

THE FLORIDA ARCHAEOLOGICAL COUNCIL
1990 PLANNING CONFERENCE

**THE FUTURE OF FLORIDA'S PAST:
AN ACTION PLAN FOR ARCHAEOLOGY IN THE 1990s**

October 27-28, 1990

Spruce Creek Preserve,
Port Orange, Florida

CONFERENCE SYNOPSIS



The Florida Archaeological Council

August 1991

THE FLORIDA ARCHAEOLOGICAL COUNCIL
1990 PLANNING CONFERENCE

**THE FUTURE OF FLORIDA'S PAST:
AN ACTION PLAN FOR ARCHAEOLOGY IN THE 1990s**

October 27-28, 1990

Spruce Creek Preserve,
Port Orange, Florida

CONFERENCE SYNOPSIS

The Florida Archaeological Council

The Florida Archaeological Council is a non-profit organization composed of professional archaeologists practicing in the State of Florida. The purpose of the Council is to promote archaeological research, education and preservation, and to work for the overall betterment of the profession.

**The Future of Florida's Past:
An Action Plan for Archaeology in the 1990s**

Edited by Robert J. Austin

The Florida Archaeological Council
August 1991

Printing by Bayprint, Inc., St. Petersburg, Florida

Front cover: Gamble Place, Spruce Creek Preserve, Port Orange, Florida. Drawing by Lisa Ward.

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

Marion Almy, Archaeological Consultants, Inc.
Robert Austin, Piper Archaeological Research, Inc.
Stanley Bond, St. Augustine Preservation Board
William Browning, Florida Department of Transportation
B. William Burger, Independent Consultant
Robert Carr, Metro-Dade County Office of Historic Preservation
Marsha Chance, Florida Department of Transportation
Joan Deming, Archaeological Consultants, Inc.
Edwin S. Dethlefsen, Piper Archaeological Research, Inc.
Richard Estabrook, Piper Archaeological Research, Inc.
April Feher, Sarasota County Department of Historical Resources
Kathy Jones Garmil, Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities
John Griffin, Southeastern Frontiers, Inc.
Kenneth Hardin, Piper Archaeological Research, Inc.
Elizabeth Horvath, National Park Service, Southeastern Archaeological Center
Kenneth Johnson, Department of Anthropology, University of Florida
Robert Johnson, Florida Archaeological Services, Inc.
William Johnson, Department of Anthropology, University of Florida
Rochelle Marrinan, Department of Anthropology, Florida State University
William Marquardt, Florida Museum of Natural History
James Mathews, New World Research, Inc.
Pamela Mathews, New World Research, Inc.
Carl McMurray, Florida Department of Transportation
James Miller, Florida Division of Historical Resources
Christine Newman, Florida Division of Historical Resources
Claudine Payne, Department of Anthropology, University of Florida
Bruce Piatek, St. Augustine Preservation Board
Storm Richards, Independent Consultant
Donna Ruhl, Department of Anthropology, University of Florida
Greg Smith, Department of Anthropology, University of Florida
Dana Ste. Claire, Daytona Beach Museum of Arts & Sciences
Robert Thunen, Department of Political Science and Sociology, University of North Florida
Louis Tesar, Florida Division of Historical Resources
Nancy White, Department of Anthropology, University of South Florida
Brent Weisman, Florida Division of Historical Resources
Ray Willis, Ocala National Forest
Anne Yentsch, Independent Consultant

This project has been financed in part with historic preservation grant assistance provided by the Bureau of Historic Preservation, Florida Department of State, assisted by the Historic Preservation Advisory Council. The contents and opinions of this report do not necessarily reflect the views and opinions of the Florida Department of State, nor does the mention of trade names or commercial products constitute endorsements or recommendations by the Florida Department of State.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	vii
The Future of Florida's Past: An Action Plan for Archaeology in the 1990s	1
Appendix A: Conference Agenda	11
Appendix B: Nominal Group Technique Guide Sheet	15
Appendix C: Small Group Priority Lists	19
Appendix D: Task Force Objectives and Membership	27
Appendix E: Process Evaluation, Summary of Results	37

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The FAC conference was held in response to a desire on the part of the membership to be a proactive force in directing future developments within the discipline. Before it could fulfill this desire, the FAC realized that it needed a clearly stated agenda. It was suggested that the most productive way to develop such an agenda would be to utilize the skills of a professional facilitator, and thus the idea of holding a working conference was born.

Several individuals worked very hard to make the conference a success. The FAC Conference Committee was chaired by Bob Austin and members included Marion Almy, Ken Hardin, Bob Johnson and Dana Ste. Claire. Dana's efforts in particular deserve special mention. As Science Curator for the Daytona Beach Museum of Arts and Sciences, administrators of Spruce Creek Preserve, Dana was responsible for obtaining permission to use the Preserve and the restored Gamble Place for the conference. The Museum donated the use of the Preserve as well as chairs, tables, coffee makers, and other incidentals. Dana was also in charge of local arrangements which means that he arranged for food to be catered, negotiated special rates at local motels, readied the Gamble Place facilities, and worked throughout the two-day event to make sure things ran smoothly. Ad hoc committee member Barbara Doran provided valuable advice and needed encouragement during many hours of telephone calls.

The FAC was fortunate to have retained as facilitators the services of Lois Knowles and her assistant Karen Moore, of the Florida State University Center for Professional Development and Public Service. Their professionalism and laid back manner were a potent mix perfectly suited to the audience, environment and subject matter of the conference. In addition to assisting Lois with the paperwork and other details, Karen Moore served as a small group leader. The other small group leaders - Paula Anderson, Karen Austin and Doreen Jernigan -were all volunteers who consented to giving up their weekend for a worthy cause and no pay. They performed their duties exceptionally well and their efforts were greatly appreciated.

The Florida Museum of Natural History donated the use of a much needed overhead projector and several tape recorders. FAC members Donna Ruhl, Chris Newman, Joan Deming and Marsha Chance served as recorders for each of the small groups.

