

COLLABORATIONS IN INDIGENOUS AND COMMUNITY-BASED ARCHAEOLOGY: PRESERVING THE PAST TOGETHER AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

Sara L. Gonzalez¹, Yoli Ngandali¹, Samantha Lagos², Hollis K. Miller¹, Ben Fitzhugh¹, Sven Haakanson¹, Peter Lape¹, and Alison Wylie³

1. Department of Anthropology, University of Washington, gonzalsa@uw.edu
2. School of Humanities, University of Auckland
3. Department of Philosophy, University of British Columbia

This paper examines the outcomes of Preserving the Past Together, a workshop series designed to build the capacity of local heritage managers to engage in collaborative and community-based approaches to archaeology and historic preservation. Over the past two decades practitioners of these approaches have demonstrated the interpretive, methodological, and ethical value of integrating Indigenous perspectives and methods into the process and practice of heritage management and archaeology. Despite these benefits, few professional resources exist to support the development of collaborative relationships between local heritage managers and Tribal nations. Filling this need, Preserving the Past Together's interactive workshops and keynote lectures involved participants in a discussion of the central themes in collaborative and Indigenous approaches to archaeology today, highlighting the local challenges and opportunities that exist for archaeologists, heritage managers, and Tribal nations to work together to care for the past. This paper presents an overview of the event series' goals, the strategies it used to foster collaboration among the diverse stakeholders of the Salish Sea, and the next steps the project's co-directors are taking to further support communication and collaboration between stewards and stakeholders in the Pacific Northwest.

On Tuesday, January 24, 2017, President Donald Trump issued an executive order expediting the environmental review and approval process through the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), while also signing a memorandum stipulating that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) expedite its approval of the Dakota Access Pipeline (DAPL). This event is significant in several regards. First, it signaled the end of a months-long protest by water protectors and Dakota Tribes to block the easement of DAPL under Lake Oahe. While other Indigenous-led protests such as Idle No More and local opposition to the Cherry Point Coal Terminal on the Salish Sea similarly featured mobilization against energy development projects that threaten Tribal cultural resources, they failed to receive the national and international attention of the DAPL protests. In this sense the water protectors successfully built an internationally recognized protest movement that has stimulated greater understanding of Tribal concerns in relation to environmental and cultural protection.

Second, reviews of the USACE application of National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 in the case of DAPL highlighted a persistent pattern within the agency of implementing its own

process for Section 106 that was, and remains, inconsistent with the process of other federal agencies. Letters of concern issued by government agencies (Bureau of Indian Affairs [2016], U.S. Environmental Protection Agency [2016], Advisory Council on Historic Preservation [2016]), Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPOs), and professional organizations (American Cultural Resources Association [2016], Society for American Archaeology [2016]) specifically highlighted the failure of USACE to adequately carry out traditional cultural property surveys within the entirety of the pipeline's right-of-way. They also criticized the USACE's failure to fulfill its duty to carry out government-to-government consultations with affected Tribal nations as outlined in Section 106. Related to this latter point, Tim Mentz (2016), the former Standing Rock Sioux THPO, publicly described how the failure to involve Tribal archaeologists in the archaeological surveys resulted in the failure to correctly identify significant cultural resources and traditional cultural properties. The destruction of these resources, which included prayer seats and burial markers, represents a failure to engage in meaningful consultation with Tribal nations. Meaningful consultation here refers to government-to-government consultation that fully integrates Tribal needs and perspectives into the plan or work for Section 106 and NEPA reviews. Significantly, it also highlights the harm that is done when Tribal knowledge is excluded from assessments of Tribal cultural resources and, thus, the critical need for substantive dialogues and the integration of Tribal knowledge into these assessments (Colwell 2016a).

Finally, this moment signaled the beginning of a concerted effort on behalf of the current administration to weaken and roll back environmental and heritage-related laws and regulations in the United States. Alongside the recent review of and subsequent reductions to national monuments such as Bears Ears—which was created in large part through the coordinated efforts of an intertribal coalition among the Navajo, Hopi, Ute Mountain Ute, Ute Indian, and Zuni Tribes—these actions represent an increasing threat to Tribal heritage and Tribal sovereignty in the United States. Tribes', archaeologists', and historic preservationists' responses to these threats have been swift and there exist concerted efforts to create broader alliances for the purpose of protecting cultural resources. Yet, there remain significant impediments to heritage professionals working in full collaboration with Tribal and other local and descendant communities to advocate for the past. How then can those invested with the care of cultural resources work together to advocate for their current and future protection?

Preserving the Past Together (PtPT), an event series hosted by the University of Washington (UW), attempted to answer this question by developing a forum for archaeologists, heritage professionals, and Tribal Historic Preservation Offices to consider the current challenges and future possibilities of collaborative approaches to managing heritage on the Salish Sea. Here, we first examine the goals of the event series and the interventions it sought to make in creating resources for Indigenous and community-based approaches to heritage management. We then briefly outline how these goals were represented in the workshops and related events for the series. We conclude with an assessment of the key outcomes of PtPT, which include the development of local and cross-institutional knowledge-sharing partnerships between Tribal nations and heritage managers, the development of a new undergraduate program in Indigenous archaeology at the UW, and creation of knowledge resources for collaborative, community-based approaches to archaeology and historic preservation in our local region.

Indigenous and Community-Based Approaches to Archaeology and Heritage Management

Initially used by Nicholas and Andrews (1997:3) to describe archaeology done “by, with, and for” Indigenous peoples, Indigenous archaeologies now consist of a broad spectrum of projects, primarily developed in the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and Oceania. Individual projects include the development of Tribal archaeology and historic preservation programs, approaches for integrating Indigenous epistemologies and ontologies into archaeological theory and method, and programs that foster the direct participation of Indigenous peoples in archaeology (Atalay 2012). The use of *archaeologies* is purposeful, denoting that each project is created in reference to the specific values and cultural protocols of the Indigenous community within which it is developed. Despite these differences, Indigenous archaeologies are united by their acknowledgement of the human and cultural rights of Indigenous communities. This acknowledgement carries with it a commitment to fostering the equitable participation of Indigenous peoples in the process of archaeological knowledge production.

