches in a Catholic school) to talk about symbols and artifacts of faith. Donna also discusses stratigraphy, or “the idea that older items are buried lower in the ground and newer pieces will be closer to the earth’s surface,” which is content knowledge covered in her fourth and fifth grade curriculum. Beth used archaeology examples in her math class, and also modeled some of the analysis that archaeologists perform.

Others were able to use artifacts in the classroom, much like archaeologists do, to have students think about who might have used them, and what they might have been used for. For example, Beth’s archaeology activity with her third grade students focused on ceramic vessel analysis. She used broken dishes and cups and had students try to reassemble the pieces, much like archaeologists might do. Beth kept all of the broken pieces, and thus, missed the opportunity to discuss why archaeologists do not always find complete vessels. The students were then asked to draw conclusions about the pieces they put together such as “who had the piece?” and “how was it used?” as well as any other
ideas they had about the people who used the vessel. Beth noted that this could easily be turned into a writing assignment.

One third grade math teacher even snuck an archaeological example into her word problems, asking students “if it takes two deer to feed 25 soldiers at the fort for three days, how many deer would they need for a week, a month, or a year.” Then, she asked students to consider change over time, “would there always be 25 soldiers at the fort?” Assignments such as these do not attempt to teach students archaeology as a field of study, nor should that be the primary goal of educator outreach programs. Instead, they ask students to engage with artifacts and archaeological materials and require them to come up with their own responses, not a pre-determined and objective correct answer.

Teachers were asked to detail any impediments they encountered in their attempts to use archaeology in their classrooms. Only two of the teachers chose to answer this question. Richard noted that his civics curriculum does not include French colonialism, so he was not able to use any specific information he learned about the fort. He was able to include archaeology in other ways, primarily as a real world example of how history is done, and how archaeologists rely on artifacts as a source of information about the past. Beth noted that the curricular content she has to cover does not always leave time for the inclusion of hands-on activities and projects (like her ceramic reconstruction). She expressed some frustration that “more and more the curriculum and test scores drive education (ridiculous).” Obviously, Beth felt that there are more important things to teach students than content knowledge and how to memorize facts, and that students learned better through hands-on activities, without the pressures of standardized testing. She had a solution for getting around these issues which she felt detracted from true learning: she
simply “closed [her] door a lot.” Likewise, Donna saw that the teachers she works with are concerned about fulfilling the CCSS and Michigan GLCEs, but the administrators give the teachers a lot of freedom in lesson design and how they choose to address each topic.

Discussion: How Teachers Use Archaeology

The teachers I worked with found many uses for archaeology in their classrooms. None actually taught archaeology as a field of study (though Beth’s ceramic analysis came close) and most taught “through” archaeology (Bartoy 2012), using artifacts to help students make connections between the past and the present and between artifacts and their own lives. Most of the activities did emphasize artifacts or material remains.

Beth’s use of archaeology in math questions demonstrated to students that there are multiple ways to learn about the past. History, especially in schools, is taught using a textbook and perhaps less commonly with the additional of archival or documentary sources (VanSledright 2011). This biases both what topics students learn, and what they understand to be valid sources about the past. Students learning history from a documentary perspective tend to learn about the western world, particularly from the time of colonial exploration. Prehistory is mostly excluded from curricular content due to the written materials. Document based history places primacy on written sources. This excludes many other ways of learning about the past. Students need to be exposed to other sources of information so that they consider them as valid when they look for answer their own questions. The teachers’ uses of artifacts begin to break down the idea
that written sources are the only way to learn about the past. Though the teachers did not explicitly teach archaeology, they introduced students to the concept of materials as informational sources. This broadens students’ conceptions of how history is learned.

What I particularly liked about Beth’s ceramic lesson, and the writing lessons centered on artifacts, was that the ultimate goal of these assignments was to understand people. The students analyzed artifacts and used them to make inferences about the people who used them. Teachers could easily fall into a trap of discussing objects simply as things, but this is not how archaeologists view them. Archaeologists see artifacts primarily as a source of information about the people who made, used, and discarded them. When students are asked to write about what artifacts best represent themselves, they begin to consider ways in which the material goods they have tell a story about their lives. They begin to see artifacts as a source of information about people. They also make connections with the past through artifacts, especially in lessons such as the one Donna used in her classroom. The students of Catholic faith learned about French Jesuits who shared many of their beliefs. The artifacts, like crosses and rings, were similar to objects they may own and value as symbols of their faith. Beth’s ceramic lesson also asked students to consider people. Though they were looking at a ceramic vessel they were not asked to provide a description of the artifact, instead, they were asked to think about who might have used the piece and for what purpose. The focus is placed on the people as the object of study, and the artifact is seen as a source of information.

Although Karen does not teach in a traditional classroom setting, and expressed the concern that she is not sure she will have the opportunity to use archaeology, she does have several ideas for how she might in the future. Karen works with technology; when
students spend classroom time with her in the library, her lessons focus on using technology as a method of learning. Some of the teachers she works with have specific content goals in mind, meaning she cannot deviate too far from their curriculum. Sometimes, however, she can offer a day or two to students on topics of her choosing.

The focus of Karen’s curriculum is on teaching students to use the internet and web based applications to enhance their skills and learning. In particular, she teaches students how to use databases, how to perform internet searches, how to evaluate web sites, and how to develop research and literacy skills. These broad competencies can be applied to any topic, including archaeology, but she notes that mandated content takes precedence over additional topics. In particular, Karen saw the internet as a tool for students to connect with archaeologists and the processes of archaeology. If she found a willing teacher to collaborate with, she might have students learn to skype by contacting archaeology students, or participate in a virtual field trip to learn more about the archaeological process. Karen’s ideas present archaeology as a topic (and a career option) centered on learning web-based skills.

As discussed above one of the goals of the FSJ archaeology camp for educators is to provide enough information and resources for the teachers to design and implement archaeology in their classroom. Despite some of the impediments they face, alumni of the camp have been able to use what they have learned in their classrooms. This is certainly an accomplishment of the program, but it can go further. What the project has achieved is the creation of a network of teachers who are interested in archaeology, know a little about it, and are willing to experiment with it in their classrooms. The next step the project can take is to create a forum for continued contact within this network to
encourage the sharing of ideas and facilitate discussion and collaboration between archaeologists and educators.
CHAPTER VI

UNDERSTANDING EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

In the previous chapter, I have discussed how the larger context of education often limits the ability of teachers to include archaeology in their curriculum. In order for archaeologists to truly collaborate with educators we must be aware of this context. In this chapter I detail some of debates concerning education, particularly social studies, in American schools. I also discuss the rise of business models in education and their consequences for both teachers and students.

Education plays a primary role in the enculturation of youth. It instills in them the values and behaviors acceptable in order for them to engage correctly in society (Price 2003:723). Education is also a highly contested political issue with politicians from all points of the spectrum arguing for its importance and reform. An enormous overhaul in public education standards in the form of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) occurred in 2001. This legislation sought to address concerns about the supposed lagging standards and performance of students in America’s public schools, particularly vis-à-vis other developed nations. Critiques of NCLB and current education practices have led to reconsiderations of curricula and methods; ideas such as differentiated instruction and backward planning have been promoted as ways to improve student learning outcomes (Hursh 2007; Jeppson 2010; Kim and Sunderman 2005; McTighe and Brown 2005).

Anthropologists have been slow to confront the issue of standardized testing and standardized knowledge in schools and archaeologists have tended to remain silent regarding the debate on social studies education (Price 2003; Jeppson 2012). Despite the
recent trend towards social activism in anthropology (see also Stottman 2010) which has led to challenges of systems of inequality, anthropologists largely remained silent as Americans debated and passed NCLB including its provisions for high-stakes standardized testing.

