

Preserving the Past Together: Cultural Resource Management, Collections Management
Professionals, and the Accessibility of Archaeological Collections

Cameo E. Kale

A thesis

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the

Requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

University of Washington

2017

Committee:

Wilson O'Donnell

Peter Lape

Nancy Hoffman

Program Authorized to Offer Degree:
Museology

© 2017 Cameo E. Kale

University of Washington

Abstract

Preserving the Past Together: Cultural Resource Management, Collections Management Professionals, and the Accessibility of Archaeological Collections

Cameo Kale

Chair of the Supervisory Committee:
Associate Director Wilson O'Donnell
Museology

The purpose of this study was to better understand the relationship between cultural resource management (CRM) professionals and archaeological repositories, and how that relationship impacted the accessibility of archaeological collections. Current literature suggested that the curation crisis was negatively affected by the working relationship between CRM professionals and repositories. The curation crisis directly impacts the accessibility of archaeological collections. Data was collected from nine CRM archaeologists and two repository collections management professionals who participated in semi-structured interviews. The research was guided by questions revolving around job role perceptions, making archaeology accessible, and the general relationships between CRM and repository professionals. The results of this study provided support for calls to action for CRM archaeologists and repository professionals to work together, but found that there were certain times in which collaboration and contact were more useful than others. This study also found that developing personal relationships and understanding different perspectives was essential for creating constructive working relationships. This study was limited by the small sample size of participants. This study also did not

interview tribal repositories or archaeologists – a limitation that leaves an opportunity for future work on this topic.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my thesis chair and advisor, Wilson O'Donnell, for his guidance over the past two years. I would like to extend that gratitude to my entire committee for showing me patience and kindness as I completed my research. I also want to thank the research participants who took the time out of their busy days to provide thoughtful answers to my questions.

I extend my thanks to the amazing University of Washington Museology faculty and staff who have taught me so much over the last two years. Thanks to my incredible supervisors and co-workers at the Burke who showed compassion, understanding, and great friendship throughout this ordeal. To my wonderful cohort – I know I couldn't have made it this far without you – thank you all! To those friends with whom I've grown particularly close over the past two years, I will always cherish your love and support. I want to thank my big sister, who continues to be a constant source of inspiration and comfort, and finally, I extend a very special thanks to the very special man in my life, Morten, who stuck with me through every up and down. Tusen takk!

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	i
Table of Contents.....	ii
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2: Literature Review.....	5
Chapter 3: Methods.....	14
Chapter 4: Results.....	18
Chapter 5: Discussion.....	34
Chapter 6: Conclusions.....	40
References.....	41
Appendices.....	43

Chapter 1: Introduction

As the Society for American Archaeology states, “Collections are preserved for both scientific research and public education. The application of new technologies and dating techniques to old collections yields valuable new information that may lead to new theories and understandings about our human past.”¹ They are also “preserved for use in museum exhibits so that the public may benefit from the archaeological research that unearthed them.”² While both archaeologists and repository collections management professionals agree that collections are important resources for scientific research and public outreach, the ongoing curation crisis prevents some collections from reaching their full educational potential.³

The curation crisis refers to the limited amount of resources available to properly care for the influx of archaeological collections over the past 100 years.⁴ Cultural resource management companies, whose work is part of “legally mandated or contracted archaeology,” generate most of the archaeological collections in the US.⁵ According to

¹ “Archaeological Collections,” *SAA*, accessed May 29, 2017, http://www.saa.org/publicftp/public/educators/05_collections.html.

² *Ibid.*

³ W. Marquardt, A. Montet-White, and S. Scholtz, “Resolving the Crisis in Archaeological Collections Curation,” *American Antiquity*, 47(2) (1982): 409.

⁴ Barbara Voss, “Curation as research. A case study in orphaned and underreported archaeological collections,” *Archaeological Dialogues*, 19(2) (2012): 146.

⁵ William Green and John Doershuk, “Cultural Resource Management and American Archaeology,” *Journal of Archaeological Research* 6, no. 2 (1998): 122.

SAA, archaeological collections “include not just the artifacts from an archaeology project, but also the associated information and records such as soil samples, field notes, maps, photographs, and related historical documents.”⁶

These collections are held in repositories where collections management professionals see to the long-term care of collections. The long-term care of collections includes maintaining the general wellbeing of artifacts and associated documents, making sure those collections are well organized, and making sure the data are accessible to researchers and the public.⁷

Current literature suggests that there is a disconnect between the work CRM archaeologists do and the work of collections management professionals. The care of collections is often thought to be solely the responsibility of collections repository staff. It seems to be out of the scope of client-focused CRM firms to care for the collections they generate post survey.⁸ The current literature considers this disconnect between CRM archaeology firms and collections repositories to be a negative factor in the on-going curation crisis, which in turn negatively impacts the accessibility of collections to researchers and the public.⁹

⁶ “Archaeological Collections,” *SAA*, accessed May 29, 2017, http://www.saa.org/publicftp/public/educators/05_collections.html.

⁷ L. Sullivan and S. Terry Childs, *Curating archaeological collections: From the field to the repository* (Archaeologist's toolkit) (Walnut Creek: Altamira Press, 2003), 3.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 28.

⁹ Teresita Majewski, "Not Just the End Game Anymore A Perspective from the Western United States on Proactive Budgeting for Project Curation Needs in a Changing Archaeological World," *Heritage & Society* 3, no. 2 (2010): 169.

The literature that discusses this disconnect often includes calls to action to reconnect the professions and asserts that shifting the paradigm to include long-term collections management in what constitutes the archaeological process is necessary to reduce the negative effects the disconnect has on the curation crisis.¹⁰ However, the literature does not seem to address *why* the disconnect manifests itself. A clearer understanding of why there is a disconnect between the work CRM archaeologists and repository professionals do will make a stronger argument for implementing those calls to action. By reducing the effects of the curation crisis, archaeological collections can reach their full potential as an accessible resource for researchers and as an educational tool for the public.

It is the purpose of this study to better understand the relationship between CRM professionals and repositories, and how that relationship impacts the accessibility of archaeological collections. The research questions guiding this study are as follows:

1. How do CRM archaeologists perceive the job roles of repository professionals?
2. How do repository professionals perceive the job roles of CRM archaeologists?
3. How do both professions work toward making collections and archaeology as a whole publicly accessible?
4. What does the relationship between CRM archaeologists and repository professionals currently look like?

By speaking with professionals from both the CRM and repository communities, this study hopes to more precisely define the current relationship, and uncover new solutions,

¹⁰ Wendy Bustard, "Archeological Curation in the 21st Century. Or, Making Sure the Roof Doesn't Blow Off," *Cultural Resource Management*, 23(5) (2000): 14.

or at the very least, reinforce solutions already put forth by the current literature to the curation crisis as it pertains to the intersection of field archaeology and collections repositories.

Chapter 2: The Literature Review

The purpose of this study was to better understand the relationship between cultural resource management (CRM) professionals and repositories, and how that relationship impacts the accessibility of archaeological collections. This study is situated within literature on the curation crisis, collections accessibility, and best practices within CRM archaeology and collections management.

Curation Crisis

Lynne P. Sullivan and S. Terry Childs provided a succinct overview of the US curation crisis history in their book *Curating Archaeological Collections: From the Field to the Repository*. They identified the New Deal era as a significant start to the increase in archaeological collections created by new federal projects.¹¹ Unfortunately, those federal programs championed fieldwork over curation, as fieldwork offered more labor-intensive work opportunities for the unemployed. Sullivan and Childs suggested that the “increased separation between the making of archaeological collections (i.e., fieldwork) and the caring for archaeological collections (i.e., curation),” negatively affects curation crisis.¹² They went on to talk about other key issues occurring in the 1970s and 1980s that affect the curation crisis, all drawing back to the disconnect between field archaeologists and repository staff. These issues included the rise of private CRM firms, which are often not

¹¹ Sullivan and Childs, *Curating archaeological collections*, 11.

