

# ANG 5931: Practice of Public Archaeology

## Fall 2023

Section A440 (Class 29266)  
Tuesday, Periods 4–6  
(10:40 am–1:40 pm)  
Turlington 1208H

## Kenneth E. Sassaman

Office hours: Mon. and Weds. 9:00-10:30  
Office: Turlington B372; phone: 352-294-7601  
Otherwise at Lab: Thurs. and Fri. 8:30-3:00  
Lab phone: 392-392-6772  
[sassaman@ufl.edu](mailto:sassaman@ufl.edu)



*Description.* A graduate-level practicum in the professional aspects of public archaeology, including law, ethics, heritage management, government and tribal consultation, community collaboration, and public communication.

*Course Objectives.* Through a series of workshops with stakeholders engaged in public archaeology, students will develop an understanding of the legal, ethical, and practical challenges and opportunities of serving societal interests in heritage management. This course provides a working foundation in the law and practice of public archaeology for students who may pursue careers as project managers in heritage management; as compliance professionals in government agencies and tribes; as public-outreach personnel for nonprofit outfits; and related specialties, as well as anyone whose trajectory may intersect these domains from the domains of either policy or practice. Specific student learning outcomes (SLOs) are provided in the class topics detailed below.

*Format.* As a practicum, this course is designed to impart relevant knowledge and useful skills for professional employment in public archaeology. After the first few weeks—when we cover the fundamentals—we host one or more weekly guests who are employed in some aspect of the field. Our guests provide first-hand accounts of their job experiences, using case material and other resources to illustrate the best practices for success, as well as cautionary tales of failure. Guest presentations are paired with weekly readings on the topic at hand to develop working knowledge of the literature, and to widen the purview of the weekly topic to regional, national, and international scales. Short opening lectures by your instructor set the stage for interactive learning. Both guest presentations and reviews of literature are participatory activities, in the sense of workshoping.

*Readings.* The breadth of literature in public archaeology is as vast as its varied stakeholders. The foundational literature of the 1970s has been eclipsed by a greater, more diverse body of work over the past two decades, notably in Indigenous archaeology and community-based work. Over the course of the semester, we engage much of this new literature while also ensuring

working knowledge of what came before. Your instructor hopes to provide all readings via Canvas, free of charge. All posted readings are required (see class topics below), and supplemental sources are listed in living documents that students help to compile over the semester. A starting list is appended at the back of this syllabus.

*Expectations.* Regular class attendance and participation is essential to your success in this practicum. Together they warrant 20 percent of your final grade, 10 percent each for being there and for contributing each week. Another semester-long expectation is keeping a journal. You are expected to transcribe in digital form a continuous record of your experience with this course. This includes notes on readings, class presentations and discussions, group and individual projects, and any other relevant information. The intent of this exercise is to develop a resource that you can consult in years ahead as you work in public archaeology. The journal is worth 20 percent of your final grade. Your instructor will review your entries after three weeks and provide advice, if needed, for ensuring full credit. Finally, the balance of 60 percent of your course grade is divided into group (30 percent) and individual (30 percent total for two) assignments. The former involves the crafting of proposals for survey, testing, and data recovery in response to planned development. Groups will also serve as regulatory agents in evaluating the proposals of peers. Individual projects entail (a) 5-10 minute in-class review of an assigned federal law with emphasis on the intent, stipulations, and consequence of that law (10 percent); and (b) compliance review of an actual public report (20 percent), an assignment predicated on command of the criteria employed by regulatory authorities to review reports.

## **COURSE SCHEDULE**

### **Week 1 (Aug. 29): Introducing Public Archaeologies**

Why do we care about the past? Who has claims to the material past, and why? Predicated on societal interests to steward material remains of the human past is the legal and regulatory apparatus for managing archaeological and historical resources for the public good. In the U.S. and many other countries, a diverse industry in cultural resource management (CRM) or heritage management provides the professional services to help various stakeholders fulfill legal obligations to stewardship. The heritage interests of federally recognized tribes involve similar laws and management, in addition to unique challenges attending a history of land dispossession and related colonial impacts.

Both included within and going beyond mandated stewardship are the efforts of academics, museum professionals, nonprofit agencies, advocational societies, activists, and citizen scientists to engage with the past through material remains. And beyond all interests sanctioned in legal and ethical terms are countless persons who seek objects of the past for personal or monetary gain. There are indeed many stakeholders in the greater world of heritage, some of whose interests may be intrinsically contradictory to others, but many of whom are integrated in operational networks to ensure that public interests promulgated by law are well served.

