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1 INTRODUCTION

This thesis explores the potential for teaching archaeology through collections-based research as a model for making archaeological education more inclusive at higher education institutions. As the cost of archaeological field schools continues to rise, they become even more inaccessible to an increasing number of undergraduate students, particularly those who have been historically excluded from the discipline of archaeology (Heath-Stout and Hannigan 2020). Field schools often serve as minimum requirements for graduate programs and for careers in cultural resource management (CRM) archaeology; however, these programs are often focused on a particular set of excavation and field skills, rather than technical writing, lab analysis, or curation; skills also needed for a career in CRM. Ideally, an undergraduate education would be more comprehensive by including hands-on coursework in all aspects of archaeology.

Collections-based courses have the added bonus of allowing more students to have access to archaeological research and to conduct research with existing resources that are located on university campuses or in nearby repositories. In addition, lab-based courses can fit into standard timetables during a semester, and unlike with many summer field schools, students are not pressured to disrupt paid employment. Expanding the number of cost-effective training opportunities for students in lab and field settings is critical for increasing the accessibility of archaeological education (Heath-Stout and Hannigan 2020).

By utilizing ethnographic methods, this study examines the learning experiences of undergraduate students in introductory archaeology courses at Georgia State University (GSU). Located in downtown Atlanta, GSU is one of the largest institutions of higher education in the USA and its student body is one of the most diverse (USG 2022; GSU 2021d). Comparing student experiences in a traditional lecture course with those of students enrolled in a hands-on
project lab with a legacy collection of archaeological material curated at GSU, this study explores the potential of lab-based courses as sites of active learning and as models for more inclusive and accessible archaeological education at higher education institutions. In this study, I address two research questions: 1) How do experiential learning classes with archaeological collections and traditional lecture courses impact students’ understanding of and engagement with archaeology at the introductory level? 2) What effects do hands-on, inquiry-based pedagogical methods have on creating an inclusive and accessible archaeological education at Georgia State University? Through my research, I have identified the benefits of expanding lab-based learning in early archaeological education including but not limited to teaching the importance of accurate data collection in the field and the necessity of budgeting for lab and curation work in project budgets; skills needed to succeed in all archaeological careers, including CRM. Even more significant, this study shows the importance of increasing the diversity of undergraduate students exposed to engaging and effective archaeological education with the expectation that it could lead to more diverse people pursuing careers as archaeological professionals.

In Chapter 2, I review the scholarship on archaeological pedagogy and the current trends that shape education goals, course design, and theoretical frameworks for coursework at the undergraduate level in the United States. Notably, there has been an increasing emphasis on public archaeology and active or experiential learning frameworks in traditional coursework and archaeological field schools. This chapter also provides an overview of the archaeological “curation crisis” being faced by repositories across the United States (Childs 1995; Marquardt et al. 1982) and the possible opportunities for teaching with legacy collections, amongst other types of archaeological collections. These pedagogical shifts are significantly different than early to
mid-twentieth century models and reflect broader conversations in the discipline, both in
academic and professional or CRM spheres. These discussions about the practice of archaeology
and who archaeology is conducted by, for, and with (e.g., Atalay 2012) are intimately linked to
wider social movements in the United States such as Black Lives Matter, #MeToo, LGBTQ
activism, amongst many others.

After establishing the pedagogical terrain of archaeology in the 21st century, Chapter 3
presents a detailed overview of the field site for my thesis including a history of GSU, the
administrative and pedagogical innovations that have shaped undergraduate success, and the two
introductory archaeology courses examined in this study. I outline the history of the Metropolitan
Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA) archaeological collection as well as previous and
current research conducted with the collection. While this collection has been a critical teaching
tool for the Department of Anthropology at GSU, it is also characterized by the well documented
issues of a legacy archaeological collection. Legacy collections, amongst other types of
archaeological collections, contribute to the ongoing “curation crisis” that repositories face
across the United States (Childs 1995; Childs and Sullivan 2004; Marquardt et al. 1982). These
issues are presented in the final section of this chapter along with the possible educational
opportunities associated with artifacts like those found in the MARTA collection.

In Chapter 4, I present the outline for this thesis project including the development of the
study, the methodology, and theoretical frameworks. In this section I address the ethical
considerations of this project and detail the qualitative methodologies that I selected for the
purposes of my study. Analysis of the qualitative data collected is presented in Chapter 5,
including a breakdown of the participants’ undergraduate major and education level. This
chapter discusses identified themes surrounding participants’ understanding of archaeology and
its origins, the role of science and curation in archaeology, the process of archaeology, as well as the impact of specific pedagogical design from each course.

In Chapter 6 I present my recommendations for future lab-based courses and the need for an expansion of qualifying training programs for archaeologists at the undergraduate level. Finally in Chapter 7, I offer my concluding remarks and discuss the limitations of the current study. I also present future directions for this research to explore further questions about increasing accessibility and inclusion in introductory and other undergraduate level archaeology courses centered on lab work or curation.
2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL PEDAGOGY

While there have been broader trends of advances in archaeological pedagogy, for the purposes of this study, I focus primarily on undergraduate education in the United States. While relevant case studies of pedagogical innovations from other settler colonial states are included in the literature review, the narrower scope of this study is a pragmatic and methodological choice because the organization of American anthropology departments differs from programs in other regions. The foundation of archaeology in the United States is intricately linked to the development of American anthropology, and consequently it is often taught as a subfield of anthropology. In addition, American models of teaching archaeology have changed as a result of both cultural resource legislation and also theoretical shifts in the academy in the 20th century that are particular to the political and socioeconomic terrain of higher education in the USA.

Due to these significant shifts in archaeological practice at the end of the 20th century, the Society of American Archaeology (SAA) developed principles of archaeological ethics in 1996 and a complementary set of principles in 2000 for teaching archaeology that were based in foundational methods and techniques and that would prepare students for careers within and outside of archaeology (Wholey and Nash 2014). The SAA is one of the largest organizations dedicated to the research and protection of archaeological heritage in the Americas, representing over 7,000 members in professional and avocational archaeology (SAA 2022). Specifically, these curricular reforms were premised on the need to incorporate training in cultural resource management and public archaeology in order to prepare students for the actual practice of archaeology since the majority of employment opportunities are found in CRM rather than academia (Bender 2000; Lipe 2000). In the mid to late twentieth century, public archaeology was commonly seen as synonymous with cultural resource management (CRM) and its legal
requirements to identify, evaluate, and manage archaeological resources for the public good (Nassaney 2004; White 2000). Since that time, there have been significant shifts in the practice of archaeology and an increasing number of archaeologists who argue that there should not be a distinction between public archaeology and other archaeologies. The core principles identified during the 1996 SAA meeting included stewardship, diversity of stakeholders, social relevance, ethics and values, effective written and oral communication, fundamental archaeological skills, and real-world problem solving (SAA 2020). The foundational skills identified by the SAA committee include survey and cartography, stratigraphy, archaeological methods, database management, and technical writing (Davis et al. 1998; Wholey and Nash 2014). Notably, there is no specific recommendation for innovative courses in artifact analysis, lab management, or curation at the undergraduate level. While these principles established by SAA are important values to recognize as a collective of practitioners and educators, these recommendations did not include suggestions for specific pedagogical innovations. Additionally, while the SAA (2000) recommendations moved beyond some of the critiques of traditional introductory level courses, these pedagogical techniques do not challenge the status quo and do not increase accessibility to research opportunities, educational, and employment opportunities to underrepresented populations within archaeology.

In comparison, scholarship in STEM fields has proven the myriad of other benefits gained from research-based pedagogy, particularly for undergraduates. Contemporary studies have shown that active learning courses result in higher exam scores and better student performance, particularly for underrepresented groups in fields that have been traditionally dominated by white men (Estrada et al. 2016; Freeman et al. 2014). These studies have also shown that research or project-based pedagogy during undergraduate education leads to more
students graduating with a STEM degree, increased acceptance to graduate programs, and continued training or working in the field following graduation (Hernandez et al. 2018).

Presently archaeology is not classified as a STEM field; however, as a discipline that lies at the intersection of the sciences and the humanities, it provides students a wide variety of investigative, analytical, and interpretive skills that are adaptive across STEM-related professions. The key with research-based pedagogy is to avoid the banking concept of education, (Freire 1993) and instead ensuring that we are teaching through archaeology rather than simply teaching archaeology (Bartoy 2011: 555).

2.1 Inquiry-Based and Active Learning

In the last two decades, there has been an increasing emphasis on inquiry-based pedagogy across many STEM disciplines (Deak et al. 2021); however, many of the available archaeological case studies are centered on field schools. These courses are often understood as the primary site of active learning because archaeological field schools involve experiential methods to teach students the fundamental skills required for a career in archaeology (Cobb and Croucher 2014). There is a critical need however, to further examine the possibility of archaeological pedagogy as transformative education (Arendt 2013; Blouet 2020; Henson 2017; Stottman 2017), particularly when considering questions like who is applying to study archaeology or how we are reproducing particular hierarchies and power structures in learning domains that promote certain ways of practicing archaeology and interpreting the past (Hamilakis 2004: 295).

In particular, the distinction between hands-on learning and constructivist pedagogy will become increasingly important for meeting the SAA Teaching Archaeology principles and to transform the discipline into an inclusive field of practice. Research has shown that hands-on
learning models have beneficial impacts on student education (Mullins 2019; Prince 2004); however, I would argue that training in archaeological methods should also be premised on constructivism, a pedagogical model based on the principle that people, both students and teachers, are actively involved in the construction of knowledge (Bartoy 2011: 554). While archaeological field schools can employ constructivist models of learning, particularly as spaces where students and teachers actively construct and co-constitute knowledge, there has been less emphasis placed on active learning opportunities for undergraduates in lab settings (Bartoy 2011; Conkey and Tringham 1996; Connell 2012; Hein 1998).

2.1.1 Alma College Archaeological Project

As previously outlined, field schools are often seen as sites of active learning, but there are several recent examples of archaeological methods courses that address some issues of access through new courses based in inquiry-based pedagogy. One example is the Alma College Archaeological Project conducted by Kristin Landau. This fieldwork-based project was designed to utilize active learning models to teach archaeological skills and principles of public archaeology to undergraduate students. To avoid some of the pitfalls of traditional field school models, such as summer tuition and fees and undertheorized projects, Landau (2019: 3) developed a course that provided experiential research to undergraduates within their traditional spring term on campus. Her curriculum model provided a more accessible course with active learning components because it did not require additional summer term tuition and travel costs and as it was located on the college campus itself. The Alma College undergraduates were asked to participate in community archaeology days where they would be responsible for interpreting the archaeological site and their excavation to members of the public. In addition to the active learning components involving collaboration in excavation and interpretation, the students were
asked to keep “student-centered journals” in which they could record their own views and experiences, as well as reflections on the practice of archaeology (Landau 2019:10).

In her evaluation of the Alma College Archaeological Project, Landau recognized the benefits of active learning including students taking on leadership roles and one student who chose to change their major to archaeology. Additionally, the student-centered journals highlighted some of the challenges that are involved in this model of research-based pedagogy, such as interpersonal conflicts, lack of participation, and one circumstance of a student throwing artifacts into the back-dirt pile to avoid excavating another level (Landau 2019: 15). The Alma College Archaeological Project embodied many of the principles of active learning, but the difficulties provide a helpful framework for considering other ways to ensure sustainability in research-based education.

2.1.2 Archaeology on College Hill Project

Another example of recent inquiry-based pedagogy is the Archaeology on College Hill (AoCH) project conducted during multiple years at Brown University. An explicit goal of this undergraduate course was to conduct student-centered fieldwork based in research opportunities and active learning models (Dufton et al. 2019: 304). Students were actively involved in shaping the research design, including placement of excavation units based on their interpretation of geophysical survey results. The excavations took place in a central location of campus, which allowed more students to participate in the course than a traditional field school located in a remote area off-campus or abroad. As with many field training courses, students participated in hands-on training throughout the entirety of the research process from design, field work, lab analysis, and limited public interpretation through blog posts and archaeology days (Dufton et al. 2019).
While the AoCH project is more traditional in situating the field as the primary location for active learning, Dufton and the other project leads sought to incorporate constructivist pedagogy into multiple aspects of the course, allowing students to drive the research questions and interpretive activities. Since the course was conducted over several years, comparative data across the class cohorts are useful for understanding some of the longer-term impacts of research-based pedagogy. The survey results from the undergraduate students align with the results of active learning in STEM fields, including continued involvement in the project, increases in students majoring in archaeology and pursuing employment or graduate education in archaeology (Dufton et al. 2019: 313).

2.1.3 Governmental Training Programs

In addition to these academic case studies, there has been an increase in the number of training programs based in active learning principles, particularly programs run by federal agencies. One such program is the Urban Archaeology Corps (UAC) program run by the National Park Service (NPS), which was developed in the last decade. The program was explicitly designed with the goals of employing diverse youth to work in urban national parks, to utilize archaeology as a method of teaching civic engagement and stewardship, and finally to increase the visibility of archaeology and the NPS as career options (NPS 2015). While this program is not based in academia, the pedagogical strategies are based in active learning principles and public archaeology principles. The UAC focuses on community engagement and teaches through archaeology, using it as a tool to develop critical thinking skills and developing connections within communities by exploring the past. The emphasis on constructivist models has resulted in several participants returning to participate in the program for multiple years (NPS 2015).
Since every project has a public facing component including, but not limited to, the development of interpretive videos, participation in education days, and collection of oral histories, all the participants are trained with ethical considerations that better reflect 21st century archaeological practice (NPS 2015). In addition, the focus on employing local youth to work in urban national parks increases the accessibility of the archaeological projects, allowing the participants to learn foundational excavation skills and public archaeology methods that can be used to foster connections within and between community members. As the program is only a few years old, there will need to be more longitudinal studies on the sustainability of UAC and its effectiveness in increasing accessibility of archaeology to a diverse set of stakeholders.