¹² *Ibid.*, 5.

tied to the repositories that will ultimately house the collections. Therefore, CRM firms were less accountable to the collections post survey. Other issues included the Historic Preservation Movement, which advocated for preservation of sites and artifacts, but did not provide any guidance on how to do so; the conservation ethic that encouraged long-term care of collections because archaeological sites are non-renewable resources, but did not account for long-term care cost; and Native American concerns that influenced legislation regarding archaeological collections.¹³

With the passing of the 1990 Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) and the Curation of Federally Owned and Administered Archaeological Collections (36 CFR pt. 79), Wendy Bustard pointed out that collections management finally had a sense of accountability as the regulations forced “agencies to locate and inventory their collections, and to make formal arrangements with non-federal repositories.”¹⁴ However, because the curation crisis was already in full swing, collections repositories faced many challenges in complying with the new and improved standards for collections care including an enormous backlog of uncatalogued artifacts, limited staff and money resources, and inadequate storage facilities.¹⁵

Much of the literature regarding the archaeological curation crisis concluded with calls to action in hopes of relieving the negative effects of the crisis. Andrew Jamieson, Sullivan and Childs, and Bustard all called for a multi-disciplinary approach to solving the curation crisis and encourage archaeologists to work closely with repository staff

¹³ Ibid., 19-21.

¹⁴ Bustard, *Archeological Curation in the 21st Century*, 11.

¹⁵ Ibid., 10.

throughout their fieldwork process.¹⁶ In *A Checklist for Sustainable Management of Archaeological Collections*, S. Terry Childs and Danielle M. Benden pointed out “problems associated with the curation crisis often relate to the general lack of formal collections management and curation training for professional archaeologists.”¹⁷ Some researchers called for collections management curricula to be included in at least graduate level archaeological programs.¹⁸

Despite the claim that there is a disconnect between field archaeologists and collections repository staff and the call to action to reconnect those professionals within the literature, there does not seem to be much research delving into how and why that disconnect currently manifests itself. Without understanding the current relationship between field archaeologists and repository staff, the calls for action may not be as effective as the literature suggests.

Collections Accessibility

Despite the conflicting opinions about who is responsible for what, “professional archaeologists in America seem to have reached a consensus that systematic

¹⁶ Andrew Jamieson, “Developing Strategies for Sustainably Managing Archaeological Collections,” *Journal of Eastern Mediterranean Archaeology and Heritage Studies*, 3(1) (2015): 76; Sullivan and Childs, *Curating archaeological collections*, 11; Bustard, *Archeological Curation in the 21st Century*, 14.

¹⁷ S. Terry Childs, and Danielle M. Benden, "A Checklist for Sustainable Management of Archaeological Collections," *Advances in Archaeological Practice* 5, no. 01 (2017): 20.

¹⁸ Sarah Cain, “A Preliminary Study on Curation Concerns in Higher Education Anthropology Programs with a Focus on Archaeological Collection,” Master’s thesis, Southern Illinois University Carbondale, 2013: 51; Sullivan and Childs, *Curating archaeological collections*, 34.

archaeological collections are vital to current and future comparative research,¹⁹ the data from archaeological collections are important to the excavating archaeologists *and* to future researchers.²⁰

However, as Barbara Voss pointed out in *Curation as Research: A Case Study in Underreported Archaeological Collections*, archaeological professionals do not often view the curation process as investigative research; curation is only viewed as a management process.²¹ By disconnecting themselves from the curation process, archaeologists perhaps do not fully understand the research potential collections have post survey. Collections not only benefit scientific researchers, but also the public by way of exhibition and general information requests.²²

Even if archaeologists and repository staff agree on the importance of archaeological collections, Sullivan and Childs pointed out:

If we do not know what is in a collection, where its contents are located, when it was last inventoried or inspected, and where the documents and reports containing essential contextual information about the collection are located, then it is all rather useless until found. In fact, why keep a collection at all if it is not known about or accessible?²³

The curation crisis directly affects a collection's accessibility.

¹⁹ W. Marquardt, et al., *Resolving the Crisis*, 409.

²⁰ Voss, *Curation as Research*, 166.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 149.

²² Suzanne Keene, *Fragments of the world: Uses of museum collections* (1st ed.), (Oxford: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann, 2005): 78.

²³ Sullivan and Childs, *Curating archaeological collections*, 35.

Collections Management

With the increase in federal regulation of archaeological excavations and collections like NAGPRA and 36 CFR pt. 79, collections management policies are becoming better tools in caring for archaeological collections. The American Alliance of Museums (AAM) provides collections stewardship best practices as a reference for any institution.²⁴ However, despite collections management policies becoming the norm, they are still not standardized between institutions. In *Long-Range Preservation Planning*, Sherelyn Ogden provided an in-depth long-range preservation plan for the Minnesota Historical Society (MNHS), Minnesota's main collections repository. However, not all repositories have as much funding as MNHS to keep up with the stricter collections management regulations.²⁵ Furthermore, as repositories try to keep up with their own care standards, they are forced to increase the cost of curation fees, which cause some CRM firms to fail to comply with state and federal regulations because of limited budgets.²⁶ Again, Sullivan and Childs cited the lack of collaboration between archaeologists and repository staff in the creation of these management policies to be negatively affecting the curation crisis.²⁷

²⁴ "Collections Stewardship," *AAM*, accessed May 29, 2017, <http://www.aam-us.org/resources/ethics-standards-and-best-practices/collections-stewardship>.

²⁵ Sherelyn Ogden, *Long-Range Preservation Planning*, (St. Paul, MN: The Minnesota Historical Society, 2012).

²⁶ Bustard, *Archeological Curation in the 21st Century*, 11.

²⁷ Sullivan and Childs, *Curating archaeological collections*, 11.

Field Archaeology

The Society for American Archaeology lays out the best practice standards for archaeological survey. Best practices include accountability and public outreach, but often only within the context of the fieldwork itself.²⁸ Cultural resource reporting standards like those of Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation follow in the same vein, only guiding archaeologists in conducting fieldwork but not post survey management.²⁹ Those same standards also focus more on federal and state projects, rather than projects contracted by private clients. In Washington State, all archaeological sites, whether they are on public or private land, are protected from unauthorized excavation.³⁰ As the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP) points out on their website:

...artifacts from public lands managed by the state of Washington or by political subdivisions of the state, such as cities, counties, ports, school districts and other special districts, that are excavated under a Washington State Excavation Permit, be curated in a repository that meets the federal standards published in 36 CFR Part 79.³¹

Requirements for obtaining an archaeological permit to work on federal lands, state lands, or lands of political subdivisions of the state do not go beyond naming a repository

²⁸ “Principles of Archaeological Ethics,” *SAA*, accessed May 29, 2017, <http://www.saa.org/AbouttheSociety/PrinciplesofArchaeologicalEthics/tabid/203/Default.aspx>.

²⁹ “Cultural Resource Reporting,” *DAHP*, accessed May 29, 2017, <http://www.dahp.wa.gov/sites/default/files/CR%20Update%202015%282%29.pdf>.

³⁰ “RWC 27.53.060 Archaeological Sites and Resources,” *Washington State Legislature*, accessed June 4, 2017, <http://apps.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=27.53&full=true#27.53.060>.

³¹ “Collections,” *DAHP*, accessed May 29, 2017, <http://www.dahp.wa.gov/collections>.

that meets the 36 CFR pt. 79 standards for curating collections generated by fieldwork.³² Private lands are a different story. As previously mentioned, all archaeological sites in Washington State are protected, however, there are no laws requiring private landowners to curate their collections within archaeological repositories, and if they do, the repositories are not required to be up to federal standards. DAHP recognizes that most archaeological sites are on privately owned land and will therefore “be preserved through the generosity of private landowners, or not at all.”³³ This is a particular issue as CRM archaeologists take part in a bidding process to get contracts. If they are dealing with private landowners, it can be appealing for CRM archaeologists to choose repositories that do not have curation fees, or have fewer fees than repositories that are up to federal curation standards in order to get the bid. As will shortly be discussed, collections tend to suffer when curation is not properly budgeted for.

Teresita Majewski pointed out the importance of budgeting for collections management in CRM in *Not Just the End Game Anymore*. She stressed that the budgeting process must start at the very beginning of a project if it is to be effective.³⁴ Budgets are vital for both the archaeology fieldwork process and the ensuing long-term curation to go smoothly. Unfortunately, creating an accurate budget can sometimes become more expensive than a client would like. Childs and Benden reminded clients they “should not automatically accept the lowest bid for CRM projects that inadequately budgets for

³² “Summary of Information Required of an Applicant,” *Washington State Legislature*, accessed May 29, 2017, <http://apps.leg.wa.gov/WAC/default.aspx?cite=25-48-060>.

