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Week 1


15th Jan

Practical: The IoA’s 410 lithic collection.

Week 2

Lecture: Terminology, technology and typological attributes of stone tools.

22nd Jan

Practical: Handling session. Identifying lithics and their diagnostic characteristics.

Week 3

Lecture: The Chaîne Opératoire and further lithic typology.

29th Jan

Practical: Handling session. An examination of the pre-handaxe industries of the Oldowan and Clactonian followed by Acheulean handaxes.

Week 4

Lecture: The Middle Palaeolithic.

5th Feb

Practical: Discussion of the Chaîne Opératoire diagram and a Levallois and Middle Palaeolithic handling session

Week 5

Lecture: Syn-depositional and post-depositional factors affecting lithic assemblages.

12th Feb

Practical: Handling session. Upper Palaeolithic stone tools and technology.

Week 6

17th - 21st February READING WEEK

Week 7

Lecture: The Upper Palaeolithic and beyond.

26th Feb

Practical: Test 1 (Runs in two groups from 12.15-14.30).

Week 8

Lecture: Indirect percussion and pressure flaking.

4th Mar


Week 9

Lecture: Discussion between MBR and knapping expert.

11th Mar

Practical: Knapping demonstration.

Week 10

Lecture: Later prehistoric tools from the Neolithic to the Iron Age and ground-stone artefacts.

18th Mar

Practical: Lithic reports.
Week 11  Lecture: Excavating and recording strategies for lithic assemblages and a brief introduction to the concept of style.

25th Mar  Practical: Test 2 (Runs in two groups from 12.15 – 14.30).

ASSESSMENT
The course is assessed by two in-class observation/written tests each worth 20% of the final mark, and a critical analysis of a published lithic report, worth 60% of the final mark. The report should be 2500 words in length (see appendix).

Test 1 will be on Wednesday 26th February 2020.
Test 2 will be on Wednesday 25th March 2020.

The final piece of assessed work for the course takes the form of a critical report:-

1/. Go to a journal containing a paper on an excavation with a substantial lithic report and critically assess the report. You will need to consider points such as:- How well does it stand on its own? How well does it integrate with the rest of the report? Is the information contained in it put over clearly and readily understood? Is it simply descriptive or does it develop the study of the stone tools, using intra and inter site data? Consider the illustrations and tables and how they contribute to both the lithic and overall report.

2/. Glynn Isaac’s statement concerning the study of stone tools and their contribution to understanding the past, is one of the seminal statements in lithic studies. Write an essay that critically examines and expands upon the statement: what is its basis in fact; does it fairly sum up the efforts of archaeologists to date; is it applicable to all periods across the range of prehistory?

3/. The handaxe is one of the most enigmatic tools in prehistory, with a longevity of around 1.8ma. Taking a wide range of evidence into consideration what are your views on the use of handaxes and why do you think they proved to be such a geographically ubiquitous; hominin species diverse; and resilient, tool type?

Hand in date Monday April 27th 2020.

Attendance
A register will be taken at each class. If you are unable to attend a class, please notify MBR by email or text. Departments are required to report each student’s attendance to UCL Registry at frequent intervals throughout each term. Students are expected to attend at least 70% of classes.
**Information for intercollegiate and interdepartmental students**

Students enrolled in Departments outside the Institute should collect hard copy of the Institute’s coursework guidelines from Judy Medrington’s office (411A).

**Dyslexia**

If you have dyslexia or any other disability, please make your Course Co-ordinators aware of this fact and discuss with them whether there is any way in which they can help you. Students with dyslexia are reminded to indicate this on each piece of coursework.

**Feedback**

In trying to make this course as effective as possible, we welcome feedback from students during the course of the year. All students are asked to give their views on the course in an anonymous questionnaire which will be circulated at one of the last sessions of the course. These questionnaires are taken seriously and help the co-ordinator to develop the course. The summarised responses are considered by the Institute's Staff-Student Consultative Committee, Teaching Committee, and by the Faculty Teaching Committee.

If students are concerned about any aspect of this course we hope they will feel able to talk to the Course Co-ordinator, but if they feel this approach is not appropriate, they should consult their Personal Tutor, the Academic Administrator (Judy Medrington), or the Chair of Teaching Committee.