Another example of active learning through archaeological training is the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Veterans Curation Program (VCP). The program was created to provide veterans with a “bridging experience from military service into the public sector,” and to assist in the long-term curation of at-risk archaeological collections belonging to the USACE (USACE 2021). The program provides veterans with hands-on laboratory experience and training in archaeological, archival, and technological skills that can be transferred to other jobs. Veterans are hired as archaeological technicians and assist the USACE with rehabilitating archaeological collections to ensure that they are brought up to current federal standards as required by 36 CFR 79, or the ‘Curation of Federally-Owned and Administered Archeological Collections’ regulation passed in 1990 (Arendt 2013: 91). One of the primary benefits of the VCP is the transferrable skills obtained by veterans who may or may not choose to pursue archaeology as a profession. In particular, the advantage of a lab-based, rather than field-based, project is the opportunity to obtain proficiency with various computer software programs, database entry, and other technological skills that are increasingly required by a wide variety of
professions (Arendt 2013: 97). Although the VCP is not designed to train veterans to become archaeologists or historians specifically, the program model highlights the ways in which archaeological training can be made accessible to diverse groups of people from a variety of backgrounds (Casselberry 2012; USACE 2021).

2.2 Public Archaeology & Archaeological Pedagogy

As part of the Society for American Archaeology (SAA)’s educational goals, a set of ethical guidelines were developed and published in the edited volume, *Teaching Archaeology in the 21st Century* (Bender and Smith 2000). This volume outlined principles for a 21st century archaeology that includes the identification of the community or communities’ stakeholders, formation of partnerships beyond archaeology, understanding the legal boundaries involved, effective communication, recognition of diverse decision-making structures, and the need to plan project goals ahead of personal goals (Watkins, Pyburn, and Cressey 2000). While these specific principles are not incorporated into every public archaeology project, common approaches in contemporary archaeology include activism, multivocality, collaboration, and community engagement, although these are not mutually exclusive (McDavid and Brock 2013: 160).

Gabriel Moshenska (2017:6) identifies seven common categories for public archaeology including 1) archaeologists working with the public, 2) archaeology by the public, 3) archaeological education, 4) public sector archaeology, 5) open archaeology, 6) popular archaeology, and 7) academic public archaeology. In addition to numerous and often overlapping definitions of public archaeology, the main principles can also be found in community, collaborative, and engaged archaeologies, amongst other names that often depend upon the context and the individual project director (Bollwerk et al 2015; Kowalczyk 2016; Schadla-Hall 1999). These broad categories capture the extensive continuum of public archaeology practice,
yet if public archaeology exists “in a tangle of overlapping definitions and interpretations,” then how does this affect the ways in which students are trained (Moshenska 2017:3)? These concerns are similar to those raised by Hamilakis (2004) regarding the impacts of specific pedagogical traditions within archaeology, particularly those developed from within neoliberal, higher education institutions.

For the purposes of this study, I have identified three common themes across the archaeological pedagogy literature including public archaeology as community engagement, as community-service learning, and finally as collaboration or community-based archaeology. While there are shared values between the frameworks, each theme places greater emphasis on a particular pedagogical framework and level of involvement with members of the public. While many public archaeology projects acknowledge the different positionalities of the faculty, students, and community members involved, and seek to illuminate histories silenced by hegemonic narratives, not all projects explicitly state this activist framework (Tilley 1998: 318-325). By understanding archaeological pedagogy as a form of cultural production (Hamilakis 2004:288), we can see why it is important to consider the methods and frameworks for teaching public archaeology at higher education institutions.

### 2.2.1 Community Engagement

The first thematic group is the broadest category and encompasses formal coursework in archaeology, academic internships, and public outreach events. These public archaeology projects involve a certain degree of community engagement and are often centered on archaeological education events or the inclusion of community knowledge in the archaeological interpretation process (diZerga Wall et al. 2004; Zutter and Grekul 2020). Many of these courses or programs are conducted in the same region as the university and in some instances, the
courses involved an archaeology of the university itself (Dufton et al. 2019; Stubbs et al 2010). Another shared pedagogical feature of these courses, programs, and internships is that the entirety or the majority of the archaeological labor itself is conducted by university students and faculty, while community members fill the visitor, consultant, or client role. It is important to note that the archaeological work is primarily situated around excavations and fieldwork, which is a consistent trend in the literature concerning advances in archaeological pedagogy.

2.2.2 Community-Service Learning

The second theme across the literature is public archaeology as community service learning (CSL) projects. With one exception, most of these CSL case studies took place between 2000 and 2012, with the same professors shifting to an explicit “public archaeology” framework in the last decade. However, the archaeologists do not address this shift in terminology in their more recent works, however; this is likely indicative of the current perspective of public archaeology as a continuum rather than as CRM only. The primary goals of CSL include students providing a service to meet a community need, active reflection on the practice, student learning, and increased commitment to civic participation through volunteerism (Nassaney 2004: 91). Rather than archaeological coursework centered on research questions alone, CSL projects are designed to provide students with firsthand training to solve real world problems that can be applied outside of a classroom setting (Freund, Clark, and Gidusko 2019; Lockard 2012; McLaughlin 2009:61;). Similar to the community engagement category, CSL partners can serve as site hosts and may be consulted during the research process, but often their greatest involvement is in the final interpretive materials (Baugher 2009; Chilton and Hart 2009).
2.2.3 Collaborative and Community-Based Projects

The final thematic group is teaching public archaeology through collaborative or community-based projects. Similar to the CSL courses, community-based projects frame archaeology as not scholarship for the sake of scholarship, but instead scholarship in aid of the community (Gonzalez et al. 2006: 391). Many of the case studies involved indigenous archaeology frameworks and were based in collaborative partnerships with Tribal Nations, Native Hawaiian Organizations (NHOs), First Nations, and indigenous communities. Almost all of these community-based projects were conducted over the course of several years and were designed for students and community members alike to participate in multiple field seasons or to continue their work into professional and academic careers (Lima et al. 2018; May et al. 2017; Smith et al. 2020). These projects teach students more than archaeological methods because the collaborative work highlights that research is a “social practice with social consequences” rather than an isolated academic exercise (Silliman and Dring 2008:79).

With the community as equal partner rather than as a client or consultant, this pedagogical model challenges the structured learning hierarchy that is inherent in many university courses, and in archaeological field schools in particular (Cipolla and Quinn 2016; Gonzales et al 2006: 397). These courses provide students with first-hand experiences in the complexities of public archaeology, particularly surrounding the concept of “community”. Although communities may be defined as “a unit of identity that is reinforced through social interactions and characterized by a degree of common identity, shared experiences, and/or geography proximity,” (Atalay 2012: 90) archaeologists need to be aware that individuals are situated within multiple communities across different scales, that we must be cautious to avoid creating or reifying communities (see also, Pyburn 2011). Often the idea of community or
communities will be blurred as the “concept ceaselessly creates, struggles, renegotiates, transforms, destroys, and renews itself, constantly redefining what and who is and is not community” (Onciul 2016: 81). These complicated webs of belonging and identity that are integral to the concept of community highlight the need for anthropological praxis and long-term collaborative relationships between institutions and stakeholders because communities are always changing and the participants in the process will change over time. The application of praxis throughout the process should be the goal in order to prevent singular and static interpretation of the past, present communities, and possible futures. In fact, many of these public archaeology courses challenge students to consider how certain knowledges are traditionally valued in the process of archaeological knowledge production (Atalay 2008; Bendremer and Thomas 2008; Lightfoot 2008:222).

2.3 Legacy Collections and the Curation Crisis

Although archaeological field schools are understood as primary sites of active learning, many museum and collections management courses already use practice-based and embodied learning principles that can easily translate into collections-based research courses, particularly those involving legacy collections (Benden 2019; Krmpotich 2015). Legacy collections are often the result of archaeological excavations conducted prior to or immediately following the passage of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 and 36 CFR 79, and consequently do not follow current standards of data recording or collection care. Often these collections have site-specific nomenclature, outdated methodologies, and have been stored with varying degrees of analysis, documentation, and curation (Olson and Cathcart 2019:104). Due to the lack of resources to properly curate these legacy collections, archaeological repositories are continually caught in an ongoing “curation crisis.”
Documentation of the archaeological “curation crisis” began in the 1970s following the passage of cultural resource and historic preservation legislation. The concept of the curation crisis refers to the rapid growth of archaeological collections at repositories without the adequate resources for their perpetual curation (Marquardt et al. 1982; Childs and Sullivan 2004; Friberg and Huvila 2019; Voss 2012). Archaeological excavations conducted as compliance for Section 106 of the NHPA have significantly contributed to the number of artifacts that must be curated, particularly when development-led projects are hastily planned and conducted with a minimal research plan (Voss 2012). In addition, shifting employment trends have resulted in significant changes to the education and training that archaeologists receive. Over the course of the 20th century, many archaeologists became employed through CRM firms, federal agencies, and universities, rather than museums, resulting in an increasing number of professionals who are not trained in curation methods (Campbell 2011: 12; Childs and Sullivan 2004).

One distinct advantage of using legacy collections in undergraduate courses, however, is in the multitude of management issues associated with them. As many of these collections have remained unstudied since their initial excavation report, they present new opportunities for research that can inform contemporary archaeology (King 2019; Voss 2012). Since many of these legacy projects were conducted prior to current cultural resource legislation, research-based courses would provide students with the avenues to develop fundamental archaeological skills and to consider the importance of method, theory, and ethics of field- and collections-based archaeology (King 2016; Schiappacasse 2019). These skills are increasingly relevant to current archaeological practice as many professionals call for greater action to address the curation crisis.
Another important aspect of collections management is a greater recognition that the objects or artifacts are products of “various scales of collecting materials and processes of making” and are embedded in social relationships that vary throughout time and space (Bell 2017; Shanks and Tilley 1992;). The increased professionalization of museums and archaeology has resulted in strict disciplinary views of objects as specimens, rather than as complex and socially embedded in layers of meaning (Srinivasan et al. 2010). For CRM archaeological collections in particular, the archival documents and artifacts are organized and reported as a series of objects, rather than as “sets of complex relationships that include objects” (King 2010:145). This is an important observation because often the traditional curatorial role represents authority and can be antithetical to ways in which ‘artifacts’ are understood and function within descendant communities (Nicks 2003:24).

2.4 Teaching an Inclusive and Accessible Archaeology

All of the referenced public archaeology courses were designed around experiential learning, a framework that works well with archaeological field projects, and often these experiences were paired with a critical reflection assignment. Students gained first-hand experience in considering questions such as, who is at the table? Who gets invited back? Who is listened to? (Little 2010:158). It is important to note that the bulk of these case studies are centered around archeological fieldwork. Yet, there are many significant opportunities for students to engage in public archaeology projects within museum or lab-based settings. Since archaeological excavation is inherently a destructive practice, archaeologists have an ethical obligation to conduct research with existing data and collections, instead of perpetually conducting new or additional fieldwork. With mounting pressure to address the crisis of curating
thousands of archaeological collections, particularly in the United States, universities could
develop engaging methods of teaching public archaeology without ever excavating another unit.

While field schools continue to be an important place of archaeological training, there has
been increasing recognition of the problems associated with a singular focus on the traditional
model of these courses. Often field schools are conducted in the summer and require students to
tavel to remote field sites, regardless if the course is domestic or international. A recent study of
archaeological field schools found that the cost of tuition, room and board, travel, and the loss of
wages as a result of participating in a field school, can result in significant financial barriers for
students (Heath-Stout and Hannigan 2020). The physical and financial exclusivity of field
schools contributes to more long-term inequities in the discipline by fundamentally limiting who
has access to archaeological training that is required for a career in archaeology. Historically, lab
work has been viewed as the “housework” of archaeology, and women have been relegated to
these roles that are seen as less prestigious in comparison to the masculine practices of
excavation (Gero 1985; Heath-Stout 2019:4). Developing collections-based courses that are
designed as spaces of professionalization presents an opportunity to challenge these gendered
roles and to train undergraduates to value all aspects of the archaeological research process.

In addition, there is a need for a multifaceted pedagogical intervention since the literature
has shown that archaeology is often dominated by straight, white, cisgender people, with recent
scholarship pointing to the lack of diversity along class and disability axes as well (Heath-Stout
2019; Heath-Stout and Hannigan 2020). For example, in archaeological research and practice,
there is often an assumption of heteronormativity, and students who are entering the discipline
may feel unsafe in remote and often rural site locations that do not have access to adequate
healthcare for LGBTQ students (Blackmore et al. 2016). Additionally, field schools often house
students according to man/woman gender categories that do not acknowledge a diverse set of identities and student safety (Blackmore et al. 2016; Rodríguez 2015). Like many other disciplines, recent studies have also documented high rates of sexual harassment and assault amongst those conducting fieldwork at all levels (Meyers et al. 2018; Voss 2021a). Sexual harassment is not exclusively an issue of fieldwork alone; however, Bradford and Crema have noted that “fieldwork is a low-risk environment for perpetrators… a high-risk environment for marginalized individuals” (2020:2, as cited in Voss 2021b). Since many traditional field schools have often been treated as a right-of-passage for archaeology undergraduates, unfortunately they can be utilized as a course to weed people out through the “cowboy mentality” or “frat party”-like cultures (Landau 2019; Wade 2020). As critical introductory courses, archaeological field schools and collections-based courses need to develop codes of conduct with strict enforcement mechanisms and need to develop more inclusive spaces for a more diverse set of students (Heath-Stout 2019; Voss 2021b).