The benefits of engaging Indigenous perspectives in archaeology are now widely documented. They include adding depth to interpretations of cultural landscapes (Cipolla and Quinn 2016; Colwell-Chanthaphonh et al. 2010; Ferguson and Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2006; Herrmann et al. 2017; Liebmann 2012), developing creative approaches to archaeological methods and mitigation of damage to Tribal cultural resources (Gonzalez 2016; Liebmann 2017), and contributing to the health and well-being of Indigenous nations (Schaepe et al. 2017). The impact of Indigenous archaeologies has reverberated within the discipline and is evident in contemporary archaeology’s focus on public outreach and the equitable engagement of affiliated and descendent communities. Yet, other than a limited number of case studies that feature collaborative partnerships with Tribal archaeology and historic preservation offices (e.g., Anyon et al. 2000; Bendremer and Thomas 2008; Cipolla and Quinn 2016; Klesert and Downer 1990; Marek-Martinez 2016; Stapp and Burney 2002), there exist few examples or assessments of how Indigenous and community-based participatory research approaches can be applied within cultural resource management (CRM) settings. This lack of resources does not mean that collaborative work with Tribal nations is absent from CRM. Indeed, in addition to numerous cultural resources programs in the Pacific Northwest (Washington, Oregon, and Idaho), the region is home to 24 THPOs (15 in Washington, 7 in Oregon, and 2 in Idaho) and many are recognized as leaders in Tribal historic preservation. For comparison, Washington State alone has the third highest number of THPOs across the United States, with California (41) and Oklahoma (20) ranked 1st and 2nd, respectively. This level of representation results in deep relationships among Tribes, CRM firms, and heritage professionals, which is reflected by a number of innovative collaborative research partnerships (e.g., Ball et al. 2015, 2017a, 2017b; Edwards and Thorsgard 2012; Larson 2018).

In designing PtPT, our goal was to foster meaningful dialogue among Tribal nations, professional heritage managers, and archaeologists and to provide a space for these stewards and other local stakeholders to consider how Indigenous and community-based approaches might be adapted within local contexts. The project’s co-directors (Gonzalez, Lape, Haakanson, Fitzhugh, and Wylie) envisioned a series of panel discussions, interactive workshops, and public lectures by national leaders in collaborative and Indigenous archaeologies that would serve as catalysts

for situating local preservation needs and challenges within the larger landscape of Tribal historic preservation and CRM. The events themselves would also serve as a medium for creating an open source Best Practices in Collaboration toolkit, designed to collate participants' collective knowledge and create a knowledge base for engaging in meaningful consultation and collaboration with Tribal nations and other local and descendant communities.

In addition to contributing to local knowledge sharing networks, we had an additional goal. The UW has a deep commitment to working with Tribal nations and other Indigenous communities. In hosting these dialogues, we—as representatives of this institution—had a unique opportunity to think creatively about how the resources of the university could be best leveraged to support the capacity of local stewards and stakeholders to protect and care for heritage on the Salish Sea.

Modeling Indigenous, Collaborative Research Through Event Design

While case studies of Indigenous archaeology typically address work initiated directly by Indigenous communities or in partnership with outside researchers, PtPT is unique in that it was designed as an intervention directed primarily at building the capacity of non-Tribal heritage managers to engage in collaborative research. Drawing on the approach that Gonzalez uses to teach Indigenous and community-based methods in both classroom and field courses (Gonzalez 2015; Gonzalez et al. 2018; Gonzalez et al. 2006), PtPT used the seminar series to model and engage seminar participants directly in an Indigenous and collaborative practice. We provide here a brief examination of the Indigenous, collaborative process PtPT employed to develop the event series and then explore how this framing impacted the structure of individual events.

Indigenous and community-based archaeologies are predicated on building long-term, reciprocal relationships between research partners that are grounded in the values of respect, trust, and integrity (Atalay 2012; Colwell 2016b). While PtPT did not emerge out of a single community-based partnership, the long-standing, and in many cases personal, relationships that the project's co-directors established with local Tribes, agencies, and heritage managers created the foundation for event development. Prior to the initiation of the seminar series, Gonzalez, as both Chair of the Society for American Archaeology's Indigenous Populations Interest Group and as a faculty member at UW, formally met with local THPOs to introduce the project and solicit feedback from potential Tribal participants. This process of consultation, alongside that conducted by Lape and Haakanson through the Burke Museum, was essential to integrate the specific concerns of a wide variety of heritage stewards—from Tribes to government agencies to local CRM firms—into our events. In planning events we had imagined that each event would serve 20 to 30 individuals; however, each event ultimately hosted 40 to 130 individual participants and in total the workshops had over 330 attendees. Additionally, 23 Tribal nations from Washington, Oregon, and Idaho participated in the seminar. This level of participation reflects both the interest in the project and, importantly, the strength of the project co-directors' relationships with heritage managers in the region.

Acknowledging the history of relations between Indigenous, and specifically Tribal nations, and archaeologists highlights the importance of proceeding *in a good way* through our planned dialogues with heritage managers. This phrase is often used in Tribal contexts and references demonstrating respect and reciprocity through one's personal relations. Within the context of the

workshop series, this translated into the following. First, hosting events at *wələbʔaltx^w* – Intellectual House and Suquamish’s *sgwədzadad qəl ʔaltx^w* – House of Awakened Culture—spaces that are, by design, Indigenous spaces—was a key means of welcoming, and, importantly, centering the perspectives of Tribal participants (Figure 1). PtPT also provided honorariums to THPOs. This funding recognized that THPOs, Tribal elders, and Tribal scholars are often invited to offer input and guidance on projects, but rarely compensated for their expert knowledge and labor. Likewise, we recognized the significant funding constraints of THPO programs and thus offered additional travel support for Tribal participants to attend the workshops.