It is time that anthropologists take up these issues. Archaeologists, with their long history of public outreach to school educators also need to reconsider their approach. They need to understand the issues that classroom teachers are facing in order to truly be able to consider ways in which archaeology might be used to address some of these problems. In this chapter I will provide a brief overview of some of the issues surrounding the political debate over education. I will then examine how these conditions have led to changes in both the purpose and process of school through the development of factory models of education. Finally, I will explicate some of the problems associated with the rise of standardized testing and high-stakes accountability. It is my goal to demonstrate that these issues need to be understood by archaeologists, especially those who would like to work with educators.

The Politics Of Education and the Culture Wars

A crucial issue in education today is how to address the diverse learning needs of children while still meeting mandated content standards (McTighe and Brown 2005). Teachers face a balancing act as they juggle the needs and strengths of their students with the demands placed upon them through legislation such as 2001 NCLB Act, passed by a large majority in both houses of Congress and signed into law by President George W.
Bush. People of all political persuasions have expressed concerns about education and the curriculum taught in America’s public school system, but disagree on what the goals and content should be (Jeppson 2012).

The very question of what children are taught in schools is an important consideration which educators at the local, state, and national levels must address when making decisions about educational standards. The curriculum is a subject of political debate. While it is often presented as an unquestioned body of knowledge, it is actually socially dependent, political, and contested. Students are presented with information transmitted through their teachers and their textbooks. This delivery makes the information seen as immutable facts rather than interpretations. It is also incomplete; what goes into, and what is excluded from, a textbook has been debated (Swartz 2009; Jeppson 2012). The textbook narrative of history presents the views of the dominant society which are then seen to be natural, and thus, reproduced (Swartz 2009).

History education has always been a source of contention between progressive and conservative factions. I will briefly expand on the current political debate surrounding the subjects of social studies/history as they are most relevant to incorporating anthropology and archaeology. At the core is a debate over whether students should be taught a more traditionalist history versus a broader social studies curriculum. Jeppson (2010:71) argues that the issue is not simply history versus social studies, but whether students will be taught a narrow or broad view. History is sometimes conceived (particularly at the K-12 level) as a more narrow teaching of peoples, places, and events in the past. Social studies developed in the early twentieth century as a broader multidisciplinary approach which incorporates anthropology, archaeology,
economics, geography, history, law, philosophy, political science, psychology, religion, and sociology (Jeppson 2010:72-73; National Council for Social Studies: http://www.socialstudies.org/about). Social studies education is comprised of ten educational themes: culture; people, places, and environments; individuals, groups, and institutions; production, distribution, and consumption; global connections; time, continuity, and change; individual development and identity; power, authority, and governance; science, technology, and society; and civic ideals and practices (National Council for Social Studies:, http://www.socialstudies.org/about). There has been a tacking back and forth throughout the twentieth century between a traditional history of important names and dates and a broader focus on issues like multiculturalism (Jeppson 2012; Nash et al. 1997).

The culture wars of the 1990s saw an intense debate on the social studies curriculum. The term ‘culture wars’ refers to a division between liberal and conservative values, which come into conflict over specific political issues. During his presidency, George H.W. Bush worked to develop a set of national standards to ensure that all students achieved satisfactory levels of competency in their school subjects. Coupled with this was a national testing movement designed to assess how well students had learned and retained the information. Public support for these measures was high and a committee was formed to create the National Standards for History (Nash et al. 1997). However, as these standards headed for publication a battle ignited over what the standards proposed to include. Conservatives, led by Lynne Cheney, the former chairman of the National Endowments for the Humanities, railed that important American heroes were being left out. They felt that the inclusion of topics such as the Ku Klux Klan and
McCarthyism portrayed American as gloomy and doubted whether students should be encouraged to think critically about issues such as the business practices of John D. Rockefeller (Nash et al. 1997:4).

This debate is ongoing, and includes issues such as whether (and how) cultural diversity should be celebrated, whether Western civilization or world history should be the focus, and whether “traditional” (read: nationalist) history should be emphasized over critical and diverse thematic issues (Jeppson 2010:71). Right-wing conservatives deride social studies curriculum as something which “denigrates the study of American heroes, sees free market economics as Imperialist, and promotes cultural relativism” (Schneider 2004 as quoted in Jeppson 2010:72). In one particularly astonishing and un-veiled example, the 2012 Texas Republican Party platform explicitly stated, “We believe that the teaching of a multicultural curriculum is divisive. We favor strengthening our common American identity and loyalty instead of political correctness that nurtures alienation among racial and ethnic groups” as well as “we oppose the teaching of Higher Order Thinking Skills, critical thinking skills, and similar programs…which focus on behavior modification and have the purpose of challenging student’s fixed beliefs and undermining parental authority.” The push against social studies is real, and has tangible negative consequences for students (Jeppson 2010).

In some respects, the culture wars debates over social studies serves to mask deeper issues concerning the role of schools and standardized content. Arguments over what is taught dominate the public debate and prevent a deeper consideration of the way the schools function to reproduce society (Wurst and Novinger 2011). Instead of encouraging possibilities for free thinking, education serves as an ideology and students
are indoctrinated with nationalistic and patriotic messages which cause them to accept the authority of the state. National testing movements limit the possibilities of education and render students incapable of challenging normative assumptions (Wurst and Novinger 2011:264)

Yet, social studies education can be powerful. Its themes parallel the research of most historical archaeologists who have pursued research topics outside the purview of traditional history. This research works against a nationalist ideology and illuminates the experience of women, children, ethnic and racial minorities, and questions capitalism and inequality. Historical archaeologists have sought to question and break down the “national meta-narrative” as they weave together pieces of history to create a more inclusive, complex understanding fraught with conflict and contradictions, and by doing so have raised questions about the inevitability of the present (Jeppson 2010:74).

The Role of Education in Society

In order to understand the problems in current educational policy and practice it is necessary to consider the role of public education in American society. Schooling serves the function of transmitting core cultural values and beliefs to children and functions as an ideology (Jeppson 2012; Wurst and Novinger 2011). Education in the United States developed as a local community affair where what is taught in the classroom and which methods are used is the express purview of local governments. This has been transmitted to the national stage and has taken the form of intense ideological debates (Jeppson 2012).
Orr and Rogers (2011) suggest that public education serves two main functions. It seeks to educate children and give them the knowledge and skills to participate as democratic citizens, and it seeks to equalize opportunities between those of varying wealth or “ameliorate problems like institutionalized racism and class privilege” (Au 2009:45). However, Orr and Rogers (2011) also argue that the role of school is to prepare students for high paying jobs in the market economy. Suggestions like these are part of the problem because they encourage educational practices which are counterproductive to engaging students in critical thinking. Current trends in educational practices, however, have caused a shifting of these goals, and instead, treat students as products in a quest to reproduce the labor force and maintain unequal relations of power and wealth.

At its best, education should mitigate the effects of differing life circumstances, but this can only happen when students have equal opportunities for education. As Henry A. Giroux (2012:6) notes “…schools have a long history of simply attempting to reproduce the ideological contours of the existing society, they are capable of much more, and therein lies their danger and possibilities.” Giroux is entirely correct, and his point has not gone unnoticed. Right-wing politicians have sought to hamper this ultimate function of schools by passing legislation, such as NCLB, which requires standardized testing as the measure of learning (Jeppson 2012).