The conference was funded in part by a grant from the Florida Department of State's Division of Historical Resources. George Percy, Director of the Division, gave his support and encouragement to the project from the beginning. Carl McMurray, who at that time worked for DHR in Grants Administration, provided valuable technical assistance to the committee when it was preparing its grant application.

To all of these individuals and organizations, the FAC owes a very large THANK YOU.

THE FUTURE OF FLORIDA'S PAST: AN ACTION PLAN FOR ARCHAEOLOGY IN THE 1990s

As we stand at the doorstep to the 21st century, Florida faces many critical issues regarding archaeological research, preservation and education. These issues transcend archaeology's traditional concerns with potsherds and arrowheads. Instead, a dwindling resource base, reduced funding, overcrowded curation facilities, reburial, treasure hunting, inadequate treatment of archaeology and prehistory in Florida's grade schools, all loom as serious problems in need of attention and action.

Tragically, most of these issues translate into a loss of archaeological sites and data. Florida's archaeological resources are being destroyed at an alarming pace. At the current rate of destruction, most prehistoric sites and many historic sites will be gone within 25 years. This dramatic loss of sites will affect all archaeologists involved in research, resource management and education, and will rob the public of its cultural heritage.

How Florida's archaeologists respond to these problems will determine the future of the discipline and of the resource base. Professional archaeologists are the best informed, best equipped and most directly affected by the problems facing Florida's past. It is our job to assure that sites are collected, researched, interpreted and preserved.

As a first step towards resolving these problems, the Florida Archaeological Council (FAC) held a statewide planning conference entitled "The Future of Florida's Past: An Action Plan for Archaeology in the 1990s." The goal of the conference was to identify key issues and problems facing archaeology in Florida, and to begin developing strategies for solving them. The conference was held on October 27-28, 1990 at Gamble Place on Spruce Creek Preserve in Port Orange, Florida. The 150 acre preserve, run by the Daytona Beach Museum of Arts and Sciences, serves as an interpretive and educational center for environmental and cultural resources. A grant from the Florida Department of State's Division of Historical Resources helped fund the conference.

The two day event brought together 38 archaeologists from around the state to address a wide range of topics. For the first time in several decades, archaeologists had the opportunity to meet together to discuss the future of the discipline and the resource. The conference provided the FAC with the opportunity to develop a clear agenda that can be communicated to legislators, educators, other professionals, and special interest groups. More importantly, it resulted in concrete plans for achieving the goals of that agenda.

The Future of Florida's Past

Orderly brainstorming was a key ingredient of the conference format. The FAC hired a professional facilitator, Lois Knowles of Florida State University's Center for Professional Development and Public Service, to help the group focus on specific issues and encourage maximum participation by all who attended. Utilizing a process called the Nominal Group Technique (NGT), the facilitator was able to encourage all of the participants to think and work through problems together. Small work groups, each with their own group facilitator, discussed and prioritized the issues of greatest concern. The entire group then reassembled and decided which issues should receive primacy for immediate action by the FAC.

The outcome of the conference was the identification of six issues in need of immediate action, and the formation of task force groups to begin work on addressing these issues. Each task force developed a mission statement, identified short and long term objectives, assigned task force members to complete specific tasks, and set deadlines for completion. The six task force groups include:

- * **Communications**
- * **Education/Awareness**
- * **Support/Funding**
- * **Public Schools Curriculum**
- * **Legislation/Lobbying**
- * **Professionalism**

Communications

The Communications Task Force was formed to enhance communication between archaeologists and other interest groups, and to devise ways to better articulate archaeology's role and relevance to Floridians in the 1990s. Specific objectives include identifying communication opportunities and constraints, identifying target audiences, developing ways to promote a positive public image to other professionals, and educating those in the profession on how to better communicate with the media.

Education/Awareness

The primary objective of the Education/Awareness Task Force is to increase public awareness about archaeology and its value. An immediate goal is to develop a definition of archaeology and a statement of relevance - in particular, why should the public care about archaeology? A long term goal is to develop educational material for distribution to planners, developers, policy makers and the general public.

Support/Funding

This task force was created to explore the commitment of state funding for archaeology, to discuss ways to increase private sector support for archaeology, and to increase public funding. The group's first objectives are to develop a list of potential funding sources and interview professional fund raisers for information on possible fund raising activities.

Public Schools Curriculum

Establishing a state wide curriculum in Florida prehistory and archaeological conservation that is aimed at the 4th grade level is the goal of this task force. The group's objectives are to review existing curricula, gather educational information on similar curricula in other states, review the process for adopting curricula into Florida's school system, and investigate grant funding for developing the curriculum.

Legislation/Lobbying

The goal of this task force is to enhance the conservation of archaeological sites and collections through the legislative process. Task force members are reviewing the status of existing legislation and will work with the State Archaeologist to review cultural resource legislation in other states.

Professionalism

This group was formed to promote quality of work, ethics and growth within the profession. Its objectives include providing suggestions for the establishment of minimum professional standards and a peer review system, and providing input to the FAC Membership Committee regarding membership qualifications requirements.

TASK FORCE PROGRESS REPORT

Most of these objectives were designed to be completed by the next FAC general meeting which was held in Tampa on March 16, 1991. At that time the task groups shared their accomplishments and set new objectives. Many of the task force groups had already completed some or all of their short term objectives. Others were still in the process of doing so. The following is a brief status report on the accomplishments of the task force groups to date.

The Future of Florida's Past

Communications Task Force

A large amount of information on communication opportunities and target audiences was collected by the task force and was distributed to the members at the March meeting. A brief article on communicating with the television media ("Facing Television Cameras in the Field") was published in the December 1990 issue of the FAC newsletter. Other articles focusing on different media are planned for future issues of the newsletter.

Information gathering will continue regarding communication opportunities and constraints. More articles focusing on different media are planned for future issues of the FAC newsletter. A statement regarding the relevance of archaeology was drafted by the Education/Awareness committee (see below).