Figure 1. UW Tribal Liaison, lisaaksiichaa Braine, welcomes Workshop 1 participants to the *wələbʔaltx^w* – Intellectual House.

Second, each event began with an acknowledgement that these dialogues were being held on the shared lands and waters of the Suquamish, Muckleshoot, Tulalip, and Duwamish nations. Prayers offered in support of the sharing of knowledge followed this acknowledgement and were led by Tribal elders. These practices are now common features in archaeology settings, though often their purpose is glossed over or lost to audiences. As Laluk (2015:219–220) states, “it is important for outside researchers and sometimes Tribal members as well, to understand that these blessings are necessary and not just for the benefit of the Tribal project participants and the Tribal community, but for all project personnel, their families, future well-being and to maintain continued balance and harmony in the world.” Beginning with prayer manifests respect and observes proper relations, thus creating a ceremonial and sacred context, which is necessary to the process of sharing Tribal knowledge and learning. Integrating prayer thus acknowledges its power in these contexts, as well as reminds archaeologists of their work’s cultural and spiritual contexts.

Finally, as personal anecdotes attest, the sharing of food in Indigenous archaeologies is of central importance. Providing food for guests is a core part of being a good host and is a demonstration of one’s respect and gratitude for their guests. Likewise, the preparation and sharing of meals creates an intimate social setting for coming to know one another that is critical for nurturing relations. PtPT thus hosted a meal for participants prior to any formal conversation and sharing of knowledge so as to help build a spirit of reciprocity, mutual respect, and partnership among all

participants. As hosts we also honored all of our invited speakers with small gifts, many of them made personally by the project's members, in further, personal acknowledgement of our gratitude and respect.

Indigenous archaeologies call for the creation of more equitable relationships between archaeologists and Indigenous communities that are based on the ability—and right—of Indigenous peoples to participate directly in the interpretation of their heritage. In rethinking these relations, Indigenous archaeologies are also substantially transforming relations *within* the discipline. For example, Gonzalez et al. (2018) highlight how Indigenous perspectives challenge archaeologists to reassess hierarchical models of teaching that are predicated on the authority of an instructor to provide content to students, who are themselves positioned as passive consumers of information. Indigenous and decolonizing pedagogies attempt to subvert this dynamic through the creation of a dialogic and interactive learning environment. In such spaces students *and* teachers actively—and equitably—contribute to the mutually related processes of teaching *and* learning. This is most typically achieved through a combination of what Freire (2000:89) refers to as problem-posing—that is using student- and teacher-generated problems as lines of classroom inquiry, discussion-based activities, and reflective assessments that use pre-existing and newly gained knowledge to reflect on a given issue. Of note, this type of dialogic approach to education, which is also employed in emancipatory, feminist, and other anti-oppressive pedagogies (e.g. Conkey and Tringham 1996; Croucher et al. 2014; Hamilakis 2004; hooks 1994; Wylie 2007), has become a standard part of teaching “best practices” within primary and secondary education, though the specifically Indigenous, feminist, and decolonizing roots of these approaches aren't often acknowledged.

As a reflection of its Indigenous, community-based framing, the PtPT workshop used a combination of short, formal lecture-based content with interactive, small-group discussion activities that were oriented around audience- and project-generated questions and problems. While the former helped introduce participants to key concepts and information, small group breakout discussion sessions provided opportunities for participants to apply their existing knowledge to the posed questions and problems, which were in turn shared with the larger workshop group. We argue that this format created a process for collective knowledge sharing and learning that centered the specific needs and perspectives of workshop participants, rather than simply those developed solely by the project. The format of the workshops thus engaged participants directly in collaborative inquiry as initiated by Indigenous archaeologies, modeling for them the methods they might themselves use in their own work.

Overview of Events

In total, PtPT hosted four lunchtime workshops, two public lectures, an interactive forum at the 10th Annual Tribal Cultural Resource Protection Summit, and a final day-long workshop hosted by the Suquamish Tribe at *sgwədzadad qəl' ?altxw* – House of Awakened Culture. In the following sections we briefly outline these events, highlighting their individual goals, format, and content.

Workshop 1: Collaborating on Heritage in the Salish Sea (January 12, 2017)

Our first event, held at *wələbʔaltx^w* – Intellectual House, hosted over 130 attendees. The event featured a keynote lecture by Chairman Leonard Forsman (Suquamish Tribe; Vice-Chairman of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation), which was followed by a panel discussion facilitated by Sara Gonzalez (UW Anthropology) with the following individuals: Larry Campbell (Swinomish Indian Tribal Community), Dennis Lewarch (Suquamish Tribe), Steven Mullen-Moses (Snoqualmie Indian Tribe), Scott Williams (Washington State Department of Transportation), Lance Wollwage (Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation), Bob Kopperl (WillametteCRA), and Hilary Soderland (UW School of Law). Both panelists and the audience were asked to respond to two questions. First, what unique legal, policy-related, community-related or other challenges do you face in managing heritage? Second, what opportunity do you see for contributing to a more collaborative approach to historic preservation and heritage management?

Chairman Forsman's opening keynote and the panelists' discussion highlighted several key challenges, including the fiscal constraints of THPOs, educating individuals in historic preservation who have no training in cultural resource management or consultation, and the conflicts that arise over narrow definitions of cultural resources. In terms of opportunities, individuals highlighted how research on early historic Indigenous places could form a key basis for building collaborative research partnerships with Tribes, and how the formation of personal relationships has the potential to change the types of dialogue that occur between interested parties. Audience responses to the questions were collated following the event and used to further narrow topics and invited panelists for future events (Figure 2).