The Factory Model of Education

The national standards movement in education is not necessarily a new idea, but it has now been codified into law and this contributes to the rise of the factory model of
education. The idea of using standardized testing for assessing educational achievement grew throughout the twentieth century as the ideas of scientific management (derived from business) were applied to school systems (see Au 2009 for a complete discussion of the rise of scientific management in education). The 1983 publication of *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Education Reform* is seen by many as the impetus for the modern standardized testing movement within schools (Au 2009). This Reagan Administration report bemoaned the lagging standards of US schools on a world-wide scale, made allusions to impending war with the Soviet Union, and accused US schools of satisfaction with mediocrity. The report prompted changes in graduation requirements and state level standardized testing throughout the next two decades (Au 2009).

As a result of the neoliberalism of the 1980’s, market-based practices have become commonplace in American schools (Bartlett et al. 2002). These practices have sparked a debate about school choice and voucher systems—forcing students and parents to become consumers of education. Increased fact drilling, memorization, and standardized testing have become metrics of success for schools (Bartlett et al. 2002). Instead of leading to productive forms of knowledge, this model of education creates citizens unable and ill prepared to think critically and problem solve in schools of the world beyond.

Standardized testing was less problematic when it was used as one of several methods for gauging student achievement (Darling-Hammond 1991). However, with the advent of high-stakes testing and accountability through the standards movement, these tests are frequently the only method of assessment. High-stakes testing affects teachers, students, administrators, communities, schools, and districts since the results may be tied
to grade promotion, teacher salary and tenure, or used to rank schools, teachers, and students (Au 2007; Nichols and Berliner 2008).

Standardized testing became cemented in American schools with the passage of NCLB in 2001. NCLB was implemented with two goals: to raise the standards of American students and to decrease the achievement gap between high performing students and those who struggle in school. The idea that increasing testing demands and knowledge benchmarks will lead to more equal education is misguided and does nothing to address the underlying issues of poverty and institutionalized racism that lead to worse educational outcomes for these students. Test scores are being used to punish individual teachers, students, and schools, and to justify and normalize ongoing social inequality (Price 2003).

Standardized testing allows for the quick and objective ranking and sorting of students based on scores, and thus, was an attractive method for ranking students, teachers, and schools (Au 2009). However, in actuality they serve to reduce students to scores, objectifying them in the process. According to Au (2009:41) this objectification is the key link to understanding the fundamental connection between systems of standardized testing and the application of logics of capitalist production and social efficiency to education. By reducing students to numbers, standardized testing creates the capacity to view students as things, as quantities apart from their human qualities.

The incorporation of high stakes testing in education comes in concert with the increasing importance of business models in daily life and the drive towards privatization of schools (Nichols and Berliner 2008). This is problematic; students are not products who can be tested for knowledge in the same way a company tests is merchandise for quality (Nichols and Berliner 2008). Furthermore, the ability to memorize and regurgitate
facts will not help students to develop into engaged citizens, but instead, produces adults who do not seek to challenge authority and accept the status quo ideology. While standardized test scores may be an accurate judge of how well a student can memorize and regurgitate information in a high pressure situation, they are not an accurate indicator of cognitive thinking skills or the ability to use knowledge to solve real-world problems (Darling-Hammond 1991). Standardized tests lend themselves to standardized knowledge and penalize students for creative and critical thinking as well as limit the scope of possibility in general thinking skills (Price 2003).

As Barlett et al. (2002) argue there has been another, more subtle and insidious change in concert with the marketization of schools—a change in the very purpose of education. The development of character, knowledge for engaged citizenry, and the ideals of social mobility and justice has long been values of importance to Americans when they consider the role of schools (Barlett et al. 2002: 6). Indeed, formal schooling is one way in which cultural values are transmitted to and learned by children (Jeppson 2010). With the rise of market principles in education its purpose is fundamentally changed. Instead of believing in social mobility and justice (and learning the skills needed to recognize and challenge injustice) students are taught how to be workers, to value profit, and to take arbitrary measures of value as fact. Students are not taught to challenge injustice and prejudice; existing inequalities are naturalized and preserved.

The test scores of American students have declined over the past two decades and calls for increased testing, to increase school accountability, have exacerbated the problem. One sector does stand to profit: the lucrative test manufacturing, test preparation, and test processing industries which reap millions of dollars per year (Au
2009; Price 2003). In the United States, as opposed to many other nations, testing is controlled by private publishers looking to make profit by ranking students “cheaply and efficiently” (Darling-Hammond 1991: 220). This system, again, is not designed to benefit students, but to benefit big business in generating profits and ensuring a future workforce unlikely to challenge issues of social inequality.

The Effects of Standardized Testing on Educational Practices

Though education has long been conceived as a means of educating the whole person, that idea has fallen by the wayside with the advent of factory models of education where knowledge is “created by experts, disseminated by teachers, and students are tested to see how well they absorbed and retained it” (Bruer 1999:649). Students become commodities in the capitalist production of education (Au 2009; Barlett et al. 2002; Bruer 1999). The use of standardized tests as the sole measure of academic achievement has caused schools to be run like factories and the educational practices which have developed as a result discourage critical thinking and exacerbate existing problems. Teaching practices that have evolved to meet educational targets set forth in NCLB are “at odds with what educational research confirms are requirements for promoting genuine student engagement, understanding, and longitudinal achievement progress” (McTighe and Brown 2005:235). These practices include teaching overly broad curricular content while neglecting the depth of each topic, the narrowing of curricular content to include only tested material, one size fits all teaching activities geared towards testing (test prep worksheets instead of hands-on experiences), all at the detriment of actual learning (McTighe and Brown 2005; Sloan 2007). Teachers have no choice but to comply with state and federal laws, but that is not to say that teachers should sacrifice students’
learning to meet testing standards: rather, they must utilize new methods to do both (McTighe and Brown 2005).

Of particular note, and detriment, is in history classrooms where instruction is often reduced towards testing “proficiencies”—a focus on names, dates, and events (Sloan 2007:29). This is contrary to the actual practice of history which students do not get to engage in. There is little time to prepare students to analyze data, consider cause and effect, understand multiple viewpoints, or construct a well-reasoned argument when the test contains only multiple choice questions. Students will benefit from exposure to multiple viewpoints during the course of their education. Working in intercultural environments encourages students to work out differences and to understand multiple perspectives, “respectfully arguing within a framework of difference is good preparation for dealing with the complexities of the future” (Suárez-Orozco 2005:211).

Through Au’s synthesis of high stakes testing research, he found that 80% of the studies he examined demonstrated some form of curricular change associated with the implementation of high stakes testing. Overwhelmingly, this change was manifested in a narrowing of curricular content, with subjects not tested being cut or excluded from the curriculum (Au 2007: 262; Townsend 2002). The study also showed the increasing fragmentation of material provided to students. Rather than learning integrated topics, information was presented in small bits related to test questions. Au concluded that there was an increase in lectures and teachers providing “direct transmission of test related facts” (Au 2007:262). It is significant to note that while most of the studies Au examined showed a decrease in curricular content, the fragmenting of information, and an increase in lectures, a small number of studies demonstrated the opposite: an expansion of
curricular content, more integrated lessons, and student-centered learning (Au 2007). Au suggests that it is the structure of the tests themselves that help explain his conclusions. Teachers in states who felt that standardized tests were well designed and did not promote memorization of facts were more likely to feel that their teaching was not negatively impacted by high stakes testing.

The Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) standards set forth in NCLB use only one system of measurement and require all schools to meet the same performance level (Kim and Sunderman 2005). While this sounds like a worthy goal, education research has demonstrated a distinct disadvantage for low-income students, particularly those of African-Americans and Hispanic descent. Narrow curricular focus along with one size fits all testing requirements fails to take into account issues of diversity in both race, wealth, and ethnicity as well as learning style. Minority students are alienated by this approach, which has lasting negative effects on their education (Gregory 2012).