As outlined above, developing more inclusive and accessible archaeology courses will require significant and radical changes to our educational programs and the discipline as a whole. A re-examination of our traditional teaching paradigms is necessary in order to understand how systemic ableism, structural racism, sexism, and other forms of discrimination are embedded in our taken-for-granted pedagogical models and overall archaeological practice (Flewellen et al. 2020; Heath-Stout 2021b). These transformations need to occur at all levels of archaeological pedagogy, including introductory archaeology courses, often the first place that most students encounter archaeology as a discipline. Although individual archaeologists are incorporating more inclusive pedagogies in introductory courses through frameworks like Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and Teaching Across Cultural Strengths, these initiatives are not commonplace
across all higher education institutions (Oland 2020). In addition, more archaeologists need to critically consider the colonial origins of the discipline and transform the ways in which we teach undergraduate students about archaeological methods, theory, and ethics (Bruchac 2014; Supernant 2020). These pedagogical shifts should be paired with conversations around cultural patrimony, repatriation, and ideas of ownership that are ongoing in museum studies but have direct implications for archaeological practice (Abu-Lughod 2020; Bruchac 2014). Diversity needs to be more than inclusive language; rather, true diversity based in accessibility, accommodation, and inclusivity requires action, because diversity language does not have a necessary relation to changing organizational values (Ahmed 2012: 65).
3 AN ENDEAVOR IN RESHAPING HIGHER EDUCATION

3.1 Georgia State University

3.1.1 Transformation of an Urban University

Georgia State University (GSU) began as a commuter evening School of Commerce and functioned as a part of the Georgia Institute of Technology, or Georgia Tech, from 1913-1933 (Smith 2010). The institution has been reorganized a number of times in its 108-year history, including the establishment of its independent status as the University System Center from 1933-1947, quickly followed by its incorporation as the Atlanta Division of the University of Georgia (UGA) from 1947-1955. In 1955, the Board of Regents re-established the independent college as the Georgia State College of Business until 1961, when it became known as Georgia State College. It was 1969 when the institution became Georgia State University as it is known today (Smith 2010). For half of the institution’s history, GSU only served white students. The University System of Georgia overwhelmingly sought to maintain segregation through a variety of moral and racial standards for admission, and the first legal victory against segregation policies in higher education was Hunt v. Arnold, in which three black women sought to gain admission to GSU (Daniels 2019). Despite a legal victory in 1958 against race-based admission policies, the plaintiffs Barbara Pace Hunt, Iris Mae Welch, and Myra Elliot Dinsmore, ultimately did not gain admission to GSU because of “moral character” qualifications (Daniels 2019). It was not until 1962, that GSU admitted its first African American student, Annette Lucille Hall (Reed 2009: 212).

Despite the discriminatory history of university education in the state of Georgia, in the years following the Civil Rights movement, a more diverse student body was admitted to GSU. A significant number of institutional changes have radically transformed GSU from the original
all-white commuter school to one of innovative pedagogies and data-driven technologies that serve an increasingly diverse undergraduate population. As a result of institutional redirection and pedagogical innovation by faculty, GSU has continued to be recognized as an “innovative engine of social mobility” (Fausset 2018). In the 2022 edition of the U.S. News & World Report’s Best Colleges, GSU was ranked the No. 2 most innovative university in the country and the No. 2 best for undergraduate teaching (GSU 2021). GSU is highly acclaimed for social mobility rankings, first-year experiences, diversity, and learning communities (GSU 2021a). At the beginning of the 2020-2021 school year, there were 28,771 enrolled undergraduate students comprised of 40.1% men and 59.9% women enrolled at the downtown campus (GSU Factbook 2020; National Center for Education Statistics 2021). As shown in Table 1, the undergraduate population continues to reflect the racial and ethnic as well as socioeconomic diversity of the surrounding Atlanta area (National Council for Education Data 2021; Rehagen 2012).

Table 1. 2020-2021 Reported Race/Ethnicity of Undergraduate Population at Georgia State University (IPEDS College data 2020-2021, Georgia State University)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percent of Undergraduate Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity unknown</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-resident alien</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While college education itself remains inaccessible to many Americans, GSU has become a model for successfully graduating a diverse population of undergraduates. The university has been consistently ranked among top institutions for commitment to undergraduate teaching and innovation. All of these changes have been implemented in the last two decades and the new 21st
century mission is clearly outlined in the GSU Strategic Plan and includes the following goals (GSU 2011):

**Goal 1** – *Becoming a national model for undergraduate education by demonstrating that students from all backgrounds can achieve academic and career success at high rates.*

**Goal 2** – *Significantly strengthen and grow the base of distinctive graduate and professional programs that assure development of the next generation of researchers and societal leaders*

**Goal 3** – *Become a leading public research university addressing the most challenging issues of the 21st century*

**Goal 4** – *Be a leader in understanding the complex challenges of cities and developing effective solutions*

**Goal 5** – *Achieve distinction in globalizing the university*

In order to meet the above goals and successfully serve students, GSU has implemented a variety of programs to identify and address the structural barriers for minority, part-time, military, low-income, and first-generation college students (Gumbel 2020). Financial assistance programs, such as Panther Retention grants, provide emergency funding to cover modest financial shortfalls and ensure that students are able to pay tuition and fees, preventing thousands of students from dropping out (GSU 2019). Other financial programs include Keep Hope Alive, which provides a $500 stipend for two semesters to students who have lost the HOPE scholarship and enrolls them in a rigorous financial literacy program, and the SunTrust Student Financial Management Center (SFMC) which provides students with financial literacy resources including FAFSA guidance (GSU 2019). For many students in the state of Georgia, the HOPE scholarship, which is funded by state lottery revenues, is critical for their ability to pay for in-state college tuition, but it can be difficult to maintain the necessary GPA required to demonstrate sufficient academic achievement. According to the GSU administration, another critical component to the increased student success is the GPS Advising system, which utilizes predictive analytics to identify hidden risks and important milestones for all of the undergraduate
majors (GSU 2019; Gumbel 2020: 118). The predictive aspect allows advisers to intervene earlier and allow students to stay on track in their degree programs. Through these innovative programs and faculty and staff efforts, GSU has become the only public university in the United States at which there are no achievement gaps based on race, ethnicity, or income level. African American, Latino, and Pell students now graduate at rates at or above the rate of the student body overall (GSU 2019). In addition to predictive advising, almost all incoming freshman at GSU join a Freshman Learning Community (FLC), comprised of cohorts of 25 students within the same “meta major,” either STEM, business, arts and humanities, policy, health, education and social sciences (GSU 2021b). These cohorts take all of their classes together in the first semester and this model has been shown to improve retention and reduce time to graduation (GSU 2021b; Collins 2020).

3.1.2 Pedagogical Innovation

In addition to significant administrative changes, the GSU administration has prioritized pedagogical innovation through new education programs and the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning and Online Education (CETLOE). CETLOE has emerged as an important site for pedagogical training and innovation at GSU due to its Faculty Teaching Fellowships, which allow GSU faculty to conduct research in the area of teaching and learning, as well as designated instructional designers who work with faculty to incorporate new technology into their classrooms (GSU 2019). GSU has made it an institutional priority for faculty to participate in a variety of undergraduate teaching initiatives such as mentors in undergraduate research or community-based learning projects, although these initiatives do not always receive financial support.
One of the more recent innovative programs at GSU, the Experiential Project-Based Interdisciplinary Curriculum (EPIC) program, improves the experience of students with experiential and learning modeled on a Liberal Arts education (Collins and Renken 2019). The EPIC program is modeled on Georgia Tech’s Vertically Integrated Projects (VIP) program, which engages undergraduate and graduate students in long-term, large-scale, multidisciplinary projects led by faculty members (GSU 2021c). The VIP program model extends project-based learning beyond a single semester, allowing students to gain research and professional skills while participating for up to three years (Georgia Tech 2021). Traditional models of undergraduate research, often a one-to-one faculty mentorship model, have proven to be ineffective for serving large numbers of students, particularly students from historically underserved minorities (Sonnenberg-Klein, Abler, and Cole 2018: 6). As a result, Georgia Tech VIP teams are comprised of a faculty advisor, graduate students, and undergraduates currently in their sophomore, junior, or senior year of study (Georgia Tech 2021).

The VIP program incorporates high-impact learning practices which have been shown to increase student retention, contribute to cumulative learning, and benefit students of many backgrounds (Association of American Colleges & Universities 2021). High-impact educational practices include but are not limited to first-year seminars, ePortfolios, learning communities, service or community-based learning, writing intensive courses, internships, and undergraduate research opportunities (Kuh 2008). When these high-impact educational practices are linked to results-oriented engagement through sustained student involvement, these models can result in successful community engagement initiatives that improve the lives of students as well as communities (Hoy 2012). Research has shown that not all students participate equally in these course models, with first-generation college students and students of color participating in lower
numbers (Kinzie 2012). These high-impact learning practices are increasingly being incorporated into student success initiatives at GSU.

Like the VIP program, the EPIC program at GSU enrolls students in individual project labs across various departments and programs to create long-term, project-based opportunities for undergraduate students. As outlined below, the project labs are designed to provide students with the opportunity to (Collins 2020):

1. *Develop and demonstrate 21st century skills like digital literacies, complex problem solving, and teamwork*
2. *Apply knowledge from classes to real-world projects with impact*
3. *Build networks with faculty, community groups, non-profits, and businesses*
4. *Build a portfolio to show what they know*

The Department of Anthropology at GSU developed an archaeology-specific project lab, the Phoenix Project, which began in the fall semester of 2020. These courses incorporate active learning and project-based curriculum to teach students about archaeology through the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA) collection.

### 3.2 Curating Urban Archaeology

#### 3.2.1 The MARTA Collection

The MARTA collection is comprised of over 500 boxes of artifacts collected during the late 1970s in advance of construction for the MARTA rail lines in Atlanta. These archaeological surveys were led by GSU professor Dr. Roy Dickens and conducted by undergraduate students in the Department of Anthropology as compliance for the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966. The excavations were conducted between 1976 and 1979, and the MARTA collection represents one of the earliest large-scale urban archaeology projects in the United States (Bowen and Carnes 1977; Carnes and Dickens 1978, 1979; Dickens and Barber 1976;
Futch et al. 1980). The MARTA collection has been stored at GSU, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and the University of Georgia, but was returned to GSU in 2011 through the work of Dr. Jeffrey Glover and the Department of Anthropology (Raviv 2018). The collection includes objects from archaeological sites across Atlanta and includes evidence of the Battle of Atlanta, late nineteenth and early twentieth century dumps, wells, and taverns. The collection is now stored in the Laboratory of Archaeology in Dahlberg Hall at GSU. Since 2011, there have been four master’s theses centered on the MARTA collection (Blank 2021; Bryant 2015; Cook 2014; Thompson 2016), several presentations at the Georgia State Undergraduate Research Conference (GSURC), and numerous class projects from the Archaeological Methods course (ANTH 4590/6590), a cross listed upper-division and graduate-level class. The majority of the collection, however, has not been re-analyzed since its original curation and can be considered a legacy archaeological collection. By enrolling undergraduate students in experiential learning and project-based coursework like the Phoenix Project Lab, students have the opportunity to explore the complex relationships and varied meanings of objects in legacy collections.

3.2.2 Archaeological Curriculum at Georgia State University

In addition to the significant number of research opportunities and Archaeological Methods course mentioned above, GSU provides undergraduate students with a wide variety of archaeological coursework such as the introductory level Archaeology and Prehistory, Archaeology of South America, Mesoamerican Archaeology, Archaeological Practice and the Public, Archaeology of Death and Dying, and Archaeological Theory. The diversity of coursework offered at GSU, particularly at the upper (4000/6000) level, allows students to learn about regional archaeological histories as well as important methodological and theoretical
frameworks in archaeology. As with many anthropology departments in the United States, there are many unexplored possibilities for teaching introductory archaeology courses at GSU, particularly through hands-on learning, which is often reserved for upper division classes.
4 TEACHING INTRODUCTORY ARCHAEOLOGY-RESEARCH DESIGN

4.1 Development of the Project

While archaeological field schools can employ constructivist models of learning, particularly as spaces where students and teachers actively construct and co-constitute knowledge, there has been less emphasis placed on active learning opportunities for undergraduates in lab settings (Bartoy 2011; Conkey and Tringham 1996; Hein 1998). Constructivist models are based on the principle that people, both students and teachers, are actively involved in the construction of knowledge (Bartoy 2011: 554). This pedagogical model rejects the “banking concept of education,” in which students are containers to be filled with knowledge rather than as active participants in the creation of knowledge (Freire 1993:53). Archaeological lab courses offered at the undergraduate level have the potential to serve as important sites of active learning, particularly with the growing public recognition of the general inaccessibility and frequent lack of inclusivity of field schools (Landau 2019; Rodriguez 2015; Wade 2020).

This study addresses this gap in existing research. Specifically, it examines the potential for teaching archaeology through collections-based research in undergraduate archaeology courses. As the cost of archaeological field schools continues to rise, these courses are even more inaccessible to an increasing number of undergraduate students, particularly those who have been historically excluded from the discipline of archaeology (Heath-Stout and Hannigan 2020). Collections-based courses could allow more students to have access to archaeological research and to conduct research with existing resources that are located on university campuses or in nearby repositories. Specifically at GSU, lab courses based around the MARTA collection could serve as additional spaces for archaeological training. By utilizing ethnographic methods, this
study examines undergraduate experiences in introductory archaeology courses at Georgia State University (GSU) in order to understand the role of experiential lab-based curriculum and its impacts. Located in downtown Atlanta, GSU is one of the largest institutions of higher education in the USA and its student body is one of the most diverse. Comparing student experiences in a traditional lecture course with those of students enrolled in a hands-on project lab involving the legacy collection of archaeological material curated at the university, this study explores the potential of lab-based courses as sites of active learning and as models for more inclusive and accessible archaeological education at higher education institutions.

4.2 Methodology

The proposed project examines student experiences in two different introductory semester-long archaeology course formats at Georgia State University, specifically the traditional lecture format of the Archaeology and Prehistory (ANTH 2030) course and the experiential learning format of the Phoenix Project Lab (PERS 2002) in the Department of Anthropology. The Archaeology and Prehistory course introduces undergraduates to an overview of human prehistory across the globe through an archaeological lens (Appendix B.1). This class was held twice a week for an hour and fifteen minutes during both the Fall 2021 and Spring 2022 semesters. Like many introductory classes at the university level, this course is taught every semester and follows more a traditional lecture format with exams, five short paper assignments, and one brief “Archaeology in the News” assignment. Enrollment for this course is capped at 60 students.