Workshop 2: Meaningful Collaboration and Indigenous Archaeologies (February 16, 2017)

Engaged, collaborative forms of archaeological practice that integrate the perspectives of multiple stewards and stakeholders are a key feature of archaeological practice in the twenty-first century. Assessing the value of these approaches within the context of cultural resource management, this workshop specifically assessed how Indigenous and community-based archaeologies provide heritage managers with an alternate framework for undertaking heritage research and management. Our goals were to (1) facilitate understanding of the premise and goals of Indigenous and community-based archaeologies, (2) provide resources on how to establish community-based research protocols, and (3) work with participants to articulate how these approaches might be integrated with their own practice. Sara Gonzalez directed the workshop with Chip Colwell (Denver Museum of Nature & Science), Sven Haakanson (UW/Burke Museum), and Briece Edwards (Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde Deputy THPO) offering relevant case studies of collaborative and community-based research projects undertaken in partnership or initiated directly by Tribal nations. In total the workshop hosted 82 attendees, the majority of whom expressed a desire to learn successful models of collaboration and to network with heritage managers in agencies, Tribes, and cultural resources.

guide their offices' missions or individual work and, second, assess the challenges they face in articulating these values in their work or carrying out those missions. These discussions provided an opportunity for participants to share the strategies they have used to successfully negotiate institutional, organizational, community, and regulatory values and operating structures. Given the large number of Tribal representatives, these discussion questions created a space to center the specific concerns and challenges that Tribes encounter when working within the current framework of historic preservation. This allowed attendees from non-Tribal organizations to both understand the diversity of Tribal values and needs across the Pacific Northwest and to identify how and why these values and needs differ from or might conflict with those of agencies, museums, or other heritage organizations.

In conjunction with the workshop, Ora Marek-Martinez delivered a public lecture at *wəłəbʔaltxʷ* – Intellectual House. As the former director of the Navajo Nation Archaeology Department and the Navajo Nation Historic Preservation Department, Marek-Martinez presented a case study of how the Navajo Nation uses its cultural protocols and values to structure its approach to historic preservation and archaeology. Given that the Navajo Nation THPO program is one of the first Tribal historic preservation departments in the country and oversees the largest land base of any Tribal nation in the United States, Marek-Martinez's lecture provided a significant opportunity to think about methods and strategies of Tribal historic preservation. Marek-Martinez specifically addressed the challenges of articulating a sovereignty-based approach to heritage management that is structured by Navajo cultural protocols.

Workshop 4: Best Practices in Collaboration (May 23, 2017)

All participants in the seminar series and attendees of the 10th Annual Cultural Resource Protection Summit were invited to participate in a day-long workshop that was hosted by the Suquamish Tribe at *sgwədzadad qəl ʔaltxw* – House of Awakened Culture. The event featured three break-out sessions on the following topics: *Guidelines for Establishing Meaningful Consultation*, *Defining Success in Collaborative Partnerships*, and *Institutional Interventions: Building the Capacity of UW to Engage in Collaborative Heritage Management*. Facilitators for the event included Charles Menzies (University of British Columbia [UBC] Anthropology), George Nicholas (Simon Fraser University), Dave Schaepe (*Stó:lō* Research and Resource Management Centre), Allyson Brooks (Washington State Historic Preservation Officer), Peter Lape (Burke Museum/UW Anthropology), Ben Fitzhugh (Quaternary Research Center Director/UW Anthropology), and Sara Gonzalez (UW Anthropology). The purpose of these sessions was to identify best practices in collaboration and meaningful consultation, share strategies developed within the context of Tribal nations'—including Canadian First Nations'—partnerships with archaeologists and heritage managers, and evaluate next steps for PtPT.

In response to feedback from prior workshop attendees, we also wanted to ensure that there were ample opportunities for, first, Tribal representatives to share and learn strategies for developing the capacity of a Tribal historic preservation or archaeology program and, second, for heritage professionals to likewise learn about key strategies that they might implement for contacting and working with Tribes more effectively. In light of these requests, we felt that the participation of colleagues and Tribal representatives from Canada would situate discussions within a

transnational framework, thus highlighting the issues that Indigenous nations across the Salish Sea face and the strategies they use to protect their heritage.

Workshop 5: What's Cultural about a Natural Resource? (May 25, 2017)

The final event, a panel discussion that was planned in coordination with the 10th Annual Cultural Resource Protection Summit, offered an opportunity to engage a wider audience in the event series. Archaeologists and cultural heritage managers are responsible for protecting cultural resources, but what constitutes a cultural resource? Definitions of cultural resources typically focus on tangible heritage, and specifically archaeological sites and artifacts, however, a wider range of tangible as well as intangible heritage—songs, viewsheds, soundscapes, Tribal histories and knowledge, place names—are culturally meaningful and thus constitute a cultural resource. On the Salish Sea, for example, Tribal advocacy for preserving First Foods such as salmon, huckleberries, and water emphasizes that these natural resources are, in fact, cultural. This panel brought together representatives from Tribes, First Nations, academic institutions, CRM firms, and the National Park Service to explore how heritage managers and Tribes are redefining cultural resources so that they are inclusive of the perspectives and values of local Tribal communities.

Preserving the Past Together: Outcomes

When we began planning for the seminar series and concluding conference we envisioned two outcomes. First, a collectively authored toolkit for best practices in collaboration and, second, the development of pilot community-based research projects developed between seminar participants. In addition to these outcomes we had planned to host a series of listening sessions with workshop participants to further identify projects and outcomes that UW and the Burke Museum might facilitate. In the following, we briefly examine the current outcomes and future directions of PtPT.