Education/Awareness

Information was obtained on educational programs within Florida and in other states. A summary of this material will be written and distributed to task force members. A preliminary outline for the educational brochure was developed at the March meeting and this was distributed to other task force members for their input. A list of all county planning departments is being compiled with names and phone numbers of the individuals responsible for archaeology or historic preservation compliance review (if any). Those counties with a county archaeologist will also be identified. This information will be used in FAC educational material distributed to land developers, planners, etc.

Requests for information were mailed to possible target groups such as planners, developers, educators, other professionals. A data base is being developed that the FAC can use for future educational efforts.

Progress was made on organizing a public forum on archaeology and public education which is tentatively planned for 1992. The title of the forum will be "Present Meets Past: A Forum on Archaeology, Cultural Encounters and Public Education." Potential speakers have been identified and funding sources are being explored.

A definition of archaeology and a statement on its relevance to society was drafted. The definition of archaeology was published in the next issue of the FAC newsletter so that all FAC members would have an opportunity to comment. Once these comments are received, the definition will be finalized.

As part of this process, a brief questionnaire was developed and distributed to a non-random sample of 100 non-archaeologists. The purpose was to obtain input on these issues from those who do not participate in the practice of archaeology. There was a 35% return rate on the questionnaires and the information will be included in the final draft of the definition and in FAC educational material.

An Action Plan for Archaeology in the 1990s

Although the sample was not a statistically valid one, nonetheless the responses provided an interesting glimpse into how the public perceives archaeology. Of the 35 respondents, 28 or 80% defined archaeology as the study of the past or ancient past. Only about 9% specifically mentioned the recent past (i.e. historic) as comprising part of archaeology's study domain, and only 9% defined archaeology as the study of humans with no time frame reference. Thirty-four percent stated that archaeology is the study of past cultures. Sixty three percent of the respondents included artifacts, material remains or physical remains in their definitions. Interestingly, only 14% used the term "science" or "scientific" when referring to archaeology, and only 11% mentioned the relationship between humans and the environment in their definitions.

The responses to the question regarding the value of archaeology were also interesting. Two main themes appeared throughout the responses - archaeology enables us to better understand the past and archaeology can provide us with a better understanding of ourselves, the present and/or the future. Over 50% of the respondents included at least one of these statements in their responses. Nineteen percent indicated that the value of archaeology was in better understanding the relationship between humans and the environment. Only one respondent mentioned the economic value of archaeology.

Finally, of the 35 respondents, 22 or 63% had visited an archaeological or historical site within the past year, and all 35 stated that they would support legislation to protect archaeological sites.

Support/Funding

There were no representatives of this task force at the March meeting.

Public Schools Curriculum

Information continues to be gathered on school curricula in archaeology or prehistory. At the March meeting it was decided that providing teacher's workshops should be a part of the task force's mission. Review of the process of adopting a curriculum in the state is continuing and a flow chart of the process will be developed. It was suggested that the FAC develop and distribute educational packets to be used as a teacher and curriculum development resource.

Legislation/Lobbying

Progress was made on reviewing existing archaeological legislation in other states and in working with the State Archaeologist to review rules implementing the FDHR draft guidelines and the unmarked human burial bill (Ch. 872, F.S.). Existing legislation was evaluated to determine which laws might be strengthened to encourage additional site preservation and/or to increase adequate review and compliance procedures. The following issues were identified:

The Future of Florida's Past

- 1 - Strengthen Chapter 267, the Florida Historical Resources Act and Chapter 258, the State Parks and Preserves Act to ensure that the Florida park system is required to inventory all archaeological sites in the state park system as mandated. The procedures established by the Florida Department of Transportation could serve as an example of positive site protection and enforcement of the law.
- 2 - Increase the penalty for damaging archaeological sites on state lands (Ch. 267.13). The present fine is \$500 and the perpetrator is charged with a misdemeanor. In Arizona, the disturbance of archaeological sites is a felony with a maximum punishment of five years in prison and a \$250,000 fine.
- 3 - Amend the Government in the Sunshine Law to exempt the Florida Master Site File so that site information cannot be obtained by persons who might use it inappropriately to locate and loot sites. There are many other exemptions to this law in Florida. Furthermore, the federal government protects similar information from the use of persons without appropriate credentials.
- 4 - Strengthen the laws and regulations pertaining to cultural resources on lands under the jurisdiction of the state's Water Management Districts. The review of potential impacts to archaeological sites are supposed to be reviewed by DER as part of the wetlands permitting process, however, this does not always occur. Some districts are not required to seek permits from DER. Finally, some wetlands alterations, if performed by the districts, require no DER permits at all.
- 5 - Amend Chapter 163, the Local Government Comprehensive Planning and Land Development Regulation Act and Chapter 187, the State Comprehensive Plan Act to include the identification of site probability zones as a requirement of local comprehensive plans, and include archaeological survey as an appropriate, measurable planning goal. Currently, Comprehensive Plan requirements call only for an inventory of known archaeological sites; there is no provision for the identification of previously unrecorded sites.

Professionalism

Comparable societies of professional archaeologists in other states were contacted by the Task Force in order to obtain information regarding peer review processes and how they work in other states. It was discovered that either peer review of contract reports is not conducted by the professional organizations, or in those cases where some type of peer review did take place, there was no appreciable

An Action Plan for Archaeology in the 1990s

impact on the quality of work conducted. The Task force also discussed the complicated mechanisms necessary to disseminate reports, and the amount of time needed to review these, and concluded that a systematic review of all contract reports was beyond the capability of the organization. The task force recommended that the FAC ask DHR for the opportunity to provide selective peer review of reports.

A questionnaire was distributed to the FAC membership to gather information on salaries within the discipline. Fifty-seven percent of those who received questionnaires responded. The resulting data were compared to other, similar professions to determine where archaeology ranks in terms of salaries. The results, which were mailed to the membership in June, provide an interesting glimpse into the economic state of the profession. Table 1 provides the computed average salaries for six employment categories. Unlike some professions, the highest average salary in the archaeology profession is in the Academic-Instructor category while the lowest, not surprisingly, are the Academic-Student and Private Employee categories. For comparison, salary data for State employment classes were obtained from the Division of Historical Resources and the Department of Environmental Regulation. The average starting salaries for Environmental Scientists at DER were consistently higher than comparable job classes within the Division of Historical Resources, sometimes by as much as 28%

In addition, 51% of the respondents find it necessary to work two or more jobs (either archaeology or non-archaeology related) in order to meet their financial obligations. When questioned about job benefits, 24% responded that they are not covered by Workman's Compensation; 33% receive no annual leave; 29% receive no sick leave; and 33% have no retirement plan.

