Anthropology 4496B/9110B
Principles of Applied Archaeology
Preliminary Syllabus, Winter 2015-16

Wednesdays 1:30 – 4:30
Room: SSC 3315

Instructor: Peter Timmins
Office: SSC 3213
Office Hours: Mondays, 4:00 - 6:00 pm
Email: ptimmins@uwo.ca; Phone: 519-661-2111 ext. 85097

Prerequisite: Registration in fourth year in any program.

INTRODUCTION

This course will examine the principles and concerns that are integral to the practice of applied archaeology in North America, and the role of applied archaeology in heritage management in general. The course will review legislation and professional practices that govern applied archaeologists, and in particular the form of archaeology carried out by consultant archaeologists hired by third parties to undertake archaeological investigations in advance of land development or resource extraction (commonly called Cultural Resource Management - CRM). While the readings will draw on the experience of applied archaeology from across North America and beyond, the course will focus on applied archaeology as currently practiced in Ontario.

Over the last 4 decades CRM archaeology has grown to dominate the practice of archaeology in North America to the point that it now constitutes the majority of all archaeology conducted on an annual basis, and provides employment for the majority of professionals in the field. Increasingly CRM archaeology has also begun to define the critical issues facing archaeology more generally.

The course will explore how applied archaeology meshes with heritage conservation and land use development laws and policies. We will examine how consultant archaeological practice is regulated and, specifically, how the 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists govern the practice of CRM archaeology in Ontario from background studies (Stage 1), through methods of site identification, assessment and significance evaluation (Stages 2-3), to preservation or excavation (Stage 4), report production and collections management. We will critically examine the logic and assumptions underlying the Standards and Guidelines and will discuss several issues inherent in this type of archaeological practice, including determinations of archaeological potential, site significance, ethics, communicating with non-archaeologists (developers, descendant communities, the public), dispute resolution, and contested claims to archaeological heritage.
ASSIGNMENTS

1. Presentations on Readings (30%):

This course will be conducted as a seminar and will rely heavily on in class presentations followed by discussion to explore the ideas raised in readings that will be assigned for each week. In each class you will alternate with other students in leading class discussions on the assigned readings. The number of class discussions you lead will depend on enrolment in the course. Students will be assigned the readings that they will lead discussion on in advance of each class. You will be expected to provide a brief synopsis of the reading, highlighting key themes. Then you will pose questions about the reading to guide the class discussion and critique. Your presentation should be no more 15 minutes long and we will allow 10-15 minutes for discussion of each reading. You may incorporate additional information, including other papers, case studies, personal experience, etc., to flesh out your presentation and contribute to the discussion. You will be marked on your presentations, your ability to identify key issues and generate discussion, and your ability to help lead the class discussion.

2. Participation (20%):

You are expected to attend every class, read all of the assigned readings, and participate fully in discussions that will be led by other students and the instructor. You will be marked on your ability to engage with the material presented and participate in the class discussions.


In CRM archaeology many activities are done routinely to comply with specific standards, without giving much thought to possible issues with the practice. For this assignment you will be asked to consider such a routine practice, and then conduct a review of it beyond consulting practice. Is the logic of the practice sound when considered in a broader context of a archaeological study? Does the practice strike a fair balance between archaeology, developer and descendant community needs and interests? Are there alternative methodologies that can be employed? What are the underlying assumptions inherent in the adoption of the practice? You will be expected to substantiate your findings with reference to existing literature concerning these archaeological methodologies or practices. You will present your findings as a 15-20 minute conference paper, complete with a PowerPoint presentation, in the March 9th class. Each presentation will be followed by a brief discussion in which you may be asked questions by members of the class.

You are required to submit a 7-10 page written summary on the day of the presentation. Topics should be selected by the fourth class (January 27th), allowing you five weeks to prepare this presentation. You will be marked on your ability to accurately describe the practice in question, to identify and critique the assumptions inherent in the practice, and discuss viable alternatives to the current practice (if they exist). Consider whether the underlying assumptions are a reflection of archaeological bias, normative archaeological thought, the business of CRM (client cost, competitive bidding), regulatory logic, bureaucratic motives, etc…? You will be marked on your conference presentation and the written report.
Examples of practices that can be critiqued include:

a) The concept of archaeological potential and determining where to survey/not survey
b) Excavation methodology: excavation to artifact yield cutoffs (e.g. on lithic scatters)
c) Excavation methodology: topsoil stripping on Woodland or Historic sites
d) Excavation methodology for undisturbed sites: shovel excavation or piece plotting?
e) Bureaucratic challenges to site preservation
f) Geophysical Methodology in CRM – waste of time or real alternative?
g) The value of 20th century archaeological sites?
h) Defining qualifications/professionalism in CRM
i) Labour practices and the value of labour in CRM (compared to other professional disciplines)
j) The logic (or absence of logic) in determining cultural heritage value or interest
k) Managing human remains in CRM
l) Bureaucratic archaeology and regulatory review processes
m) Managing collections
n) Public and descendant community consultation

You may choose an alternative topic, subject to my agreement.