Best Practices in Collaboration Toolkit

The primary outcome of the seminar series is the creation of a Best Practices in Collaboration toolkit, which is designed as an open access set of resources, including a report that consists of suggested processes and guidelines for engaging in collaborative research, fact sheets, and a bibliography on collaborative and community-based participatory research in archaeology and heritage management. Each aspect of the toolkit draws on a variety of data, including feedback from workshops, contributions made by workshop facilitators and keynote speakers, as well as the work of members of the project team, including Ngandali, Lagos, and Miller who, as graduate project assistants, worked closely with the co-directors to coordinate the Best Practices in Collaboration Workshop and synthesize its results. In the following we provide a brief summary of toolkit's individual components and an update on its status.

During the spring term of 2018, prior to Workshop 4, Gonzalez led a graduate seminar at UW, *Indigenous Archaeology*, through which students developed resources for the toolkit. These resources included the development of a bibliography of Indigenous, collaborative archaeologies and community-based research, as well as the creation of a series of fact sheets to be distributed to seminar participants (Figure 3). The latter are brief, two-page, informational handouts that

synthesize key resources on topics that were identified during the workshops and in the course of the graduate seminar. Students took the lead on designing a coherent template for the Fact Sheets, which were modeled after those produced by Intellectual Property Issues in Cultural Heritage Project coordinated by George Nicholas and Kelly Bannister at Simon Fraser University. In total, students produced six fact sheets: Collaborating on Heritage, the Collaborative Continuum in Archaeology, Collaborative Engagement with Curious Publics, Repatriation, Sustainable Archaeology, and Intellectual Property. All fact sheets were provided to Workshop 4 participants and are currently publicly available on the project website (<http://blogs.uw.edu/preserve>).

The main component of the toolkit is a report that identifies key processes and guidelines for engaging in collaborative, community-based archaeology and heritage research. Included in the report are also case studies that provide readers with additional resources for understanding the variety of approaches used to develop collaborative partnerships with Tribal nations, as well as a series of examples for how to negotiate specific obstacles or challenges faced in collaborative research. As with all other resources, the report will be sent to all participants and made publicly available on the project website following its review by project participants and other partners.

Content for the report relies on, first, feedback generated through the culminating workshop on Best Practices in Collaboration hosted by the Suquamish Tribe and, second, on research undertaken by project members and students enrolled in *Indigenous Archaeology*. In regard to the workshop, attendees participated in two breakout sessions: (1) How do you Create a Collaborative Partnership? Guidelines for Establishing Meaningful Consultation & Collaboration and (2) Defining Success: What Makes for a Successful Collaborative Partnership? In each break-out session facilitators worked with their groups to discuss the methods that are vital for collaborative partnerships and strategies for evaluating their impacts. Given the number of U.S. and Canadian Tribal representatives participating in the workshop, these discussions focused on partnerships established with Indigenous nations, rather than inter-agency or inter-institutional projects, though facilitators' own positions did afford opportunity to engage with the specific challenges and opportunities of working within larger Tribal and well as non-Tribal organizations and institutions.

Following the workshop, Gonzalez, Ngandali, Lagos, and Miller collated notes from the breakout sessions, as well as feedback cards from other workshops. As a culminating project for the UW *Indigenous Archaeology* graduate seminar, Miller used this data to create a draft Best Practices in Collaboration report. This report is now being edited and readied for review by project partners. This review consists of soliciting individual comments from the seminar's invited facilitators, workshop contributors, participating THPOs, as well as through formal listening sessions, described below, which will be used to workshop the report. The final toolkit will be distributed to all workshop participants, as well as be made publicly available on the project website (link above), alongside other resources including video, transcription, and PowerPoint slides for each workshop and other associated resources (e.g., relevant publications, reports, and case study documents).



COLLABORATING ON HERITAGE

YOLI NGANDALI

FROM CONSULTATION TO COLLABORATION

What is the difference between consultation and collaboration? **What does collaboration look like?** How do we share information and resources, understand and appreciate each other's responsibilities, and help each other succeed? What actions can you take to help in your own work settings? This fact sheet outlines some of the challenges and opportunities for improvement as we **build collaborative practice & relationships** across the spectrum of heritage management.

Collaborative partnerships are built on a foundation of trust. They establish effective means of communication and attempt to integrate the voices of all partners into the research process. From this foundation, research partners work together to define goals and methods of research that are reflective of their goals and shared values.

Moving from a consultative framework to a collaborative heritage framework is not a linear process. At each stage of the project partners must assess and readjust their work to emerging needs of all involved. While the scope of a project may change, what remains constant is a long-term commitment to collaborative engaged research practice.¹

DEFINITIONS:

CONSULTATION: Consultation as legally mandated through the Section 106 process, refers to seeking, discussing, and considering the views of other participants, and where feasible, seeking agreement with them. (36 CFR Section 800.16 (f).²

MEANINGFUL CONSULTATION: (1) Potentially affected community residents have an appropriate opportunity to participate in decisions about a proposed activity or undertaking. (2) The concerns of all participants involved will be considered in the decision making process, and (3) The decision makers seek out and facilitate the involvement of those potentially affected.³

COLLABORATION: Collaboration is dynamic and fluid; it is not one set of practices.⁴ Moves to a model of shared power and mutually beneficial partnerships. This means that no one agency, tribe, or group monopolizes power and expertise and use the others as mere tools. Collaboration operates from a foundation of reciprocity, equity, trust.

2017 SURVEY

The Preserving the Past Together Seminar Participants were surveyed on January 12, 2017 at the inaugural event, "Collaborating on Heritage in the Salish Sea". The participants were asked to address the specific challenges and opportunities for preserving cultural heritage in the Pacific Northwest.

Q: What challenges and opportunities do you see in historic preservation within our region?