Table 1: Average salaries of professional archaeologists in Florida.

Employment Category	Average Yearly Income	Average Years Experience
Academic-Instructor	\$43,489	20
Academic-Student	\$17,680	6.5
State Employee	\$24,192	11
Federal Employee	\$26,884	15
Local Public Service	\$28,080	11
Private Employer	\$39,196	12.5
Private Employee	\$23,987	3.6

PROJECT EVALUATION

By all indications, including the subjective observations of the event's organizers and the professional facilitators, as well as the verbal and written comments of the participants, the conference was a success. This was due, in part, to the setting itself. One of the goals was to provide the membership with a retreat where they could concentrate only on archaeology and the issues at hand. Spruce Creek Preserve provided an ideal locale for reflection and productive brainstorming with no outside distractions. The restored Gamble Place, an early 20th century, wood frame, bungalow style house, served well as a meeting facility, although some of the small groups moved outdoors to take advantage of the pleasant weather and natural surroundings.

The two day format was also an important part of the process because it provided time enough to fully explore all of the issues that the participants felt were in need of discussion. Day 1 focused on identifying and prioritizing issues while Day 2 was spent forming task force groups, establishing goals and objectives, assigning tasks and developing concrete timetables for their completion. Without this second day, the conference would not - in fact, could not - have been considered successful.

Everyone who attended agreed that the use of a professional facilitator was a critical factor contributing to the conference's productive outcome. Imagine nearly 40 diverse personalities attempting for two days to arrive at some consensus opinions on their profession without some form of structure to guide them. The facilitator, her assistant, and the three volunteers who served as small group leaders, were instrumental in keeping the conference controlled, focused, and on schedule. All but one of the small group leaders had past experience as facilitators, and neither the facilitator nor any of the small group leaders were archaeologists. Some participants expressed a desire to have individuals with more knowledge of the profession serving in the role of facilitator/group leader. However, the facilitation process requires a certain degree of objectivity in order to keep the group focused without becoming personally involved in the debate - a potential problem had archaeologists served in that capacity.

The facilitator's use of the Nominal Group Technique was the third ingredient in the recipe for success (see Appendices A and B for an outline of the procedure followed during the conference and an explanation of the NGT method). The structure imposed by NGT at first seemed awkward, but in the end proved to be extraordinarily useful. Instead of inhibiting creative thought, it provided an opportunity for more ideas to be expressed than would normally be the case with an unstructured format. The flexibility of the technique allowed for lively debate on many topics, but at the same time limited nonproductive digressions by forcing the participants to remain focused on specific goals. Most importantly, it allowed everyone to participate equally in the process, thereby taking advantage of the wealth of ideas and experiences of the organization's members.

In terms of the issues themselves, education ranked high on everyone's priority list. This was demonstrated by the fact that three of the six task force groups were created to address this issue from

An Action Plan for Archaeology in the 1990s

different perspectives. It was almost unanimously agreed that in order to solve some of the discipline's most pressing problems, non-archaeologists need to be made aware of archaeology's value in an increasingly complex world that seemingly cares little about its past. If the level of awareness can be raised, and if the value of archaeology can be communicated successfully, then preservation of the resource base, support for archaeological legislation, and increased funding for archaeological research will be easier to obtain. Archaeologists simply need to do a better job of communicating with school children, the general public, educators, developers, government officials, other professionals and special interest groups such as Native Americans, amateur archaeologists and hobbyists; and they must be able to do so in a clear, interesting and convincing manner.

One shortcoming of the conference was the reluctance of the FAC to address two of the more controversial issues in contemporary archaeology - Native American reburial and the reevaluation of the concept of significance in cultural resource management. Although both of these topics were raised and discussed, no consensus was reached regarding the FAC's position on these issues and no firm commitment to a course of action was taken. The reburial issue was not included in the top priorities of any of the four small groups and only one group listed significance as a priority issue. No task force was created to deal with these issues, although a reevaluation of significance could be included among the aims of the Professionalism task force.

Procedurally, there was some difficulty at first adapting to the NGT. The process requires that participants distinguish between identifying problems or needs, and developing ways to solve the problems or satisfy the needs. Satisfactory solutions cannot be developed if the needs are not explicitly stated. Often, this distinction was overlooked and group discussion tended to stray from needs to solutions and back again. When this happened, it was up to the group leader to ensure that the group remained focused on the task of identifying problems first, and postpone work on developing the solutions to the problems until Day 2. Many participants suggested that more time be spent at the beginning of the conference explaining the nuances of the method so that this confusion can be avoided in the future.

Although the conference was well attended, the FAC cannot be said to represent the profession as a whole since not all archaeologists practicing in Florida are members of the FAC. Furthermore, many FAC members did not attend the conference (although over one-third of the membership did). While these facts do not diminish the accomplishments of the conference, they do point out the need for greater participation by the rest of the professional community in planning for Florida's archaeological future, particularly since the issues that were raised at the conference affect all archaeologists practicing in the state.

While we consider the conference to be a success, its long term usefulness can be measured only by the results of the task force groups during the coming months and years. Will the positive energy generated by the conference be sustained as the FAC membership confronts the more mundane chores required

The Future of Florida's Past

to meet the objectives of the task force groups? Will deadlines be met? Will goals be achieved? Or will the enthusiasm dissipate amidst job duties and academic responsibilities? The conference provided the opportunity to chart Florida's archaeological future by setting goals, deciding on what actions to take and how to take them. The true test of its success will be reflected in the personal commitment of the FAC membership to follow through and complete its tasks.