³³ “Stewardship,” *DAHP*, accessed June 4, 2017, <http://www.dahp.wa.gov/site-stewardship>.

³⁴ Majewski, *Not Just the End Game Anymore*, 167.

curation costs.”³⁵ A project that is under budget “undermines the goal of working toward a sustainable process, is contrary to the intent of the law, and is detrimental to collections preservation and accessibility for future research.”³⁶ Majewski drove her point home by stating, “When agencies are in the dark or denial about these costs, the collections (artifacts and paper and digital records) generated from archaeological work generally will always be treated inadequately.”³⁷

Childs and Benden discussed the current lack of consensus when it comes to collection/no collection and culling policies:

Decisions involving no-collection projects, sampling, in-field analysis, and object reburial have a serious impact on the availability of robust, systematic field collections for future research, education, interpretation, and uses by descendant communities. The legal and ethical ramifications of no-collection policies and related strategies have been questioned for some...while others...call for a critical analysis of collecting practices.³⁸

Despite archaeologists’ best efforts, reports and field notes are intrinsically biased by the scaffolding of current archaeological theory.³⁹ As Andrew Christensen noted in *The Role of Museums in Cultural Resource Management*, “no archaeological report comes close to presenting the potential information contained in materials excavated from a site. Any

³⁵ Childs and Benden, A Checklist for Sustainable Management of Archaeological Collections, 17.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Majewski, Not Just the End Game Anymore, 169.

³⁸ Childs and Benden, A Checklist for Sustainable Management of Archaeological Collections, 20.

³⁹ Robert Chapman and Alison Wylie, *Evidential Reasoning in Archaeology*, Debates in Archaeology, (London; New York: Bloomsbury Academic, an Imprint of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, 2016): 3-4.

report is a first approximation that can be improved and expanded as new techniques and new theories are developed.”⁴⁰

The literature does well to identify that there is a disconnect between archaeology field practices and collections management practices. However, the literature does not thoroughly identify the current relationship between field archaeologists and repository staff. Understanding that relationship will hopefully allow for better communication between the professions, and will perhaps identify new solutions in addressing the curation crisis or will at least reinforce solutions already put forth by the current literature.

⁴⁰ Andrew Christenson, “The Role of Museums in Cultural Resource Management,” *American Antiquity*, 44(1) (1979): 162.

Chapter 3: Methods

Research Goal and Questions

The purpose of this study was to better understand the relationship between cultural resource management (CRM) professionals and repositories, and how that relationship impacts the accessibility of archaeological collections. The research was guided by the following research questions:

1. How do CRM archaeologists perceive the job roles of repository professionals?
2. How do repository professionals perceive the job roles of CRM archaeologists?
3. How do both professions work toward making collections and archaeology as a whole publicly accessible?
4. What does the relationship between CRM archaeologists and repository professionals currently look like?

Methodology Approach and Framing

The study used a qualitative approach, employing semi-structured in-person and phone interviews. Two sets of questions guided the interviews, one tailored to CRM professionals and one tailored to repository professionals. Given the mostly open-ended nature of the interview questions, in-person and phone interviews were the best method to capture complex answers to complex questions in a timely fashion. Conducting the interviews in person and over the phone also allowed for additional data to be collected as supplementary questions arose.

Sampling

Nine CRM archaeologists and two repository professionals were interviewed. The research was geographically bound to professionals working in Washington State. The difference in sample size is reflective of, though not directly proportional to, the greater number of CRM firms working in Washington State compared to the number of repositories based in Washington State.

CRM firms were identified from the Association of Washington Archaeology's (AWA) consultant list. Individuals selected within the firm had to hold a position in which they interact with repository professionals as a part of their job duties.

Repositories were identified from a repository list provided by the 2016 Washington Curation Summit. Selected repositories had to be able to hold federal archaeological collections. Individuals selected from repositories had to hold a position in which they interact with CRM archaeologists as a part of their job duties.

Tribal repositories were excluded from this study due to the scope of the thesis. Relationships between tribal collections management professionals and CRM archaeologists, as well as relationships between tribal collections management and non-tribal collections management professionals, are an important factor in the accessibility of collections and archaeology. It is a topic that deserves a study that can dedicate that could not be fully accomplished in this thesis given the scope and the timeline of the master's program.

Instrument and Protocol

Participants were initially contacted via email and interview times were subsequently established. Phone interviews were recorded with the Automatic Call Recorder app, version 5.26. In-person interviews were recorded with the Smart Recorder app, version 1.8.0. Length of interviews ranged from 15 minutes and 29 seconds to one hour, 20 minutes and 23 seconds. The mean duration was 38 minutes and 32 seconds, and the median duration was 31 minutes and 58 seconds. Handwritten interview notes were also kept using pen and paper.

Questions for both CRM archaeologists and repository professionals were organized into five sections:

1. Basic Information
 - E.g., how long have you worked in xxx field?
2. Standard Procedures
 - E.g., once a repository agreement is established, how frequently do you stay in contact with the repository/CRM firm for that project?
3. Job roles
 - E.g., do you think repository professionals/CRM archaeologists should be more involved in the archaeological fieldwork process/long-term curation process?
4. Access to Collections – Professional Use
 - E.g., how do you think repositories can better serve CRM archaeologists?
5. Access to Collections – Public Outreach

- E.g., how do you make archaeology accessible to the public?

The University of Washington found the interview instruments to be institutional review board exempt. See Appendices A and B for the full set of interview questions.

Analysis

All audio interviews were uploaded to a research project file and transcribed using NVivo. The interviews were imported into a Word document and printed so the coding could be done by hand. Each interview was reviewed once to establish a working coding rubric. Once the main themes were identified, the interviews were reviewed again, once for each established theme. The interviews were coded using emergent coding. See Appendix C for the full coding rubric.

Limitations

This study is limited by its sample size. Given the nature of the data collection method, only so many people could be interviewed within the time constraints of the thesis process. The study was also limited by response of the selected interview candidates. Twenty-four professionals were originally contacted, but only 11 were able to participate in the study. The sample size of repository professional participants is also much lower than the sample size of the CRM professionals. This was reflective of the participant criteria laid out above. Despite these limitations, the results of this study have significant implications for repositories holding archaeological collections and CRM professionals.

Chapter 4: Results

The purpose of this study was to better understand the relationship between cultural resource management (CRM) professionals and repositories, and how that relationship impacts the accessibility of archaeological collections. This chapter summarizes the data collected in the interviews with nine CRM professionals and two repository professionals. The results are divided into five sections based on the themes that emerged during coding:

1. Procedures
2. Professional Use – Access to Collections
3. Public Outreach and Access to Collections
4. Barriers
5. Relationships

Quotes and examples will be used to exemplify each theme.

1. Procedures

When asked how frequently they stay in contact with a repository or a CRM company after a repository agreement has been established, the immediate answer of all participants was a variation of “hardly at all.” The initial response was then usually modified to include examples of particular projects that required more communication as questions arose. One repository professional agreed that contact usually only happened at the beginning and end of a project. In cases where the project was likely to generate a

large collection, or if there were known budgetary issues, the participant said the repository would make a point to check in more often.

If we have a question about the guidelines... (CRM)

Not at all. I mean basically they say 'yeah, we'll take it.' They'll contact you, you don't contact them until you're ready to transfer it. (CRM)

Not at all. Well, if we have questions we'll go back and ask. (CRM)

Very rarely throughout the project...we have kind of two touch points, one at the beginning when they get the curation request, and one right at the end when they're ready to transfer. (REP)

Seven of the CRM participants talked about including a collection/no collection policy in the project plan. While they all acknowledged that repository fees do come into play when deciding whether to collect artifacts from a site, CRM professionals felt that research value was the main driving force behind their collecting choices.

