

DRAFT

Governor's Archaeology Advisory Commission

Report on "Survey Monkey" Response to GAAC Training Opportunities

Introduction

The Professional Competency Committee of the Governor's Archaeology Advisory Commission is in the process of developing a series of training opportunities to allow professional archaeologists to increase their knowledge of Arizona archaeology as well as current practices within the field of archaeology. A survey requesting input on the desirability of potential training opportunities was provided to the professional community via a "Survey Monkey." On the survey, GAAC requested that the public rank each of the training opportunities in order of desirability, and also to provide input on any other training needs. The GAAC survey was announced on the AAC-Listserv and the Archaeology Southwest-Listserv on October 18, November 6, and November 20, 2012. It was also posted on the AAC website. The following report documents the results of the survey.

Training Opportunities

The choices that were presented to the public included the following workshops:

1. Identification of historic sites statewide.
2. Learn the types of studies that geomorphologists conduct, and how this specialty can be better integrated into archaeological examinations.
3. Field identification of protohistoric sites – including specific type site (i.e. Apache, Yavapai, Sobaipuri) characteristics and diagnostic artifact types (e.g., ceramics and projectile points).
4. Identification of pottery types in Northern Arizona (this would be a web-assisted course taught at NAU, but could be customized to fit a particular location in the state and might feature information from the swvirtualmuseum.nau.edu).
5. GPS and archaeological site mapping (learning about the latest available technologies and techniques for sites, features, landscapes, etc.).
6. Three-dimensional modeling (based on recent advances in use of digital photography and/or lidar to create precise 3-D models of artifacts, features, trench profiles, sites).

7. Digital image analysis (use of false-color images to detect paint, inscriptions, etc. on artifacts and architecture that are not visible to the naked eye).
8. Use of Google Earth in archaeology (e.g. Google Earth flyovers of archaeological sites and landscapes, etc.).
9. Data management update (what is the latest on agency efforts to digitize legacy data [maps, photos, documents, site forms]?; where does TDar fit into the archaeological work today?; anything that we need to know about the capture and dissemination of digital data that might make our work easier and more effective, especially site file searches, background research, etc.).
10. Identification of Paleoindian sites and artifacts (would make use of new information on the antiquity of Western Stemmed Tradition points, typology of late Paleoindian points and flaking patterns, identification of Paleo sites in the absence of paleo points (e.g. possible Clovis blades, and scrapers/planes, overshot flakes, large bifaces, etc.).
11. In-field artifact identification, analysis, and recording of ground stone implements.
12. Basic Southwestern ceramic identification (i.e. paste, ware, types, etc.).
13. Preparation of National Register of Historic Places nominations for prehistoric and/or historic cultural resources.

The public was also asked to answer the following questions:

1. What other topics would you suggest for workshops, and at what levels (e.g. beginning, intermediate, advanced) should these workshops be offered?
2. Would it be desirable if these workshops could offer college credit or some form of certification? No? Yes? Don't Really Care?
3. Would you be interested in participating in a workshop that was entirely web-based? No? Yes?
4. Would you be interested in participating in a workshop that was entirely web-assisted? (i.e. use of blackboard – Learn or other online instructional software to offer or all of the workshop content in advance of a face-to-face meeting, use online methods of evaluation as a pre-requisite for workshop attendance [in order to allow participants to maximize the limited time available for their face to face experience], use online methods to evaluate the effectiveness of the workshop itself).

5. Would you be interested in being a trainer on any specific subject? If so, please let us know what subject you would be interested in teaching?

SURVEY RESULTS

A total of 46 responses were received from the three postings. Based on the responses, the workshops are ranked from the most desirable to the least desirable:

1. Field Identification for Proto-Historic Sites
2. Identification of Historic Sites Statewide
3. Identification of Northern Arizona Pottery Types
4. Data Management Update
5. GPS and Archaeological Site Mapping
6. Geomorphology and Archaeological Sites
7. Identification of Paleoindian Sites
8. National Register Nomination Forms
9. Three-Dimensional Modeling
10. Digital Image Analysis
11. In-field Artifact Analysis of Ground Stone Artifacts
12. Google Earth in Archaeology
13. Basic Southwestern Ceramic Identification

The other questions that were offered in the survey involved the presentation (in person or web-based) of the workshops and the ability to earn credits for participation. Most of the respondents were overwhelmingly supportive of both a web-based workshop (74.5%) and a web-assisted workshop (80.9%). Although most respondents (60%) were not concerned about earning credits for the training sessions, 37% desired college credit or certification for the workshop.

The other questions requested suggestions for upcoming training ideas and a call for volunteers that would be willing to train others in a specific subject. Topics that were suggested by the respondents for future workshops could be subsumed under the following categories: methodology, artifact identification, legal responsibilities and documents, and Native American issues.

Most of the responses included methodological issues such as permitting, survey practices, site eligibility evaluations, research, and artifact identification. Specifically, respondents were interested in having a workshop on the archaeological permitting and notification requirements for different agencies, as well as changes and updates in survey methodology (methodologies specific to each agency). Also, several responses requested assistance in conducting research with on-line journals, archival research sources, and effective ways to disseminate the results of archaeological research to the public. Additionally, a respondent requested training on evaluating National Register eligibility of archaeological sites through assessment of context and integrity as well as assessing eligibility of

cultural landscapes. Also, there was some interest from respondents in understanding the basic geology of Arizona, common chipping stone materials, and distinguishing between faunal and human bones.

Responses falling under the category of legal responsibilities and documents included the desire for a workshop designed for state, county, and municipal agencies to better understand their responsibilities under state and federal laws. Additionally, respondents were interested in understanding how to write legal documents such as programmatic agreements and Memorandums of Agreements.

The remaining responses were focused on Native American issues such as Tribal scoping, identifying Tribal issues, integrating Native American perspectives and values in determining significance of archaeological sites, working with Tribes to identify sacred sites and Traditional Cultural Places/Properties, and improving communication and collaboration between state agencies and Native American Tribes.

Unfortunately, although 10 respondents did suggest that they would be willing to train other archaeologists on a particular topic, none left their names, so it is not possible to contact them.

SUMMARY

In summary, GAAC's Public Competency Committee solicited public comment from the professional archaeological community on their needs and desires for continuing education classes. The community responded that the need was greatest for identifying diagnostic materials associated with Proto-Historic sites in the field. This was followed by the desire to identify historic sites throughout the state. The third most-requested training opportunity was for a class on the identification and analysis of diagnostic northern Arizona pottery types. Additionally, the profession is comfortable with training opportunities that are web-based or web-assisted, and, although college credit may be available, it is not a necessary component or desire for these classes. Finally, the survey also recognized future training needs concerning National Register eligibility evaluation, Native American consultation, legal responsibilities and documents, methodological and permitting issues, and artifact identification.