**Health and safety**

The Institute has a Health and Safety policy and code of practice which provides guidance on field work, site visits, laboratory work etc. This policy is revised annually and the new edition will be issued in due course. All work undertaken in the Institute is governed by these guidelines, and students have a duty to be aware of them and to adhere to them at all times. This is particularly important in the context of the laboratory/field/placement work which will be undertaken as part of this course. Specific information pertaining to activities associated with this course shall be given prior to their undertaking.
INTRODUCTION TO THE COURSE
This course will train the student to recognise the characteristics of humanly modified lithics, to understand and interpret the techniques of their manufacture, and to comprehend their various uses. The course also studies stone tool assemblages from the perspective of the excavator and analyst, taking into account methodologies for extraction and interpretation and by looking at the taphonomic history of artefact assemblages. Finally, we shall examine the different ways we might interpret past human behaviour from the analysis of stone artefacts. Stone artefacts dominate the prehistoric archaeological record, are a significant component of the material cultural repertoire of later prehistoric and early historic societies, and are an extremely important and interesting area of archaeological research. We shall concentrate on ways in which we can approach the analysis and understanding of prehistoric technologies in particular but will also consider typological, functional, contextual and cognitive analysis of stone artefacts, and examine the different ways we can build an understanding of past human behaviour from the analysis of flaked stone and to a lesser extent ground stone tool assemblages. The Institute has extensive stone tool reference material and we shall utilise prehistoric assemblages from Britain, Europe and Africa, although material from other regions will be introduced when appropriate.

Aims
The specific aims of the course are to introduce you to:
- Methodological approaches used in the identification and analysis of stone artefacts.
- Ways in which stone artefacts can be and have been used to interpret the dynamic human past.
- The importance of stone artefacts as a source of information about past human behaviour.

Objectives
On successful completion of this course you should:-
- Understand the basic elements of the fracture mechanics of stone.
- Be aware of the range of information lithic assemblages provide on past human behaviour.
- Be familiar with the different approaches used in lithic stone analysis.
- Be able to illustrate lithic artefacts for study purposes.
- Be able to produce a critical essay on an academic report of a lithic assemblage.
- Be able to describe and critically assess a lithic assemblage.

Learning Outcomes
On successful completion of the course students should have developed:
- Observational skills and critical reflection.
- The ability to apply acquired knowledge of a topic.
- Demonstrate a good understanding of the principles and methods by which lithic data are acquired and analysed.
• Show an awareness of the issues involved in planning, designing, and executing a specialist post-excavation report.

Course Information
The handbook contains the basic information about the content and administration of the course. If necessary, additional subject-specific reading lists and individual session handouts will be given out at appropriate points in the course. If you have queries about the objectives, structure, content, assessment or organisation of the course, please contact me (MBR). This handbook is also available on the course Moodle site.

Teaching Methods
The course is taught on a weekly basis in Term 2 by lectures and practical handling sessions. Practical sessions have been incorporated into the scheduled sessions and follow on from the lecture that runs between 11.00 and 12.00, with one group attending between 12.00 and 13.00 and the next group between 13.00 and 14.00.

Workload
There will be 20 hours of lectures and practical handling sessions in this course. The total workload for the course is 180 hours: you will be expected to undertake about 80 hours of reading for the course, plus about 80 hours preparing for and producing the assessed work.

Key readings
There are a number of books that provide a good introduction to lithic technology, terminology, and methods of analysis. If you are interested in lithic analysis, the Holdaway and Stern, Andrefsky, Odell and Inizan are good. For those of you who wish to try your hand at flint knapping, then Whittaker is a useful reference.


Rocks vary in the manner in which they fracture and their suitability as raw material for stone tool manufacture, points that knappers in the past understood well. We will concentrate primarily on flint and other crypto-crystalline rocks, and the structural properties that make them highly suitable for knapping purposes. We will consider ways in which we can source the location of raw materials and what that information can tell us about past human behaviour. We will also study evidence for quarrying and transport of stone, and consider whether the type of stone available affected the manufacturing process. We will then identify the visible characteristics of knapped stone artefacts. We shall then consider the meaning of Glynn Isaac’s famous statement on Stone tools made back in 1977 and discuss its relevance today.