SLOs: 1. understand syllabus, format, expectations; 2. become familiar with variations on public archaeology; 3. become familiar with various stakeholders in public archaeology.

Readings: review SAA webpages on Public Archaeology (<https://www.saa.org/education-outreach/public-outreach/what-is-public-archaeology>); Richardson and Almansa-Sánchez 2015

## **Week 2 (Sept. 5): Ethics 101 - Principles and Responsibilities**

Stewardship is the central of eight principles of archaeological ethics adopted by the Society for American Archaeology (SAA) in 1996. The others include accountability, commercialization, public education, intellectual property, reporting, curation, and training. As then-SAA President Bruce Smith noted when these principles were adopted, ethics is an open and ongoing project. Indeed, since the 1990s, the practice of public archaeology has encountered new challenges—like repatriation and intangible heritage—that ensure an expansion of SAA’s principles in years to come.

Professional ethics are the purview of the SAA, Register of Professional Archaeologists (RPA), American Anthropological Association (AAA), and Archaeological Institute of America (AIA), among other organizations. We find more general ethics in consideration of basic human rights, such as self-determination and freedom of religion, as well as safeguards against harassment and abuse. Archaeology in the U.S. is adapting to such challenges through greater inclusion and equity; it has work yet to do.

SLOs: 1. identify the perspectives of various stakeholders on the way the archaeological record is perceived and valued; 2. comprehend the eight SAA principles of archaeological ethics; 3. become familiar with current debates regarding cultural patrimony.

Readings: Selections from Lynott and Wylie 2000; Fowler 2018 (Chapter 4 in McManamon 2018)

Register of Professional Archaeologists <https://rpanet.org/>

Case Study 1: The Big Dig <https://thebigdigflorida.com/>

Case Study 2: Mammoth Carving

<https://www.nationalgeographic.com/adventure/article/110622-mammoth-bone-oldest-art-americas-science>

[https://www.manorauctions.com/auction-lot/paleolithic-mammoth-bone-incised-image-man-fish\\_7404CA6B1B](https://www.manorauctions.com/auction-lot/paleolithic-mammoth-bone-incised-image-man-fish_7404CA6B1B)

Case Study 3: Miami site contamination <https://prismreports.org/2023/05/24/miami-tequesta-archaeology-related-group-illness-cancer/>

### **Week 3 (Sept. 12): Legal Mandates and Enabling Regulations**

Focusing on the legal basis for CRM in the U.S., we review legislation since the 1960s that structures how archaeology is conducted for the public good. The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and its amendments have a defining role in the compliance archaeology of land-altering activities (i.e., Section 106), while the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990 gives legal heft to a postcolonial trend that has gained momentum in recent years. These and other federal laws have various counterparts at the state, municipal, and tribal levels. Beyond law are enabling regulations that specify operating procedures and standards of practice for both service providers and those who solicit and evaluate their work. All public archaeologists must be knowledgeable about the laws and regulations that structure the work they do.

For this meeting, each student is assigned a federal historic preservation law to summarize for the class in 5-10 minutes and provide some observations on the effectiveness of its intent and how it relates to other federal statutes.

SLOs: 1. become familiar with the laws that govern the treatment of archaeological sites and historic cultural resources in the U.S.; 2. become familiar with enabling regulations for the solicitation, budgeting, production, and review of mandated archaeological services; 3. understand how and why historic preservation law has evolved to become more inclusive of descendant and affected communities.

Readings: McManamon 2018, Chapter 1; King 2013, Chapter 1; Neumann et al. 2010, Chapter 2

### **Week 4 (Sept. 19): Regulatory Apparatus and Prioritizing Allocation of Scarce Resources**

Legislation at various levels sets mandates (often unfunded) that require organizational structures and operational procedures to become reality. Here we review the federal organizational structure from the top down, but spend most of our time exploring the organization and operations of a state historic preservation office (SHPO), where federal edict gets translated into state-regulated practice. We will be joined by the Florida Deputy SHPO in charge of compliance and review.