...have some language in the original agreement about collecting or culling process. (CRM)

If we're monitoring, we're typically monitoring under a monitoring plan. So, we've tried to think about what if we found anything, what would be significant? So, we're kind of trying to not be just collecting everything that we see, but being selective...we might say that we would note broken bottles, but we would only collect whole ones, or something like that. (CRM)

So, I try to balance out meaningful data, protecting the resource, and overall value. (CRM)

CRM participants also cited pre-contact versus historic artifacts as playing a role, as well as protecting the resource, and adhering to tribal wishes:

The historic assemblages are the ones that can be huge – it would be unreasonable to collect and keep absolutely everything. Prehistoric sites don't tend to be the ones that are that huge, so there's less of an issue with collecting. We haven't excavated any village sites... (CRM)

I haven't curated for a long time. One of the things that's happened with the Tribes that I work with – they don't want us to collect any artifacts, and most of the agencies are non-collection now...most of the survey work is non collection. (CRM)

...and the Tribe asked us not to collect it. So, some of that is collecting on the desires on all the people who are involved on making the decisions, so that's kind of a circumstantial thing. (CRM)

CRM participants who discussed culling were all of the opinion that it is a useful practice as long as it's done with lab work and documentation. The decision to cull is also driven by research value, but again, CRM participants acknowledged curation fees as a limiting factor.

And in terms of culling artifacts, yes I am perfectly okay with that. We've had projects where we've had maybe 500 cobble stones, you know, and there isn't much you can say about cobble stones. We collected types of choppers, and left the rest out there. It's a tool type you can make in a second. (CRM)

Yes, it would have been thousands of dollars to curate them (CRM)

Both repository participants felt more strongly that CRM archaeologists were motivated by repository fees to cull artifacts.

I think it probably affects...culling for sure. It affects what gets collected probably less, especially for private property, but it definitely affects what stuff comes to the museum. (REP)

I think that we all need to be talking about what gets kept, and what gets discarded, and why...what we've been talking about in the curation community is [culling] things like large bulk soil samples, fire cracked rock, tin cans and glass – but you know, some of those bits and pieces can be very instructive. Who decides? (REP)

All of CRM participants agreed that prepping a collection for curation was their responsibility, but six of the nine CRM participants specifically pointed out that once a collection is transferred to the repository, their obligations toward the collection are done.

Once it winds up in a curation facility...the burden shifts. (CRM)

The industry as such doesn't have a need to go back. Research professionals do, Tribal people do. It's just not part of the work that we do. (CRM)

I think once the collections have been turned over to the repository, it's not really the CRM company's responsibility to necessarily have to be involved. Because once the collection is turned over to the repository, that pretty much means the project is closed out and the CRM company is pretty much done with their obligation to their client. (CRM)

2. Professional Use – Access to Collections

CRM participants considered the greatest resource a repository could provide was available, helpful staff and a well-written set of guidelines. The CRM participants were appreciative of guidelines that were clear and short. When questions arose that the guidelines didn't answer, the CRM participants explained how useful the actual repository staff were.

For us, they are invaluable. We use repository staff for their expertise all the time. I don't have a full time curation specialist on my staff. We're a small shop. Even if my shop were 3 or 4 times the size that it is, it still wouldn't be able to afford a full time curation specialist. So with that said, we need the expertise from whatever repository we're dealing with to help us do the best job that we can in the quickest amount of time and provide a high quality product. (CRM)

Six CRM participants also considered repositories to be a comparative collections resource. Two of those participants talked specifically about the faunal collections at the Burke Museum and one spoke highly of the Burke's Office of Public Archaeology (OPA)

archives.⁴¹ One CRM participant also recounted that small museums in small towns near the project area could also prove to be useful in getting a sense of the area's history.

Whether or not they actually recalled using a repository for its collections, most of the CRM participants simply liked the idea that they knew it was available to them and that it was important to be able to have access.

Definitely, especially for bones, for faunal. The comparative collections that the Burke has are really, I mean we can't have that...type of resource here so easily so it's helpful to us. (CRM)

This is amazing. This is stuff you cannot find on Wisard as far as primary information. Some of it's pretty boring and dry, but it gives you a glimpse into the Office of Public Archaeology that UW ran in the '70s...so if someone asks me 'oh the...site, wasn't that an OPA project? Where did you get those photos in your site report?' OPA archives, they're there! Yes, it is a resource for more than just curating collections. (CRM)

I don't really use the collections...but [it's] important to have access. (CRM)

Two CRM participants discussed the importance of being able to easily go back to a collection for further analysis, whether it was spurred on by personal interest or extra money came in for further analysis on a project.

Sometimes I revisit them after 10 years go by, for specialized analysis. Since I know that the material is there, I knew about it because I helped collect it. (CRM)

For example, if I go back to an assemblage because maybe I have some money to do a radiocarbon date...recently we did this, and one of [the repository] people was able to point me in the direction of another consultant that does work specifically on plant products. (CRM)

⁴¹ The OPA, operated by the University of Washington, conducted many archaeological projects throughout the 1970s and 1980s before it was disbanded. Many of the collections generated by the OPA went to the Burke Museum, but the associated archives went to the UW Special Collections. In 2005, the Burke Museum received a grant to reunite the collections and the archives; Laura Phillips, "Burke Museum Receives Grant to Save Records," *AWA News* 9, no. 3 (2005): 5.

CRM participants were divided on the proposition of using repository professionals to provide support in educating clients about the necessities of curation and its accompanying fees. One thought it would be a great idea, as they didn't always have the resources to devote to such an endeavor. Two saw the potential of having an extra expert justify the curation budget. One CRM and one repository participant saw it as maybe happening on a case-by-case basis. One CRM participant felt that it was really the role of the CRM archaeologist to be aware of the necessity of curation and that repository professionals shouldn't be too involved in the contract negotiations when budget justification is discussed.

I don't know that the repository necessarily has, or should be involved in that negotiation contract stuff. But what they could provide is say, 'okay, yeah, with this volume of materials it's reasonable to think that it would take this much time to curate.' (CRM)

No, I think that it's the CRM professional's job to understand curation well enough to be able to scope it adequately, just like any other component. (CRM)

3. Public Outreach and Access to Collections

The CRM participants generally mentioned giving public lectures and teaching classes and workshops. One of the more specific examples of archaeological public outreach the CRM participants gave revolved around the client. One participant described having a show-and-tell type of meeting with clients so they could see and learn about what was coming out of the project. This was also an opportunity for the CRM archaeologists to explain to the clients why they were keeping certain artifacts. Another CRM participant counted all the time talking on the phone with the client answering

questions. The participant said that those instances often led to the client gaining an appreciation for both the archaeological work and the archaeological resource.

Collaborative archaeology public outreach showed up in a number of different forms. Both CRM and repository participants talked about public events like the Burke's Archaeology Day and the Portland State University Archaeology Roadshow. Both of these events allow archaeologists and repository professionals to reach a large audience in one setting. Both repository participants and four of the CRM participants also brought up the benefits of working directly with tribal nations to facilitate public outreach:

...to collaborate with the tribal governments because usually the tribal governments around here have education programs and traditional life ways and subjects and ancestors and history of the land and so they're often looking to involve community members in that sort of aspect of unearthing old stuff. So you have their latent interest, and the resources of the tribal offices too can sometimes help. (REP)

One of the tribes involved has sort of stimulated some interest and something is gonna happen with that collection, which is good. (REP)

As far as making collections accessible to the public, both repository participants talked about museum exhibits and events. Academic research including any classes or interns that used the collections was also mentioned. Fewer examples were offered as to how CRM and repository professionals collaborated to facilitate collections access and use. One CRM participant talked about simply advising private landowners to curate their newly generated collections with repositories. Another participant made sure to recommend sites and collections to graduate students looking for thesis and dissertation topics.

When directly asked about having repositories help CRM companies with their archaeology public outreach component, many of the CRM participants expressed

interest. One participant saw the repositories as possibly providing more creative ideas to the CRM professionals that they wouldn't normally have time to develop.

Yeah, that would be interesting, especially for projects that are going to have a mitigation element to it...I would think that museums and museum professionals would have better maybe ideas, or at least maybe would be able to think outside the box. So yeah, it would be nice to be involved in that way. (CRM)

When directly asked about helping repositories facilitate further research and access to CRM generated collections after a project had ended, the CRM archaeologists' interest was far less enthusiastic. Four participants didn't see facilitating collections access after a completed project to be their responsibility. Three hesitantly said it could potentially happen on a case-by-case basis. No matter what type of collaboration was happening, all participants acknowledged that institutions and agencies with a required public outreach component drove most collaborative efforts. Additionally, all participants discussed the need for collaborative outreach to be written into initial agreements and proposals for the outreach to take place. This will be discussed further in the next section.

