**Wheelbarrows full of mud: improvising a learning programme on a community archaeology project**

Gabriel Moshenska, Sirio Canós-Donnay, Jesús Fernández Fernández

**Abstract**

What happens when you are asked to run a learning programme for young people on a community archaeology project, at the very last minute and with minimal resources? This paper is an overview and critical review of the programme that we and some of our students coordinated for a group of local children in the village of Villanueva de Santo Adriano, Asturias, Spain. It describes the planning and delivery of the five-day programme of activities, some of them standard fare for archaeological education and others improvised or designed for this specific site and excavation project. The paper looks at the feedback and aftermath of the project, including a shocking episode of vandalism, and reflects on the lessons and outcomes of the project.

**Keywords**

Archaeological education, community archaeology, ecomuseum, public archaeology, vandalism

## Introduction

This article describes an improvised learning programme for young people that we ran at the last minute, without a budget or a fixed plan, as part of a wider community archaeology project. It also reflects on a close and ultimately problematic relationship that emerged between the excavation team and some local young people. Our aim in sharing these experiences is to communicate honestly some of the challenges, ambiguities and varied outcomes of programmes of this kind, and to outline some lessons learned, both negative and positive. As such, we intend this as a modest contribution to the research literature on involving young people in archaeological projects (e.g. Corbishley 2011; Moe 2016; Smardz and Smith 2000; and for specifically Spanish examples see Moreno Torres and Márquez-Grant 2011). We believe that there is a tendency for archaeological learning programmes, particularly those aimed at young people, to be viewed through somewhat rose-tinted lenses, and to gloss over negative outcomes and failures: a more honest approach to reflection and reporting has value for a developing discipline.

## Background to the project

The programme in question took place under the auspices of the *Community Archaeology of the Commons in Asturias* project, a collaboration between the La Ponte Ecomuseum in Villanueva de Santo Adriano and the University College London (UCL) Institute of Archaeology (for further details of this project and its archaeological findings see Moshenska and Fernández Fernández 2017; Fernández Fernández et al. 2018). Since 2015 the Ecomuseum team have worked with staff and students from UCL to excavate part of a medieval settlement and its associated common agricultural land. This community

archaeology project is itself part of a larger project on the medieval agrarian landscapes of Asturias (Fernández Mier et al. 2014).

Villanueva de Santo Adriano sits in a valley in central Asturias, some 15 kilometres south-west of the regional capital Oviedo. The valley itself is a remarkable multi-period landscape featuring a ninth-century church, medieval and post-medieval industrial remains, and two caves containing Palaeolithic rock art. Through the efforts of the La Ponte Ecomuseum, a community owned and led heritage resource centre, many of the small and dwindling local population have an understanding and appreciation of the archaeological heritage of the area. Aside from its archaeological work the Ecomuseum runs heritage tours, maintains historic buildings and sites, and promotes the tangible and intangible cultural heritage of the region (Alonso González and Fernández Fernández 2013; Fernández Fernández, Alonso González and Navajas Corral 2015).

The focus of our fieldwork project is the remains of the medieval settlement San Romano, which a catastrophic flash-flood destroyed around the time of the onset of the Little Ice Age in the region (c.1400), the remains buried under a thick layer of rock and debris carried down the steep hillside by the fast-moving water (Fernández Fernández, Moshenska and Iriarte 2017). Following a series of testpits aimed at tracing the depth and extent of the alluvial material, we began a series of larger trenches aimed at uncovering structural remains and retrieving bulk soil samples. The lower levels of flood-borne material contained extensive structural remains including building stone and roof tiles, and in 2017 and 2018 we found lines of postholes in the underlying layers. Future work will focus on the search for further structural remains, although the deep layers of alluvial material make geophysical survey impractical (Fernández Fernández, Moshenska and Iriarte 2017).