How do we decide what to preserve? What to excavate? What to let go? The regulatory apparatus of public archaeology includes decision-makers who answer these questions by following the law and best practices. However, SHPOs often lack sufficient human and material resources to address all mandated needs. We are interested in learning how they prioritize the distribution of their effort, and how that intersects with the criteria for assessing significance firmly established at the federal level.

SLOs: 1. become familiar with the structure and operation of governmental agencies directly charged with the acquisition, oversight, and/or provision of archaeological services pursuant to federal and state laws; 2. identify limitations on ability of agencies to meet demand.

Readings: Sebastian 2010 (Chapter 5 in Sebastian and Lipe, eds., 2010); King 2013 Chap. 3

### **Week 5 (Sept. 26): Launching Group Projects: Responding to Requests for Proposals for Archaeological Services**

We are joined by staff of the National Park Service and the U.S. Forest Service to learn how proposed actions with potential to effect historic and archaeological resources are evaluated and acted upon pursuant to federal and state law. We will also introduce two Requests for Proposals (RFP), one for a Phase I survey, the other Phase II testing. Over ensuing weeks, groups of three to four students will each prepare a proposal for one of the two projects and serve as reviewers for the other project.

SLOs: 1. review the parameters of the proposed land-altering activities with regulatory agents; 2. produce a list of compliance objectives and steps needed to achieve them; 3. develop division of labor among team members, including personnel budgeted in the proposal.

Reading: Neumann et al. 2010, Chaps. 3 and 4

Standards and Guidebooks:

FL SHPO Standards: <https://dos.myflorida.com/historical/preservation/compliance-and-review/regulations-guidelines/>

FDOT Guidebook: [https://www.fdot.gov/docs/default-source/environment/pubs/cultmgmt/Handbook\\_11-04.pdf](https://www.fdot.gov/docs/default-source/environment/pubs/cultmgmt/Handbook_11-04.pdf)

### **Week 6 (Oct. 3): Compliance Archaeology 1**

One of the exciting things about compliance archaeology involving assessments of site significance is Criterion D of the National Register: the potential for a site to teach us something. This is where research comes in, as does a nuanced understanding of local culture history, general literature, current methods, and your ability to apply all of this to problem orientation. Compliance archaeology is, by law, a research endeavor. Sure, much of compliance archaeology is mundane survey work that enables developers to proceed as planned for lack of significant remains. But even lowly lithic scatters can be rendered significant and worthy of attention if put into a compelling research context.

Aside from the research potential of any site, other factors constrain compliance decisions. We will ask professionals from the private sector of cultural resource management how they allocate limited resources among alternative ends. What are their major considerations before responding to an RFP? How are contract negotiations handled? We may also ask about programmatic agreements and noncompetitive bidding. Above all we hope to learn from our guests what makes for good proposals across various phases of compliance archaeology.

SLOs: 1. apply the major laws that govern the treatment of archaeological sites and historic cultural resources; 2. understand the methods through which archaeologists, architectural historians, and historic preservationists evaluate cultural resources; 3. evaluate site eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places.

Reading: Neumann et al. 2010, Chaps. 5 and 6; King 2013, Chap. 3

### **Week 7 (Oct. 10): Compliance Archaeology 2 and Individual Projects, Reviewing Reports**

We consider this week the deployment of resources for addressing the scopes of work for various types of projects. For a typical Phase 1 survey, we would be working with a specified “area of potential effect” (APE) and deploying a team to conduct reconnaissance survey according to parameters spelled out in the scope. If we are awarded a contract to conduct Phase II work for this same APE, we will target for secondary testing those sites deemed potentially eligible for the National Register, per concurrence by the SHPO/THPO. If later we have the chance to provide data-recovery for significant sites in the APE for which avoidance is not possible, we will likely need a much larger field crew over an extended period to meet our goals. Above all this, we may have standing arrangements to provide compliance services to agencies developing management plans for land under their jurisdiction, actions consistent with Section 110 of the NHPA.

We will also be visited by archaeologists of the Florida Bureau of Archaeological Research to learn how state lands are managed for cultural heritage, and to review the permitting process for working on state land. We will reserve time to introduce individual projects, namely the compliance review of actual public reports. By this date, each of you will have received an actual report to review by the end of the semester. We will take a look at the process and criteria by which reviews are conducted.

SLOs: 1. understand the difference between Phase I, II, III compliance; 2. know how to appropriately match resources (time, labor, equipment, supplies) to compliance needs; 3. become familiar with federal, state, and local permits required to conduct compliance archaeology.