4. Barriers

This section will address all the perceived barriers that arose in each of the previous themes.

Procedural Barriers

Every participant cited budgeting the unknown as the biggest procedural barrier. Multiple participants talked about doing their best to use various formulas to estimate how large collection will ultimately be, but there's no way to really know what's coming

out of the ground. Many CRM companies don't have staff dedicated to curation preparation, so correctly budgeting the necessary time and resources is essential.

With archaeology, you just don't know what you're going to get. We're going to give them an estimate for not only the work but then the curation...it's hard to know...I try to do formulas, like per artifact, per 100 artifact trying to figure out...it doesn't work; every project is different. It's a huge unknown. (CRM)

One repository participant pointed out that since curation preparation is the last stage of a CRM project, any problems that arise during the project that require reallocating resources is often felt most by the repository. Curation is what tends to suffer.

The [repository] is at the tail end of this whole industry, so any problems that pop up between project proponents and CRM companies or city planners, engineers, tribes, any of that stuff that pops up...somewhere along the line gets inherited by the [repository] at the end. So, there're just a lot of things that can go wrong, and it makes it tough to negotiate and to navigate good outcomes in some places. (REP)

While budgeting for the unknown is tricky, three of the CRM participants discussed the importance of including language in the initial contracts that allow the company to approach the clients and ask for more money. A few admitted that asking for more money is always hard, but the contract gives them some footing to renegotiate. CRM participants also saw the collection/no collection policy in a project design as a way to avoid generating unexpected collections.

I think on that to be really blunt on the CRM side, people need to do a better job of scoping their budgets and putting in really good assumptions, so that they can go back to the client and say you know, 'we thought we would only find, 400 formed tools, and we found 60,0 and so the analysis time is much more for those tools and we also need to account for finding more artifacts.' And it's challenging to ask clients for more money. But that's why you write your contracts and your scopes and your budgets with good assumptions so you have the leverage to go back and say 'our expectations weren't met.' It is really hard. (CRM)

I always try to do something in the budgets...having it clearly stated in the proposal that this does not include curation, because curation is a whole separate thing that we can't anticipate until we know what kind of archaeological sites we have. I usually try to do that, because trying to squeeze money out of a budget that was really intended for only say survey and nothing else, is so problematic. (CRM)

For repository professionals, a major procedural barrier was getting CRM professionals to view properly prepping collections to a repository's standards as a worthwhile component of their work process. Completing a project as quickly as possible and within budget is the main goal of a CRM company. Depending on which repository a CRM company is using, prepping collections can be time consuming and expensive. However, repositories sometimes have incentives in place to encourage well-prepped collections. For example, one CRM participant praised the Burke's 10% discount for a perfectly prepped collection as a great incentive. The participant was able to use that 10% discount goal as a way to justify the budget to the client and ultimately saved money on a project. The repository gets the benefit of a collection that doesn't need extra resources.

Professional Access Barriers

While six CRM participants mentioned repository collections as a useful resource in research and analysis, two participants admitted to only knowing about them because of personal relationships with the repository. CRM participants felt that the repositories are not clearly advertising that they can be a resource to CRM professionals beyond curation preparation consultation.

To be honest, I don't think they make it across the board clear. It would be nice if there was [sic] something more explicit. (CRM)

I guess I don't see that as being an advertised kind of thing, it's more of 'I work in this area so I know what's out there and so I reach out to the

*repository, ' versus a lot of outreach about...it's much more case by case.
(CRM)*

Ease of access was another subtheme that emerged when CRM participants talked about using repositories as resources. One participant commended the Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation's (DAHP) Wisaard tool as being very accessible. "DAHP's Wisaard online database provides access to our inventory of historic properties including properties listed on the Heritage Barn Register, Washington Heritage Register (State Register), and the National Register of Historic Places."⁴² The participant thought that the best way for a repository to be accessible was to have online access.

Different standards at different repositories can be an issue, but the eight CRM participants who discussed them agreed that a clear, concise document outlining the curation guidelines is incredibly helpful. Three of those participants noted the drastic page reduction of the Burke's curation guidelines from an 80+-page document to an 8-page document. Generally, CRM participants maintained that for a repository to be seen as a useful resource, it could not have red tape barring access.

Ultimately, a CRM professional's decision to utilize the repository came down to cost-efficiency. Smaller projects didn't warrant the time it would take to conduct further research at a repository.

Not sure we need that. Good to know they're there. Not exactly efficient for project time – we don't do research for research's sake. (CRM)

...most of the projects are small...not time efficient. (CRM)

⁴² "Find a Historic Place," *DAHP*, accessed May 29, 2017, <http://www.dahp.wa.gov/learn-and-research/find-a-historic-place>.

Public Outreach Barriers

Generally, participants cited logistical barriers to facilitating public outreach, whether that was site safety, site confidentiality, or the usual time and money constraints. CRM participants also pointed out that not every project has an obvious public outreach opportunity. As previously touched upon, many CRM projects are small-scale surveys on private land.

Depending on the situation, it could be an active construction site, and so there are those logistical things that might also prevent that from working out in certain circumstances (CRM)

A lot of our clients are Mom and Pop, looking to subdivide their land or whatever. I end up spending a lot of time explaining the justification for archaeology and the budget. (CRM)

The greatest issue that emerged was one of timing and collaboration. Every participant explained that collaborative public outreach really only happens when it's written into the initial agreement, contract, or proposal. If it doesn't happen from the beginning, it isn't likely to happen at all.

A lot of the projects we work on, especially with the forest service/BLM, they always want a public component. A lot of times...when I worked for the NPS, they always want a public component and, the BLM wants a public component... (CRM)

...we need to get the work done on time on budget and if it's worked in, if it's the right kind of project and it's worked into the schedule and everything else...and that happened with...we had tours, but we worked all that stuff out ahead of time. (CRM)

I think that if a CRM professional has outreach as a component as a part of their permit or MOA or other agreement or plan that's in place that has the curation component, then they might have a need to deal with the repository. (CRM)

Furthermore, there was some disagreement as to who should propose public outreach collaborations. Some felt repository professionals shouldn't play a large part in contract negotiations, while one felt it was a missed opportunity for input.

...the CRM companies usually won't [initiate public outreach components] because they're so hemmed in by their other needs. And that's something we could do, I think part of my job at the [repository] is supposed to be to doing more of that kind of stuff... (REP)

I don't think I really see kinda knowing that in advance unless there's some kind of MOA, and that happens frequently...there has to be someone there asking for that so unless, I mean, it could be suggested by us, but we're not the ones deciding what the important mitigation measures are. (CRM)

They [the repository] are on all the permits, they're an interested party, but they really don't chime in at all. They're pretty much kept out of the loop. They're not on the conference call. They'd have a chance to chime in. We apply for a lot of permits and never do the curation facilities have anything to do with it. (CRM)

CRM participants also indicated that if a public outreach component isn't written into the initial agreement documents, public outreach is seen as extra work. It's hard to get buy-in from CRM or repository professionals when they aren't being compensated for their time. Even if it is a project that the company or institution is interested in doing, money can still be an issue.

So it's not like I can even put a lot of money aside to say we're going to do this public project and we're gonna fund it. In order to do that we have to get a grant for it. So even for those public institutions whose job is to ostensibly do this kind of public stuff, it's extra curricular in some way to go out; you gotta get the project together and then go out and get the resources, which makes it harder. (REP)

One repository professional pointed out that some CRM companies do have some monetary incentives in place to encourage archaeologists to conduct research and publish

papers. The participant thought that it would be a benefit if repositories had incentives like that in place for CRM archaeologists.

5. Relationships

All participants alluded to the importance of each profession having an understanding of what the other does and why they do it. Six specifically advocated for getting experience in the other profession, though hardly any of the CRM participants had formal training in curation methods. Some received on the job training, and one participant pointed out:

I think one of the challenges for CRM professionals is that you have to go through curation, the curation process a number of times to be competent at it, and it doesn't come up enough for us. We spend a great deal of our time in the Pacific Northwest convincing clients to avoid and minimize. Which is good, we're saving sites, but it also means that professionals don't get the same opportunity to have to go through the curation process. (CRM)

Both repository participants had experience working as CRM professionals. Participants felt that having an understanding of the constraints that come into play in both professions allowed for smoother relationships.