Increased standardized testing translates towards standardization in education, where students are presented with facts to be memorized. It is the poorer neighborhoods that are more likely to implement this approach to learning so that students can pass the tests (Chamberlain 2004). In wealthier neighborhoods “parents wouldn’t put up with that mess for one moment” (Hillard as quoted in Chamberlain 2004: 99). Townsend (2002:225) also notes that remedial practices in failing school districts are more likely to include drilling of facts as opposed to the more hands-on, experiential, and critical thinking oriented lessons that their advantaged peers receive (see also Swartz 2009: 1062). This reifies the division between wealthy and poor in two ways. It naturalizes the idea that poor undereducated parents are not invested in their children’s education. In
actuality, they are products of the same system and have not been given access to the tools to challenge this it. Wealthier, more educated parents challenge standardized education because they have the knowledge and ability (and maybe even the time) to do so. Consequently, the system of inequality is reproduced with children of wealthy parents enjoying educational and economic success while children of poor parents are unable to get ahead. The children of poorer parents are not given the opportunity to succeed on these tests and will be unable to compete with wealthier children, an outcome that preserves the rigid social structure (Nichols and Berliner 2008; Swartz 2009).

School funding, tied to test scores, is highly problematic and high-stakes testing overlooks how to adequately deal with students who are unable to meet mandated standards. NCLB threatens sanctions for underperforming schools which stand to lose federal funding, or be shut down if they do not have high enough test scores (Au 2009). Students who are likely to receive low test scores already tend to be in underperforming school districts. Loss of funding, in effect, “penalizes them twice” (Darling-Hammond 1991:223). When a school’s rating is changed to “unacceptable” the students, teachers, and district are stigmatized. Sloan (2007) has observed that in an effort to raise test scores and improve their reputation, teachers more inclined to teach towards the test and narrowed the curriculum further. In some (albeit extreme) examples low-performing or learning disabled students may receive recommendations to drop out of school and test for a GED. This is based on the fear of the school loosing funding or the teacher being penalized for the failure to meet AYP requirements (Chamberlain 2004). When test scores become the prime qualifier of good education actual learning falls by the wayside.
Teachers, afraid of not meeting testing requirements or of merit-based pay, may be unwilling or unable to do anything to fix the system. Instead of investing in teachers and treating them as both professionals and “engaged intellectuals” they are criticized as “welfare queens,” deskilled, and forced to present standardized curricular content in unchallenging ways (Giroux 2012:2-3). The problems in education are compounded because of an ever smaller pool of qualified candidates who choose to become teachers (Chamberlain 2004). Apple (quoted in Sloan 2007: 26) argues that high stakes accountability testing de-skills teachers and turns them into mere technicians because they are “expected to deliver, and are only rewarded for delivering, instruction that targets a narrow range of facts and skills that can be assessed through standardized tests.” Teachers may be given scripted lessons to teach which deprives them of their professionalism and their creativity. A good teacher is able to create lesson plans and use methods which will best reach their students. Teachers felt that high-stakes assessment as the sole measure of accountability was an attack on their own professionalism and their capacity as educators and primary decision makers. As they note, it is not just students who are viewed as “products” in a business model of education, but teachers are little more than factory workers who do not possess specialized knowledge and are easily replaceable (Seashore Louis et al. 2005:184). When teaching is reduced to scripts educators become disempowered because they are told that they do not know how to teach (Ortiz quoted in Chamberlain 2004:99). This is neither true nor fair, and ultimately does not benefit students. Instead teachers ought to be empowered to construct the classroom conditions that provide the knowledge, skills, and culture of questioning that are necessary for students to participate in critical dialogue with the past, question authority, struggle with ongoing relations of power, and
prepare themselves for what it means to be active and engaged citizens in the interrelated local, national, and global public spheres (Giroux 2012: 6).

Education should not be boring or rote, it should be engaging and empowering. To do this, students must be viewed as agents responsible for the creation of their own knowledge, rather than as passive recipients (Franklin and Moe 2012:569). The question is then, “what should be the ultimate goal of education?” I reject a business-oriented model of education, where knowledge must be standardized and measurable and its primary purpose is to impart job-related skills which preserve the status quo. Students who are allowed to think critically pose a problem for those most invested in the status quo, which is one politically motivated reason for implementation of standardized models of education. As Giroux argues (2012:9) schooling must not simply be seen as job training. A good education will prepare a student to enter the workforce, but that student will not do so passively. A good education will also prepare the student to challenge injustices that he or she encounters.

The teachers I spoke with as part of my study face these issues and contradictions every day in their classrooms. Every teacher I asked felt that the purpose of education was more than a body of rote knowledge and served to prepare students to ask questions, to think, and to be able to interact with the world. Yet, as demonstrated by teachers like Jeff, this is increasingly hard because of the pressures associated with the standardized testing movement. Throughout my study I admired the knowledge and creativity of the educators I worked with. They expressed frustrations with the educational system, but they were still ultimately optimistic and believed in the value of their work. For many teachers, like the ones in my study, there are still exciting opportunities for collaboration.
ARCHAEOLOGISTS use objects to study the past, but it is about people, not objects. This is why archaeology must include people and be responsive to communities needs. The days are long past when archaeologists could work in the ivory tower, responsible only to the needs of the academy; they must recognize that archaeology is an applied field with great benefits to people outside the profession (Nassaney 2009).

Archaeology and anthropology were born of colonialism and they have a long history of unequal relationships with the people they study. Archaeology, in particular, places an emphasis on western knowledge, the scientific way of knowing about the past (Phillips and Allen 2010; Smith and Wobst 2005). Archaeologists have begun to address the colonial roots of the discipline and change their practices in order to challenge earlier assumptions. Archaeology’s goals in terms of public education and outreach are too often framed towards educating the public about archaeology which preserves the power relations between the archaeologist and the public (Bartoy 2012). As seen in collaborative projects between archaeologists and indigenous groups, descendant peoples, and local communities, there is a willingness on both sides to work towards a solution. No longer can the archaeologist assume a privileged position of knowledge.

Archaeologists do possess a skill set and knowledge which sets them apart from those not in the discipline, but, they must not wield this as power over groups whose history they wish to study, and they must recognize that their way of knowing about the past is not the only way. By enhancing collaboration and by extending the idea of collaboration,
archaeologists can help to further decolonize the discipline and knowledge. The benefits of archaeology must go beyond the academy. Archaeology encourages people to develop and use critical thinking skills. Through their interactions with the public, especially children, archeologists can teach this skill which will then serve to democratize knowledge by enabling people to think for themselves. Archaeologists like Sonya Atalay (2006:301) have noted that archaeology provides a framework to help develop critical thinking skills in children and give them the tools to better engage with issues in the world around them.

Giroux (2012: 11) argues that education is not simply about critical thinking, but also social engagement. The realm of public archaeology, especially critical historical archaeology (Leone 2010), is exemplary in its intersection of the two. Through its involvement with the public, archaeology can challenge social norms and provide a model for engagement in civic life. Civic engagement is increasingly seen as a goal of public outreach archaeological projects where there are substantial benefits for both the archaeologist (and students) and the community (Little and Shackel 2007).

Community civic engagement is seen as an important avenue to pursue democratic reform and civic and educational equality within the public school system. As defined by Orr and Rogers (2011:9) “public engagement for public education is about the public addressing its shared interest in expanding democracy and educational opportunity.” Archaeology, as community service learning, can also be used to pursue democracy and archaeology can provide unique educational opportunities to students. Within this framework, archaeology can benefit education while empowering its practitioners and creating agents of social change. As Nassaney (2009) notes civic
engagement may not immediately challenge social conditions, but it empowers people to seek social justice. According to Nassaney (2012b) the emancipatory potential of archaeology is realized through partnerships with public groups leading to multiple perspectives on the interpretation of archaeological materials. These are the overarching goals of the Fort St. Joseph Archaeological Project and the summer camp programs and public outreach it offers are one way which they involve people in the work.