CHALLENGES

- Law, Policy, and Regulations
- Attitudes, Interests, and Priorities
- Poor education and training
- Costs and funding
- Communication, connections, and networking

OPPORTUNITIES

- Commitment to collaborating together through long-term partnerships.
- Appropriate representation in education, outreach, and training activities.
- Positive attitudes and conversations
- Using laws, policies, and guidelines for mutual benefit.

DEFINING SUCCESSFUL PARTNERSHIPS

The practice of collaborating on cultural resource protection originates from a philosophical stance of inclusiveness: **all people create knowledge**.⁵ Cultural resource management is most effective when local and descendant communities are given the opportunity to meaningfully contribute to historical narratives and evaluations of significant historic resources. Successful agency-community partnerships require that all partners share power, communicate clearly and listen carefully, understand and empathize with one another's circumstances, and remain fluid and flexible.

The most successful partnerships have outcomes that: **SATISFY** all partner's primary needs & interests; **DEVELOP** the capacity of both partners, and **CONTRIBUTE** to longer-range social change.

LONG TERM GOALS IN COLLABORATION

- Mutual respect and shared values working toward a shared goal.
- Deep understanding of strengths and limitations of each partner's organization.
- Commitment to avoid duplication of labor and maximize scarce resources.
- Investing in meaningful and reciprocal long-term relationships. This involves intentional and proactive efforts to maintain working relationships even after changes in staffing.
- Budgeting time and resources for recurring education, outreach, and training opportunities.

PRACTICAL STEPS FORWARD

- Letters of recommendation and support for grant applications and budget modifications.
- Follow ups and **face-to-face meetings**. Encourage face to face exchanges and the use of video chats instead of just e-mail.
- Defining who has access to project data. How will information be shared with community and outsiders.
- Develop mechanisms for partners, students, and trainees (tribal and non-tribal) to receive **constructive feedback**.
- Reflect on, reevaluate, and readjust your own practice. Do your work habits and procedures for your office create specific challenges to collaboration?

RESOURCES

¹Atalay, Sonya (2012). *Community-Based Archaeology: Research with, by, and for Indigenous and Local Communities*. University of California Press, Berkeley.

²Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (2004). 36 CFR PART 800 Protection of Historic Properties. Electronic document, accessed May 2017. <https://www.achp.gov/106seminar/1002-14324.htm>

³Environmental Protection Agency (2003). Federal Register Volume 68, Number 109, Electronic document, accessed May 2017. <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2003-06-06/html/03-14324.htm>

⁴Cowell, Chip (2016). Collaborative Archaeologies and Descendant Communities. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 45:113-127.

⁵Strand, Kerry, Sam Marullo, Nick Cutforth, Randy Stoecker and Patrick Donohue (2003). *Community-Based Research and Higher Education: Principles and Practices*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., San Francisco.

P. 1



Preserving the Past Together Workshop 1: Collaborating on Heritage January 12, 2017 Photo credit: Susan Haladoun

FOLLOW US ON FACEBOOK AND TWITTER:
Facebook.com/preservethepast
@preservethepast #PreserveUW

P. 2

COLLABORATING ON HERITAGE, a fact sheet by Yoli Ngandali.

Integrating Community Feedback into Project Goals and Outcomes

Modeling successful collaboration includes integrating partners' perspectives into the design, implementation, and reporting of a research project. Given this, each workshop featured multiple avenues for audience and participant feedback, including individual response cards, small-group discussions, and a final conference where the audience could provide informal and formal suggestions for the future directions of the seminar series. Through these engagements, we identified two projects that faculty have begun to work on through their affiliated units: the creation of an Indigenous Archaeology option for UW Anthropology and development of partner-institution grants to support collaborative knowledge sharing.

Option in Indigenous Archaeology

The need for training programs in Tribal and Indigenous archaeology emerged as a repeated theme in participants' feedback. In response, project collaborators initiated the development of a new Anthropology major option at UW that, in part, fulfills these needs. Options provide students with a focused course of study within a major. In this case, the Indigenous Archaeology Option highlights multi-disciplinary training in collaborative and low-impact methods for studying Tribal heritage and history and features courses in Anthropology, American Indian Studies (AIS), and the Comparative History of Ideas (CHID) program. This innovative undergraduate curriculum draws on the expertise of UW faculty to provide the first opportunity of its kind for undergraduates to receive direct training in Indigenous and Tribal approaches to archaeology. To date the option has been approved by affiliated departments and is now under review by the UW Curriculum Committee. We expect that the curriculum will open to students in the fall term 2019.

We envision using this educational pathway as a catalyst for the development of new courses and training opportunities that meet the stated needs of local community partners, as well as students. The current curricular strengths of the UW archaeology program include hands-on training in a variety of field and lab-based archaeological techniques (e.g., zooarchaeology, historical material analyses, lithic analysis, geoarchaeology, GIS, GPS and total station mapping, dating techniques, and geophysical survey) that are in-demand skills in both CRM and Tribal historic preservation. Given these strengths, we see great potential in establishing formal internship opportunities with local partners, including government agencies, CRM firms, and Tribal archaeology programs. For example, Tribal responses to internship preferences pointed to critical needs in the areas of GIS, mapping, and geophysical survey. Targeted internships in these areas would help fill programmatic needs within THPO programs, while providing students with on-the-job training that would enhance students' ability to pursue a career in archaeology or CRM post-graduation.

Similarly, UW Anthropology and Burke Museum faculty members are exploring additional opportunities to develop courses that help meet the needs of local partners. For example, Lape and Haakanson's recent course, *Dugout and Skin Boat Documentation & Voyaging*, created a model for an Angyaaq boat building course with the Sugpiaq community on Kodiak Island, while Gonzalez's community-based field school, *Field Methods in Indigenous Archaeology*, uses the context of an undergraduate field school to undertake research identified as critical by the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde Community of Oregon. We see great opportunity for

expanding courses with service-learning components that directly contribute to Tribal capacity to care for and protect cultural heritage.