I think there is a lack of understanding of what each group needs or what the responsibilities of each group are, and I have been on both sides of that. So, I would say there have been times where I think the repository staff don't have field experience, so they don't understand what it is, why we sometimes make the decisions we do in the field, and so then they're reacting to 'why aren't you doing it this way' kind of questions and it's really not very realistic expectation on their part. So, managing those expectations on the repository side of like, what will these collections be, how will they be organized, sometimes it doesn't take into account the realities of what we encounter in the field. (CRM)

I think there should be some overlap, so there's an understanding of what goes on and why something is the way it is...actually getting your hands dirty, working in the repository, even if it's just labeling artifacts. (CRM)

One CRM participant brought up the issue of clients refusing to pay, or being unable to pay, for services once a project was already underway and a collection had been generated. The participant recounted an instance in which a client wasn't able to pay, but the CRM company and the repository were able to work out a deal to make sure the collection was properly cared for. The participant acknowledged that repositories don't have the budget to take in collections for reduced prices all the time, but because the repository had an understanding of the situation, the collections didn't suffer.

Both CRM and repository participants pointed to the types of connections made by professionals as playing a major role in the quality of relationships between both professions. Everyone agreed that basic contact and availability is essential to doing a good job whether it's curating collections, or public outreach collaborations. Four CRM and both repository participants went a step farther to maintain that personal relationships are just as essential.

I do think that having one-on-one, face-to-face personal relationships can do a lot more than having a curation person out screening with you and a CRM person...I dunno, inventory a collection or whatever. (CRM)

You're not going to be doing much of any kind of archaeology if you're not working in concert with the tribe. (CRM)

I think just having more dialogue...I get the sense that [this repository] is a little more isolated. For whatever reason, I don't know if it's because they don't...I just have a hard time getting in touch with anybody...I don't know. I guess from that standpoint, I would say communication between...making sure our spheres overlap in ways other than just emails and business... (CRM)

So I mean straight up there are archaeologists in WA who run their own companies who have bad blood with either one of us personally, or the [repository]...who just won't deal with the [us] as a result. (REP)

Overall, every participant said they generally felt like the relationship between CRM and repository professionals was a positive one.

Chapter 5: Discussion

The purpose of this study was to better understand the relationship between cultural resource management professionals and repositories, and how that relationship impacts the accessibility of archaeological collections. The literature maintains that there is a disconnect between the two professions and that the disconnect negatively impacts the curation crisis.⁴³ There does not seem to be much research into understanding why there is a disconnect. Data for this study was collected by interviewing nine CRM professionals and two repository professionals.

Discussion

As the literature suggested, there is a disconnect in how CRM archaeologists and repository professionals view their own roles and responsibilities and the roles and responsibilities with the other side. The literature stated that CRM archaeologists don't feel as if the long-term care of collections is their responsibility and that their work ends when the fieldwork ends. While the repository participants did provide examples of times in which that opinion still exists and is acted upon, all of the CRM participants in this study seemed to accept their responsibility in properly prepping collections for curation. This study suggested CRM archaeologists are interested in doing their part to ensure the long-term care of collections.

⁴³ Majewski, Not Just the End Game Anymore, 169.

There were many instances in which role and responsibility perceptions matched up. CRM archaeologists expected the repository professionals to be available for technical questions throughout the fieldwork process. Both sides acknowledged the need to check in when needed. While one participant mentioned an instance in which it was difficult to get a hold of a certain repository, it seems repository professionals accepted the responsibility of being available based on the data. It also appeared that as a whole, CRM archaeologists accepted their part in the long-term care of collections by prepping the collections for curation; however, both sides agreed that after the collection was transferred to the repository, the burden did shift. The disconnect appeared to be in the understanding of the standards and constraints each side had.

Neither field has reached a consensus when it comes to collecting and culling policies.⁴⁴ This study suggested that since no project is the same, coming up with a standard policy might be difficult. However, the study also suggests that continuing to have conversations about the needs of the individual projects with each side will ultimately produce the most effective plans.

This study suggests that both CRM and repository professionals are interested in public outreach. However, it appears that CRM archaeologists do not consider facilitating research on CRM generated collections to be an act of public outreach. This may stem from the position that CRM archaeologists are not responsible for collections once they're transferred to the repository. The study also suggests that CRM archaeologists and repository professionals are interested in collaborating with one another to enable public outreach. An interesting detail to emerge from this study is the question "who is

⁴⁴ Childs and Benden, A Checklist for Sustainable Management of Archaeological Collections, 20.

responsible for initiating public outreach?” Both sides agreed if collaborative public outreach is going to work, it needs to be set up in the initial stages of a project. However, neither side took full responsibility for making that happen.

As previously mentioned, any disconnect that arose between CRM archaeologists and repository professionals was rooted in a lack of understanding of standards and constraints each side had. While all participants seemed to have a general sense of understanding the constraints of the other side, participants who had experience in both fields were able to cite more specific examples of those constraints.

This study found that when personal relationships are established, contact between professions happens more frequently. Participants with personal relationships with repositories knew more about what the repository could provide by way of research access. Personal relationships and the ability to informally interact with the other side also appeared to play a role in gaining empathy and understanding.

This study suggests that if CRM archaeologists are to utilize repository collections for research purposes, or any other purpose for that matter, repository professionals need to better advertise what they have to offer. Encouraging CRM archaeologists to use collections more in their own research may also engender a greater investment in those collections. This could also shift the perception that facilitating collections research in collaboration with repositories is a valuable form of public outreach.

Implications

This study supports the calls for action already put forth by the literature, including the need for both professionals to work more closely together, and to ideally gain experience working in both fields.⁴⁵ Including curation standards and methods courses in anthropology and cultural resource management degree programs is important, but training should be available and taken advantage by professionals currently in the field. This study acknowledges setting up workshops and trainings takes a lot of resources, but if there is enough buy-in from both professions, and if it is done collaboratively, the benefit of participating in such an endeavor should outweigh the cost.⁴⁶

This study also asserts that as personal relationships are strengthened, CRM archaeologists and repository professionals become more invested in each other's success and are therefore more likely to commit to those calls to action. Additionally, when positive relationships are developed, problem-solving collaboration is easier to initiate should issues arise. That being said, both sides should be proactive in developing contingencies for certain unfortunate issues, such as what to do in the case of abandoned collections. Having a basic policy in place detailing what each can offer and what each expects of the other provides a jumping off point for an otherwise difficult conversation.

⁴⁵ Bustard, *Archeological Curation in the 21st Century*, 14; Sullivan and Childs, *Curating archaeological collections*, 35, 57.

⁴⁶ One repository professional suggested this could potentially be done on a small scale. If a CRM firm is willing to send their staff to the repository with a collection that needs to be prepped, the repository would be happy to devote their time to that CRM archaeologist and collection. The CRM archaeologist would get direct, hands-on experience, which they can then disseminate to their co-workers, and the repository knows they are getting a properly prepped collection and will hopefully continue to get properly prepped collections from that CRM firm in the future.

Policies and standards are necessary in both fields. This research suggests that collaboratively creating policies that affect both sides is beneficial and drives smoother work interactions. Guidelines written for curation standards should reflect the voices of both the repository and CRM professionals. That being said, this study shows that archaeology and the management of archaeological collections is not always a straightforward process. Every project is different. Open communication and frequent communication is essential to make sure every project and transfer of collections runs as smoothly as possible. This study recommends implementing an evaluation system in which repositories check in with CRM professionals to make sure current repository guidelines are clear and reasonable. This would also be an opportunity for both professions to identify areas that need improvement in the guidelines and in practice.

Finally, if CRM archaeologists want to facilitate public outreach, they can't always rely on other institutions to ask for it. As previously mentioned, not all projects have obvious public outreach components. The archaeologists are the ones with the most intimate knowledge of the projects and should have the agency to recommend a public outreach component. As previously mentioned, if collaborative public outreach is going to work, it needs to be set up in the initial stages of a project. If that is the case, CRM archaeologists need to be more willing to involve repository professionals in the project negotiation stage, at least when a possible public outreach component has been identified. On the other side, if repositories see the benefit of teaming up with CRM professionals to facilitate public outreach with the collections, they need to be willing to put in the front-end work.