The initial results are encouraging. As noted above, many task force groups have already completed their first set of tasks. New tasks were assigned at the March meeting. The FAC plans to sponsor another facilitated conference in the near future to evaluate the progress of the organization in achieving some of its long term goals. It will also use that opportunity to reevaluate priority issues and set new objectives for reaching its ultimate goal - the preservation of Florida's past for the future.

APPENDIX A
CONFERENCE AGENDA

FAC PLANNING CONFERENCE AGENDA

DAY 1 - Saturday, October 27 - Issues & Problems

QUESTION: WHAT ARE THE MAJOR ISSUES/PROBLEMS FACING
FLORIDA ARCHAEOLOGY IN THE 1990s

- 8:00** Registration & Refreshments
- 9:00** FAC Organizational Comments
- 9:30** Introduction of Process
- Schedule
 - Working question(s)
- 9:45** BREAK - Move to small groups
- 10:00** Introductions
- 10:10** Individual Response Time
- Individuals write responses to question
- 10:25** Orderly Brainstorming
- Participants verbally offer solutions/suggestions in round-robin style
- 12:00** LUNCH
- 1:00** Clarification/Structural Discussion
- Round-robin questions about solutions/suggestions for further clarification
 - Suggested changes in wording, regrouping and/or combining of items listed
 - Round-robin expression of opinions/viewpoints
- 2:30** Open Discussion
- 2:45** BREAK
- 3:00** Final Discussion & Review of Solutions/Suggestions
- 3:10** Priority Ranking
- Individual written ballot to determine top 3 priorities
 - Group leaders calculate and record top 3 priorities
- 3:30** Evaluation of Priorities
- 3:40** BREAK
- 4:00** Large Group Presentation
- Small group leaders present priorities
- 4:20** Analysis of Priorities/Final Comments
- 4:45** END DAY 1
- 6:30** Barbecue dinner for FAC members and families

DAY 2 - Sunday, October 28 - Goals & Objectives

QUESTION: WHAT SHOULD THE FAC DO BY 1995 TO SOLVE
THE MAJOR ISSUES/PROBLEMS FACING FLORIDA ARCHAEOLOGY?

- 8:30** Refreshments
- 9:00** Introduction to Process
- 9:10** BREAK - Move to small groups
- 9:15** Express Main Goal (Mission Statement)
- 9:35** Working Session
- Set objectives (Small steps to accomplish goal)
 - Set deadline for each objective
 - Volunteers to be responsible for meeting objectives
- 11:15** BREAK
- 11:30** Large Group Presentation
- 12:00** Final Comments
- 12:15** END DAY 2

APPENDIX B

NOMINAL GROUP TECHNIQUE GUIDE SHEET

NOMINAL GROUP TECHNIQUE (NGT) GUIDE SHEET

What is the "Nominal Group Technique" and why is it used?

The Nominal Group Technique or NGT was developed by Van de Ven and Delbecq in 1974. It is a process which can be used with groups to find out feelings and ideas of participants.

According to Van de Ven and Delbecq, the primary objectives of NGT are:

- * to increase the productivity of group action;
- * to facilitate group decision making;
- * to stimulate the generation of critical ideas;
- * to give guidance in the aggregation of individual judgements;
- * to save human effort and energy; and
- * to leave participants with a sense of satisfaction.

What are the advantages of using NGT?

- * It is a non-threatening process which forces participants to think and work through problems together.
- * It provides attendees with meaningful participation.
- * It makes use of the wealth of ideas, experiences, and skills of community members.
- * It gives participants the opportunity to plan together for the future.
- * It provides more accountability to the program -- a summarizing product is created by the participants.
- * It allows for "multiple directional" learning:

Traditional Lecture Method	ONE WAY	Expression and Learning
Nominal Group Technique	MULTIPLE WAY	Expression and Learning

Speaker	VERSUS	participants
Speaker		participants
Participants		speaker
Community Leaders		community leaders
Participants		participants

How will the Nominal Group Technique be carried out?

A program facilitator will provide the structure to carry out the NGT process. She will explain the process to the audience at the start of the program. She will lead them through each step of the way. The audience will be divided into small groups which will each have their own group facilitator.

Exactly what are the steps in the Nominal Group Technique?

	STEPS	EXPLANATIONS AND DETAILS
1.	QUESTION/PROBLEM PRESENTATION	1. In small groups, participants silently write down their ideas/suggestions in brief statements or phrases.
2.	PARTICIPANT EXPRESSION OF IDEAS/SUGGESTIONS	2. Each participant tells the group one idea from his/her list. "Round-robin" style continues around the group until all ideas have been expressed and listed on a flip chart. (Save discussion of ideas until next step.)
3.	DISCUSSION OF SUGGESTIONS	3. Each participant has an opportunity to clarify what he/she has suggested. Participants may also express reasons for agreement or disagreement with ideas suggested by other participants.
4.	PRIORITY RANKING (Written Vote)	4. Each participant receives three 3-by-5 inch cards. He/She then selects the best three ideas from all of the suggested ideas and writes one on each of the three cards. Each idea is then ranked by writing point values on each card: the best idea receives 3 points, the next best is given 2 points, and the remaining idea is assigned 1 point. The Group Facilitator then collects all of the cards, tallies the vote, and records the results on a flip chart in front of the group.
5.	DISCUSSION OF RESULTS	5. The small group members discuss the results (clarifications, new concerns, voting patterns, etc.)

APPENDIX C

SMALL GROUP PRIORITY LISTS

APPENDIX C: SMALL GROUP PRIORITY LISTS

The 38 conference participants were divided into four smaller groups consisting of from 8 to 10 people. A group leader was assigned to each group to serve as small group facilitator. Following NGT procedures, each group identified a number of issues in need of discussion. Each group member was allowed to express a single issue at a time in a round-robin format which continued until all ideas were exhausted. In nearly all of the groups, the number of issues totaled between 30 and 40. Sometimes individual issues were similar enough to be subsumed within a more general statement and in this way the number of issues were reduced. Finally, small group members voted on the three most important issues they felt the FAC should focus on during the next five years. At the end of Day 1, all participants reconvened and each small group presented their three priority issues to the total group. Because many of the groups selected similar issues among their top three priorities, some of these were combined resulting in a total of six major issues. On the second day, task force groups were formed to address each of these major issues.