Readings: King 2013, Chap. 4; Lindauer 2018 (Chapter 5 in McManamon 2018)

SHPO/THPO criteria for technical review of reports

### **Week 8 (Oct. 17): Tribal Heritage**

There is a complexity to tribal heritage management that goes beyond decision-making at the SHPO level. For starters, the areas of interests for tribes often extend beyond the borders of the states in which they currently reside. Multiple governments get involved. What is more, the office of Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO) has to negotiate two worlds: that imposed by federal and state governments, and that structured and valued through tribal consensus. On matters of heritage, tribes consult internally at many levels, including

religious. Federal law affords a good deal of autonomy for THPOs in fulfilling roles otherwise held by the SHPO, but with very little funding. For many tribes, not all requests for tribal consultation triggered by federal and state laws can be obliged due to limited resources, a problem THPOs share with SHPOs in most states.

A conversation with THPO professionals gives us a chance to learn how participation in the compliance realm of CRM articulates with tribal values and goals of heritage. We will ask how archaeology serves tribal needs beyond those mandated by law, and explore the frontiers of tribal archaeology in reframing inquiry about the past in expressly Indigenous ways. We might also ask about collaborations with non-tribal professional and agencies, as well as the value of public outreach to tribes.

SLOS: 1. understand the unique circumstances and opportunities federally-recognized tribes experience in conducting compliance operations; 2. appreciate the challenges of THPOs in balancing the interests of their tribes with legal obligations for historic preservation.

Readings: selections from Backhouse et al. 2017; Dongoske et al. 2018 (Chapter 8 in McManamon 2018); Steeves 2015

## **Week 9 (Oct. 24): NAGPRA**

The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990 was transformational, if slow to start. It took years for various stakeholders to understand its implications and develop capacity to meet its mandates. Like many federal mandates, funding for the stakeholders called to action was wishful. Museums and other repositories holding skeletal remains of known or potential Native American persons, as well as associated belongings, were obliged to inventory their holdings and notify the appropriate federally recognized tribes, any of which could make a claim for repatriation. This is but one of several dimensions of tribal consultation mandated by NAGPRA. How states integrate their own government-to-government relations with tribes varies, as does the capacity of THPO offices to meet all requests for consultation, as well as proactive efforts to reclaim ancestors.

We will meet with persons at repositories at UF and elsewhere whose jobs are to comply with NAGPRA on behalf of their respective institutions. We hope to learn what works and what does not work, and how those outcomes are affected by exogenous forces: fiscal, political, cultural, or other. We will also meet with persons from federally-recognized tribes whose jobs are to respond to NAGPRA requests, and, when possible, proactively seek repatriation of tribal ancestors and associated belongings on behalf of their people.

SLOS: 1. understand the legal and ethical rationale for repatriating ancestral remains and associated belongings to Native American descendants; 2. identify the tasks required to conduct a NAGPRA review of repositories; 3. identify the process by which NAGPRA claims are conducted.

Readings: selections from Chari and Lavalley 2013

## **Week 10 (Oct. 31): It's a Business**

In the early days of CRM, many universities in the U.S. took up the opportunity to pursue compliance archaeology, and some developed full-blown contract operations. Not many have survived to this day, and private firms now account for the bulk of contract work. Although some academic archaeologists would prefer to keep compliance archaeology out of the open market, the reality is that demand far exceeds supply of such services, so, short of total government control, open-market competition is beneficial to archaeology writ large. When demand for compliance archaeology exceeds supply, government agencies may have grounds for waiving mandates.

We can barely touch on the myriad business aspects of a CRM firm in three hours, but we will ask colleagues who spend their days working through them what is most important to understand. Quality compliance archaeology is not cheap, nor should it be. But in an open market, how much variation do we see in profit margins, overhead, and related matters that affect bottom lines? What are the differences between small and large firms, beyond scale? What is the role of nonprofit organizations in meeting compliance needs?

SLOs: 1. understand the fundamentals of cultural resource management as a business.