The community archaeology element of the project is fundamental to our working philosophy, and is based on the involvement of the La Ponte Ecomuseum. Ecomuseums are community- owned and -managed heritage hubs, often in rural areas, that provide a focus for a range of activities including guided walks, community events, traditional music and crafts, and recording and preserving oral histories and intangible cultural heritage (Davis 1999). A consortium of local people run La Ponte Ecomuseum, with a panel of advisors and supporters. The Ecomuseum works to record the culture and lifeways of this small and rapidly depopulating rural community (Navajas Corral and Fernández Fernández 2017). Through the efforts of the Ecomuseum, a number of local people have been involved in various aspects of the archaeology project. Some have participated in our workshops on identifying and replicating medieval ceramics, others have attended our lecture programmes, and a few have got involved in the excavations themselves.

**The learning programme**

Summer 2018 saw the fourth season of the UCL-La Ponte field project, focusing on the excavation of two parallel trenches and the processing of environmental samples collected in previous years. Before the excavation began, we ran a three-day heritage workshop, exploring the archaeological heritage of the village and valley and learning about traditional pottery making and bread baking through practical workshops. At this early point, just before excavation began, we were asked if we could incorporate a public archaeology programme for local young people who were taking part in an educational course during the summer holidays. The proposal came from the Development Agent at the *ayuntamiento* (local council): all of us involved in running the project are ideologically and institutionally committed to collaborative public archaeology, so we agreed to put together a programme.

Several things are worth noting at this point. Firstly, the woman running the education programme was part of the La Ponte Ecomuseum team, and she maintained overall responsibility for the young people throughout. No activities with the young people took place on the site in her absence, and we strongly discouraged them from getting too close to our working areas (although as public spaces we could not exclude them from the site altogether). Secondly, we were being asked to commit a considerable amount of our time: five hour-long sessions over five days, out of a ten-day excavation. Thirdly, we had relatively meagre resources to run this session: the Ecomuseum provided plastic buckets and spades for the young people, and the *ayuntamiento* contributed as well. The makeup of the audience was also unusual, consisting of three distinct groups (ages are all approximate):

- Three girls who were staying close to the site, aged from eight to 10. They were intelligent, focused, articulate, and had some English
- Three boys aged eight to 12, from a single socially and economically marginalised local family. They were exuberant, very enthusiastic and often highly focused
- The two children of the programme leader, aged around four and six.

The varied ages, along with the other demands and restrictions, presented us with a considerable challenge in designing and running successful sessions.

The programme we designed, in collaboration with a self-selected volunteer group of the UCL students, was partly pre-planned and partly improvised on a day-to-day basis as we tracked the weather, monitored the attention span and enthusiasms of the young people, and scrambled around for materials and resources to run the activities. We ultimately delivered the programme as follows:

1. Introduction to the site, discussion about the tools and methods of archaeology, and a site tour
2. Building a model of the medieval village and then flooding it with an avalanche of mud and stones to replicate the fourteenth-century catastrophe and to see what, if anything, survived
3. Excavation on a raked-out section of the spoil heap with pre-planted 'finds' (modern coins, broken ceramics and tiles)
4. Building outlines of their own houses from stones (including interior walls, fittings, furniture) to see how they would appear to future archaeologists
5. Pottery-making (coil pots and pinch pots). We saved this until last as an activity that could be brought forward if we had a rainy day – but we didn't.

How did this work in practice? By the programme's beginning we had already encountered most of the participants: the village is small, and the arrival of a large group of foreigners was notable to them, even in a high-tourist-traffic area at the peak of tourist season. The boys and at least two of the girls lived close to the excavation site located on the edge of the village, and we encountered them daily in travelling to and from the dig. The boys also zoomed around the village on bicycles nearly constantly, and we had already met them when they cycled around our dig house shouting English language obscenities at us that they had learned from a passing scout troop. The boys did this in a cheeky rather than aggressive spirit, and we experienced a change to a much friendlier relationship once their involvement in the excavation began. In preparation for the learning programme we briefed the student participants in basic guidelines around working with young people. Given the setup of the excavation there was no way that they could be alone with a young person at

any point but we emphasized obvious points such as not touching in any circumstances, caution in the use of language, and reporting anything of concern.