“Most Palaeolithic archaeologists ... tend to believe that the assemblages of humanly flaked stones that we recover in quantities from sites such as Olorgesailie preserve a great deal of valuable information about the craft traditions, the cultural affinities, and the economic life of the hominids who made them. This belief is in part a matter of faith, and there is a danger that in our enthusiasm we may overextend the exegesis of stone artefacts. It sometimes appears that all of us treat stone artefacts as infinitely complex repositories of palaeocultural information and assume that it is only the imperfections of our present analytical systems that prevent us from decoding them. But is this really so?" (Glyn Issac. Olorgesailie, 1977:207)

See the papers given on the Moodle site.


Louis Leakey famously referred to stone tools as “fossilized human behaviour.” In order to reconstruct ancient behaviour from these material remains it is necessary to collect detailed and accurate information about technologically relevant aspects of artefact typology, frequency, morphology and size. These include both qualitative and quantitative attributes. This lecture will introduce basic concepts and methods in lithic analysis, with special attention to the relevance of particular attributes to different research questions. In the practical the students will handle a range of raw materials ranging from obsidian to conglomerates, we shall then identify the visible characteristics of knapped stone artefacts.

Essential Reading


Further Reading


Week 3 Lecture: The Chaîne Opératoire and further lithic typology.

29th Jan Practical: An examination of the pre-handaxe industries of the Oldowan and Clactonian followed by Acheulean handaxes.

The concept of Chaîne Opératoire will be introduced and discussed. The course so far has enabled us to identify the various stages of a lithic reduction sequence. The sequence from start to finish is known as the Chaîne Opératoire and applies to any reduction sequence regardless of its technology, age or complexity. Within the Chaîne Opératoire, we have learnt about what types of raw material make the most effective stone tools and how to describe the physical attributes of both the end object of reduction (façonnage) and the waste products (débitage): related concepts of reduction sequence and tool histories will also be considered. The technology of manufacture through percussion - direct and applied which creates the physical attributes has been examined as has the typological subdivision of stone tools. We have discussed the problems of using typology as a dating method, with relation to diachronous geographical distribution of technologies and tool types; together with simple technique and type repetition within a more limited spatial distribution.

Outside of the class, students will draw-up the links in a chaîne opératoire, where the category boxes are given for different types of artefact: Next week in the practical class we shall go through the diagram and discuss the challenges of reconstructing life histories from excavated tools. In the practical we shall look at technological and typological attributes of stone tools across a wide temporal spectrum from the Oldowan to the Acheulian, examining the concept of Mode 1 and 2 industries. We shall also touch upon the often neglected subject of debitage, examining a variety of flake types and cores.

Essential reading for the Chaîne Opératoire


Week 4  The Middle Palaeolithic.

5th Feb  Practical: Discussion of the Chaîne Opératoire diagram and a Levallois and Middle Palaeolithic handling session

The lithic technologies of the Middle Palaeolithic of Europe and Middle Stone Age of Africa are characterised by distinctive set of forms produced by the Levallois technique, a planned method for obtaining predetermined flakes, blades and points. We shall study the technique and identify the different Levallois reduction strategies. The Levallois is also a technique whose presence or absence defines the Mousterian Industries of the Middle Palaeolithic; we shall take a look at the classic Charentian, Quina, Denticulate and Acheulian tradition industries of this time period. The question of the variability in these industries which has taxed archaeologists and students alike for over forty years will be examined. The lecture will close with a consideration of the Châtelperronian, and examine the claims from Arcy-sur-Cure, that this material was made by the Neanderthals. In the practical we shall get our first look at Upper Palaeolithic tools, with an emphasis on the production of blades and bladelets. (Please also see the papers posted on the Moodle site). The practical session today will involve examining Levallois and Mousterian material from the Institute’s collections. We shall examine the techniques required to prepare cores for the removal of Levallois flakes and examine Bordes’s classic division of the Mousterian industries in France.

Essential reading


**Further reading**


Week 5  Lecture: Syn-depositional and post-depositional factors affecting lithic assemblages.

12th Feb  Practical: Handling session. Upper Palaeolithic stone tools and technology.

Both in the lectures and practicals to date, we have had a brief look at the types of taphonomic processes that can affect lithic assemblages. Today we shall take this further by studying these processes in more detail. We shall consider syn-depositional alteration of artefacts and assemblages in conjunction with post-depositional process that affect lithics. It is important to examine how these effects might be apparent in the archaeological record, as the net results of these processes are the assemblages that are collected, excavated and interpreted by archaeologists. In the practical session we shall start to come to terms with the increasing complexity and specialisation that is found in the Upper Palaeolithic lithic industries.