Readings: Dore 2018 (Chapter 13 in McManamon 2018)

## **Week 11 (Nov. 7): Technical Reporting**

Ask any CRM professional charged with producing reports of compliance archaeology and they will tell you that skill in technical writing is indispensable for the business but underserved in the university curricula of anthropology students. We are taught how to think and write critically, perhaps even creatively, but not technically, at least not in typical anthropology classes. Writing reports to fulfill the terms of CRM contracts requires precision, clarity, attention to detail, and adherence to guidelines of the state and other regulatory authorities. We invite colleagues with deep experience in report writing to share with us their advice on how to cultivate effective skills. We will learn from them the differences between letter reports, interim reports, and final reports, as well as the use of “executive” or “management” summaries, and the review process. We will also ask them about “boiler plate” in reports, when it can or should be used.

SLOs: 1. identify the main components of a technical report of archaeological compliance work; 2. understand how the requirements of technical reporting structure the content and format of reports.

Readings: Neumann et al. 2010, Chap. 7



## **Week 12 (Nov. 14): Curation and Data Management**

Those charged with curating the voluminous collections of materials (artifacts, other samples, field records, photographs, analytical records, and reports) generated from CRM have been warning of a crisis for decades. The physical and human-resource capacity to store and manage collections in perpetuity is woefully inadequate, despite legislative edict and lots of good will. We will meet with collections managers and curators from UF to get the latest forecast on the challenges ahead. We will also talk with agency archaeologists who have developed alternatives to in-field data collection as one solution to the curation crisis. Can a profession that identifies as “scientific” operate without the means to curate its data beyond the point of acquisition, without the means to ensure replicability of results and to enable future research? Why bother keeping anything if we never intend to refer to it again?

SLOs: 1. appreciate the legal responsibilities and material constraints experienced by repositories of archeological materials; 2. consider the positives and negatives of alternatives to data collection in the field that fulfill legal mandates for compliance archaeology but do not result in the transfer of objects to repositories.

Readings: Sullivan and Childs 2003; Trimble and Farmer 2018 (Chapter 12 in McManamon 2018)

Digital Archaeological Record: <https://core.tdar.org/>

Digital Index of North American Archaeology: <https://opencontext.org/projects/416a274c-cf88-4471-3e31-93db825e9e4a>

## **Week 13 (Nov. 21): Presenting to the Public and Working with Citizen Scientists**

Implicit to heritage law is the obligation to share with the public knowledge gained through the practice of compliance archaeology. The importance of public outreach has strengthened in recent years, and is now part of project proposals from the start, when resources and opportunities allow. Within and beyond CRM, too, is growing collaboration between archeologists and communities affected by their work. Civic engagement is necessary for not only sharing archaeological knowledge, but also to open dialog to alternative points of view. Archaeology will do well to prepare for growing empowerment of local communities, as well as tribes, to structure the agenda of compliance work in years to come.

We invite to class professionals in the business of public outreach in archaeology, notably colleagues of the Florida Public Archaeology Network (FPAN). Although archaeologists of FPAN are not engaged in compliance archaeology per se, they occupy an important space between the profession and the public, plus they engage in citizen science with partners in long-term projects of public good. We will ask how their work articulates with that of compliance archaeology.

SLOs: 1. critically evaluate the means by which archaeological and historical resources are presented to the public; 2. identify legal and ethical mandates for disseminating the results of compliance archaeology to the public; 3. identify ways that archaeologists have partnered with citizens to achieve historic preservation goals.

Readings: Moshenska 2017 (Chap 1 in Moshenska 2017); Grima 2017 (Chap 6 in Moshenska 2017)

Heritage Monitoring Scout Program FPAN: <https://hms.fpan.us/about>

FLBAR Guidebook: <https://files.floridados.gov/media/30867/handbook.pdf>

### **Week 14 (Nov. 28): Acquisition and Protection, from Local to Global**

One aspect of public archaeology that cuts to the heart of the preservation ethic are programs of site acquisition, protective covenants, and set asides. These run the gamut from government land designations (e.g., national and state parks, monuments, refuges), nonprofit acquisitions (e.g., Archaeological Conservancy), and international statuses (e.g., UNESCO World Heritage). A global perspective on acquisition and protection opens our view to possibilities beyond those enacted in the U.S. We invite to class UF professors who work abroad to share their experiences with local, national, and international heritage programs. We will ask them to comment as well on the status of compliance archaeology in their respective study areas.

SLOs: 1. identify various governmental and nongovernmental programs for land acquisition in the U.S. and beyond; 2. understand how and why heritage management approaches vary across the globe.