**The programme in practice**

In a more ideal situation with a longer lead-in time we would have run sessions with the young people away from the excitement and distraction of the excavation – in a classroom or similar – to discuss the principles of archaeology, explain the history of the area and of the site itself, and to begin to gauge their levels of knowledge and interest (compare Moshenska, Dhanjal and Cooper, 2011). This helps, as Connolly and Heath (1999) note, to encourage the young people to move away from the persistent view that archaeology is synonymous with excavation: this is particularly important for participants who are less able or inclined to take part in the excavation itself. In the event, we incorporated as much of this background as possible into the start of the programme. **<Insert Figure 1 around here>**

**Day 1.** On the first day of the programme we welcomed the group to the excavation. Before taking them to see the trenches we introduced ourselves, learned their names, briefed them on health and safety, and talked to them about archaeology. The programme leader communicated much of this as translator. We tried to ascertain their prior knowledge of archaeology: two of the girls had visited the excavation in previous years and were extremely knowledgeable and articulate about the concepts, tools, aims and even the English and Spanish terminologies of excavation. We gave them a guided tour of the two trenches pointing out features, stratigraphy and working practices, and introducing them to members of the team (Figure 1). Overall we were impressed and encouraged by their interest, attention spans and ability to retain information.

**Day 2.** We worked with the children to construct a model village from clay, earth, stones, twigs and other materials. They took to this very enthusiastically, working on an old spoil-heap, in a hollow that roughly approximated to a valley with steep, mountainous sides. Both the girls and the boys demonstrated considerable imagination and initiative in this task, building specific structures like a church (the only stone-walled building), a bridge, and a water trough for animals.

The aim of this activity was to introduce the children to one of the most significant events in the history of their village: the avalanche of water, mud and rocks that destroyed the medieval village and buried its remains. In the tour of the trenches the previous day we had shown them the very clearly defined layers of pale grey stone and rubble, mixed in with building stone and tiles from buildings caught in the flow. The highlight of the session therefore was the inundation of the model village: we filled a wheelbarrow with water, soil and stones and tipped it over the side of the spoil-heap to run down on to the model, to loud cries of 'avalancha!' from the children (Figure 2). Following the destruction we examined the remains of the village and the children noted that only the stone-walled building, the church, had survived the avalanche in any reasonable state: the other buildings were swept away, broken or buried. **<Insert Figure 2 around here>**

**Day 3.** We held a mock-excavation for the children, working at a distance from the actual trenches on a raked-out area of the spoil heap about two metres square, seeded with a variety of artefacts. We put in modern Euro cent coins, broken pieces of modern ceramics, and an assortment of oddments collected from around the site including chocolate wrappers, apples, feathers, and a carved wooden figure.

We introduced the excavation activity with another health and safety briefing emphasising situational awareness, safe tool use, not using hands to dig, and the general

importance of working slowly, carefully, and gently. This activity was extremely successful in that the children worked methodically to cover the whole 'dig' site, expressed excitement at every find, and remained focused and engaged in the task for the full 45 minutes we allocated to the activity. Monitoring attention is an important part of activities like this: when a participant becomes bored they can become careless of their own and others' safety, display fidgety or destructive behaviour, and distract others. We were alert to this and prepared to offer alternative activities if necessary, but these were not needed on this occasion or at any other point in the programme.

Some archaeological educators have questioned the use of simulated 'sandpit' excavations such as this: Connolly and Heath (1999, 12) argue cautiously that they should be used only as a means of explaining the significance of context, and even then only as part of a larger programme of archaeological activities such as ours. This is based in part on the supposed risk that over-enthusiastic young diggers will go on to dig other sites unsupervised. For excellent resources on running simulated excavations in archaeological learning see Brown (n.d.).