The Phoenix Project Lab is one of the project labs taught through the EPIC program at GSU and is intended to provide students with the opportunity to utilize scientific advances in archaeology to generate engaging content for the public in the Atlanta area (Appendix B.2). This
class was held every Wednesday from 5:00-5:50 pm. The early portion of the course introduces students to the discipline of archaeology, archaeological collection management, and scientific methods utilized by archaeologists through lectures and hands-on engagement with re-bagging artifacts from the MARTA Archaeological collection. In the latter half of the semester, the final projects are selected collaboratively with students in the class based on student interest in particular methodologies that can be utilized with the MARTA collection. For the Fall 2021 semester, students selected one from three final projects including an ArcGIS Story Map focused on archaeological sites located along the North-South MARTA line, 3D photogrammetry of artifacts, and pXRF scanning of stoneware whiskey jugs from the collection. Fifteen undergraduate students were enrolled in the Fall 2021 semester.

Since it is more common to discover archaeology as an undergraduate student than at any earlier point in education (Heath-Stout 2019: 252), these two courses will serve as a case study to explore the impacts of hands-on inquiry-based pedagogy utilizing archaeological collections and opportunities to increase the accessibility of archaeological education. In addition to the findings from the interviews with undergraduate students enrolled in these courses, this project draws upon secondary literature from education theory in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields and teaching methods from public archaeology in order to propose a framework for collections-based archaeology curriculum.

Methods utilized for this research include limited participant observation in each classroom and semi-structured interviews with individual participants. The qualitative nature of the data collection places greater emphasis on the students’ reported experience to address the following research questions including:
1. How do experiential learning classes with archaeological collections and traditional lecture courses impact students’ understanding and engagement with archaeology at the introductory level?

2. What effects do hands-on, inquiry-based pedagogical methods have on creating an inclusive and accessible archaeological education at Georgia State University?

A total of eight undergraduate students, four participants from each course, were interviewed about their understanding of archaeological collections and of the role of archaeology as a result of their enrollment in an introductory archaeology class. The recruitment of participants was conducted through an in-person announcement during regularly scheduled class time and a follow up email asking interested students if they would like to participate in the study. An informed consent document was emailed to all interested students prior to any audio recording and/or written recording of the interview (Appendix A.1). All participants agreed to being recorded during their individual interviews.

Following participant observations and semi-structured interviews, I utilized grounded theory and inductive approaches in my data analysis (Charmaz 2014). Participant observations consisted of in person observations during regularly scheduled meetings for Archaeology and Prehistory and the Phoenix Project Lab, including documentation of normal education activities such as the kinds of questions asked by students and level of engagement. In an unobtrusive manner, I noted trends in overall classroom practices between the traditional lecture course and the experiential project lab, rather than an analysis of individual student behaviors. I took notes on pedagogical methods that were utilized during each course including active or traditional learning techniques, assignment discussions, and lecture format. No identifiable data were collected during participant observation. This study included eight semi-structured individual
interviews, consisting of four participants from the Archaeology and Prehistory course and four students from the Phoenix Project Lab. The individual interviews lasted between 15 minutes up to an hour and consisted of ten predetermined questions, often with additional follow-up questions based upon student responses (Appendix A.2). Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, all interviews were conducted virtually via WebEx at a time agreed upon by me and the student participant.

Lastly, the study was originally designed to include two focus groups involving the same participants from the semi-structured interviews. One focus group would have comprised of students enrolled in the Phoenix Project Lab and the second focus group students enrolled in the Archaeology and Prehistory course. The focus groups were intended to last between one to two hours and each focus group would have taken place in the Archaeology Lab located in Dahlberg Hall at GSU, or as a virtual meeting in Webex, at a time agreed upon by all participants (Appendix A.3).

Recruitment of participants from both courses was conducted in November 2021 and March 2022. Due to low numbers of student participants from Archaeology and Prehistory in the Fall 2021 semester (n=2), I recruited additional participants during the Spring 2022 course. Both iterations of Archaeology and Prehistory were taught by the same professor, Dr. Jeffrey Glover. The Phoenix Project Lab was taught during the Fall semester of the 2021-2022 school year, and consequently I only recruited students from the Fall semester. Since I served as the teaching assistant in the Phoenix Project Lab, the semi-structured interviews with those students were not conducted until after the conclusion of the Fall 2021 semester. Interviews with students from Archaeology and Prehistory were conducted in December 2021, and in January and March 2022,
following the participants’ review of the informed consent document and agreement to participate in this study.

The eight individual interviews and class observations utilized purposive sampling to select participants from two introductory archaeology courses, the Archaeology Phoenix Project Lab in the EPIC program, and the Archaeology and Prehistory course. The interviews were audio recorded with permission from the participants, stored on a password-protected personal computer that is not connected to cloud storage, and then thematically transcribed for research purposes. No identifiable data were collected during the interviews or focus groups, and all transcriptions or field notes were de-identified to ensure that no identifiable information was inadvertently collected. The recorded interviews, field notes, coding sheets, and transcriptions will be deleted after the final write up and submission of my master’s thesis in summer 2022.

4.3 Theoretical Framework and Analysis

An inductive method of thematic transcription and coding was applied to all the data, which allowed me to note or identify themes and topics of importance throughout the interviews and participant observation. These codes informed my recommendations for future collections-based archaeology courses at the university level in Chapter Six. In this study, I employ grounded theory, or theory derived from the words of informants, because in a constructivist model of teaching, students are active co-creators of knowledge within and about the classroom (Bartoy 2011; Charmaz 2014).

The proposed study is informed by anthropological praxis models of research (Kozaitis 2000, 2013; McGuire 2008; Warry 1992). Anthropological praxis generates theory to inform change, founded in a theoretical tradition that recognizes individual agency and how change occurs constantly on an individual scale to aggregate into a collective change that creates a space
for understanding and intervening in social problems (Ervin 2015). Praxis is “reflection and action upon the world in order to transform it” (Freire [1970] 2000: 51). Integral to the participatory and collaborative work is theory that is “grounded in principles of community organization, fairness, justice, empowerment, participation and self-determination” (McCloskey et al. 2011: 4). One of the crucial aspects of praxis is conscious action to bring about positive changes to provide opportunities for people to demonstrate their agency through theoretically informed and ethically sound empirical research and data analysis (Kozaitis 2013).

Some specific examples of praxis within archaeological work include the incorporation of greater cultural competency in order to the re-evaluate processes of teaching and practicing archaeology in order to radically transform the discipline and make it more accessible. Archaeologists should not only learn culturally appropriate ways to behave at archaeological sites and landscapes, but also culturally appropriate ways of handling the artifacts after they have been removed from these contexts (Atalay 2012; Mauger and Bowechop 2006). In this way, archaeology projects should be “relevant to, accessible by, and done for the benefit of local communities” (Atalay 2012:7). By using anthropological praxis principles, archaeologists can teach undergraduate students how they might utilize more holistic approaches like archaeological ethnography that necessarily involves long-term commitments, participant observation, interviews, and archival work in addition to archaeological practice (Meskell 2005).

Specifically, the involvement of undergraduate students in project-based coursework across multiple disciplines has been shown to be an effective model for teaching requisite skills and retaining students who have been historically excluded from these disciplines (Estrada et al. 2016; Freeman et al. 2014; Kinzie 2012; McPhee and Przedpelska 2018). Through an ethnographic study of undergraduate experiences in introductory archaeology courses at GSU,
this study provides recommendations for collections-based courses that promote a more inclusive and accessible archaeology. The proposed study is designed with an anthropological praxis framework to inform undergraduate archaeology lab courses, including future iterations of the Phoenix Project Lab, at GSU.

4.4 Limitations

Limitations of this research are a direct result of the traditional course format for undergraduate courses as well as the real-world factors that many students face during their undergraduate education such as scheduling conflicts between class, work, and extracurricular activities, financial hardship, family and community commitments, etc. While many students initially agreed to participate in this study (approximately thirty students between the Archaeology and Prehistory courses, and nine of fifteen students from the Phoenix Project Lab), the resulting sample population was significantly smaller. Many students did not respond to email communications regarding interview scheduling requests, while others were not able to participate due to other engagements including coursework and family emergencies. In addition to lower participation levels, these same challenges made the scheduling of focus groups not feasible. Having a greater number of participants would have influenced the findings and recommendations of this study; however, the lack of student engagement speaks to the myriad of challenges faced by undergraduate students at GSU. The difficulty in recruiting a greater number of students highlights the need for accessible and quality education at the university level.
5 UNDERSTANDING ARCHAEOLOGY - FINDINGS

In this chapter, I present the analysis of the data collected over the course of this study and compare the observed themes between the traditional Archaeology and Prehistory course and the Phoenix Project Lab, with its emphasis on active learning.

For the purposes of this study, I interviewed four participants in the Phoenix Project Lab from Fall 2021, two participants in the Archaeology and Prehistory class from Fall 2021, and two participants from the Archaeology and Prehistory class in Spring 2022. Each participant was asked about their undergraduate major and their current level of undergraduate education to gain some insight into the students enrolling in these introductory archaeology courses (Table 2).

Table 2. Participant Undergraduate Majors and Level of Undergraduate Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introductory Archaeology Course</th>
<th>Undergraduate Major</th>
<th>Level of Undergraduate Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix Project Lab</td>
<td>General &amp; Choral Music Education</td>
<td>4th Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix Project Lab</td>
<td>Media Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>3rd Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix Project Lab</td>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>1st Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix Project Lab</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>3rd Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology &amp; Prehistory</td>
<td>Applied Linguistics &amp; Anthropology</td>
<td>3rd Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology &amp; Prehistory</td>
<td>Anthropology &amp; Political Science</td>
<td>4th Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology &amp; Prehistory</td>
<td>Linguistics (formerly Anthropology)</td>
<td>2nd Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology &amp; Prehistory</td>
<td>Psychology, Anthropology Minor</td>
<td>2nd Year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notably, none of the participants or other students from the Phoenix Project Lab were pursuing degrees in anthropology or any other related social science field. In comparison, the participants from the Archaeology and Prehistory courses were studying anthropology or had recently switched from anthropology to another related field, largely because this course serves
as a prerequisite for some upper division coursework. For the participant who had recently changed majors to linguistics, they were still interested in finding potential intersections between linguistics and anthropology, specifically archaeology.

Participants were also asked if their respective course was required for the completion of their degree at GSU. For all participants, the archaeology course met an elective or general core education requirement, rather than a specific pre-requisite needed for later coursework in their majors. Participants from the Phoenix Project Lab enrolled in the PERS 2002 course, which meets the Area B: Institutional Foundations requirement in the Core Curriculum for undergraduate education at GSU. Due to the wide variety of project labs available to students under the PERS 2002 registration, a couple of participants from the Phoenix Project Lab did not realize that they had signed up for an archaeology course but saw it as a “pleasant surprise” after the initial class meeting.

5.1 Perceptions of Archaeology

This section outlines the shared themes identified from responses regarding previous perceptions of archaeology, how participants might communicate what archaeology is, and why students chose to enroll in an introductory archaeology course.

5.1.1 Indiana Jones, Popular Media, and Scientific Journalism

For the majority of the participants, popular media and scientific journalism were the primary ways that they had encountered archaeology prior to their introductory coursework at GSU. Notably, fictional characters like Indiana Jones and Lara Croft were specifically referenced by students enrolled in the Archaeology and Prehistory course, often noted as an inspiration to students who are pursuing archaeology or anthropology as an undergraduate major. These same students, however, were quick to distance themselves from this initial interest and identified the
Indiana Jones franchise and Uncharted video games as problematic in nature. In the words of one participant,

I guess I understood that the treasure hunter, Nathan Drake-type deal was BS, also looting....But I didn’t understand the meat of it. It was more like yeah, I know objectively that there are people out there on these sites, digging in the dirt for stuff and it wasn’t running from boulders, but I didn’t really know what archaeology was.

Often these same participants in Archaeology and Prehistory referenced early curriculum or family influence that contributed to their interest in learning about the past, although these sources were often not archaeology-specific. One student spoke to a specific gifted program at their elementary school in which students were engaged in hands-on activities such as fossil digs, but was quick to note, “I think I went to a really rich school, like a city school, so there was only a handful of us in there [class], so they could afford to do that.” While most participants did not point to class as a contributing or limiting factor in their previous interactions with archaeology, this same participant determined that socioeconomic status likely influenced their understanding of archaeology, stating, “I grew up poor, like below the poverty line, which [is] probably one of the reasons why I didn’t hear about archaeology until I was a little older.” Although other scholars have identified socioeconomic status, amongst other factors, as one reason why students do not discover archaeology until college (Heath-Stout 2019: 252), this participant was the only one to specifically address this issue without prompt.

Comparatively, the students from the Phoenix Project Lab did not speak to any family passion for history or influential curriculum prior to enrollment at GSU. Rather, most students referred to various forms of media that gave them an interest in the past, if not archaeology specifically. Notably, the popular franchises like Indiana Jones and Tomb Raider were not referenced by any Phoenix Project Lab participants. One participant explicitly stated that, “I
watched it [Indiana Jones], but it's not something that I like to re-watch and it's not like, what brought me into it [archaeology].” This marked difference between the course participants warrants further investigation into the role of popular media and the kinds of students who choose to pursue anthropology in their undergraduate education.

More commonly, these participants referenced popular media and scientific journalism based on real world events and research, rather than fictionalized stories of archaeological adventure. News articles, television series, and social media platforms were recognized as key sources; however, as one participant stated, “I don’t ever go pursuing it, but when I’m just around, I’ll see it and end up watching it… I don’t recall watching any documentaries. It would be something like on YouTube.” The variety of media forms mentioned by Phoenix Project Lab participants highlights the important relationship between public archaeology and media to garner additional interest in the discipline.