Inter-institutional Knowledge Sharing Networks Grant

A significant goal and outcome of the workshop included connecting researchers across campus interested in developing, or already involved in, community-based, collaborative research with Tribal nations. Building such a network of scholars serves several purposes including creating knowledge-sharing networks designed to support scholars' active engagement in collaborative research, as well as connecting researchers and community partners with relevant resources. Development of such research clusters is a critical element of fostering institutional capacity to support Tribal and community-based research partnerships. Currently, UW launches a Center for American Indian and Indigenous Studies, which will create permanent support for community-based, Tribal and Indigenous research and further foster institutional connections with Tribal and other Indigenous nations across the Pacific.

In support of these efforts, Gonzalez and Wylie, the latter now faculty at UBC, worked in partnership with Andrew Martindale (UBC Anthropology) to develop a grant proposal for the purpose of building a Salish Sea-focused research cluster in collaborative, Indigenous archaeologies. This proposal emerges from both PtPT and UBC's Indigenous/Science Initiative, which was similarly designed to bring faculty in the humanities and sciences together with First Nations communities for the purpose of establishing collaborative research partnerships. In the grant application we proposed to build an inter-university infrastructure for (1) supporting collaborative research with Indigenous nations, (2) creating opportunities for interdisciplinary research by connecting materials science labs and individual researchers across institutions, and (3) establishing relationships with Tribes and First Nations in the United States and Canada. Funding of this project would support a series of workshops hosted by UW and UBC, as well as collaborative partnership planning visits with First Nations in Canada and THPOs in the United States.

Listening Sessions

As a final outcome of the event series, the project is in the process of establishing a series of listening sessions with workshop participants. While the initial workshops hosted between 40 and 130 attendees, listening sessions will be more intimate, focused conversations involving active participants in the workshops. The primary goal is to work with partners to develop pilot community-based projects and undertake initiatives proposed through the workshop series. Based on workshop feedback and continuing discussions with participants, we have identified the following topics for listening sessions:

- Heritage Internship Opportunities
- Pilot Community-Based Research Initiatives
- Low-Impact Archaeology Training Programs
- Indigenous/Science Research Cluster
- Review of Best Practices in Collaboration Toolkit

We welcome individual inquiries for these sessions (preserve@uw.edu) and will notify workshop participants of opportunities to sign up. As with all prior workshops, resources from

these sessions, as well as formal outcomes, will be made publicly available through the project website.

Conclusion

So much of the work done by archaeologists, CRM professionals, and non-Tribal and Tribal heritage managers overlaps and yet we still face many barriers to our effective communication with one another. In initiating PtPT, we recognized the power of getting everyone in the same room together to consider the question of how our collective voices and action can be used to better care for the history, heritage, and futures that we are all committed to protecting and preserving for future generations. It is our hope as project members that the spark of collective thinking and relationships forged through the seminar series serve as resources that can be drawn upon in the advocacy for history, heritage, and culture on the Salish Sea. As the project moves forward with the knowledge created in these spaces, we look forward to putting your suggestions into practice and taking our next steps together.

Acknowledgments

This project would not have been possible without the considerable thought, time, and resources each participant put into the seminar series. We benefitted from the individual, personal, and collective comments and feedback by a variety of partners, who are too numerous to name here. Preserving the Past Together was generously funded by UW's College of Arts & Sciences, Office of Research, Intellectual House Academic Planning Committee, Quaternary Research Center, Department of Anthropology, and the Burke Museum. We are also indebted to the Suquamish Tribe and Dennis Lewarch (Suquamish THPO) for hosting PtPT's final workshop at *sgwədzadad qəl' ?altxw* – House of Awakened Culture. We greatly appreciate the excellent editorial support of Amanda Taylor and the constructive comments of reviewers.

References Cited

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation

2016 Letter to Lieutenant General Thomas P. Bostick, Re: Dakota Access Pipeline Project, May 19, 2016.

American Cultural Resources Association

2016 Statement on the Dakota Access Pipeline Controversy, September 28, 2016.

Anyon, Roger, T. J. Ferguson, and John R. Welch

2000 Heritage Management by American Indian Tribes in the Southwestern United States. In *Cultural Resource Management in Contemporary Society: Perspectives on Managing and Presenting the Past*, edited by F. P. McManamon and A. Hatton, pp. 120–141. Routledge, London.

Atalay, Sonya

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

Ball, David, Rosie Clayburn, Roberta Cordero, Briece R. Edwards, Valerie Grussing, Janine Ledford, Robert McConnell, Rebekah Monette, Robert Steelquist, Eirik Thorsgard, and Jon Townsend

2015 *A Guidance Document for Characterizing Tribal Cultural Landscapes*. U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Pacific OCS Region, Camarillo, CA. OCS Study BOEM 2015-047. <https://www.boem.gov/Pacific-Completed-Studies/>, accessed February 2, 2019.

2017a *Characterizing Tribal Cultural Landscapes, Volume I: Project Framework*. U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Pacific OCS Region, Camarillo, CA. Pacific OCS Study BOEM 2017-001. <https://www.boem.gov/BOEM-2017-001-Volume-1/>, accessed February 2, 2019.

2017b *Characterizing Tribal Cultural Landscapes, Volume II: Tribal Case Studies*. U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Pacific OCS Region, Camarillo, CA. OCS Study BOEM 2017-001. <https://www.boem.gov/BOEM-2017-001-Volume-2/>, accessed February 2, 2019.

Bendremer, Jeffrey C., and Elaine L. Thomas

2008 The Tribe and the Trowel: an Indigenous Archaeology and the Mohegan Archaeological Field School. In *Collaborating at the Trowel's Edge: Teaching and Learning in Indigenous Archaeology*, edited by S. Silliman, pp. 50–66. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

Bureau of Indian Affairs

2016 Letter from Lawrence S. Roberts, Office of the Secretary to Mr. Brent Cossette, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Re: DAPL, March 29, 2016.