**Day 4**. Based on the age range of our group we decided to run an activity that could be both straightforwardly creative and also, if required, more analytically complex. We asked the children to collect buckets full of small pebbles from the spoil-heap, and showed them – using a previously constructed example – how to make the outline plan of a building by laying out the pebbles as walls and interior fittings (Figure 3). We asked them to build the ground floors of their own homes in this way, and to include features and fittings such as beds, furniture, ovens and doors. The aim of this activity was to build on the village flooding on day two, reflecting on how an archaeologist would understand and interpret your house if only the ruins were left.

In practice, as is common in activities with young children, we learned more than we expected about their family lives from the models they build and their explanations of the interiors of their homes. The levels of detail were impressive in most cases and included explanations of important features like microwaves, televisions, and individuals' bedrooms and beds. We toured the whole group around so everybody got a chance to exhibit and explain their model. Following this, several of the children buried their houses under a bucket of soil as a mini-avalanche, leaving a slightly sinister field of tiny tumuli behind our spoil-heap. **<Insert Figure 3 around here>**

**Day 5**. The final day activity, pottery-making, was by far our most successful in terms of impact and participant response and feedback. We used a bag of clay leftover from our medieval pottery workshop the previous week, mixed with clay-rich soil from our spoil-heap to make it easier to model and to create a larger amount. We taught the children two distinct techniques: coil-building a pot up from a flat circular base; and pinch-pots worked from the inside out from a solid ball of well-worked clay. The children took to these – in particular the pinch-pots – very enthusiastically, and repeatedly asked for more clay to make more pots. Pretty soon there were rows of pots, some of them decorated. When they left at the end of the session we agreed that they could take the leftover clay home with them. As they left one of the boys presented us with decorated pots as gifts. An hour later as we walked back to our dig house for lunch we passed him, sat outside his house with a bag of clay and a long line of pots he had made and decorated. These moments were amongst the highlights of the entire programme for us.

**Feedback**

We had asked the programme leader to gather feedback from the children and pass it on to us. We asked them specifically to tell us what they most enjoyed and why – any more would, we judged, have tested their attention spans. The letters, all of them utterly adorable, included thanks to some of the staff and students by name, and attempts at writing in English. They mentioned different activities, and between the seven letters all four of the practical activities were mentioned. The most popular (and also, not coincidentally, the last) was the pottery-making, followed by the model-village-destroying. It is worth noting the value and impact of any activity where you get to make something and take it home.

Aside from the written feedback the children expressed their gratitude and enjoyment in various ways and at different points throughout the programme. We were impressed with their commitment – the whole group completed the five-day programme – and with their enthusiasm and concentration. We had anticipated and planned for short attention spans, particularly amongst the boys, and were proved wrong. Our interactions with the children off the site changed over the course of the programme: after a few days they greeted us when we met them in the village, and the boys no longer shouted obscenities at us. At other times of day outside of the learning programme the boys returned to the excavation to talk to us, to show us their pets – a puppy and a kitten – and to ask if they could keep helping us dig. When their puppy disappeared we were enlisted in their search party.

The boys showed a consistent interest in the excavation, asking us what we were finding, and giving their own interpretations of the findings. We were particularly impressed with the logical, thoughtful and carefully-argued nature of these interpretations, and by the

time and consideration that had clearly gone into them. None of the rest of the group showed so much interest in the interpretation of the site.

**Aftermath**

A few days after the learning programme ended we closed down the excavation for the year, completed the photograph and documentation, and began to deconstruct the wood and tarpaulin cover over the trenches. The next day, as the students prepared to leave, we lined the trenches with geotextile in preparation for back-filling. Returning to the site in the afternoon we found it in disarray: the wooden framework for the covers had been broken apart, some pieces snapped, and the larger parts pushed into the trenches. The geotextile that had been carefully laid and weighted with stones had been pulled apart and partially dragged out of the trench (Figure 4). The only likely or even feasible suspects for this were the boys. **<Insert Figure 4 around here>**

We reported the damage to the police, who inspected the site. The parents of the boys came to the excavation to acknowledge that the boys were responsible for the damage and to apologize: we accepted their apology and, after checking that the damage to the site was superficial, we withdrew the police report. Reporting criminal damage to an archaeological site is a legal requirement in Spain, but we did not want to pursue it further.