Program Evaluation

The children who attended the archaeology camp had a unique opportunity to explore their interests in an environment which encouraged them to learn and be excited about the process. According to these children, this environment is lacking throughout their formal education. They feel that when teachers use lecture and textbooks methods in the classroom they are more likely to be bored and not find value in their education. Conversely, the more creative and hands-on experiences they had in school the more likely they were to say that they felt they benefited from their classroom experiences.

Extra-curricular programs for students are a good way to introduce them to both the process of archaeology and develop the thinking skills archaeologists rely on. However, as the children who attended the camp confirmed, they already have an appreciation for history. How such a program would fare with students without this prior disposition is unclear. What is clear is that students are engaged and interested when material is relevant to their lives and when it is presented in a manner that lets them be involved. This is an avenue for project archaeologists to explore further—but it will present another set of challenges. A partnership with local schools provides an
opportunity to think about ways in which archaeology can be integrated into the local curriculum.

By and large participants in the FSJ summer camp program are satisfied with them. The teachers were all inclined to indicate that the programs had met their initial goals. Moreover, the program was successful at helping teachers understand how archaeology can be incorporated in the K-12 classroom; teachers of all different subject matter and grade levels came up with, and executed, lesson plans which involved archaeology in direct and indirect ways. The network of teachers that the project has established is a group of motivated and creative professionals. They are engaged in seeking out continuing education programs which match their interests and they use the information provided to enhance the experience of students in their classrooms. These teachers are a far cry from the stereotypical portrayals of “welfare queens” popular in American culture (Giroux 2012). These teachers have the ability to truly reach students in ways that archaeologists are not equipped to do. However, by partnering with archaeologists a beneficial collaborative partnership may emerge. The project has not fully tapped into the tremendous resources and potential represented by this network of teachers and it should look to do so.

When done well, outreach efforts to educators can be successful and ultimately beneficial to school children. That does not mean that there are no problems in implementing such an approach. Educators often had a general interest in the subject, but very little prior knowledge or experience in archaeology. This is a good start, but for the program to reach a wider audience it must prove its applicability. Before they attended the FSJ summer camp program, most teachers only had a vague idea of the applicability
of archaeology to a diverse range of subjects and learning goals. Afterwards, the teachers were likely to express ways in which they thought they might be able to work archaeology into their curriculum. For many teachers time and core curricular goals were still a major concern; they might be able to work in a lesson or two, but simply could not afford to devote major space to archaeology in their classroom.

In terms of my study, I wish I had more time to spend with participants. Although my role as a staff member of the project gave me valuable insights it did hinder the amount of time I had to conduct interviews. The chapter on education is largely drawn from survey results. I believe that I could reword some of my survey questions to elicit better answers. In particular, I asked participants to describe how well they understood archaeology. Instead, I might now ask what they know about archaeology and where they had learned this information. I would also spend more time, in both the pre- and post-course surveys asking about specific curricular and teaching goals and educational philosophy. This would allow me to better connect my research into educational policies and practices with real world examples. In the post-course surveys I would ask more specifically about interest in collaborative projects and areas in which this would be both possible and beneficial.

One of the major limitations of my work is in not truly engaging in collaborative work with the educators. Though my initial goal was to assess the success and shortcomings of the camp program and to understand how it helps teachers use archaeology in their classrooms, thinking about future collaborative projects is the logical next step. Throughout I have argued that archaeologists need to be knowledgeable about the issues that educators face and receptive to their specific needs. I tended to ask
questions about the validity of archaeology as a classroom approach and whether or not the camp program provided the basis for the teachers to implement it, but at no point did I ask if any of the teachers were interested in embarking on a collaborative project to develop tailored archaeology lessons for their classrooms. I suggest that this is an avenue which should be explored further.

**Future Directions**

Municipal archaeology is one framework from which to consider the Fort St. Joseph Archaeological Project. As defined by Douglas Appler (2012:41) municipal archaeology concerns itself with understanding the entire history (through archaeology) within modern boundaries of a particular city. One significant difference is that the project is primarily concerned with the 18th-century fort, and not the breadth of history of Niles, Michigan. In addition, residents of the community are encouraged to take part in the excavation, research, and lab work performed by the archaeologists. The project provides many opportunities for the public to become involved in the various stages of the work. Unique to FSJ is an archaeology advisory board, which represents many different community interests and perspectives in making decisions about the project. Though excavations at the fort are likely to continue for a number of years, it might be worthwhile for project archaeologists to consider other sites of interest to the Niles community.

Elsewhere, I have indicated the project has formed a network of teachers loosely connected by their experiences in the program. Contact with these teachers should not
end when the camp does. Instead, the project should consider ways in which they can maintain and develop these relationships. The educators connected to the project are valuable resources and have the potential to reach many more students than the archaeologists ever could. Simple social media, such as an online forum or Facebook group page for alumni of the program and project archaeologists could be used to provide a forum for continued interaction.

The community service learning approach which the project operates in is a useful context for extending collaborative efforts with educators. In one example Scott McLaughlin (2009) developed a community service learning course at this university in which both students and local teachers were participants. This could be a useful approach to consider. It would provide a forum for students, project archaeologists, and teachers to come together and discuss their respective specializations in regards to educational needs. The goal of the course could be to work together to create a lesson or unit which uses archaeology to help students think about the past in new ways. Archaeology is a powerful tool for students; as seen in my work with middle school aged children, the way their classes are formatted privileges knowledge which is derived from traditional historical sources. By using archaeology, students will better understand how multiple sources can be used to learn about the past. Students will also be able to engage directly in the work the historians and archaeologists actually perform. History is much more than a simple recitation of names, dates, and events. By having students work with multiple sources to understand the lives of people in the past they will be better able to think critically about how interpretations are formed and how history is crafted. This is best achieved when
archaeologists do not work in isolation, but practice what they profess to be a strength of public archaeology, namely genuine collaboration.
APPENDIX A

Bone Lab Activity Form

Site: ________________________________________________________________

Tray: ___________________________________________________________________

Species (English): _______________________________________________________

Species (Latin): _______________________________________________________

Bone: __________________________________________________________________

Side (if known/applicable): ________________________________________________

Description of Artifact (color, shape, size, evidence of butchering/modification, marks, etc.):________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Sketch:

![Sketch Image]
# Appendix B
## Bones Used for FSJ Bone Lab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accession</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Bone</th>
<th>Side</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11-2-57</td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Sacrum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N. American Beaver</td>
<td>Vertebræ</td>
<td>Lumbar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Femur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Radius</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Femur</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Vertebræ</td>
<td>Lumbar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-2-62</td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Vertebræ</td>
<td>Cervical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Vertebræ</td>
<td>Lumbar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Ulna</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNK (Large Mammal)</td>
<td>Distal calcaneus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Radius</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N. American Beaver</td>
<td>Tibia</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Scapula</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Tibia</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Femur</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Humerus</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Ulna</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Ulna</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-2-65</td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Scapula</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Humerus</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Vertebræ</td>
<td>Lumbar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Radius</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Scapula</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Humerus</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Radius</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Scapula</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Tibia</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Vertebræ</td>
<td>Lumbar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-2-71</td>
<td>Wild Turkey</td>
<td>Femur</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Tibia</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Tibia</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNK (Large Mammal)</td>
<td>Rib</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Humerus</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Rib</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Tibia</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Radius</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N. American Beaver</td>
<td>Scapula</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Tibia</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Animal</td>
<td>Bone/Part</td>
<td>Side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-2-80</td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Innom ilium</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Ulna</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Femur</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>tibia</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-2-82</td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Lumbar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Humerus</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Innom ilium</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N. American Beaver</td>
<td>Rib</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Rib-a</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Humerus</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Humerus</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raccoon</td>
<td>Ulna</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canadian goose</td>
<td>Sternum</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Lumbar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>vertebrae</td>
<td>Thoracic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-2-106</td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Carn. Max. tooth p4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Radius</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Cervical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Ulna</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Calcaneus</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNK (lastor?)</td>
<td>Humerus</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNK (senusu?)</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Thoracic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Femur</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Tooth p4</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Cervical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wild boar</td>
<td>Astragalus</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNK (servus?)</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Thoracic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Radius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Scapula</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Scapula</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passenger pigeon</td>
<td>Radius</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Tooth M1-3</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-2-110</td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Tibia</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Pelvis</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-3-113</td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Humerus</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-2-120</td>
<td>UNK.</td>
<td>Femur</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-2-126</td>
<td>UNK.</td>
<td>Femur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Humerus</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Femur</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-2-128</td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-2-129</td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Femur</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-2-143w</td>
<td>deer</td>
<td>scapula</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-2-163</td>
<td>Wapiti?</td>
<td>Scapula</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-2-165</td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Scapula</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-2-169</td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Radius</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-2-171</td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-2-174</td>
<td>deer</td>
<td>Rib</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-2-175</td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Lumbar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-2-176</td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Tibia</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-2-177</td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Humerus</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-2-178</td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Femur</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-2-179</td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Tibia</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-2-180</td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Tibia</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FSJ Lexicon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sub-Category</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Artifact Definitions</th>
<th>Descriptors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity/Craft</td>
<td>Production/Maintenance/Repair</td>
<td>Chisel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flake</td>
<td>Debris from</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>stone tool production or stone working</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Saw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scissors</td>
<td>Note what part(s) present or if complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Slag</td>
<td>Waste from metal working activities, rough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>surface, metallic appearance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation/Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Straight Pin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mouth Harp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pipe</td>
<td>Describe part present (stem, bowl, etc,) and any</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>decoration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Whizzer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arms</td>
<td>Ammunition</td>
<td>Musket Ball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gun Parts</td>
<td>Butt Plate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lock Plate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trigger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gunflints</td>
<td>Blade</td>
<td>Flat facet on face</td>
<td>Describe color and type of stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projectiles</td>
<td>Projectile Point</td>
<td>Describe type if known</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household</td>
<td>Food Remains</td>
<td>Animal Bone, calcined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Animal Bone, unburned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seeds</td>
<td>Note if carbonized or uncarbonized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food/Beverage Related</td>
<td>Ceramic-Native</td>
<td>Coarse, grey to terra cotta, possibly with visible temper, unglazed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ceramic-Earthenware, tin glazed (faience)</td>
<td>Salmon colored to yellowish body, glaze may be white, blue and white, brown, or polychrome</td>
<td>Describe color of glaze and any decoration present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ceramic-Earthenware, creamware</td>
<td>Buff or white body, glaze appears clear to slightly yellow</td>
<td>Describe any decoration present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ceramic-Earthenware, whiteware</td>
<td>Buff or white body, glaze appears clear</td>
<td>Describe any decoration present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glass-Container</td>
<td>Vessels and bottles of consumables, toiletries, and pharmaceuticals</td>
<td>Describe color and any formal attributes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glass-Drinking and</td>
<td>Describe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tableware</td>
<td>serving vessels, usually clear</td>
<td>color and any formal and decorative attributes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettle Lug</td>
<td>Bracket which attaches bail to kettle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettle Hook</td>
<td>Generally S-shaped for suspending over fire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Adornment</td>
<td>Beads</td>
<td>All larger beads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Describe shape, color, any decoration and construction method</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beads - Seed</td>
<td>Describe color</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beads - Tubular</td>
<td>Describe color</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beads - Wampum</td>
<td>Describe color</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brooch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crucifix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pendant</td>
<td>Describe any decoration present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ring – Band</td>
<td>Describe any decoration present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ring- Plaque</td>
<td>Includes Jesuit Rings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tinkling Cone</td>
<td>Describe any decorative element</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>Button</td>
<td>Describe face and eye</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cufflink</td>
<td>Describe appearance (if inset, plain, or with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural</th>
<th>Building Materials</th>
<th>Daub</th>
<th>Orange or gray in color, from clay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flat Glass</td>
<td>Thin, yellow-green, lacking curvature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>Structural or with mortar present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nail</td>
<td>Describe type if known</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Fort St. Joseph Chimera Site: Map and Unit Notes
### Unit Notes

#### Unit 1

### Artifact Catalog

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpretation:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpretation:**
## Unit 3
### Artifact Catalog

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpretation:**
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### Unit 4
### Artifact Catalog

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpretation:**


## Unit 5
### Artifact Catalog

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpretation:**
### Unit 6
### Artifact Catalog

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSJ Chimera</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpretation:**
Based on the information in the map and all of the units how might you interpret the Chimera site?

What other information would you like to know about the Chimera site? What kinds of sources might be available to you?
Appendix E

**FSJ Chimera Site - Artifacts Used**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact</th>
<th>Accession</th>
<th>Box</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit 1 (hearth feature, domestic area of military home, related to unit 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calcined bone</td>
<td>8-2-30w</td>
<td>2 of 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>2-1-190</td>
<td>1 of 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seed beads</td>
<td>07-3-62w</td>
<td>2 of 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural stone</td>
<td>06-2-72</td>
<td>6 of 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic (faience)</td>
<td>10-2-78</td>
<td>1 of 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gunflint</td>
<td>02-1-69</td>
<td>1 of 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daub</td>
<td>4-1-054</td>
<td>2 of 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbonized seeds</td>
<td>6-2-36w</td>
<td>1 of 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckle fragment</td>
<td>04-1-32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 2 (post holes, blacksmith)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron nails</td>
<td>8-2-83w</td>
<td>2 of 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron axe head</td>
<td>11-2-200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chisel</td>
<td>11-2-231</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gun parts</td>
<td>10-2-113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>02-1-160</td>
<td>1 of 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead shot</td>
<td>06-2-95w</td>
<td>1 of 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slag</td>
<td>9-2-36</td>
<td>2 of 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron knife blade</td>
<td>Fsj museum collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 3 (Multi-ethnic household, French fur trader and Native woman)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay pipe frags</td>
<td>10-2-27/10-2-31/10-2-31w/10-2-34</td>
<td>2 of 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micmac pipe</td>
<td>04-1-31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinkling cones</td>
<td>07-3-25/07-3-29w</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seed brads</td>
<td>6-2-44w</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native pottery</td>
<td>10-2-20</td>
<td>1 of 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bone</td>
<td>6-2-39w</td>
<td>7 of 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcined bone</td>
<td>6-2-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesuit rings</td>
<td>Fsj museum collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead seal</td>
<td>11-2-17w/04-1-91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle galss</td>
<td>04-1-64/04-1-91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cufflink</td>
<td>11-2-43w</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wampum</td>
<td>6-2-44w</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettle lug</td>
<td>98-3-0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whizzer</td>
<td>06-1-214</td>
<td>(unsure if this is correct, illegible handwriting) might be dc-1-214 to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pendant</td>
<td>11-2-45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit 4 (domestic area with foundation wall, military home, related to unit 1)**