5.1.2 Anyone can be an Archaeologist

One of the strongest shared themes across the interviews was the idea that anyone can be an archaeologist. Students made this determination regardless of gender, race, class, disability, and what class they were enrolled in. All participants argued that to be an archaeologist, people need a passion for learning about the past, patience, and proper training. Although most participants said that their viewpoint had not changed as a result of the introductory archaeology course, the Phoenix Project Lab students indicated that their perspective on the required training had changed. Specifically, these participants concluded that there is a certain level of scientific knowledge and expertise that is required to be a professional archaeologist. This was likely due to the course emphasis on scientific methodologies in archaeology and student engagement with
some of these technologies through final projects. One student summarized this distinction by saying:

The main difference was learning everything that goes into it. Knowing the steps, how to use the different sources, and there are different specialties. The main difference was getting to know what you want to do in archaeology. I didn’t realize there were so many parts to it.

The only participant to express uncertainty about this assertion is the sole student interested in pursuing a career in archaeology. Despite the fact that this participant came to the same conclusion that anyone can be an archaeologist, they also spoke to some of the challenges they had encountered on this path.

My first barrier that I ever encountered was, well what major would you take to become an archaeologist? Not knowing that it was a subfield of anthropology… The barriers now would be, well who do you reach out to for an internship or field school? How much schooling do you need in order to actually get there?

This student’s comment is quite salient because it points to some of the earliest barriers faced by undergraduate students with an interest in archaeology. As discussed in Chapter 1, other scholars have identified similar challenges such as the affordability of field schools or access to mentorship, particularly for minority and historically underrepresented groups (Heath-Stout and Hannigan 2020); however, it is important to recognize that in this study, this student is ideally enrolled in an introductory archaeology course that should provide students with relevant information about opportunities to pursue archaeology. Another student from Archaeology and Prehistory argued that any limitations can be overcome:

Some places are really inaccessible and we need to be mindful of that for people with disabilities. Like my mom only has one fully functional arm, like she has both of her arms but she can only fully use one. So, there are some things she wouldn’t be able to do, but there are things she could do, and I think anyone could find something to do in archaeology if they really wanted.
This participant did not specify any particular aspects of archaeology that might be more accessible to individuals with disabilities, but they did express interest in learning more about the full scope of the archaeological process in an introductory class. I would argue that more active learning and hands-on components in introductory level courses could provide a more diverse set of students with applicable knowledge that could inspire students to pursue archaeology.

While most students enrolled in these courses appear optimistic that anyone can be an archaeologist, including the participants noted above, there were no discussions of specific steps needed other than the obtainment of “proper training” and “expertise.” For participants that had no prior knowledge of archaeology or simply grew up with an interest in Indiana Jones, the acknowledgement of specialized archaeological training indicates that these introductory courses likely have broader impacts such as greater awareness around looting and site destruction. Additional research on the effects of experiential learning, particularly in lab settings, and undergraduate perceptions of archaeology as a viable career are needed.

5.2 Practice of Archaeology

In this section, I outline the shared and different themes from each course related to questions about how the course has changed their understanding of archaeology, and the role of curation and lab work in the archaeological process.

5.2.1 Archaeology as Science

While the perception of archaeology as a science was shared across all participants, students from Archaeology and Prehistory spoke to the need for precision and process during excavations as well as lab work. One participated noted that:

It [Archaeology] is a lot different than what it’s perceived as… There’s a lot more that goes into it. It’s a lot of research. It’s not just excavating and going on these grand adventures. It’s doing the work and being careful and also understanding that
what you’re doing is destructive, but in the hopes that you’re doing it for research and the better good.

Interestingly, none of the students spoke to any particular archaeological methods related to the field or the lab. Instead, most students spoke in generalities about the necessity of “extreme care” and the lack of “trial and error like in other sciences.” As another student noted:

Without lab work, there is only so much we can do. It’s just a lot of guessing based on what we think something might be used for today, and today is very different. We have really amazing techniques that we can use to date stuff like this, more than I would have even imagined before…. I have a lot of reverence for things I don’t understand, and I don’t understand what goes on in labs. I understand it’s easy to mess up and it’s time consuming.

In comparison, the Phoenix Project Lab students focused much more on newer technologies being employed in the field and in the lab including LiDAR, geochemical analyses, and 3D photogrammetry. When asked about how their understanding of archaeology has changed as a result of the course, every participant referred to these methodologies as they related to in-class lectures and course projects. One participant said that lab work and curation is where they learned more about the “deeper aspects of archaeology. Like chemical compounds and how you can show the age of things from the chemical compound makeup, and you can tell where it came from because of the materials that it’s made of.” Although this particular student did not participate in the pXRF scanning of stoneware vessels from the MARTA collection, it is clear that the lectures and the proximity of other students’ experiential projects had a lasting impact on this student’s understanding of archaeology.

5.2.2 Archaeology as a Process

Another identified theme from the Phoenix Project Lab participants was the length and complexity of an archaeological project. While students from Archaeology and Prehistory mentioned the need for in-depth analysis of data recovered from the field, the Phoenix Project
Lab students frequently spoke to more components of the overall research process. As one student clearly identified:

There are a lot of steps that go into archaeology before you start digging… Like that you have to have a permit… I couldn’t go into my backyard and excavate it. You know, I would probably have to get permission from the county to like, even do that.

While the Phoenix Project Lab participants did not differentiate between CRM and academic archaeology, there was a shared understanding that archaeology was a lengthy and multi-stepped process, rather than archaeologists acting in isolation to find interesting objects or sites.

In comparison, students from Archaeology and Prehistory did not speak to the overall process of archaeological investigations, such as permits or proper permissions to conduct work, but they did refer to the necessity for care and detailed work. One fact repeatedly mentioned by these students was ‘for every hour you spend in the field, that is six hours in the lab.’ The significant time difference conveyed by this statistic prompted most students to discuss their disinterest in participating in lab work as a career as one student asserted:

One of the biggest things that stuck in my head, that really was the determiner for “maybe you don’t want to do this with your life” is the fact that every hour you spend in the field is six hours in the lab.

Despite the often-repeated alarm at the time commitment, the Archaeology and Prehistory participants expressed interest in having more hands-on or experiential aspects to their course, including lab work.

### 5.2.3 Relationship to the Public and Broader Community

Although there was a shared understanding of archaeology as a scientific field, the responses were quite varied when students spoke to the goals of archaeology. This topic was not
included in the set of interview questions; rather, students brought up these ideas through their answers about lab work and who can be an archaeologist.

Although the EPIC program is designed to have public-facing deliverables, only two of the four participants from the Phoenix Project Lab spoke to public archaeology or descendant communities as critical stakeholders in the process. This is likely in part due to the course schedule, limited to one hour a week, as well as the digital format selected for the class projects, which constrained the students’ ability to participate in public engagement. One of the participants did note that “it’s [archaeology] a service to the people in the area,” while another student explained that:

It takes more than just knowledge of archaeology. You need people who know the area and people who are familiar with the culture and the history of the area. You have to outreach and work together with people in that sense.

The Phoenix Project Lab students primarily worked on a class projects during the latter half of the course, so broader discussions of public archaeology were limited to the introductory lectures at the beginning of the semester. In addition to the class logistics, the impact of the sites studied in each class also played a role in their perception of who the public is. Participants from the Phoenix Project Lab solely worked with material culture from 19th-20th century Atlanta. As one student noted however:

Since the artifacts were from Atlanta, I felt like I could relate more. Like if we had artifacts from Europe, I can’t relate to more to my history because that’s over in Europe….I had the Civil War bullets from Decatur, and it’s from an area that I used to go to all the time back in high school Knowing that there was this Civil War battle there, it made the history a lot more meaningful.

Conversely, students from the Archaeology and Prehistory course studied sites from around the globe, primarily in other countries outside of the United States. This more traditional cross-cultural comparison and global archaeological perspective could be one of the primary
factors driving this difference. These participants spoke less to archaeology as a relevant study of their own past but seemed to be more aware of complicated past and present paths of research that result in an archaeology of the “Other”. Speaking specifically to the “who can be an archaeologist” question, one participant said:

I think anyone can be an archaeologist, but I think understanding, that people or locals from that culture, who are part of that culture ancestrally, would have a much richer perspective coming into the field or a specific location… Especially in archaeology, you certainly have to keep an open mind and be really super careful not to transplant your own cultural stereotypes onto things.

In particular, assignments such as the anti-looting paper, appeared to have significantly impacted the way in which participants viewed the relationship of archaeological research and artifact collection to descendant communities. Another student specifically referenced the role of curation and communities based on their case study:

I can’t speak to museums outside of America however, in the United States, museums, big museums, tend to be pretty white-washed… And the museums, or the museums that I have in mind with certain artifacts, they belong in a smaller museum that might get overlooked. And one that is run by the people who should own those artifacts, who they really belong to, and the people that research them. But the artifacts should be a part of the community in some way.

I would argue that these divergent responses present an opportunity to inform our assignment and lecture preparation to ensure that all students see archaeology as relevant to their own lives, while teaching students about cultural competency and the complex history of archaeological research that continues to impact the discipline today.

5.3 Pedagogical Frameworks

This section focuses on the course design and pedagogical foundation of these courses, and how this impacted students’ experience of the class. In particular, this section highlights the
different themes identified between an archaeology course based on experiential learning practices, and one that follows a more traditional lecture format.

5.3.1 Hands-On Learning in the Classroom

In this section, I discuss the role of “hands-on” activities or projects based on active learning principles. A shared theme between the courses, experiential learning played a significant role in how engaged students felt with the material presented. Since almost every class meeting involved a hands-on component through artifact re-bagging, 3D photography, or designing an ArcGIS Storymap, the Phoenix Project Lab students across the board appeared more engaged with this new field. As one student affirmed, “the class actually exceeded my expectations because there were specimens to grab and look at it, and label. Like I didn’t think we would even be doing that.” All of the participants expressed an excitement about coming to class each week and had an appreciation for the deeper understanding that the experiential components provided them. Another student said:

Being able to interact with the artifacts you all had, from seeing the actual procedures and how to handle them, how to take photos of them, or use any of the other things we used, it really enlightened me on how much deeper it [archaeology] really is from my surface knowledge.

In comparison to participants in the lecture course, the Phoenix Project Lab students did not speak to any hesitation about working with artifacts, but enjoyed learning how to properly handle and care for the objects in the MARTA collection.

Conversely, the lack of an active lab component impacted the Archaeology and Prehistory participants’ understanding of what kind of projects would even be possible at their education level. Although Dr. Glover brought replicas and artifacts to many class meetings, one student commented that they hadn’t “touched anything that has a super big amount of significance, obviously so, because I mean if I had something that super historically valuable, I
wouldn’t want other people messing with that in case they broke it.” Overall, students from the Archaeology and Prehistory course stated that they wished there were more hands-on learning opportunities, both field and lab-based, and spoke to their interest in taking additional archaeology if they could gain hands-on experience with lab and excavation techniques.

5.3.2 Student Recommendations

The majority of participants reported an overall satisfaction with the format of their respective courses and all students expressed interest in enrolling in additional archaeology courses, if there were no limitations on their coursework. All participants spoke to the constraints of the university system and changes to federal financial aid that restrict the number of non-major courses that students can enroll in.

The primary recommendations from participants in Archaeology and Prehistory were centered on a desire for more hands-on components and mixed feelings about the “Garbology” assignment. The archaeology of modern refuse, or garbology, is often attributed to William Rathje’s Garbage Project at the University of Arizona conducted between 1987 and 1995 (Rathje 1974; Harrison 2012). The Garbage Project was designed to explore contemporary patterns of consumption and waste, and relevant to this study, it was intended to make archaeological methods more relevant to undergraduates. Inspired by this project, students from Archaeology and Prehistory were asked to compare the refuse from two different sources and interpret the results of their findings in a short paper. Participants acknowledged the relevance of this assignment, noting that “it gave insight into the daily lives of archaeologists who do that;” however, one participant stated that other students in the class did not share this perspective. This student explained that:

I like creating tables. I like to organize data, but I know a lot of people didn’t see the point. I think it comes from a lot of people not wanting to do archaeology. I
don’t think much of our class are planning to do archaeology. They say it’s just a class they need to graduate.

While the entirety of a class may not be interested in every assignment, it is important to note the reasoning behind this sentiment. The participant attributed the lack of interest in their fellow students to their desire to pursue other careers, but comparatively, students from the Phoenix Project Lab had no critiques of the assignments or projects from the course. This is in part due to the design of the course and limited timeframe, which greatly reduced the number of assignments that were feasible during the semester; however, the experiential component seemed to play a significant role in how these students perceived their engagement with the course material. One participant even commented, “You know, really from the class, I thought that I could be an archaeologist. You guys made me reconsider”. For most students, the less structured nature of the course and the collaborative final projects were seen as positive aspects. One student explained that the structure as:

“Okay we’re here, let’s see what we get into today” and that was fine by me. It was perfect, honestly. It actually made me want to come to class more because you don’t know what you’re getting into, so it’s something new and fresh every day.

On the other hand, the primary recommendation from the Phoenix Project Lab participants were in regard to the timing and scheduling of the class itself. Although there were various suggestions for a more appropriate length of time, all participants agreed that the class meetings should be longer than the 50 minutes allotted to the EPIC project labs. The students felt rushed to complete certain tasks and wanted additional time to work hands-on with the MARTA collection; however, there was disagreement about whether class meetings should be held more than once a week like a typical undergraduate course at GSU.
6 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INTRODUCTORY ARCHAEOLOGY

Thematic analysis of interview data informs my recommendations for future introductory archaeology courses at the undergraduate level. These recommendations are specifically for lab or collections-based courses founded on active learning principles. These recommendations include aspects such as curriculum design, pedagogical framework, the course schedule, and staffing needs required to run a successful and sustainable project-based course over multiple semesters or years. Following an anthropological praxis model, I include the feedback from students’ experiences in these courses to inform the curriculum design, including experiential learning components, project-based feedback, and traditional assignments that significantly impacted the students’ understanding of archaeology as a discipline. The themes identified during the course of this study clearly indicate that experiential and hands-on learning at the undergraduate level have potential for creating more inclusive and accessible educational opportunities in archaeology.