Limitations

This study was limited by the small sample size of participants. Given the nature of the data collection method, only so many people could be interviewed within the time constraints of the thesis process. The study was also potentially biased by the self-selective nature of the participants. By agreeing to participate in the research of a master's student, one could surmise that the participants share a basic interest in public outreach, and that the study may have missed a set of perspective candidates with different views about the relationship between CRM archaeologists and repositories.

Another limitation of this study is the lack of the tribal perspective. This study chose not to ask people from tribal repositories or tribal based archaeologists to participate because the necessary work and care the study wanted to take in collecting data from those perspectives would be enough work for another thesis.

6. Conclusions

It was the purpose of this study to better understand the relationship between CRM professionals and repositories, and how that relationship impacts the accessibility of archaeological collections. The research was guided by four research questions: How do CRM archaeologists perceive the job roles of repository professionals? How do repository professionals perceive the job roles of CRM archaeologists? How do both professions work toward making collections and archaeology as a whole publicly accessible? What does the relationship between CRM archaeologists and repository professionals currently look like?

By speaking directly to professionals from both the CRM and repository communities, this study was able to gain a better insight into their relationships with one another. This study sees room for more work to be done with a wider pool of participants to counter self-selection biases. This study also highly recommends digging deeper into the relationships between tribal repositories, CRM archaeologists, and the relationships between tribal repositories and non-tribal repositories.

References

- “Archaeological Collections.” *SAA*. Accessed May 29, 2017, http://www.saa.org/publicftp/public/educators/05_collections.html.
- Bawaya, Michael. "Archaeology - Curation in Crisis." *Science*, 317, no. 5841 (2007): 1025-026.
- Bustard, Wendy. “Archeological Curation in the 21st Century. Or, Making Sure the Roof Doesn't Blow Off.” *Cultural Resource Management*, 23(5) (2000): 10-15.
- Cain, Sarah. “A Preliminary Study on Curation Concerns in Higher Education Anthropology Programs with a Focus on Archaeological Collection.” Master’s thesis, Southern Illinois University Carbondale, 2013.
- Chapman, Robert, and Alison Wylie. *Evidential Reasoning in Archaeology*. Debates in Archaeology. London; New York: Bloomsbury Academic, an Imprint of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, 2016.
- Childs, S. Terry, and Danielle M. Benden. "A Checklist for Sustainable Management of Archaeological Collections." *Advances in Archaeological Practice* 5, no. 01 (2017): 12-25.
- Christenson, Andrew. “The Role of Museums in Cultural Resource Management.” *American Antiquity*, 44(1) (1979): 161-163.
- “Collections.” *DAHP*. Accessed May 29, 2017, <http://www.dahp.wa.gov/collections>.
- “Collections Stewardship.” *AAM*. Accessed May 29, 2017, <http://www.aam-us.org/resources/ethics-standards-and-best-practices/collections-stewardship>
- “Cultural Resource Reporting.” *DAHP*. Accessed May 29, 2017, <http://www.dahp.wa.gov/sites/default/files/CR%20Update%202015%282%29.pdf>
- “Find a Historic Place.” *DAHP*. Accessed May 29, 2017, <http://www.dahp.wa.gov/learn-and-research/find-a-historic-place>
- Green, William, and John Doershuk. "Cultural Resource Management and American Archaeology." *Journal of Archaeological Research* 6, no. 2 (1998): 121-67.
- Jamieson, Andrew. “Developing Strategies for Sustainably Managing Archaeological

- Collections.” *Journal of Eastern Mediterranean Archaeology and Heritage Studies*, 3(1) (2015): 71-77.
- Keene, Suzanne. *Fragments of the world: Uses of museum collections* (1st ed.). Oxford: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann, 2005.
- Majewski, Teresita. "Not Just the End Game Anymore A Perspective from the Western United States on Proactive Budgeting for Project Curation Needs in a Changing Archaeological World." *Heritage & Society* 3, no. 2 (2010): 167-88.
- Marquardt, W., A. Montet-White, and S. Scholtz. "Resolving the Crisis in Archaeological Collections Curation." *American Antiquity*, 47(2) (1982): 409-418.
- Ogden, S. *Long-Range Preservation Planning*. St. Paul, MN: The Minnesota Historical Society, 2012.
- "Principles of Archaeological Ethics." *SAA*. Accessed May 29, 2017, <http://www.saa.org/AbouttheSociety/PrinciplesofArchaeologicalEthics/tabid/203/Default.aspx>
- "RWC 27.53.060 Archaeological Sites and Resources." *Washington State Legislature*. Accessed June 4, 2017, <http://apps.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=27.53&full=true#27.53.060>.
- Schiffer, Michael B., John H. House, E. Charles Adams, Claude F. Baudez, Donn Bayard, Dilip K. Chakrabarti, Robin Derricourt, Brian J. Egloff, Michael A. Glassow, Dee Green, Jane Holden Kelley, Lech Krzyżaniak, Francis P. Mcmanamon, Hattula Moholy-Nagy, Yoshio Onuki, Rodolfo A. Raffino, Roberto Reyes Mazzoni, Leslie E. Wildesen, and Ric Windmiller. "Cultural Resource Management and Archaeological Research: The Cache Project [and Comments and Reply]." *Current Anthropology* 18, no. 1 (1977): 43-68.
- "Stewardship." *DAHP*. Accessed June 4, 2017, <http://www.dahp.wa.gov/site-stewardship>.
- Sullivan, L., and S. Terry Childs. *Curating archaeological collections: From the field to the repository* (Archaeologist's toolkit). Walnut Creek: Altamira Press, 2003.
- "Summary of Information Required of an Applicant." *Washington State Legislature*. Accessed May 29, 2017, <http://apps.leg.wa.gov/WAC/default.aspx?cite=25-48-060>
- Voss, Barbara. "Curation as research. A case study in orphaned and underreported archaeological collections." *Archaeological Dialogues*, 19(2) (2012): 145-169.

Appendix A: Survey Guide for CRM Archaeologists

I am asking you to participate in an interview that will be used for my thesis research that explores the relationship between CRM archaeologists and collections repository staff. The interview will take up to 60 minutes. I will be recording the interview for my research purposes.

I may pull quotes from this interview – if so I will not include your *full name* nor will I attribute it to the *name of institution for which you work* unless you prefer otherwise.

You may refuse to participate or to answer any question at any time without any penalty.

Do you have any questions? Do you agree to participate in this interview? Thank You.

Lets begin.

Basic Information

1. Name
2. Name of organization for which you currently work
3. Title at current organization
4. How long have you worked in the CRM field?
5. Have you ever worked as a repository professional? If so, for how long, in which state(s), and in what roles?
6. Have you ever had any formal training in museum curation methods and standards?
 - a. If so, please describe the nature of the training.

Relationship Between Repository and CRM – Procedures

7. Please estimate how many projects (on-going or completed) your organization works on for any given year.
8. Once a repository agreement is established, how frequently do you stay in contact with the repository during a project?
9. Do repository fees affect the archaeological process?
 - a. Have you not collected or heavily culled to avoid or minimize fees in order to keep your bids competitive?
 - b. Is there a way to work with repositories to educate your clients about the necessity of curation fees? (Is that within the scope of a repository's duties?)

Relationship Between Repository and CRM – Job Roles

10. What roles do repositories have in the CRM project process?
11. Do those roles overlap with the roles of CRM archaeologists?
 - a. If so, how?

12. Do you think CRM archaeologists should be more involved in the long-term curation process?
 - a. If yes, what would that look like?
 - b. If no, why not?
13. Do you think repository professionals should be more involved in the archaeological fieldwork process?
 - a. If yes, what would that look like?
 - b. If no, why not?
14. Please describe any difficulties have you encountered while working with repositories.
15. Please describe aspects of working with repositories that work well.
16. In general, how would you describe the relationship between CRM firms and repositories?

Access to Collections - Professional Use

17. Do you utilize repository collections during a project? (e.g., for background research, artifact analysis, etc.)
 - a. If so, how often and in what manner?
18. If you have used repository resources at any point during a project, please describe what went well and what you would have liked to change.
19. Please indicate at which point in the project process you would find help from repository professionals/access to collections most useful.
 - a. What would that look like?
20. Would you find it useful to work with a designated repository professional throughout the project?
21. In general, how do you think repository professionals can better serve CRM archaeologists?