On the following pages are the priority lists for each small group. These are expressed as "needs", or things that the FAC needs to address or accomplish over the next five years.

GROUP 1

Priority 1: Need for an increased awareness among non-archaeologists about what archaeology is and what its value is; who does archaeology belong to?

Education - Audiences:

- Professionals
- General public - adults & children
- Legislators
- Volunteers
- Avocational archaeologists
- Planners & developers
- Other educators
- Policy makers/administrators
- Special populations, i.e. Native Americans, Blacks, Hispanics

Priority 2: Need to better understand the potential archaeological resource base of Florida.

Reasons:

- Evaluate significance
- Evaluation directions for research
- Stimulate criteria for certification
- Enable archaeologists to make better decisions regarding preservation or mitigation of sites
- Help define appropriate methodologies
- Enable archaeologists to better educate & train new archaeologists
- Help archaeologists to formulate education efforts directed to the public-at-large
- Help determine legislative needs
- Help determine level of curation

Priority 3: Need to secure adequate funding base for Florida archaeology.

Reasons:

- Reduce the number of sites lost to development
- Increase the quality of archaeology in the state
- Promote the preservation of sites - why we want to save sites
- Increase financial support (public and private) to conduct archaeology
- Maximize the data obtained from archaeological sites prior to destruction

GROUP 2

Priority 1: Need to establish archaeology in the curriculum of Florida public schools.

Priority 2: Need to propose state legislation to establish regional archaeologists.

Priority 3: Need to develop strategies for public outreach.

GROUP 3

Priority 1: Need to enhance the management and preservation of archaeological sites and collections.

Reasons:

- Legislation and compliance purposes
- Unregulated development at state, county and local levels
- Lack of relationship with SHPO
- Better understanding of current resources
- Data/information and curation management

Appendix C

Priority 2: Need to enhance the understanding and awareness of archaeology among the general public and specific target groups.

Audiences:

- General public
- Land managers
- Other professionals
- Non-professional archaeologists
- Archaeologists
- Legislatures and state agencies
- Native Americans

Priority 3: Need to improve the quality of archaeological research and professionalism.

Reasons - Issues:

- Data sharing
- Professional standards/ethics and certification
- Peer review/regional roundtables
- Site selection and significance
- Data and curation management
- Salaries
- Anthropological goals within archaeology

GROUP 4: Need to further the preservation of Florida's archaeological and historical heritage through the physical preservation of sites, and the development, preservation and dissemination of knowledge and understanding through:

Priority 1: Education

Priority 2: Professionalism. Need to promote quality of work, ethics and growth within the profession.

Priority 3: Communication. Need to:

- Develop mutual understanding of humans, both past and present
- Communicate the need and value of a finite resource
- Create a connection to the past.

APPENDIX D

TASK FORCE OBJECTIVES AND MEMBERSHIP

TASK FORCE OBJECTIVES AND MEMBERSHIP

On the following pages are the original memberships, mission statements and objectives of the six task force groups. As mentioned in the text, some of these original objectives have been met and new ones have been developed. The process of NGT requires that objectives be attainable and timetables short so that goals can be met. The process also requires that the various tasks be divided up among all task force members so that no one member becomes burdened with a large amount of work. This helps to make the objectives attainable which in turn increases individual and group satisfaction.

Appendix D

TASK FORCE: Communications

TASK FORCE MEMBERS: Louis Tesar
Claudine Payne
Greg Smith

MISSION: To enhance both internal and external communications in order to better articulate archaeology's role and relevance in Florida in the 1990s.

OBJECTIVES	COMPLETION DATE	RESPONSIBLE
1. To identify communication opportunities and constraints. List possible vehicles/publications. Distribute list at March meeting.	03-91	Louis Tesar
2. To identify target audiences including: general public, archaeologists, public administrators, AAA-trip maps, brochure racks (tourists), computer info, other professionals.	11-90	Task Force
3. To educate those in the profession on how to better communicate with the media. Column in FAC newsletter.	12-90	Claudine Payne
4. To produce a statement re: the relevance of archaeology to the public. Survey of FAC, review by Task Force, publish results in FAC newsletter.	03-91	Claudine Payne
5. To promote positive public image with other professionals. Compile a list of other organizations with similar interests.	03-91	Greg Smith

Task Force Objectives and Membership

TASK FORCE: Education/Awareness

TASK FORCE MEMBERS:

Donna Ruhl	Kathy Jones Garmil
Bill Marquardt	Anne Yentsch
Buzz Thunen	Bob Austin
Ken Johnson	Stan Bond
Pam Mathews	Bruce Piatek

MISSION: To increase public awareness about archaeology and its value to society. To answer the question "Who does it belong to?"

OBJECTIVES	COMPLETION DATE	RESPONSIBLE
1. Define what archaeology is and why it is important to the public. Identify why the public should care about archaeology. The general message must be adapted to the specific target audience.	03-91	Kathy Jones Garmil Donna Ruhl Bob Austin
2. Define the target groups in detail professionals, general public, legislators, volunteers, avocational archaeologists, policy makers/administrators, planners & developers, educators.	03-91	Bruce Piatek Buzz Thunen Pam Mathews
3. Develop a booklet/brochure for planners developers, policy makers/administrators and other professionals.	06-92	Bob Austin Anne Yentsch
4. Identify and gather information about other educational programs & evaluate their effectiveness.	11-90	Stan Bond Bob Austin
5. Sponsor a forum on archaeology and the public.	10-91	Stan Bond Bob Austin Bill Marquardt

Appendix D

TASK FORCE: Support/Funding

TASK FORCE MEMBERS: Rochelle Marrinan
Jim Miller

MISSION: To explore the commitment of state funding for archaeology. To investigate ways to increase private sector support. To increase public funding support.