- gunflints: 06-2-74
- Gun parts: 04-1-115/10-2-148
- bone: 6-2-44, 7 of 19
- Calcined bone: 09-2-100w, 2 of 2
- Ceramic (faience): 7-3-62, 1 of 1
- Military buttons: 7-3-24, 1 of 2
- glass: 04-1-73, 1 of 2
- Lead shot: 6-2-112w, 1 of 1
- Musket balls: 06-2-54w, 2 of 5
- daub: 4-1-39, 2 of 5
- Structural stone: 06-2-75, 6 of 20

**Unit 5 (post hole feature, palisade)**

- gunflints: 10-2-107, 1 of 1
- Lead shot: 6-2-33w, 1 of 1
- Seed beads: 09-2-68w, 2 of 2
- bone: 6-2-44w, 7 of 19
- Mouth harp: 11-2-49
- Straight pin: 02-1-91

**Unit 6 (Jesuit Priest’s home)**

- Religious cross: 09-2-157w
- cilice: 04-1-139
- Plaque rings: Fsj museum collection
- bone: 06-2-40, 7 of 19
- daub: 4-1-068, 2 of 5
- Calcined bone: 09-2-21w, 2 of 2
- Structural stone: 6-2-81, 6 of 20
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Lyne Site Stratigraphy Activity Worksheet

Background: The Lyne site has been excavated by archaeologists for over ten years and they have found a diverse collection of artifacts. The archaeologists believe that these artifacts represent several different occupations throughout history. The archaeologists know which artifacts were found together, but unfortunately they can’t remember in which order they were found. Your job is to examine the artifacts found in one unit at the Lyne as well as the profile stratigraphy (which is out of order) to determine: A) how many occupations occurred at this site B) what time period each occupation dates to C) who might have occupied the site during each period and D) to put the levels and artifacts back in the correct stratigraphic order to explain how the site formed over time.

Levels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>10 YR 3/2 very dark grayish brown mottled with 10 YR 3/6 dark yellowish brown, silty loam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>10 YR 3/4 dark yellowish brown sandy loam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>10 YR 2/2 very dark brown silty loam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>10 YR 3/2 very dark grayish brown mottled with 10 YR 3/6 dark yellowish brown, silty loam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>10 YR 3/3 brown silty loam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>10 YR 3/2 very dark grayish brown mottled with 10 YR 2/2 very dark brown and 10 YR 3/3 brown silty loam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions to answer:

1. In what order did the levels form? What artifacts support this interpretation?
2. How many separate occupations occurred at this site? How did you reach this conclusion?
3. What time period does each occupation date to? Which artifacts were most useful in dating the occupations?
Appendix G

Artifacts used for Lyne Site Stratigraphy Activity

A: (Alluvium fill)
- Plastic (11-1-13)

B: (Farm abandonment dumping episode)
- scissor, (98-3-15)
- Tin can fragment (8-1-6)
- Ceramic (8-1-10)
- Glass fragments (10-1-2)
- Glass, sun purpled (10-1-3)
- Mulberry transfer print (11-1-6)
- Ceramics (11-1-10)
- Clay pipe fragment (11-1-13)
- Bottle lip, brown (2-2-56), - machine made with mold seam, crown finish, 1910-present http://www.sha.org/bottle/finishstyles2.htm#Crown

C: (PZ)
- musketball (08-1-2)
- flakes (2008)
- gunflint, gray, British? (8-1-6)
- charcoal (2008)
- bone (8-1-29), unidentified
- tinkling cone (10-1-9)
- seed beads (check FSJ inventory)
- blue green glass (check FSJ inventory)

D: (PZ)
- charcoal (2008)
- hand-wrought nail (8-1-12)
- silver ring brooch (8-1-13)
- iron projectile point (8-1-24)
- bone (8-1-37) unidentified
- gunflint, gray, British? (10-1-33)
- seed beads (check FSJ inventory)
- faience (check FSJ inventory)
E: (Native occupation)
- FCR (2008)
- Flakes (2008)
- Stone projectile point (08-1-3), type unknown
- Projectile point base (8-1-11), type unknown, top broken
- Carbonized corn (10-1-28)
- Reworked projectile point (11-1-13)
- Core (11-1-18)

F: (Subsoil)
- flake (2008)
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Children’s Scavenger Hunt

Archaeologists use the materials that they discover to learn about the people who lived at the site in the past. All of the artifacts in this display case have been found at Fort St. Joseph. By interacting with re-enactors and the various booths can you figure out what these artifacts are? What can they tell you about life at the fort?

When you’ve discovered all of the artifacts return to the Children’s Booth to claim a prize!

1. Object ID: _____________________

   I. this object tells us about what people were _________________ at the Fort.

   II. the majority of these found at the Fort come from ____________________, which is a wild/domestic animal.
       Choose one

2a. Object ID:_______________

   2b. Object ID:_______________

   Hint: look for “Black Robes”
I: Who might have used these objects?________________________

II. What does this indicate about the people who lived at the Fort?
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

3a. Object ID: ____________  3b. Object ID:________________________

3c. Object ID:_________________  

I. Who might have used these items?
________________________

II. What do you think these items were used for?_____________________

III. Where was object 3a made?
__________________________, how do you know this?____________________
4. Object ID: _______________________

I. What was this object used for?

II. Who might have used this object?

III. How do you think this object got its name?

5a. Object ID: ____________  5b. Object ID: ________________

I. What were these objects used for?

II. These objects were primarily used by ____________________, which tells us about the gender roles of people at the Fort.

III. Although very little ____________________ preserves archaeologically the presence of these artifacts indicate that it was an important trade item.

6. Object ID: ________________

I. What was this object used for?

II. Who might have worn this?
III. What do you think this says about the relationships between cultural groups at the Fort?

______________________________________________________
______________________________________________________

7. Object ID: ___________________

I. Who might have used this item?

______________________________________________________

II. How does this item help archaeologists date sites? __________
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Pokagon Youth Group Lesson Plan

Questions to Address During Visit:

1. “What is Anthropology/Archaeology?”
2. “What do Archaeologists do in the Lab?”
3. “How do Archaeologists use Material Culture to Learn about the Past?”
4. “How do Archaeologists use Multiple Lines of Evidence to Learn about the Past?”

I. Objectives:
   a. Explain what anthropology/archaeology is
   b. Have students understand archaeology as an interpretive process
   c. Emphasis interpretation and lab work v. excavation
   d. Explain how archaeologists use multiple lines of evidence (documents, oral histories, artifacts, art, etc.) to learn about the past, note that these may not all agree and that none should be viewed as the only absolute truth

II. Structure
   a. 8-10 students, maybe split into 2 groups of 4-5 students each to rotate through various activities (this would require one other graduate student volunteer)
   b. 4 activities, approx. ½-1 hour each, to address the above questions

III. “What is Anthropology/Archaeology?”
   a. What do students already know about anthropology/archaeology?
   b. What do they think anthropologists/archaeologists do?
c. Mural activity- use the mural outside the lab at WMU to answer the
questions “What do anthropologists/archaeologists do?” Students should
think about some of the following questions while exploring the mural:

i. What do you see?

ii. What do you hear?

iii. What do you feel?

iv. Do you notice anything familiar?

v. Did anything surprise you or seem strange to you?

vi. What do you like most about this mural?

vii. What do you like least about this mural?

viii. How does this mural tell a story?

ix. How does this mural show what anthropologists do?

x. What kinds of questions does an anthropologist/archaeologist ask?

xi. What kinds of things are important to an anthropologist?

xii. If you were going to make a mural about your life, what would you
include? Draw/describe it. What kinds of things are important to
you?

xiii. What questions do you think are important? What would you like
to ask the people in the mural?