6.1 Curriculum Design

This section outlines my proposal for specific curriculum design based on the presence and absence of themes found in the qualitative data. Notably, only one of the participants mentioned inclusion or accessibility in archaeology. The proposed course framework would address some of those absences by incorporating more inclusive education principles and critiques from disability studies to promote a more accessible archaeological education. Inclusive curriculum design is intended to recognize and accommodate a diverse set of learning styles, cultural values, and other factors that shape how students learn (Chavez and Longerbeam 2016; Oland 2020).
Expanding inclusive curriculum design at the introductory level includes intentionality in the presentation of material, assignments, as well as the course materials themselves. As an example, course syllabi set the individual and group expectations for the course and serve as an important document for communicating the learning environment. To make syllabi and other course materials more accessible to students with learning disabilities, professors can easily make changes such as the use of sans-serif font, double-spaced text, and text that can be read by screen readers (Womack 2017).

In addition, the need for socioeconomic inclusion in undergraduate education is critical for the success of students. This is particularly relevant for universities such as GSU that specifically aim to serve a greater number of undergraduates from a variety of racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic backgrounds. One method of expanding socioeconomic inclusion is to provide students with free resources through digital course reserves rather than expensive textbooks. Another archaeology-specific approach would be to provide access to training in archaeological methods including excavation, site documentation, lab work, and curation. As evidenced by the participant interviews from this study, students are eager to participate in hands-on learning at the introductory level. To meet this demand, universities need to plan for on-campus or local field schools, as well as lab-based coursework to provide the greatest variety of training opportunities for undergraduate students.

Introductory archaeology courses, particularly experiential or active learning-based classes, could additionally benefit from the incorporation of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) principles. Curricula based on UDL guidelines provide students with multiple means of engagement, representation, and action and expression, or the why, what, and how of learning (CAST 2018). As evidenced by student interviews and participant observation in the Phoenix
Project Lab, providing students with a variety of course assignments and projects allowed students to gain new skills while allowing more options to engage with the course topics. The attributes of UDL and Teaching Across Cultural Strengths frameworks compliment the philosophical underpinnings of constructivist pedagogy since the two instructional frameworks position the student at the center of the curriculum design (Oland 2020: 6).

6.2 Constructivist Pedagogy

In this section, I focus on possible implementations of constructivist pedagogy and the need for increased opportunities for student engagement in archaeology courses at higher education institutions. If sites of archaeological education are domains where “idea, values and mentalities, past and present, are debated, contested, evaluated, critiqued and rejected” (Hamilakis 2004: 294-295), how can introductory courses provide students with the tools to be reflexive and see themselves as co-producers of knowledge? As evidenced in the active learning case studies presented in this thesis, including the Alma College Archaeological Project and Archaeology on College Hill Project, one simple method is to assign self-reflection assignments during project-based or experiential learning courses. These assignments allow students to provide feedback on the course itself, as well as to critically examine the practice of archaeology and the interpretation of findings.

In addition, collaborative or student-led projects can train students to actively create knowledge through their own research and interpretation of archaeological materials. There are an increasing number of contemporary examples of archaeological field schools based in a constructivist and collaborative pedagogy (Birch and Brannan 2015; Malouchos et al. 2022; Reckner, Duke, and the Ludlow Collective 2009), however there are fewer collections-based courses that train students in this way. Through assignments such as the ArcGIS Storymap in the
Phoenix Project Lab, or the Garbology assignment in Archaeology and Prehistory, students in this study showed that they are capable of co-producing knowledge at the introductory level. This thesis demonstrates that project-based coursework involving archaeological collections can provide undergraduate students at both the upper division and introductory levels with the opportunity to engage in generation of archaeological knowledge.

6.3 Course Schedule and Personnel Commitments

In this section, I outline some of the proposed pragmatic changes to introductory level courses based upon students’ feedback as well as my own experience serving as an ethnographer and Graduate Teaching Assistant for three iterations of the Phoenix Project Lab. These proposals will include details such as the length of time needed per class meeting, the number of course meetings, the number of times the class is offered in a school year, as well as the possibility of students re-enrolling in the course to gain additional experience.

As expressed by participants from the Phoenix Project Lab, the timing and length of class meetings is important for students and their satisfaction with the level of work able to be conducted. Although the EPIC program model is intended to introduce students to the discipline, the short introductory format has not had the same impact as the VIP program at Georgia Tech. Course meetings held for an hour once a week proved challenging for conducting larger-scale archaeology research projects since the first half of the semester had to be spent on introducing students to the practice and methods of archaeology. All of the Phoenix Project Lab participants described the lectures and class discussions as a necessary foundation for the final projects. However, the current EPIC framework leaves students with only a few weeks to collaboratively plan and conduct their final public-facing projects. The project lab model is designed for students to re-enroll in the Perspectives course, similar to the VIP program, but this goal is contradictory
to the introductory level of the course. As noted in Chapter 5, none of the Phoenix Project Lab participants were pursuing anthropology and this pattern holds true for the previous iterations of the project lab during the 2020-2021 academic year. Consequently, no students have re-enrolled in the course despite genuine interest in taking additional archaeology courses due to the constraints of federal financial aid requirements and potentially the current course format.

Based on analysis of the feedback from both courses, I would propose an alternative model of introductory archaeology courses that would function similarly to other scientific disciplines. One Phoenix Project Lab participant stated that they would re-enroll in the project lab if it was taught as a series, similar to Introduction to Chemistry I and II. In order to provide students with a strong foundation in archaeology, it would be beneficial to design the curriculum as a two-semester series with a foundations course and a project-based course, although these would not fit into the EPIC program model. High-impact and experiential learning practices would be components of both courses, but with a greater emphasis in the second semester when students could have additional time to collaboratively design and execute public-facing projects. These classes would be held twice a week for the length of a traditional class meeting. To meet the needs of a project-based class, I would recommend that the co-teaching aspect of the Phoenix Project Lab continue to be implemented for this proposed course. Based on the initial three iterations of the Phoenix Project Lab, the two instructors of record and myself found this model to be effective for the experiential component of the course because it ensures that students received more direct training than a traditional course provides.

By incorporating the principles of UDL, high-impact learning, and the goals of the current EPIC program into a typical course format, these courses could more easily be incorporated into professors’ normal teaching loads. While active learning and project-based
courses have been shown to support student success, the course design and teaching commitment do require a significant amount of preparation in order for the course to be sustainable over multiple semesters. The current EPIC model requires a considerable amount of additional labor despite the short hour-long format, and the project labs are often taught in addition to a full teaching load. The result could lead to increased professor burn out and the discontinuation of the project lab entirely due to the perpetual imbalance of teaching, research, and service requirements of university professors. To ensure the sustainability of accessible, hands-on archaeology courses, particularly at the introductory level, it is important to consider the logistical factors of course design and implementation.
7 CONCLUSION

This thesis has examined some of the ways in which active and experiential learning methods impact student engagement at the introductory level in archaeological education and proposed recommendations to expand upon this model in a more accessible manner. This study utilized the existing literature on active learning and ethnographic methods to understand the student experience of introductory archaeology courses at GSU in order to make these recommendations.

Future directions for research should include additional qualitative study with future iterations of the Phoenix Project Lab or other lab-based courses at both the introductory and more advanced levels of undergraduate education. In particular, future research should examine the ways in which hands-on lab courses can create spaces that are more inclusive and accessible but also prepare students with foundational training that is critical for a career in archaeology.

Additional studies could investigate the effectiveness of lab-based courses to address common issues associated with curation of legacy collections through experiential learning projects that allow students to learn about the curation crisis, material culture, and archaeological methods, by working through a backlog of improperly curated archaeological material. Although this research should be conducted in a variety of university contexts, I argue for additional studies at GSU because of the opportunity to improve archaeological education for this institution’s diverse student body.

Increasing the accessibility of archaeological training to promote greater diversity within the field of archaeology is critical for ensuring that multiple possible interpretations are foundational to our practice (Battle-Baptiste 2011; Heath-Stout 2019; Wylie 1997). There is a need to bring in a more diverse group of archaeologists to avoid reproducing oppressive
narratives in our work (Heath-Stout 2019:43); however, this demographic shift will require action across the discipline beginning with the first introductory course and continuing on through all levels of higher education, mentorship, and employment. By increasing the accessibility of archaeological education through hands-on work in both lab and field courses, we promote a more inclusive and diverse group of practitioners.
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APPENDICES

Appendix A

Appendix A.1 Informed Consent

Georgia State University, Department of Anthropology
Master’s Thesis Research Study
Informed Consent
Fall 2021 – Spring 2022

Title: Increasing the Accessibility of Archaeological Education: Exploring the Possibilities of Inquiry-Based Pedagogy Through Collections Research

Principal Investigator (PI): Dr. Nicola Sharratt

Student Principle Investigator (Student PI): Aspen Kemmerlin

Contact Information: Dr. Nicola Sharratt, nsharratt@gsu.edu or Aspen Kemmerlin, akemmerlin1@student.gsu.edu, 706-206-7089. Do not hesitate to contact with any questions or concerns about this study.

Procedures

You are being asked to take part in a research study:

- You are being asked to be in this study because you are a student enrolled in either the Archaeology Phoenix Project Lab in the Experiential Project-Based, Interdisciplinary Curriculum (EPIC) program, or the Archaeology and Prehistory course at Georgia State University.

- If you choose to be in the study, you will take part in one interview, which will last for 1 hour on one day, and one focus group with other students from your course, which will last 1-2 hours on one day.

- The interview will take place at a time and place agreed on by the interviewee (you) and the student PI (Aspen Kemmerlin). Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, phone and video interviews will be an option, as well as meeting on Georgia State University’s campus. The focus group will take place in the Archaeology Lab located in Dahlberg Hall at Georgia State University, or as a virtual meeting in Webex, at a time agreed upon by all participants. For both physical or virtual settings this consent form will be restated.
• There will be a maximum of 20 people in this study, which will consist of participant observation, semi-structured interviews and focus groups.

• Your interview will be audio recorded with your consent. If you do not want to be recorded, please let the student PI know and the student PI will take field notes instead.

• Questions will be asked about your major, interest in archaeology, your experience as a student during either the Archaeology Phoenix Project Lab, or Archaeology and Prehistory course, including your perspective on the teaching methods, and how your understanding of archaeology has changed as a result of the course.

Voluntary participation and withdrawal

• There is no binding contract to be in this study. You may skip questions and end the study at any time.

Consent

• If you are willing to volunteer for this research, please say “yes” in an email and in a phone/video call or physical meeting.

• If you agree to have your interview audio-recorded, please say “yes” in an email and in a phone/video call or physical meeting with the student PI.

Appendix A.2 Interview Questions

1. What is your major?
2. What is your level of undergraduate education (freshman, sophomore, etc.)?
3. Was this course required for your degree? If not, why did you choose to enroll in this course?
4. Did you have any prior experience with archaeology before taking this course, and if so, what kind?
5. What was your understanding of archaeology prior to taking this course? Where did you learn about it?
6. How has your understanding of archaeology changed as a result of this course?
7. How would you describe archaeology to someone who does not know what it is?
8. Who do you think can be an archaeologist? How has your perspective changed after taking this class?
9. What do you think is the role of lab work and curation in archaeology?
10. Did you have the opportunity to work with archaeological collections during this course? If yes, how has that experience informed your understanding of archaeology?
11. If you could change anything about the class, what would it be and why?
12. Would you enroll in another archaeology course? Why or why not?
Appendix A.2 Focus Group Questions

1. How did you learn about the course?
2. What was your prior experience with archaeology?
3. How did this course change your understanding of archaeology?
4. What did you like or dislike about the way your course was taught?
5. Who do you think can be an archaeologist?
6. What do you think is required to do archaeology?
7. How do you understand the role of lab work and curation in archaeology?
Appendix B

Appendix B.1 ANTH 2030 Syllabus Spring 2022

ARCHAEOLOGY AND PREHISTORY

ANTH 2030 (CRN:13743)
Spring 2022
T, R 11:00 am – 12:15 pm
Langdale Hall 315

Dr. Jeffrey Glover
jglover@gsu.edu
Office Phone: 404.413.5164
Office: 340B Sparks Hall
Office Hours (in person or WebEx):  T 1 – 2 pm or by appointment

Textbooks:
- *Images of the Past* (7th or 8th Edition), by Price and Feinman
- *Frauds, Myths, and Mysteries: Science and Pseudoscience in Archaeology* (8th or 9th Edition) by Kenneth L. Feder

Course Description
What is archaeology? How are fedoras, whips, dinosaurs, and aliens connected with archaeological inquiry? How and why did the ancient Maya predict that the world was going to end in 2012? In this class you will learn the answers to these questions (and many others), and why these questions are not at all related to archaeology. Archaeology is the anthropological discipline dedicated to the investigation of past human lifeways through the study of the material remains left behind by human activities. This course begins with an overview of the techniques and theories used by archaeologists to reconstruct the past. With this background, we will investigate what archaeology has to tell us about human prehistory across the globe. In the course of this overview of human prehistory, we will also critically evaluate fraudulent claims associated with archaeology (i.e., those often found on The History Channel’s show “Ancient Aliens” among others). At the end of the course, you will have gained a rich understanding of the diverse ways in which past peoples across the globe have made a living.

Student Learning Outcomes:
At the end of this class, you will be able to…
- understand how archaeological data are used to reconstruct human behaviors;
- explain how archaeological data help us identify the major transitions that have happened to human societies from the advent of the first stone tools to the development of cities (i.e., the Paleolithic, the Neolithic, and emergence of the State);
- summarize how these transitions changed the nature of human social relations and organizations;
- recognize that while cross-cultural similarities exist across time and space, these similarities must be understood within their own historical contexts;
• identify key archaeological sites around the globe and be able to integrate these sites into broader narratives about particular culture areas and regional developmental sequences; AND
• recognize and deconstruct fraudulent claims made by pseudoarcheologists about the past.