OBJECTIVES	COMPLETION DATE	RESPONSIBLE
1. Develop list of potential funding sources (private & public) and distribute to members.	12-90	Jim Miller Rochelle Marrinan
2. Interview professional fundraisers; get information on possible fund-raising activities. Make report to FAC.	06-91	Rochelle Marrinan

Task Force Objectives and Membership

TASK FORCE: Public Schools Curriculum

TASK FORCE MEMBERS: Ted Dethlefsen
Bill Burger
Jim Miller
Carl McMurray
Dana Ste. Claire
April Feher

MISSION: By 1995, to establish a state-wide curriculum in Florida prehistory and archaeological conservation at the 4th grade level in Florida schools.

OBJECTIVES	COMPLETION DATE	RESPONSIBLE
1. Review existing curriculum	01-91	Dana Ste. Claire April Feher Bill Burger
2. Review process of adopting a curriculum	01-91	Carl McMurray
3. Review options for grant funding for developing the curriculum	03-91	Carl McMurray
4. Gather current educational packets from other FAC members	03-91	Jim Miller

Appendix D

TASK FORCE: Legislation/Lobbying

TASK FORCE MEMBERS: Chris Newman
Bob Johnson
Ken Hardin
Bob Carr
Bill Johnson
Marion Almy
Marsha Chance

MISSION: To enhance the conservation of archaeological sites and collections through legislation and increased funding.

OBJECTIVES	COMPLETION DATE	RESPONSIBLE
1. Review status of existing archaeology related legislation and its current implementation	03-91	Bill Johnson Chris Newman Bob Johnson
2. Work with the State Archaeologist to review laws in other states concerning the protection of archaeological sites on public & private lands and their implementation.	03-91	Marion Almy Bob Johnson
3. Report to legislative committee and concerned legislators regarding the the results of this FAC Conference.	03-91	Ken Hardin Marion Almy Bob Johnson Bob Carr Marsha Chance

Task Force Objectives and Membership

TASK FORCE: Professionalism

TASK FORCE MEMBERS: Ray Willis
Beth Horvath
Rich Estabrook
Nancy White
Storm Richards
Brent Weisman
Bill Browning
James Mathews
Joan Deming

MISSION: To promote the quality of work, ethics and growth within the profession.

OBJECTIVES	COMPLETION DATE	RESPONSIBLE
1. Provide suggestions for the establishment of minimum standards and a mechanism for peer review	03-91	Beth Horvath Nancy White Rich Estabrook George Ballo Joan Deming
2. Provide input to FAC Membership Committee regarding proposed changes to existing membership qualifications requirements	03-91	Rich Estabrook Harry Piper Ray Williams
3. Complete survey of FAC members regarding revitalization and on-going working of regional round tables. Report on results.	03-91	Brent Weisman Nancy White Storm Richards
4. Complete survey of FAC members regarding salaries. Report on results.		Ray Willis Bill Browning

APPENDIX E

PROCESS EVALUATION, SUMMARY OF RESULTS

APPENDIX E: PROCESS EVALUATION, SUMMARY OF RESULTS

At the end of the second day, a questionnaire was distributed to the conference participants who were asked to complete and return it before leaving the Preserve. A total of 26 questionnaires were returned. Developed by Lois Knowles, the questionnaire was used to gauge how the participants themselves felt about the conference and the use of the Nominal Group Technique. A summary of the results, provided by Ms. Knowles, is presented below.

1. DO YOU THINK THE SMALL GROUP PROCESS (THE NOMINAL GROUP TECHNIQUE) WAS EFFECTIVE IN FACILITATING PARTICIPANT INVOLVEMENT IN ARRIVING AT PRIORITIES TO BE ACCOMPLISHED BY THE GROUP?

YES = 100% (26) NO = 0% (0)

COMMENTS:

This is the first time that the FAC has been able to effectively discuss its desires and consider priorities and tasks.

There was ample time for each member to contribute and the groups were small enough to not allow people to hide.

The timetable was a great idea. It forced us to focus in on the problem at hand.

By keeping the groups small enough, there was more intimacy and candor, which is not available in large group discussions. More ideas were discussed by many smaller groups than one large one.

The ability of the facilitator to manipulate participants to select objectives and place these in a priority list was what our group needed.

Everyone had a chance to comment and make a statement.

It was definitely helpful to have small groups and diverse backgrounds.

The time frame was most important.

Yes. More time would be even better, i.e. more steps in the process of refinement, but we have no time, of course.

Appendix D

The process kept the group focused.

The small groups allow everyone time to express themselves; no one is "talked over."

The process encouraged everyone to participate.

It allowed everyone to participate, with no pressure, to their own (level of) involvement.

We couldn't have accomplished anything otherwise.

Straight forward approach to "define" these objectives worked, as no one usually wants to be leader, it makes everyone respond. The facilitator's role to tease out ideas and keep us on track of problems versus means in Phase I was useful.

The structure and organization of the groups was important in bringing out problems, solutions, goals and objectives. Important issues were not always the first items discussed, but the NGT process brought them out.

I found the process tedious and somewhat irritating, but I was very pleased with the results.

Process emphasized problems instead of charting broader path for the future - reactive rather than proactive.

The larger the group, the more difficult it is to obtain/attain consensus.

A stronger statement of direction before the process starts [would be helpful].

Unfortunately, the usefulness of the whole exercise did not become apparent [to me] until Day 2.

2. WHAT CHANGES WOULD YOU RECOMMEND TO ENHANCE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROCESS?

Keeping group size and 6-9 people to allow everyone to speak their mind about specific topics.

Possible smaller groups.

None/No changes (4 responses)

Process Evaluation, Summary of Results

More discussion of process and outcomes.

[Group leaders should have] a little more knowledge about the profession.

None - you all did a good job. (But seriously, I think the process is so new to many of us that it will help us in our thinking and work management.

Nothing from you; we would have liked to have had a little more time.

Use different colored markers in writing down lists.

Possibly more time would allow for greater expansion of ideas.

Emphasis on smaller, more manageable goals as end result - some goals [are] too broad to implement. It took our group a while to realize this as an end result.