Readings: King 2020, Chap. 8

Archaeological Conservancy: <https://www.archaeologicalconservancy.org/>

Florida Forever Program: <https://floridadep.gov/floridaforever>

### **Week 15 (Dec. 5): Wrap-Up**

## READINGS AND OTHER SOURCES

Anfinson, Scott F.

- 2019 *Practical Heritage Management: Preserving a Tangible Past*. Rowman and Littlefield, Lanham, Maryland.

Atalay, Sonya

- 2012 *Community-Based Archaeology: Research with, by, and for Indigenous and Local Communities*. University of California Press, Berkeley.

Atalay, Sonya, and Alexandra McCleary (editors)

- 2022 *The Community-Based PhD: Complexities and Triumphs of Conducting CBPR*. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

Backhouse, Paul N., Brent R. Weisman, and Mary B. Rosebrough (editors)

- 2017 *We Come for Good: Archaeology and Tribal Historic Preservation at the Seminole Tribe of Florida*. University Press of Florida, Gainesville.

Chari, Sangita, and Jaime M. N. Lavalee (editors)

- 2013 *Accomplishing NAGPRA: Perspectives of the Intent, Impact, and Future of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act*. Oregon State University Press, Corvallis.

Colwell, Chip

- 2017 *Plundered Skulls and Stolen Spirits: Inside the Fight to Reclaim Native America's Culture*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Hardesty, Donald L., and Barbara J. Little

- 2009 *Assessing Site Significance: A Guide for Archaeologists and Historians* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). AltaMira, Lanham, Maryland.

Kansa, Eric C., Sarah Whitcher Kansa, Joshua J. Wells, Stephen J. Yerka, Kelsey Noack Myers, Robert C. DeMuth, Thaddeus G. Bissett, and David G. Anderson

- 2018 The Digital Index of North American Archaeology (DINAA): Networking Government Data to Navigate an Uncertain Future for the Past. *Antiquity* 92 490-506.

King, Thomas K.

- 2000 *Federal Planning and Historic Places: The Section 106 Process*. AltaMira, Lanham, Maryland.

- 2013 *Cultural Resource Laws and Practice* (4<sup>th</sup> edition). AltaMira, Lanham, Maryland.

King, Thomas K. (editor)

- 2020 *Cultural Resource Management: A Collaborative Primer for Archaeologists*. Berghahn, New York.

Lynott, Mark J., and Alison Wylie (editors)

- 2000 *Ethics in American Archaeology* (second revised edition). Society for American Archaeology Press, Washington, D.C.

Mackenthun, Gesa, and Christen Mucher (editors)

- 2021 *Decolonizing "Prehistory": Deep Time and Indigenous Knowledges in North America*. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.
- McGimsey, Charles R., III, and Hester A. Davis (editors)  
1977 *The Management of Archeological Resources: The Airle House Report*. Society for American Archaeology, Washington, D.C.
- McManamon, Frank P. (editor)  
2018 *New Perspectives in Cultural Resource Management*. Routledge, London.
- Moshenska, Gabriel (editor)  
2017 *Key Concepts in Public Archaeology*. UCL Press, open access, <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1vxm8r7>.
- Nissley, Claudia, and Thomas F. King  
2016 *Consultation and Cultural Heritage: Let Us Reason Together* (orig. 2014). Routledge, London.
- Neumann, Thomas W., Robert M. Sanford, and Karen G. Harry  
2010 *Cultural Resources Archaeology: An Introduction* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). AltaMira, Lanham, Maryland.
- Richardson, Lorna-Jane, and Jaime Almansa-Sánchez  
2015 Do You Even Know What Public Archaeology Is? Trends, Theory, Practice, Ethics, *World Archaeology* 47:194-211, DOI: [10.1080/00438243.2015.1017599](https://doi.org/10.1080/00438243.2015.1017599)
- Schneider, Tsim D., and Lee M. Panich (editors)  
2022 *Archaeologies of Indigenous Presence*. University Press of Florida, Gainesville.
- Sebastian, Lynne, and William D. Lipe (editors)  
2009 *Archaeology & Cultural Resource Management: Visions for the Future*. School for Advanced Research Press, Santa Fe.
- Steeves, Paulette  
2015 Academia, Archaeology, CRM, and Tribal Historic Preservation. *Archaeologies* 11:121-141.
- Sullivan, Lynne P., and S. Terry Childs  
2003 *Curating Archaeological Collections: From the Field to the Repository*. AltaMira, Lanham, Maryland.