Note: Any handouts or supplemental readings will be available on iCollege during the semester.

Grading Categories/Assessments

There are three “Topic Outlines” for this course (one for each third of the semester). They will indicate your weekly reading assignments and topics to be covered during the semester. Your course grade will be determined by your performance in the following categories:

• Three Exams: Each will cover readings from your text and material from lecture, as well as films and guest lectures (if and when applicable). The exams are NOT cumulative. All three are identical in format and point value, and will include a combination of multiple choice, T/F, short answer, and a take-home essay question. A study guide for each exam and select powerpoint slides (a “greatest hits” of slides) will be available on iCollege before the exam (100 pts each). The potential take-home essay questions will be handed out a week prior to the exam. You will answer one of the essay topics, and your TYPED answer will be due at the time of the exam. The take-home essay is worth 20 pts out of the 100 possible points. You can certainly use your book, BUT plagiarism will be treated as cheating. If you have any questions about what constitutes cheating then please come and talk with me or your GTA. Your essay MUST include in-text references and a bibliography. You don’t have to use sources outside of your book and class notes, but you must reference them in the essay or you will automatically lose 3 points. You will lose 2 pts (10%) for each day your essay is late.

• Directions will be posted on iCollege about the Garbology Exercise (50 pts), the (anti)Looting Assignment (15 pts), the two Myth/Fraud Assignments (25 pts each), and the Web Blog (25 pts).

• Archaeology in the News: Archaeology is a dynamic discipline and new discoveries are being made all of the time. Each student will submit a short (1 – 2 paragraph) overview of a recent news event documenting a new (since December 2021) archaeological discovery (10 pts). There will be a discussion forum on iCollege where you will post this. Please pay attention to what your fellow students have already posted. You will not get credit for posting stories that have already been presented. Include a link to the webpage or blog where you got this information. You WILL be asked to briefly (1-2 minutes MAX) present this information to the class based on your last name (see below). If you do not present the information in class, you will only be able to receive a max of 6 points by submitting the short overview. If you only present in class and do not provide the write-up, you can earn a max of 4 points. Make-up presentations are not available, except for an excused absence.

\[
\begin{align*}
A-B &= T \text{ of Week 3} \\
C &= T \text{ of Week 4} \\
D-F &= T \text{ of Week 5} \\
G-H &= T \text{ of Week 8} \\
I-L &= T \text{ of Week 9} \\
M-N &= T \text{ of Week 10} \\
P-R &= T \text{ of Week 12} \\
S-Z &= T \text{ of Week 13}
\end{align*}
\]

• Extra Credit Attendance: Incentive points are given for attendance. Students who attend 20 class sessions or more are awarded extra points based on the following scale: 20-21 (2 pts); 22-23 (4 pts); 24-25 (6 pts); 26-27 (8 pts); 28 (10 pts). Students are not penalized for lack of attendance; therefore, there are NO excused absences. A sign-in sheet will circulate during each class period. If you forget
to sign the roll sheet, you will NOT receive credit. If your name does not appear on the roll sheet, simply print your name and bring it to my attention.

- **Extra Credit:** For this optional extra credit assignment you must visit an archaeological site, museum exhibit, or archaeological related lecture and turn in a minimum two-page (double-spaced) report on the site or exhibit of interest to you. The report will involve your own personal impressions of the site, exhibit, or talk (e.g. why the exhibit interested you and what you learned from your visit). You cannot copy text from the site’s interpretive signage or from the site’s website. You must also attach your ticket stub or some other proof of your attendance. An example would be a visit to the Etowah mounds north of Atlanta or the Michael C. Carlos museum at Emory University. Further directions are posted on [iCollege](http://icollege) (15 pts).

- **Get out of Jail Free Assignment:** I understand that life can get in the way of getting assignments in on time. You will have one opportunity to turn in an assignment late with only a minor penalty. This does not apply to exams but does apply to exam essay questions or the other assignments you have to turn in for this class. The penalty will be that the assignment has a starting value of 80% instead of 100%. For example, the highest grade you could get on the Garbology assignment would be a 40 instead of a 50. Your assignment will still be graded like the others, so the 80% is just the starting value. If you have any questions about this policy, please come and talk to me or your GTA. This “Get out of Jail Free Assignment” is due no later than the 27th of April on iCollege.

**Grading**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garbology Exercise</td>
<td>50 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midterm 1</td>
<td>100 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud/Myth Assignment 1</td>
<td>25 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midterm 2</td>
<td>100 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud/Myth Assignment 2</td>
<td>25 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(anti)Looting Assignment</td>
<td>15 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology in the News</td>
<td>10 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Exam</td>
<td>100 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>425 pts</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extra Credit Attendance: 10 pts max (See scale above)
Extra Credit Museum Visit: 15 pts (Due no later than the 27th of April on iCollege)

**FYI** – this combined extra credit can boost your total grade by 8% (i.e., 85% to 93%)

**Grades**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A+</td>
<td>90-98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>90-93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>92-90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>89-87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>86-83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>82-80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>79-77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>76-73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>72-70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>69-60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>less than 60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teaching Assistant**

David Blackman  
dblackman3@student.gsu.edu

**Office Hours**  
Thursday 12:30 – 1:30 pm in the Graduate Lounge in Anthropology Dept. (3rd floor of Sparks Hall) or via WebEx by appointment.

**IMPORTANT. PLEASE READ.**

- DO NOT disrupt class meetings (regardless of format – face-to-face or online).
- Exams can only be made-up with a valid doctor’s excuse.
• Please remember that your constructive assessment of this course plays an indispensable role in shaping education at Georgia State. Upon completing the course, please take the time to fill out the online course evaluation.
• DO NOT sign the roll sheet and then walk out of the classroom.
• DO NOT arrive shortly before the end of class and then sign the roll sheet.
• DO NOT sign the roll sheet for someone other than yourself.
• Signing the roll sheet for someone other than you constitutes academic misconduct!
• Please, respect me and your fellow classmates and turn-off your cell phone before class begins / use your technology responsibly.

University Policies

• I expect each of you to follow the university posted guidelines on academic honesty (see https://deanofstudents.gsu.edu/student-conduct-policy-on-academic-honesty/). ALL work should be your own, NOT someone else’s with your name on it. If you cheat, you will face severe repercussions, which could result in removal from the university. If there are nonacademic reasons for your inability to complete the class, you can be awarded an incomplete (I) at the sole discretion of the instructor. If you receive an “I”, you have the following semester to make-up incomplete work. An incomplete differs from a hardship withdrawal (W). Hardship status is determined by the Office of the Dean of Students NOT by the instructor. You will receive a withdrawal failure (WF) if you withdraw with a failing grade, withdraw AFTER March 1st, or do not follow proper withdrawal protocol.
• Please advise me, the instructor, if you have a documented disability that needs to be accommodated. Please remember that students who wish to request accommodation for a disability may do so by registering with the Access and Accommodation Center. Students may only be accommodated upon issuance by the Access and Accommodation Center of a signed Accommodation Plan and are responsible for providing a copy of that plan to instructors of all classes in which accommodations are sought.
• Equal Opportunity Statement: GSU supports the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Executive Order #11246, Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and the Americans with Disabilities Act. No person shall, based on age, race, religion, color, gender, sexual orientation, national origin, disability, or veteran status, be excluded from participation in or be denied the benefits of or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity of the college. Any individual with a grievance related to the enforcement of any of the above provisions should contact the Office of Human Resources. The college also complies with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (FERPA), which guarantees any student the right to inspect and review his or her educational records, to challenge the content of the records and to control disclosures from the education records with certain exceptions.
• Title IX: GSU seeks to provide an environment that is free of bias, discrimination, and harassment. If you have been the victim of sexual harassment/misconduct/assault, we encourage you to report this. If you report this to a faculty member, he or she must notify one of our college’s Assistant Title IX Coordinators / Student Deans about the basic facts of the incident (you may choose whether you or anyone involved is identified by name)
• Campus Carry Statement: The Campus Carry legislation allows anyone properly licensed in the state of Georgia to carry a handgun in a concealed manner on university property with noted exceptions. It is the responsibility of the license holder to know the law. Failure to do so may result in a misdemeanor charge and may violate the Georgia State Student Code of Conduct.
If you are having trouble with the class, **PLEASE** come speak with me. I cannot help you if I do not know you are having trouble. In addition, there are tutoring services available on campus ([http://www.gsu.edu/student_services.html](http://www.gsu.edu/student_services.html) - see Counseling Center info below).

**Pronouns and Names**

Although instructors at Georgia State University receive a class roster with students’ legal names, we are not required to use these to address students in class. I realize that not everyone goes by their legal name. I am happy to use the name and pronoun you use. You can let me know about this early in the semester via e-mail or by stopping by my office.

**GSU Policy Prohibiting Students from Posting Instructor-Generated Materials on External Sites**

The selling, sharing, publishing, presenting, or distributing of instructor-prepared course lecture notes, videos, audio recordings, or any other instructor-produced materials from any course for any commercial purpose is strictly prohibited unless explicit written permission is granted in advance by the course instructor. This includes posting any materials on websites such as Chegg, Course Hero, OneClass, Stuvia, StuDocu and other similar sites. Unauthorized sale or commercial distribution of such material is a violation of the instructor’s intellectual property and the privacy rights of students attending the class and is prohibited. This policy was approved by the GSU Faculty Senate on August 21, 2020.

**Diversity, Inclusivity, and Respect Syllabus Statement**

In this class, we commit to supporting diversity and inclusion. We strive to construct a safe and inclusive environment by respecting each other’s dignity and privacy. We honor each class member’s experiences, beliefs, perspectives, and backgrounds, regardless of race, religion, language, immigration status, sexual orientation, gender identification, ability status, socio-economic status, national identity, or any other identity markers. Our class meetings and any on-line discussions are meant to provide safe spaces for free inquiry and open exchange of ideas. Difficult issues may be confronted, and controversial ideas exchanged. While at times it is appropriate to share our beliefs and opinions, we are committed to basing those beliefs on evidence-based thinking. We agree to act and communicate respectfully toward one another, both directly and indirectly, both inside and outside the boundaries of the class. All members of the class contribute to a caring, inclusive learning environment that promotes empathetic listening, encourages productive participation and sharing, and engenders growth among us all. As a classroom community, we share those values. If you ever have any concerns about the (virtual) classroom climate, please let me know. Your suggestions about how to reinforce the values of diversity and inclusion are encouraged and appreciated. I hope that we will continuously reflect upon our class processes so that we can build an inclusive intellectual community where all feel valued and supported in our learning.

**Supplemental Information for Attendance Policies**

Students who want to do well in this course will attend class following the class attendance policy. You will need an excused absence due to illness. GSU has a new process for students seeking excused absences through the Dean of Students Office. Please submit documentation to [https://deanofstudents.gsu.edu/student-assistance/professor-absence-notification/](https://deanofstudents.gsu.edu/student-assistance/professor-absence-notification/). I will then be notified by the Dean of Students of any excused absences. Should a student test COVID positive, any accommodations to the class attendance policy will be informed by evolving guidance from the CDC on quarantine. In most cases there will be no major change to mode of course delivery, so students will be responsible for collecting notes for missed in-person classes and making up any work they miss during quarantine. Anyone who has a positive COVID test is encouraged to alert the university so that appropriate contact tracing can be conducted.
Wearing Masks in Class
You are strongly encouraged to wear a face covering in all class meetings. I know that face masks may make some aspects of class more difficult. It will be harder for us all to project our voices and read each other’s facial expressions. However, I am willing to sacrifice these elements since wearing a mask (along with getting a vaccine) is something, I can control to support the health and safety of our community. Be aware that wearing face mask is not required by GSU, so there is no penalty if you choose to not wear a mask. Our university community has a strong tradition of upholding the value of mutual respect, we therefore ask students to not engage in behavior that would be disruptive if your fellow students make a different choice about wearing masks. If you have concerns, please discuss them with me, and I will work to the best of my ability to provide a comfortable environment conducive to student learning.

Disclaimer
The course syllabus provides a general plan for the course; deviations may be necessary. I will announce any changes in class and post them on iCollege. It is the sole responsibility of the student to be aware of these changes.

Additional Information
Resources for Homelessness: https://deanofstudents.gsu.edu/student-assistance/embark/

Panther Pantry at GSU - https://nutrition.gsu.edu/panther-pantry/

Information about Counseling Services at GSU
**Location:**  
Citizen’s Trust Building  
75 Piedmont Ave, N.E.  
(Next to the University Commons)  
Counseling and Testing Center, Suite 200A

**Office Hours:**  
T and W: 8:30 a.m. – 5:15 p.m.  
M, R, and F: 8:30 a.m. – 7 p.m.  
Spring Break and Summer Semester:  
M – F: 8:30 a.m. – 5:15 p.m.

**Walk In Hours:**  
M, R, and F: 11 a.m. – 4 p.m. (last appointment at 4 p.m.)  
T and W: 11 a.m. – 5 p.m. (last appointment at 5 p.m.)  
The Counseling and Testing Center is available for emergencies at any time.  
Students must present at least 30 minutes before the last appointment to complete paperwork. Appointments are scheduled on the hour.