Perhaps a little longer period of time during the early stages of the process.

A stronger "leader" facilitator for each group. Everyone worked hard, but some had better skills than others. In the four group set-up, another facilitator would have pulled more out of us and kept us on track.

Keep groups down to 10 or less would probably make them the most effective. Perhaps more time on solutions, objectives would be helpful.

At beginning, stress [that] solutions not be written first.

Moderators would have worked out a little better if they had some basic knowledge of the subject. For this particular group and subject, moving to solutions by the first afternoon may have accomplished more.

Perhaps there should be very general topics and some choice of groups at the very beginning of the conference; perhaps the results of a pre-conference poll. Need to allow a little more time for writing down our initial lists of issues and problems during the first session. Need a photocopy machine available at the conference.

Use several assumptions for each group.

Don't attempt to combine specific solutions/tasks into general all-inclusive categories. Most goals we have set for ourselves are too broad.

Appendix D

Unsure. Would need to assess the product first. On the surface, the process does not seem to need much change. Perhaps, in advance of meetings/sessions, participants might write down their perceptions of themselves and what they think the process will accomplish to be turned in; and after [going through the process] write their final view to assess - changed perceptions.

A greater degree of training for the group leaders.

I think the evaluation of priorities went on a little too long on Saturday, at least in my group. We basically rehashed the same issues over and over. We probably could have done with more time devoted to the task forces on Sunday.

A couple more formal refinement steps in the first day process would probably have helped.

Stress the fact that the usefulness of the process is not apparent until the second day and begin with more instructions.

3. WHAT DID YOU FIND MOST BENEFICIAL ABOUT THE PROCESS?

The ability to speak informally about topics that are usually discussed and then dropped.

It keeps everyone on track.

The direction provided by the facilitator keeps the process on track.

The conference presented the opportunity to interact with professionals at a level different from our usual meetings, where we interact socially and talk about our findings. Here we talked about our feelings, beliefs, priorities - and I was surprised to find that academics, students, and consultants really have quite similar concerns.

The outcome.

It allowed us to be together with the sole purpose of creating directives for our group.

The round-robin approach. The controlled open discussion.

The focus demanded by the leaders that kept us on track.

The group interaction; by having different sessions, people had various chances to participate and eventually everyone participated!

Process Evaluation, Summary of Results

The opportunity to air concerns, general and specific, "do-able" as well as ideological.

The participation in the small group process. The ability to integrate such a diverse group into stating goals.

The fact that actual objectives that are reasonable (!) are developed.

Forced us to address the questions we really needed to get at.

The clarification of problems by the group was very important in building consensus and a future orientation to archaeological problems in the state.

That the discipline of the process focused group energy in a positive direction.

Fairness, time limits, good organization.

Encouraging and allowing normally quiet people to speak their minds and have an impact. We would have saved time if we had arrived at the conference already having written down our list of major problems and issues.

Many people with different backgrounds focusing on similar topics.

Chance to spend uninterrupted time with colleagues in pleasant environment.

The time constraints which compelled bringing tasks to completion.

The structure enabled everyone to participate without allowing anyone (well, almost anyone) to dominate. Also, the second day was critical to the success of the project. Developing concrete goals and developing duties within this structure resulted in a very positive end to the conference.

It works! Plus the level of communication and interaction it supports is very positive.

Sorry, but I draw a blank when it comes to a response to this question.

Appendix D

4. WOULD YOU RECOMMEND THIS PROCESS FOR USE BY OTHER GROUPS AND ORGANIZATIONS?

YES = 100% (26) NO = 0% (0)

COMMENTS:

This is a wonderful process to root out what we're all about.

I think it is a good way to get a lot of ideas out in a non-threatening environment and come to a consensus in defining goals.

This is the second time I have been involved with this process - it has worked very well in both instances. It should work well in any group.

It works.

The type of organization utilized [in this process] should be useful in developing solutions to problems for any group.

The efficient results produced by the NGT process are well worth the work.

Yes, you did a great job, Lois and group leaders!

Yes. Come back to FAC.

Yes. The Florida Anthropological Society (which consists of both avocational and professional archaeologists) could/should do the same.

I feel that processes like these are very productive and successful in guiding thinking.

What more can I say, other than it appears to have accomplished what it promised to do.

5. IF THIS PROCESS WERE USED AGAIN AT FUTURE CONFERENCES, WHAT QUESTIONS WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE PARTICIPANTS ADDRESS?

A beginning point might be to determine/ask why the participants have decided to attend the conference.

Progress on current topics.

In intro sessions, re-cap previous conference and evaluate how we did with our goals. Considers issues we didn't focus on this time.

I think at future meetings, we should attack specific problems identified at this conference.

The other areas that didn't make the top priority this time.

Address the same issues to see how far we have gone.

The next question should detail what we have achieved and what paths should be taken in the future.

More specific solutions to begin with.

Perhaps there should be some provisions for short written statements to be sent in advance and distributed at the beginning of the conference (such as results of a pre-conference poll or short questions and answers).

More involvement by outside group (you folks [facilitators]) for focus and direction.

Let the participants decide.

Have participants write down their educational and professional backgrounds and experience, as they affect individual's perceptions (real versus felt needs) and priorities. The analysis of same could/might provide an insight into the final group consensus products. Comparison of the answers to questions 2 and 5 would give insight into what changes are needed if the two are too diverse.

Further development of legislative and broad educational subjects.

It's more a question of what questions I'd like to see avoided (i.e. philosophical and psychological).

6. OTHER COMMENTS

Thank you!

Very well done. I don't think we could have completed as much without outside leadership.

Appendix D

Good job.

Loved the experience. Thanks, Lois.

Thanks a lot!

Perhaps you need a little more flexibility or choice in assigning people to each group on the first day. I say this because I understand that one or two of the groups may have been slightly too large, whereas my group could have used one or two more people, as my group did not have the broad experience on some issues.

Excellent process - needs to be done more than once. Positions statements on main topics need to be published.

Great job, thank you!

Thanks!

[My] frustration ran rampant on day one.