

APPENDIX A

Scenario 1 – Group 1.A

Description

Dr. X has been excavating at the Neolithic site of Meze Magoula in Northern Greece for the past several years with a permit from the Greek government. However, a law passed in November, 2007, by the Greek Ministry of Culture requires that, in order for her permit to be renewed, she must fully publish all her excavated material. Dr. X has also learned that the Institute of Aegean Prehistory, her primary source of funding, will not renew her excavation funding if she loses her permit. While she has published preliminary excavation reports for every dig season, there are several groups of material requiring special attention which she has not had time to study and publish.

You have worked with Dr. X at Meze Magoula for the past two summers, and she has asked you to help her publish a burial found in one of the rooms on the site. But, because her funding has been cut until her publications are up-to-date, your group must apply for outside funding to study the material in Greece. Your goal is to write a competitive grant application that outlines your unique approach to this material and that places the material in perspective with the rest of the site and the Neolithic period.

Background

Meze Magoula is a mound site located on the Thessalian Plain in Northeastern Greece. According to the stratigraphy and the finds, the site was occupied from the Early Neolithic to the Final Neolithic periods after which it was abandoned. When the mound was excavated, archaeologists uncovered a village made up of close-packed rectangular houses and open courtyards (lower case “c” on the plan) surrounded by a wide circuit wall. The walls of the houses and the circuit wall were made of mud brick. The mound was formed as the inhabitants continually rebuilt new mudbrick houses over the ruins of older houses. The buildings that were best preserved, those that are shown in the plan, are from the Late Neolithic period.

During the excavation of Room A (see site plan), a human burial was discovered. The deceased were contracted and deposited in a storage pit beneath the floor of the room. On the floor above the pit burial were found some scattered seeds, a cup and a sherd. There were no grave goods included in the burial. So far, no work beyond excavation has been done on this material. It is not yet known, for

example, how many individuals were buried, how they died or how they lived. Neither the pottery nor the seeds have been analyzed.

Fellowship

The Northern Greece Fellowship in Neolithic Studies is a grant of \$5000 towards the study and publication of Neolithic material from Northern Greece.

Fellowship Application Requirements

A. Written Project Proposal

The Fellowships Committee attaches the greatest importance to your summary statement of the proposed project. It is important to define clearly the material you want to study and how you intend to study it. Therefore, you must first describe your material and what you know about it in detail. Then, outline how you intend to study your material including any scientific testing you would like to conduct. Discuss the questions you are exploring and state distinctly your goals and methodology as well as the relationship between the two. Please include a brief section describing any follow-up work that might be done with this or related material. Most importantly, you need to impress upon the fellowship committee how your study will add to the general knowledge of the prehistoric Aegean.

Proposal Formatting Guidelines

The written proposal will not exceed three double-spaced pages, 12pt Times New Roman font. It will include a title that clearly displays the topic of the project and that has an appropriately professional tone. Include page numbers and surnames of all group members at the bottom of each page.

B. Bibliography

A selected bibliography of important, relevant and recent literature on the topic. This will be no more than 1 page, 12pt Times New Roman font.

C. Budget

A detailed list of all anticipated expenses for the completion of your project and any outside funding you might have towards the completion of your work.

APPENDIX B

Evaluation of Written Proposals

Each element will be given a rating on a scale of 5 for excellent to 1 for weak.

(1) Style

A. All necessary elements (proposal, budget, bibliography) are present and properly labeled.

B. Project has a title that is explanatory, concise and professional in tone.

C. All elements are formatted according to the proposal guidelines.

D. Bibliography and budget reflects improvement and incorporation of suggestions made during the drafting process.

E. Proposal is well edited so that the language is appropriate, sentence constructions are varied and paragraphs are properly organized with clear thesis statements.

F. Proposal is proofread so that there are no grammar or spelling errors.

(2) Content

A. All data available from the project portfolio is presented and described as accurately and thoroughly as possible

B. Proposal is adequately organized so the reader has a logical "roadmap" to guide them through the data, research goals and questions.

C. Research goals are clearly stated.

D. Major questions / issues being addressed are clearly stated.

E. Proposal clearly outlines the methods that will be employed to research material / complete excavations.

F. Connection between materials budgeted for and research plan are clearly outlined in the proposal.

G. Intended divisions of labor within the team are clearly stated, including any additional team members (such as specialists) who appear in your budget.

H. Importance of the material / excavation is clearly related to the site / region / chronological period.

I. Clear connections are made between the arguments / hypotheses and supporting data.

J. The proposal is persuasive; that is, it makes a clear, strong argument and is well supported with data from dossiers as well as comparative data from class-readings and background research.

K. Proposal reflects the use of materials beyond those of the textbooks; that is, did you actually look at any books from the library or internet resources for comparanda.

COMMENTS:

APPENDIX C

Six Points for the Evaluation of Proposal Presentations

Your in-class presentations will be assessed using the following rubric. Award points on a scale of 5 for excellent and 1 for weak. These assessments will only be seen by the instructor, so feel free to be completely honest, but fair in your critical assessment.

(1) Organization and logic of presentation

A. Did the speakers correctly assess the audience?

B. Did the speakers adequately outline the presentation and present a logical “roadmap” of the talk for the audience?

C. Did the speakers elucidate the rationale for undertaking the study / necessity of excavation?

COMMENTS:

(2) Knowledge of concepts and recognition of where more work needs to be done, including a discussion of general observations and object descriptions as well as the hypotheses that attempt to explain the observations.

A. Did the speakers adequately synthesize the materials and data in their dossiers?

B. Did the speakers adequately demonstrate areas where more data need to be acquired (or more thinking done about existing data sets)?

COMMENTS:

(3) Demonstration of implications of research and synthesis

A. Did the speakers adequately recognize the assumption in their approach to / interpretation of their materials?

B. Did the speakers explore the implications of their research to the study of the site / region / chronological period / Aegean Prehistory?

COMMENTS:

(4) Professionalism of Talk

A. Was the presentation organized and did it follow a logical order?

B. Were the speakers articulate or were they mumbling, redundant or too advanced?

C. Were images used appropriately and in an illustrative way?

D. Did the speakers present themselves in a professional manner (speech and attire)?

COMMENTS:

(5) Ability to address questions

A. Did the speakers answer the questions adequately?

B. Were the speakers unnecessarily long-winded or disorganized in their answers?

COMMENTS:

(6) Group rapport and division of labor

A. Did the team interact in an amicable and cooperative way?

B. Was an equitable division of labor apparent from the presentation or were one or two members doing the majority of the work?

COMMENTS:

TOTAL POINTS AWARDED:

PROPOSAL: ACCEPTED

DECLINED