**Phone Numbers:**  
Main Reception Line: 404-413-1640  
Main Fax Line: 404-413-1653
ARCHAEOLOGY AND PREHISTORY
ANTH 2030, Spring 2022
T, R 11:00 am – 12:15 pm
Langdale Hall 315
Dr. Jeffrey Glover

Topic Outline 1

Week 1 [11, 13 January]
T Course Overview
R Chap. 1 – Principles of Archaeology

Week 2 [18, 20 January]
T Chap. 1 – Principles of Archaeology (con’t)
Read: Feder Chapters 1-2
R Chap. 2 – Out of Africa: Homo erectus

Week 3 [25, 27 January]
T Chap. 2 – Out of Africa: Homo erectus; Chap. 3 (Intro)
R Film: Neanderthals
Read: Feder Chapters 3-4 (skim)

Week 4 [1, 3 February]
T Chap. 3 – The Hunters – Peopling of the Americas
Read: Wade 2017
Read: Feder Chapter 5 and part of Chapter 13 (p. 335-339)
R Chap. 3 – Postglacial Foragers

Week 5 [8, 10 February]
T Chap. 4 – The Origins of Agriculture, Part I (*Essay hand-out*)
DUE: Garbology Assignment
R Chap. 4 – The Origins of Agriculture, Part II

Week 6 [15 February]
T EXAM #1 (in-class)
ARCHEOLOGY AND PREHISTORY
ANTH 2030, Spring 2022
T, R 11:00 am – 12:15 pm
Langdale Hall 315
Dr. Jeffrey Glover

Topic Outline 2

Week 6 [17 February]
R Chap. 5 – Native North Americans, Part I
Read: Feder Chapter 7

Week 7 [22, 24 February]
T Film – Native North America (*Online*)
R Chap. 5 – Native North Americans, Part II
Read: Toner – “City beneath the Mounds”
      Zorich – “The Fisher Kings”
Extra Reading: Kelly 2001 [Feasting at Cahokia];
              King 2003; Cahokia Recent Research

Week 8 [1, 3 March]
T Chap. 5 – Native North Americans, Part III
Read: Wilcox 2010
R Chap. 6 – Ancient Mesoamerica, Part I
       Read: Feder Chapter 9 and part of Chapter 13

March 1st – last day to withdraw and possibly receive a “W”

Week 9 [8, 10 March]
T, R Chap. 6 – Ancient Mesoamerica, Parts II and III
       Read: McAnany and Gallareta Negrón 2010
DUE: Fraud/Myth Assignment 1

Week 10 [15, 17 March]
NO CLASS – Spring Break

Week 11 [22, 24 March]
T Chap. 7 – South America: The Inca and Their Predecessors (*Essay hand-out*)
R Chap. 7 – South America: The Inca and Their Predecessors, Part II
ARCHAEOLOGY
AND PREHISTORY
ANTH 2030, Spring 2022
T, R 11:00 am – 12:15 pm
Langdale Hall 315
Dr. Jeffrey Glover

Topic Outline 3

Week 12 [31 March]
R  Chap. 8 – States and Empires of Asia and Africa, Part I
Read: Smith (2020) – Chapter 1 of Cities: The First 6000 Years

Week 13 [5, 7 April]
T  Chap. 8 – States and Empires of Asia and Africa, Part II
Read: Feder Chapter 10
R  Chap. 8 – States and Empires of Asia and Africa, Part III
DUE: (anti)Looting Assignment

Week 14 [12, 14 April]
T  Chap. 8 – States and Empires of Asia and Africa, Part IV
DUE: (anti)Looting Assignment
R  Chap. 9 – Prehistoric Europe, Part I
Read: Feder Chapter 13
DUE: Fraud/Myth Assignment 2 (Friday the 15th)

Week 15 [19, 21 April]
T  Chap. 9 – Prehistoric Europe, Part II (*Essay hand-out*)
R  Chap. 10 – In Conclusion: The Past as Present and Future / Review

EXAM #3 will be online

Wednesday April 27th – Get-out-of-Jail and Extra-Credit Assignment DUE on iCollege

There will be a review scheduled before the exam

Final Exam Grades will be posted on iCollege ASAP.
Appendix B.2 PERS 2000 Syllabus Fall 2021

PERS 2002: Archaeology in Atlanta: The Science of the Past

Professors:
Dr. Jeffrey Glover  jglover@gsu.edu
Dr. Nicola Sharratt  nsharratt@gsu.edu

TA:
Aspen Kemmerlin  akemmerlin1@student.gsu.edu

Project Lab Overview
Students participating in the Phoenix Project lab will learn about archaeology and Atlanta’s history by working with the MARTA Archaeological Collection. This collection of 500 boxes of artifacts is housed in the Anthropology Department’s Archaeology Lab. The collection resulted from archaeological investigations undertaken by GSU archaeologists in the late 1970s when the MARTA rail lines were constructed. This project recovered the material remains of Atlanta’s past and established the most comprehensive archaeological collection of Atlanta’s history.

Course Objectives
In PERS 2002 The Science of the Past, students will utilize scientific advances in archaeology, including the use of GIS systems and geochemical analyses to generate engaging content for public audiences around the MARTA archaeological collection. Specifically, they will situate those scientific approaches in long term and cross cultural archaeological understandings of cities and the potential and challenges that urban living brings to global populations across time and space. This course will provide skills training and professionalization not only relevant to archaeology, heritage preservation, and museum studies, but also across a range of scientific disciplines. Additionally, students will work collaboratively to identify and develop effective ways of disseminating the knowledge they generate through scientific analyses to broad and diverse publics.

This is a Project Lab course. Project Labs allow students to earn course credit over multiple semesters while working on faculty-led, interdisciplinary, public-facing projects. Through Project Labs, students have opportunities to: 1) develop and demonstrate 21st century skills like digital literacies, complex problem solving, and teamwork; 2) apply knowledge from classes to real-world projects with impact; 3) build networks with faculty, students, community groups, non-profits, and businesses; and 4) create a portfolio material to show what they know.

PERS 2002 - Scientific Perspectives on Global Problems This course is part of the PERS 2002 Scientific Perspectives on Global Problems group. This category is composed of a group of interdisciplinary courses that deal with scientific approaches to important issues on the environment, public health, or technology. Archaeology offers a unique perspective by offering both a long term perspective on the past and by providing opportunity to investigate the lived
experience of people frequently excluded from written historical accounts. The potential of archaeology is particularly important for investigating ongoing global challenges for human groups, such as the challenges and difficulties, as well as the possibilities, of living in cities. Archaeologists bring a long term and global perspective on cities unlike any other discipline; they study the very earliest cities including those for which there is no written record. Increasingly, archaeologists make use of advances in science and technology in related disciplines to reconstruct past lived experiences both in the deep past and in more recent periods, such as in post-Civil War Atlanta, the context represented by the MARTA archaeological collection at GSU. Under the guidance of anthropological archaeologists, students will generate data on artefacts dating to late 19th century urban rebuilding and growth in Atlanta and participate in comparative perspectives on the lived experience of cities in the past and present.

**Learning Outcomes**

Students will:

- Explore how material culture is as important as written sources for studying the past and reconstructing the historical processes that led to the cities we live in today.
- Gain an understanding of how objects and archaeological sites are critical to studying the history of people who have been relatively neglected in written accounts of the past (including but not limited to people of color, women, economically disenfranchised groups).
- Develop skills in archaeological science, including advanced spatial and chemical analyses
- Utilize interdisciplinary methods from the natural sciences, social sciences, and the humanities to develop robust data sets on Atlanta’s archaeological record
- Create documentation to maintain the continuity of projects and improve future work
- Enhance their knowledge of Atlanta’s 19th and early 20th centuries through hands-on learning and research with archaeological artifacts and archival research.
- Develop core career competencies including teamwork, leadership, and problem solving.

**Readings**

To Include:


**Assignments**

**Hands on: Collections Management 20%**

Students will contribute to ongoing collections management efforts in the Phoenix Project Lab by participating in ongoing conservation and data management activities surrounding the MARTA collection in the Archaeology Lab in Dahlberg Hall.
Short Assignments 30%
You will prepare a series of short assignments reflecting on the role that archaeological science can play in generating content for public engagement around archaeological sites and collections, whether in physical exhibits, websites, and social media accounts.

Project Work 50%
You will be working in groups to apply techniques in archaeological science to generate new knowledge on the MARTA archaeological collection. These include spatial analyses, geochemical, and isotopic data collection. Your project work might involve your group identifying questions of public interest around this important collection of Atlanta’s past, developing testable hypotheses, identifying and implementing appropriate methodologies, interpreting results and collaborating with colleagues in other disciplines. In addition to generating new data on the collection, you will explore effective ways to engage broad publics and diverse stakeholders with those data and methodologies. You will be assessed on your participation, deliverables, and teamwork.

Final Grades

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A+</td>
<td>100-98 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>97-93 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>92-90 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>89-87 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>86-83 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>82-80 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>79-77 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>76-73 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>72-70 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>69-60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>less than 60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policies and Responsibilities

- **Masks**
  This is an in-person class. Although GSU is not currently mandating mask-wearing, research shows that wearing a mask significantly reduces the transmission of the covid-19 virus, including the currently dominant delta variant. We ask that we all follow public health guidance by wearing masks while in our classroom.

  We also ask that you sit in the same seat each class. We are responsible for maintaining a seating chart in case contact tracing becomes necessary, and it will aid me enormously if folks consistently sit in the same place.

  GSU continues to make testing and vaccines freely available on campus. You will find further information on testing and vaccine locations at GSU, as well as a wealth of useful information on the university’s dedicated covid-19 website.

  [https://covidinfo.gsu.edu/](https://covidinfo.gsu.edu/)

  Should you test positive for covid-19, GSU encourages you to report it through the following link so they may initiate any necessary contact tracing.

  [https://covidinfo.gsu.edu/covid-19-resources/report-a-case/](https://covidinfo.gsu.edu/covid-19-resources/report-a-case/)
• **Attendance and Participation**
  You are expected to attend all classes, although I fully understand that sometimes life presents challenges. Please be punctual. You should come to class having read the assigned readings for that day. This class will incorporate intensive group dialogue and your preparation and participation are vital to the success of the course.

**GSU COVID-19 Attendance Policy on Illness**
You will need an excused absence due to illness. GSU has a new process for students seeking excused absences through the Dean of Students Office. Please submit documentation to [https://deanofstudents.gsu.edu/student-assistance/professor-absence-notification/](https://deanofstudents.gsu.edu/student-assistance/professor-absence-notification/).

We will then be notified by the Dean of Students of any excused absences.

Should a student test COVID positive, any accommodations to the class attendance policy will be informed by evolving guidance from the CDC on quarantine. In most cases there will be no major change to mode of course delivery, so students will be responsible for collecting notes for missed in-person classes and making up any work they miss during quarantine. Anyone who has a positive COVID test is encouraged to alert the university so that appropriate contact tracing can be conducted.

• **Syllabus changes**
  Changes may be made during the course of the semester. You will be notified of changes through electronic communication, and if necessary, an amended copy of the syllabus.

• **Cell Phones and Laptops**
  Please respect your own and your fellow students’ right to learn in an environment free of unnecessary distractions. Turn off cell phones before you come to class. A number of peer reviewed scientific studies indicate that students’ success declines when they use a laptop in the classroom. If you do use a laptop in class, this should only be to take notes and you should refrain from using the internet. Failure to comply with these rules will have a detrimental impact on your final grade. [https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/students-are-better-off-without-a-laptop-in-the-classroom/](https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/students-are-better-off-without-a-laptop-in-the-classroom/)

• **Pregnancy and Childbirth**
  Under Title IX of the Federal Education Amendments, pregnant/parenting students have certain rights to ensure that they can continue to participate in class activities. Students who require accommodations due to pregnancy or childbirth should discuss this with their course instructor. Please see the following document for more information [https://hr.gsu.edu/download/pregnancy-policy/?wpdmdl=6544258&refresh=5dcc17ea117aa1573656554](https://hr.gsu.edu/download/pregnancy-policy/?wpdmdl=6544258&refresh=5dcc17ea117aa1573656554) and address questions to GSU Director of the Access and Accommodations Center at 404-413-1560.
• **Student Parents and Caregivers**
  We understand that some of you may have dependent children or other care responsibilities that bring extra challenges to completing your education. GSU does not have a formal policy on children in the classroom. Although many professors normally welcome children and nursing infants into the classroom if you need to bring them, given that children under 12 remain unvaccinated from COVID-19, we are not comfortable encouraging that at present. Therefore, if you have child-care challenges or are facing other care commitments (whether to children, partners, parents or others) that may affect your class attendance or timely completion of assignments, please do contact us so that together we can identify strategies for you to see this class through successfully.

• **Students with Disabilities**
  Students who wish to request accommodation for a disability may do so by registering with the Office of Disability Services. Students may only be accommodated upon issuance by the Office of Disability Services of a signed **Accommodation Plan** and are responsible for providing a copy of that plan to instructors of all classes in which accommodations are sought.

• **Preferred Name and Pronouns**
  Instructors at Georgia State University receive a class roster with students’ legal names, but we are not required to use these to address students in class. I realize that not everyone goes by their legal names, so I am happy to use your preferred name and pronoun in class. You can let me know about this early in the semester via e-mail or by stopping by my office.

• **Policy on Academic Honesty**
  As a student enrolled in this course and in the university, you are bound by Georgia State University’s Academic Honor Code. Plagiarism, cheating, and academic dishonesty are serious offenses and carry severe penalties. If you are unsure what constitutes academic dishonesty, please ask. You should read the GSU Code of Conduct to familiarize yourself with the university’s Policy on Academic Honesty.
  [https://codeofconduct.gsu.edu/files/2019/07/2019_7_3_Academic_Honesty.pdf](https://codeofconduct.gsu.edu/files/2019/07/2019_7_3_Academic_Honesty.pdf)

• **Course Evaluation**
  Your constructive assessment of this course plays an indispensable role in shaping education at Georgia State. Upon completing the course, please take time to fill out the online course evaluation.
Course Schedule

(The course syllabus provides a general plan for the course; deviations may be necessary)

August 25: Welcome to the Phoenix Project Lab
Sept 1: What is Archaeology?
Sept 8: The MARTA collection: its history and context
Sept 15: Collections Management Hands-On Work
Sept 22: Collections Management Hands-On Work
Sept 29: Archaeological Science: a brief introduction
Oct 6: How are archaeologists using science to engage the public?
Oct 13: Archaeological Science: what can we do at GSU?
Oct 20: Scientific Analyses of artifacts
Oct 27: Project Work
Nov 3: Project Work
Nov 10: Project Work
Nov 17: Project Work
Nov 24: THANKSGIVING: NO CLASS
Dec 1: Presentation of Final projects!