Cipolla, Craig N., and James Quinn

2016 Field School Archaeology the Mohegan Way: Reflections on Twenty Years of Community-Based Research and Teaching. *Journal of Community Archaeology and Heritage* 3(2):118–134.

Colwell, Chip

2016a How the Archaeological Review Behind the Dakota Access Pipeline went wrong. *The Conversation* 20 November. <https://theconversation.com/how-the-archaeological-review-behind-the-dakota-access-pipeline-went-wrong-67815>, accessed February 2, 2019.

2016b Collaborative Archaeologies and Descendant Communities. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 45:113–127.

Colwell-Chanthaphonh, Chip, T. J. Ferguson, Dorothy Lippert, Randall H. McGuire, George P. Nicholas, Joe E. Watkins, and Larry J. Zimmerman

2010 The Premise and Promise of Indigenous Archaeology. *American Antiquity* 75(2):228–238.

Conkey, Margaret, and Ruth Tringham

- 1996 Cultivating Thinking/Challenging Authority: Some Experiments in Feminist Pedagogy in Archaeology. In *Gender and Archaeology*, edited by Rita Wright, pp. 224–250. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.

Croucher, Karina, Hannah Cobb, and Elle Casella

- 2014 Feminist Pedagogy: Implications and Practice. In *Género y Arqueología en Mesoamérica: Homenaje a Rosemary A. Joyce*, edited by M. J. Rodríguez-Shadow and S. Kellogg, pp. 121–136. Centro de Estudios de Antropología de la Mujer, Lomas de Plateros, Mexico.

Edwards, Briece R., and Eirik Thorsgard

- 2012 *Tell me What it Isn't: A Position Paper on Cultural Connection to Place*. Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde Tribal Historic Preservation Office. Copies available from Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde Tribal Historic Preservation Office.

Ferguson, T. J., and Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh

- 2006 *History is in the Land: Multivocal Tribal Traditions in Arizona's San Pedro Valley*. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

Freire, Paulo

- 2000 *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. 30th anniversary ed. Continuum, New York.

Gonzalez, Sara

- 2015 Of Homelands and Archaeology: Two Indigenous, Collaborative Approaches to Archaeology with California Tribal Communities. *SAA Archaeological Record* 15(1):29–32.
- 2016 Indigenous Values and Methods in Archaeological Practice: Low-Impact Archaeology through the Kashaya Pomo Interpretive Trail Project. *American Antiquity* 81(3):543–549.

Gonzalez, Sara, Ian Kretzler, and Briece Edwards

- 2018 Imagining Indigenous and Archaeological Futures: Building Capacity with the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde. *Archaeologies: Journal of the World Archaeological Congress* 14(1):85–114.

Gonzalez, Sara, Darren Modzelewski, Lee Panich, and Tsim Schneider

- 2006 Archaeology for the Seventh Generation. *American Indian Quarterly* 30:388–415.

Hamilakis, Yannis

- 2004 Archaeology and the Politics of Pedagogy. *World Archaeology* 36(2):287–309.

Herrmann, Edward W., Rebecca A. Nathan, Matthew J. Rowe, and Timothy P. McCleary

- 2017 Bacheeishdiio (Place Where Men Pack Meat). *American Antiquity* 82(1):151–167.

hooks, bell

- 1994 *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom*. Routledge, New York.

Klesert, Anthony L., and Alan S. Downer (editors)

- 1990 *Preservation on the Reservation: Native Americans, Native American Lands, and Archaeology*. Navajo Nation Papers in Anthropology, No. 26. Navajo Nation Archaeology Department & Navajo Nation Historic Preservation Department, Window Rock, Arizona.

Laluk, Nicholas

- 2015 Historical-Period Apache Occupation of the Chiricahua Mountains in Southeastern Arizona: An Exercise in Collaboration. Ph.D. dissertation, School of Anthropology, University of Arizona, Tucson.

Larson, Samantha

- 2018 Partnering with Indigenous Communities to Anticipate and Adapt to Ocean Change. *UW News* 21 March.

Liebmann, Matthew

- 2012 *Revolt: An Archaeological History of Pueblo Resistance and Revitalization in 17th Century New Mexico*. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.
- 2017 From Landscapes of Meaning to Landscapes of Signification in the American Southwest. *American Antiquity* 82(4):642–661.

Marek-Martinez, Ora

- 2016 Archaeology For, By, and With the Navajo People- the Nihookáá Dine'é' Bila' Ashdla'ii Way. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley.

Mentz, Tim

- 2016 Standing Rock Sioux Culturally Significant Sites, Interview with Tim Mentz. KOLC-TV. Youtube, September 17, 2016.
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=w6NapCXUjU0>.

Nicholas, George P., and Thomas D. Andrews

- 1997 *At a Crossroads: Archaeology and First Peoples in Canada*. Publication 24. Archaeology Press, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby.

Society for American Archaeology

- 2016 Letter to Lieutenant General Todd Semonite, Re: DAPL, September 13, 2016.

Schaepe, David, Bill Angelbeck, David Snook, and John Welch

- 2017 Archaeology as Therapy: Connecting Belongings, Knowledge, Time, Place, and Well Being. *Current Anthropology* 58(4):502–533.

Stapp, Darby C., and Michael S. Burney

- 2002 *Tribal Cultural Resource Management: The Full Circle to Stewardship*. AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, California.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

- 2016 Letter to U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Omaha District, Re: Additional Comments on Dakota Access Pipeline Environmental Assessment, March 11, 2016.

Wylie, Alison

2007 Doing Archaeology as a Feminist: Introduction. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 14(3):209–216.