4. Final Paper (30%):

The final assignment for the course will be a research paper, 3000-3500 words long, on a topic broadly related to applied archaeology. This paper may examine any contemporary issue inherent in applied archaeology, therefore, the range of possible paper topics is very large. The paper should be comparative and should examine the topic within the broader global context of practice, including how the topic relates to the broader discipline of archaeology and anthropology. You are expected to submit a 1-2 page paper proposal by February 10th, along with a preliminary list of references you plan to use. The paper will be due April 13th.

WEEKLY READINGS

There is no single textbook that can covers all of the topics discussed in this course, however, there is an extensive literature on the issues and practice of applied archaeology. The weekly readings will provide us with the broad context needed to fully explore the topics and issues raised.

Readings that are available online (as e-journals or as electronic resources accessible from the Weldon Library catalogue) are noted as such. I will post pdfs of other readings on OWL/Sakai for student access. I will be uploading articles to OWL throughout the term, and will try to make sure readings are available several weeks in advance of the date they are to be discussed.
COURSE SCHEDULE AND READINGS (Tentative – additional readings may be added)

1. Jan. 6, Introduction to Course

This week we will review the course outline, discuss course expectations, and review assignments, identifying student interests and preferences, and assign readings for the next two weeks of class.

2. Jan 13, Heritage Managed, Heritage Contested

Pollock-Ellwand, Nancy

Silverman, Helaine

Smith, Laurajane
2006 *The Uses of Heritage*. Routledge, London. Note: Read Chapters 1&2. (split up) Available Online

West, Suzie, and Jacqueline Ansell


Cleere, Henry

Downrum, C. & L. Price

Erikson, Clark

Schiffer, Michael & George Gumerman

Tainter, Joseph

Shackel, Paul
4. Jan. 27, The Legislative Framing of Conservation
(Note: Conference paper topics to be chosen by this class.)

Cooper, Malcolm

Cushman, David and Tony Howe

Davis, Hester

Pokotylo, David, and Andrew Mason

Willems, Willem

Polk, Michael R.

We will also look at the Province of Ontario’s web pages for archaeological programs in this class: ([http://www.mtc.gov.on.ca/en/archaeology/archaeology.shtml](http://www.mtc.gov.on.ca/en/archaeology/archaeology.shtml))

5. Feb. 3, The Life and Work of Commercial/Bureaucrat Archaeologists

Altschul, Jeffrey H., and Thomas C. Patterson

Barker, P.

Everill, Paul

Ferris, Neal
Metcalf, Michael, and Jim Moses  

Aitchison, Kenneth  

(NOTE: Final Paper Outline Due today)

Banning, E.B., A. Hawkins and S. Stewart  

Verhagen, P., Kamermans, H., and M. van Leusen  

Williamson, Ronald  

Verhagen, P., and A. Borsboom  


Feb. 17, No Class – Reading Week


Altschul, Jeffrey  

Chandler, Susan  

Darvill, Timothy  
Lipe, William

Polios, Ioannis


Brink, Jack

Carroll, Mary

King, Julia

Majewski, Teresita


9. **Mar. 9, “Conference Session” - Critiques of Ontario CRM Practice**

10. **Mar. 16, Issues of Policy, Business & Professionalism in Commercial Archaeology**

Cumberpatch, Chris, and Howell Roberts

Ferris, Neal

Grenville, Jane
King, Thomas  

Steeves, Paulette  

11. Mar. 23, **Applied Archaeology Beyond Archaeology**

Brickerman, Ira  

King, Thomas  

Klassen, Michael, Rick Budwa and Rudy Reimer/Yumks  

Welch, John, Mark Altaha, Karl Hoerig, Ramon Riley  

Ross, Anne, J. Prangnell and B. Coghill  

Thompson, Kerry  

Hodder, Ian  

See Also: Ontario as Case Study: *Aboriginal Engagement Technical Bulletin* Available at: http://www.culture.gov.on.ca/english/heritage/archaeology/AbEngageBulletin.pdf

12. Mar. 30, **Applied Archaeology and Heritage Entangled**

Allen, Harry  

Dennison, Jean  
Meskell, Lynn

Shepard, Nick

Watson, Sheila
2011 'Why can't we dig like they do on Time Team?' The meaning of the past within working class communities. International Journal of Heritage Studies 17(4) 364-379. Available Online.

Wei, Qiaowei

13. Apr. 6, Present & Future Challenges for Applied Archaeology

MacEachern, Scott

Mackey, Douglas

Wheaton, Thomas

Williamson, Ronald

Flatman, Joe, Robert C. Chidester , and David A. Gadsby

Cleary, K., Jan Frolik, Eduard Krekovic, Eva Parga-Dans, Elena S. Prokopiou

FINAL PAPER DUE April 13, 2016