After a week in which we felt that we had made a positive connection with these boys, empowered them to learn about the history of their village, and at the very least provided an entertaining distraction, this felt like a betrayal on their part, and a profound failure on ours. For the student volunteers who had helped to conceive and run the programme through the week this sense of sadness was particularly strong and it very much took the shine off what had, until that point, felt like a successful exercise in public

archaeology. That said, it is worth considering the possibility that they did not intend it as vandalism, but rather as destructive play in what was, to all appearances, an abandoned and closed site.

Speaking only from our personal experiences it is not uncommon for people to attach themselves to a public archaeology project in ways that might become complicated and problematic from practical, ethical and safeguarding perspectives. For bored young people, socially marginalized adults or lonely older people an archaeology project can attract by its novelty and perceived excitement, and through the arrival of outsiders in small or remote communities – who are often keen to make connections in the community. These attempts at connection can take the form of hanging around the excavation for long periods or visiting repeatedly; socialising with the archaeologists outside of work hours; and inviting archaeologists into their homes. It is sometimes difficult for archaeologists, who are rarely trained in safeguarding, to differentiate between friendly and appropriate connections with the local community and potentially more harmful or inappropriate relationships.

It is possible that the boys had become overly attached to the excavation. They dropped by the excavation on their bikes, they brought their pets to show us, they cycled past our dig house to shout obscenities and, later, friendly greetings. When their puppy was missing we agonized with them and helped to search for it. All this is aside from the education programme where we gave them our time, attention, and genuine heartfelt praise for their skills, dedication and hard work. And, having established this relationship, we said goodbye and left. Perhaps we should not have been surprised, then, that they vandalized our site – if that is what they intended.

**Discussion**

As we reflect on this programme and begin to plan for future seasons, it is important to consider our work within the wider context of learning in community archaeology. Community archaeology and archaeological outreach are increasingly, and justly, regarded as distinctive specialist skillsets within the discipline: this is demonstrated for example by the work of the Voluntary and Community Archaeology Special Interest Group within the UK's Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (Brown, Miles and Partridge 2018).

As experienced community archaeologists, we were confident in our ability to design and deliver a valuable learning experience for the young people, even within the limitations detailed above. Furthermore, we recognized the value to our undergraduate students of taking part in the planning and operation stages, and this was reflected in the enthusiasm and dedication of those who chose to take part. Even in more ideal circumstances, archaeological learning activities aimed at young people present a range of distinctive challenges and requirements, and it is worth reflecting on these in light of our project and its outcomes.

The primary responsibility in creating an archaeological learning programme is to give as accurate as possible a representation of the archaeological process and the human past, within the bounds of age-appropriate teaching and learning methods and available resources. While there are risks (to both parties) involved in bringing young people to a working archaeological site, experienced archaeological educators such as Don Henson (2004) and Sarah Dhanjal (2008) have argued persuasively that it offers a uniquely inspiring and valuable learning experience. Dhanjal notes that even in programmes such as the UK's Young Archaeologists Club, aimed at involving young people in archaeology explicitly *without* encouraging them to dig, the opportunity to visit and take part in excavations is by far the most popular activity (Dhanjal 2008, 53, and see Henry 2004). This chimes with our

experience: at no point during the five-day programme were the young people allowed to enter the actual excavation, although they were encouraged safely to view it on the first day, but the proximity of the working excavation was a consistent source of interest, and was arguably one of the factors in the retention of the group throughout the programme.

Another challenge for community archaeology learning programmes is consistency. Such projects are typically short-lived, and if not one-offs then usually run as recurring annual events. As such, there will be a series of beginnings and ends, the mismanagement of which we identified as a potential contributing factor in the vandalism. In exploring this issue of continuity previously (see Moshenska, Dhanjal and Cooper 2011) we noted the importance of economic sustainability and the maintenance of individual and organisational partnerships. However, while this earlier project in a school worked with a new cohort each year (as is common in such projects), the recurrent project in Villanueva is likely to engage with many of the same young people each year. For this reason, for future years we need to explore ways to build a programme that develops and evolves alongside our audience's educational needs and interests (See also Dhanjal 2005). As part of this, we will look at fitting future programmes as closely as possible to the young people's formal (and, as appropriate, their informal) learning.