IV. “What do Archaeologists do in the Lab?”

a. Bone Lab Activity (Animal bones)

i. Start by thinking about the kinds of animals that are in
Southwestern Michigan.
ii. Then think about which of these might be used for food

iii. students will help to wash, draw(?), and identify bones, using study collections and books

iv. What do bones tell us about the past? Think about foodways, butchering practices, eating practices

v. Talk about the site the bones came from. What do the bones tell us about the site?

vi. Think about different “moments” in history, were people eating the same kinds of food or different kinds of food

V. “How do Archaeologists use Material Culture to Learn about the Past?” and “How do Archeologists use Multiple Lines of Evidence to Learn about the Past?”

a. Chimera Site Activity

i. Students will start by considering their own homes, if an archaeologist were to excavate their homes many years from now what would they find? What would they not find (heirloom pieces might have been passed down, perishable etc.)? How would objects be found that reflect the arrangements of rooms/space in their homes?

ii. Students will be given a site map which shows features and units

iii. Students will look at trays containing artifacts “found” (These are real artifacts, but I made up the site and arranged artifacts accordingly) in each unit at the site
iv. Students will consider each tray separately to think about what kinds of activities were performed in each area.

v. Students will then think about the site as a whole, what conclusions can they make.

vi. Students will then consider other sources of information which might also tell them about the site. What else might you use to learn about this site? (maps, historic records, family interviews etc.)

VI. Address aspect of Native history/artifacts (this can also be an opportunity for students to share aspects of their history and culture with me – it is not just archaeologists who can “say” something about Native history, this is an area where Native people should have a voice in the telling of their own history)

a. Fort St. Joseph artifacts- Objects such as projectile points/scrappers, tinkling cones, religious rings/medals, animal bones, beads etc. will be available for students to explore. These were used by Native people in the past and also in the present.

b. Students should consider some of the following questions:

   i. Are some of these objects familiar to you? Why/why not?

   ii. What do these objects mean to you?

   iii. What do these objects say about your culture/your life? (have you beaded? Can you use beading to tell stories of your life? Do you dance at the pow wow? Does your regalia have tinkling cones? Do
the religious medals correspond with your current religious practices?)

iv. In what ways do you think your ancestors lives were similar to yours? In what ways were they different?

v. What kinds of things are important to your life/culture that might not be represented here?
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Mural Photos

photo credits: James C. Dunnigan
Appendix K

Pokagon Youth Group Chimera Site Activity Map
Unit Notes

Unit 1 (descriptions of artifacts, interpretation)

Unit 2 (descriptions of artifacts, interpretation)

Unit 3 (descriptions of artifacts, interpretation)

Unit 4 (descriptions of artifacts, interpretation)

Unit 5 (descriptions of artifacts, interpretation)
Chimera Site Interpretation

Based on the information in the map and all of the units how might you interpret the Chimera site?

What other information would you like to know about the Chimera site? What kinds of sources might be available to you?
Appendix L

Artifacts from Fort St. Joseph

Take a look at the artifacts recovered from Fort St. Joseph. These represent objects used by Native Americans in the past as well as the present.

What do you notice about this assemblage?

As you explore the artifacts consider the following questions.

VII. Are some of these objects familiar to you? Why/why not?

VIII. What do these objects mean to you?

IX. What do these objects say about your culture/your life?

X. In what ways do you think your ancestors lives were similar to yours? In what ways were they different?

XI. What kinds of things are important to your life/culture that might not be represented here?
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Fort Saint Joseph Educators Summer Camp
Pre-Course Survey

The Fort Saint Joseph Archaeological Project values your input as we evaluate the effectiveness of the Summer Camp program for Educators and strive to make improvements.

How did you hear about this program? ___________  What grade do you teach? ___________

What subject do you teach? ___________  How many years have you been teaching? ______

What town, state do you live in _____________  What town, state do you teach in? ____________

What was your primary reason for attending this program? Please circle one.

Continuing Education Credits  Interest in Archaeology  Both  Other, please explain:

____________________________________________________________________________________

Please respond to the following questions. Use the back if you need more space.

1. How would you describe your current knowledge of archaeology? (none or little/took a course/popular media etc.)

2. What specific knowledge or skills are you hoping to gain from this program?

3. Where do see archaeology fitting into your current curriculum? (specific content areas/units/subjects/methods etc.)

4. What do you see as the main challenges to incorporating archaeology in the classroom? (time constraints/need to prepare for state tests/ill fit with school curriculum etc.)
5. How much time do you have/or do you devote on a weekly basis to developing new lesson plans?

Please circle the number which best matches your response. 1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Uncertain, 4= Agree, 5= Strongly Agree.

I am already familiar with archaeology.

I believe a hands-on approach is effective for teaching at the grade level/subject I teach.

I frequently use hands-on lesson plans in my teaching.

I can see archaeology fitting in to my curriculum.

I would be willing to spend time doing research and creating lesson plans to teach archaeology.

I would be likely to use ready made lesson plans to teach archaeology in my classroom.

The Fort St. Joseph Archaeological Project thanks you for your input!
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Fort Saint Joseph Educators Summer Camp
Follow Up Survey

The Fort Saint Joseph Archaeological Project values your input as we evaluate the effectiveness of the Summer Camp program for Educators and strive to make improvements.

What year did you attend this program? ____________ What grade do you teach? ____________

What subject do you teach? ____________ How many years have you been teaching? _______

What town, state do you live in ____________ What town, state do you teach in? ____________

Why did you choose to attend this program? Please circle one.

Continuing Education Credits  Interest in Archaeology  Both  Other, please explain:

________________________________________________________________________________________

Please respond to the following questions. Use the back if you need more space.

1. Before attending this program what were two things you expected it to help you with professionally? Did it achieve those goals?

2. Since attending this program list two ways you have been able to incorporate either French colonialism/Fort St. Joseph/Archaeology into your classroom lessons. If you are able to outline or attach a lesson plan that would be greatly appreciated.

3. If you were unable to incorporate French colonialism/Fort St. Joseph/Archaeology in your classroom what was the reason(s)? (lack of time/inadequate knowledge of subject/ill fit with curricular goals etc.)

4. List two things this program did particularly well and two areas where it could use improvement.
Please circle the number which best matches your response. 1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Uncertain, 4= Agree, 5= Strongly Agree.

This program increased my knowledge of archaeology.  

This program communicated the benefits of teaching archaeology in the classroom.  

I can see archaeology fitting in to my curriculum.  

This program gave me knowledge which I can implement in my classroom.  

I was satisfied with the resources provided by the Program for future research.  

I would like the program to provide lesson plans for classroom use.  

Would you be interested in further communicating via email with the Graduate Student Researcher about your experience in the program?

The Fort St. Joseph Archaeological Project thanks you for your input!
Appendix O

HSIRB Approval Notice

Date: May 29, 2012

To: Kristina Wirtz, Principal Investigator
   Erica D’Elia, Student Investigator for thesis

From: Amy Naugle, Ph.D., Chair

Re: HSIRB Project Number 12-05-22

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research project titled “Educational Benefits of Collaborative Youth Archaeological Programs” has been **approved** under the **expedited** category of review by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the application.

Please note: This research may **only** be conducted exactly in the form it was approved. You must seek specific board approval for any changes in this project (e.g., **you must request a post approval change to enroll subjects beyond the number stated in your application under “Number of subjects you want to complete the study.”**) Failure to obtain approval for changes will result in a protocol deviation. In addition, if there are any unanticipated adverse reactions or unanticipated events associated with the conduct of this research, you should immediately suspend the project and contact the Chair of the HSIRB for consultation.

**Reapproval of the project is required if it extends beyond the termination date stated below.**

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

**Approval Termination:** May 29, 2013
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