Access to Collections - Public Outreach

22. How do you make archaeology accessible to the public?
23. Should repository professionals collaborate with CRM archaeologists to aid in public outreach during CRM projects?
 - a. If so, what would that look like?
 - b. What barriers do you foresee?
24. Would you be interested in collaborating with repository professionals to facilitate further research on CRM generated collections?
 - a. If so, what would that look like?
 - b. What barriers do you foresee?

Appendix B: Survey for Repository Staff

I am asking you to participate in an interview that will be used for my thesis research that explores the relationship between CRM archaeologists and collections repository staff. The interview will take up to 60 minutes. I will be recording the interview for my research purposes.

I may pull quotes from this interview – if so I will not include your *full name* nor will I attribute it to the *name of institution for which you work* unless you prefer otherwise. You may refuse to participate or to answer any question at any time without any penalty. Do you have any questions? Do you agree to participate in this interview? Thank You. Lets begin.

Basic Information

1. Name
2. Name of organization for which you currently work
3. Title at current organization
4. How long have you worked in the collections management field?
5. Have you ever worked in the CRM field? If so, for how long, in which state(s), and in what roles?

Relationship Between Repository and CRM – Procedures

6. Do you require CRM firms to contact you regarding storage before they get their project approved by the State?
7. Once a repository agreement is established, how frequently do you stay in contact with CRM archaeologists during their project?
8. About how many CRM generated collections do you receive in any given year?
9. While fees are necessary, how do you think they affect the archaeology field process?
 - a. How frequently do you see researchers not collecting or culling heavily to keep their bids competitive?
 - b. Do you know if firms have decided against using your repository due to curation fees? If so, how often do you think that happens?
 - c. Is there a way to work with CRM firms to educate their clients about the necessity of curation fees? (Is that within the scope of a repository's duties?)

Relationship Between Repository and CRM – Job Roles

10. What roles do CRM firms have in the curation process?
11. Do those roles overlap with the roles of repository professionals? How so?

12. Do you think repository professionals should be more involved in the archaeology fieldwork process?
 - a. If yes, what would that look like?
 - b. If no, why not?
13. Do you think CRM archaeologists should be more involved in the long-term curation process?
 - a. If yes, what would that look like?
 - b. If no, why not?
14. Please describe any difficulties have you encountered while working with CRM firms.
15. Please describe aspects of working with CRM firms that work well.
16. In general, how would you describe the relationship between repositories and CRM firms?
17. How do you think that relationship affects (or doesn't affect) the curation crisis?

Access to Collections - Professional Use

18. Do CRM archaeologists use repository collections?
 - a. If so, how often and for what purposes?
19. Do you encourage CRM archaeologists to use repository collections?
 - a. If so, how?
20. Do you offer specific services (e.g., help with forms, research, prepping artifacts, workshops, etc.) to CRM archaeologists?
 - a. Are there services you would like to offer but do not currently do so?
 - b. If so, what are they and what barriers are currently in place keeping you from offering them?

Access to Collections - Public Outreach

21. How do you make CRM generated collections accessible to the public?
22. Would you be interested in collaborating with CRM archaeologists to facilitate further research on those collections?
 - a. If so, what would that look like?
 - b. What barriers do you foresee?
23. Should repository professionals collaborate with CRM archaeologists to aid in public outreach during CRM projects?
 - a. If so, what would that look like?
 - b. What barriers do you foresee?

Appendix C: Coding Rubric

Theme	Sub-theme	Key Concepts	Examples
Procedure	Process	Contact	"Not at all. Well, if we have questions we'll go back and ask." (CRM)
		Responsibility	"Once it winds up in a curation facility...the burden shifts." (CRM)
	Policies	Collecting	"So, I try to balance out meaningful data, protecting the resource, and overall value." (CRM)
		Culling	"And in terms of culling artifacts, yes I am perfectly okay with that. We've had projects where we've had maybe 500 cobble stones, you know, and there isn't much you can say about cobble stones. We collected types of choppers, and left the rest out there. It's a tool type you can make in a second." (CRM)
Theme	Sub-theme	Key Concepts	Examples
Professional Use - Access to Collections	Resource	Guidelines	"[we use] guidelines as a resource." (CRM)
		Collections/Archives	"Definitely, especially for bones, for faunal. The comparative collections that the Burke has are really, I mean we can't have that...type of resource here so easily so it's helpful to us." (CRM)
	Service	Staff	"For us, they are invaluable. We use repository staff for their expertise all the time." (CRM)
		Client Education	"No, I think that it's the CRM professional's job to understand curation well enough to be able to scope it adequately, just like any other component." (CRM)

Theme	Sub-theme	Key Concepts	Examples	
Public Outreach - Access to Collections	Education	Lectures	"For the stuff that's happening locally, I honestly just do like a lecture once a year, and kind of do a recap of the work that the department is doing and just share some of the interesting things. Because the people who attend those aren't really there for hunks of metal, [more for] 'check out this shiny US cavalry button we found at the fort while monitoring.'" (CRM)	
		Exhibits	"The museum - [we] have stuff on exhibit." (REP)	
		Client Education	"We have these show and tells with our clients - that helps them understand, it gives us a chance to show them why it's important to save these things for the future and it also let's them see like okay, especially for historic, this tray here is all broken glass that all we can say is it was a bottle." (CRM)	
	Collaboration	Events	Events	"and the Archaeology Roadshow." (CRM)
			Tours	"When I worked for the NPS, they always want a public component, and the BLM wants a public component...because they're trying to develop their programs, [like] tours, etc." (CRM)
			Research	"we did have a historical collection - we had a lot of bulk samples that didn't get...the artifacts weren't washed. We got students to take those bulk samples to sift, wash, research, look for makers marks, etc [the] artifacts. [It was a] year long project" (CRM)
		Responsibility	Tribes	"One of the tribes involved has sort of stimulated some interest and something is gonna happen with that collection, which is good." (REP)
			Responsibility	"I would think that museums and museum professionals would have better...ideas or at least maybe would be able to think outside the box. so yeah, it would be nice to be involved in that way." (CRM)

Theme	Sub-theme	Key Concepts	Examples
Barriers	Procedural	Budgeting the Unknown	"With archaeology, you just don't know what you're going to get. We're going to give them an estimate for not only the work but then the curation...it's hard to know." (CRM)
		Incentives	"...they gave us a 10% discount because it was a perfect submission." (CRM)
	Professional Access	Ease of Access	"I think it's important to have access. Easy access - avoid bureaucratic BS." (CRM)
		Cost Effectiveness	"Most of the projects are small, [it's] not time efficient." (CRM)
		Logistics	"Depending on the situation, it could be an active construction site, and so there are those logistical things that might also prevent that from working out in certain circumstances." (CRM)
		Timing of Collaboration	"...we need to get the work done on time on budget and if it's worked in, if it's the right kind of project and it's worked into the schedule and everything else...but we worked all that stuff out ahead of time." (CRM)
	Public Access	Extra Work	"...it would end up being the personal interest of the archaeologist rather, I mean it wouldn't be necessarily something we would be getting paid for. So it would definitely be much more like 'this site is really interesting and I still have more questions and I want to do this.' And it would be more of an independent kind of a thing than something we'd get paid for necessarily." (CRM)

Theme	Sub-theme	Key Concepts	Examples
Relationship		Experience	"I think there is a lack of understanding of what each group needs or what the responsibilities of each group are, and I have been on both sides of that. So, I would say there have been times where I think the repository staff don't have field experience, so they don't understand what it is, why we sometimes make the decisions we do in the field, and so then they're reacting to 'why aren't you doing it this way' kind of questions and it's really not very realistic expectation on their part. So, managing those expectations on the repository side of like, what will these collections be, how will they be organized, sometimes it doesn't take into account the realities of what we encounter in the field." (CRM)
		Training	"I think one of the challenges for CRM professionals is that you have to go through curation, the curation process a number of times to be competent at it, and it doesn't come up enough for us. We spend a great deal of our time in the Pacific Northwest convincing clients to avoid and minimize. Which is good, we're saving sites, but it also means that professionals don't get the same opportunity to have to go through the curation process." (CRM)
	Connections	Personal	"...making sure our spheres overlap in ways other than just emails and business." (CRM)
		Contact	"I think just having more dialogue...I get the sense that [this repository] is a little more isolated. For whatever reason, I don't know if it's because they don't...I just have a hard time getting in touch with anybody." (CRM)