The age of the participants is an important factor, and one that we will take more careful account of in future. In previous work, we have found the 7-11 age range – corresponding to 'Key Stage 2' in England and Wales – to be the most receptive to learning about and participating in archaeology (Dhanjal 2005; Moshenska 2009). Most of the participants in our programme were within this age range. However, projects working with older children in the 12-18 range have been notably successful as well (e.g. Knowles 2012;

Lewis 2014). In developing future programmes, we will take the age of participants into account, along with the feedback outlined above.

It was clear that the popular activities involved making (or making and breaking), and that the flexibility and open-endedness of these activities corresponded to an extent with the constructivist approach to archaeology learning that Dhanjal (2005) amongst others has outlined and practiced (see also Henson 2017). In our experience hands-on learning in an archaeological environment is a source of encouragement and confidence-building for young people who struggle in more traditional 'sit still and listen' classroom-based learning environments. Overall, we are happy that the activities we used and designed constituted an appropriately diverse programme of activities that introduced the participants to some of the most important concepts and practices of archaeology at a level commensurate to their abilities and needs. This is the foundation that we will build on in future.

**Acknowledgements**

This project could not have taken place without the enthusiasm and commitment of our student volunteers from UCL Institute of Archaeology who helped to devise and run the learning programme and endured mud-fights and youthful exuberance in the name of public archaeology. We are grateful to UCL Institute of Archaeology for a Fieldwork Grant that enabled this project to take place, and to Agencia de Desarrollo Local de Santo Adriano for their support of the learning programme. This paper has benefitted immeasurably from the input of the editors of this journal and from the generous comments and suggestions of two anonymous referees. Finally, our warmest thanks to the young people who took part in the programme and gave it their time, energy and attention.

**References**

Alonso González, Pablo and Jesús Fernández Fernández. 2013. “Rural Development and Heritage Commons Management in Asturias (Spain): The Ecomuseum of Santo Adriano.” *Journal of Settlements and Spatial Planning* 2: 245-253.

Brown, James, Dan Miles and Annie Partridge. 2018. *Voluntary and Community Special Interest Group Community Archaeologist Survey Report*. Unpublished report.

Brown, Shelby. n.d. *Simulated Digs: Layer Cake, Shoebox, and Schoolyard*. Archaeological Institute of America Education Department Lesson Plans. <https://www.archaeological.org/education/lessons/simulateddigs>

Connolly, Marjorie and Margaret Heath. 1999. “Lessons Learned: Students Excavating at Crow Canyon Archaeological Center.” *Society for American Archaeology Bulletin* 17(2): 10-12.

Corbishley, Mike. 2011. *Pinning Down the Past: Archaeology, Heritage, and Education Today*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press.

Davis, Peter. 1999. *Ecomuseums: a Sense of Place*. London: Leicester University Press.

Dhanjal, Sarah. 2008. "Archaeological Sites and Informal Education: Appreciating the Archaeological Process." *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites* 10(1): 52-63.

Dhanjal, Sarah. 2005. "Touching the Past?" *Papers from the Institute of Archaeology* 16: 35-49.

Fernández Fernández, Jesús, Pablo Alonso González and Oscar Navajas Corral. 2015. “La Ponte Ecomuséu: una Herramienta de Desarrollo Rural Basada en la Socialización del Patrimonio Cultural.” *La Descommunal* 1(2): 117-130.

Fernández Fernández, Jesús, Gabriel Moshenska and Eneko Iriarte. 2017. “Archaeology and Climate Change: Evidence of a Flash-flood During the LIA in Asturias (NW Spain) and its Social Consequences.” *Environmental Archaeology*. https://doi.org/10.1080/14614103.2017.1407469

Fernández Fernández, Jesús, Pablo López Gómez, Gabriel Moshenska, Carmen Pérez Maestro and Víctor-Esdras García Blanco. 2018. “Arqueología agraria y del campesinado medieval. Intervenciones en la aldea de S. Romano (Villanueva de Santu Adrianu): campañas 2015-2016.” In *Excavaciones Arqueológicas en Asturias 2013-2016*, 347-58. Oviedo: Gobierno del Principado de Asturias.

Fernández Mier, Margarita, Jesús Fernández Fernández, Pablo Alonso González, José Antonio López Sáez, Sebastián Pérez Díaz, Begoña Hernández Beloqui. 2014. The

Investigation of Currently Inhabited Villages of Medieval Origin: Agrarian Archaeology in Asturias (Spain). *Quaternary International* 346: 41-55. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.quaint.2014.01.032

Henry, Pippa. 2004. "The Young Archaeologists' Club: its Role Within Informal Education". In Don Henson, Peter Stone and Mike Corbishley (eds) *Education and the Historic Environment*. London: Routledge, 89–99.

Henson, Don 2004. "Archaeology in Schools." In Don Henson, Peter Stone and Mike Corbishley (eds) *Education and the Historic Environment*. London: Routledge, 23-32.

Henson, Don. 2017. "Archaeology and Education". In Gabriel Moshenska (ed.). *Key Concepts in Public Archaeology*. London: UCL Press, 43-59.

Knowles, John. 2012. "Aimhigher and Deserted Medieval Villages". In Gabriel Moshenska and Sarah Dhanjal (eds). *Community Archaeology: Themes, Methods and Practices*. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 63-70.

Lewis, Carenza. 2014 "'Cooler than a trip to Alton Towers': Assessing the Impact of the Higher Education Field Academy, 2005–13." *Public Archaeology* 13(4): 295-322. DOI: 10.1179/1465518715Z.00000000076

Moe, Jeanne M. 2016. “Archaeology Education for Children: Assessing Effective Learning.” *Advances in Archaeological Practice* 4(4): 441-453. https://doi.org/10.7183/2326-3768.4.4.441

Moreno Torres, Sergio and Nicholas Márquez-Grant. 2011. “Forty years of ‘Archaeology for children’.” *AP: Online Journal in Public Archaeology* 1: 29-44. http://dx.doi.org/10.23914/ap.v1i2.5

Moshenska, Gabriel. 2009. "Second World War archaeology in schools: a backdoor to the history curriculum?" *Papers from the Institute of Archaeology* 19: 55-66.

Moshenska, Gabriel, Sarah Dhanjal and Don Cooper. 2011. “Building Sustainability in Community Archaeology: the Hendon School Archaeology Project.” *Archaeology International* 13: 94–100. DOI: http://doi.org/10.5334/ai.1317

Moshenska, Gabriel and Jesús Fernández Fernández. 2017. “Landscapes of the Medieval Commons in Villanueva, Asturias, Spain.” *Papers from the Institute of Archaeology* 27(1). http://doi.org/10.5334/pia-518

Navajas Corral, Oscar and Jesús Fernández Fernández. 2017. “La Ponte-Ecomuséu: a Link Between Innovation and Community Involvement.” In Raffaella Riva (ed.) *Ecomuseums and Cultural Landscapes: State of the Art and Future Prospects*. Santarcangelo di Romagna: Maggioli Editore, 231-7.

Smardz, Karolyn and Shelley J. Smith. 2000. *The Archaeology Education Handbook: Sharing the Past with Kids*. Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.

**Figures and captions**

Figure 1: Introducing the children to the site. (Photo by Jesús Fernández Fernández)

Figure 2: ‘Avalancha!’ Preparing to bury the model village in mud. (Photo by Gabriel Moshenska)

Figure 3: Creating the outlines of houses in pebbles, prior to burying them. (Photo by Gabriel Moshenska)

Figure 4: Damage to the site during closing down. (Photo by Jesús Fernández Fernández)