Essential reading


Further reading
You should also use your electronic journal access to look through some recent issues of the Journal of Taphonomy.

Week 6  17th -21st February READING WEEK

Week 7  Lecture: The Upper Palaeolithic and beyond.

26th Feb  Practical: Test 1 (Runs in two groups from 12.15-14.30).
In comparison with what has gone before, the Upper Palaeolithic lithic assemblages show increasing technological and typological complexity. We shall start by considering again the Châtelperronian, a controversial industry that many archaeologists believe was made by the Neanderthals. The controversy revolves not just around which species of hominin was responsible for the tools but whether this was a natural evolution in Neanderthal lithic technology or an imitation of the lithics and other artefacts made by their modern human, Aurignacian, neighbours, and this is the topic we shall discuss today. We shall then look at the other key European UP industries; the Aurignacian, Gravettian, Solutrian and Magdalenian, whilst also considering a couple of sites from further east in Eurasia. The Upper Palaeolithic/ Later Stone Age usually refer to blade technology and standardized retouched tools. The Mesolithic is characterised by microlithic technology, bifacial and ground stone technology. We will review the most typical tool types from each period in order to understand similarities and differences between them. (Please also see the papers posted on the Moodle site).

Essential reading


Bar-Yosef, O. and Bordes, J-G., 2010. Who were the makers of the Châtelperronian culture? *Journal of Human Evolution* 59, 586-593.


Further reading


Week 8  Lecture: Indirect percussion and pressure flaking.


Most of the lithic material we have studied to date is the result of direct percussion, either by hard or soft hammer. Today we consider the concept of indirect percussion, from the simplest bipolar anvil technique, through to its most advance manifestation in the form of pressure flaking. Also under consideration will be the use of the punch technique, which is particularly relevant to the production of blades and bladelets (lamellar industries). In the practical that follows we shall handle a variety of types of cores, flakes/blades and tools produced by indirect percussion, across a wide temporal range. The readings for this section are largely contained within those for fracture mechanics and the Upper Palaeolithic section from Week 7, some of the articles are available for download from the Moodle site.


Week 9  Lecture: Discussion between MBR and Karl Lee on knapping.

11th Mar  Practical: Karl Lee’s knapping demonstration.

A practical session with flintknapper Karl Lee. The lecture will take the form of a discussion between Mark and Karl, where we shall explore the nuances of learning how to knap and discuss the connection between knapping and information transfer in the past. We shall also consider and discuss, complexity, form, function and style, which we shall cover in depth in the last lecture of the course.

Have a look at Karl's work on his Primitive Technology website at:-
http://www.primitive-technology.co.uk

Week 10  Lecture: Later prehistoric tools from the Neolithic to the Iron Age and ground-stone artefacts.

18th Mar  Practical: Lithic reports.

Lithic industries undergo a reversal in complexity during the Late Bronze Age as metal arrives in significant quantity, this is most manifest in the Iron Age when lithics return to a pre-Acheulian simplicity. We shall take a look at the increasing specialisation of the knapper, whereby lithic production passes from many to the few and the professional knapper appears. Examination will be made of other new developments such as the imitation of metalwork by lithic knappers, the ceremonial discard of lithics and the production of stone tools as weapons for use against other humans. Ground stone artefacts are any artefacts in which abrasion of stone played a key role in manufacture. John Lubbock originally defined the Neolithic as the Age of polished (and ground) stone. The main artefact classes are ground stone axes and querns. Beads and stone-ornaments were also produced by grinding. While some types of stone can be shaped by knapping, followed by grinding, others are worked by pecking, drilling and sawing. In the practical we shall address lithic reports, both as stand-alone articles and as a component part of site reports. The practical will lay the ground for the third assessed piece of work in the course, which is a critical appraisal.
of a lithic report, which will include a consideration of the manner in which lithic artefacts are illustrated in books and papers, and consider the changes that cheap colour publishing and digital photography have had on the way lithic illustrations are published.

**Essential reading**


Butler, C., 2005. *Prehistoric Flintwork* (Ch.6 Early Neolithic flintwork; Ch.7 Neolithic Axe Production; Ch.8 Later Neolithic and early Bronze Age flintwork). Stroud: Tempus IOA KA BUT.


**Further reading**
Week 11 Lecture: Excavating and recording strategies for lithic assemblages and a brief introduction to the concept of style.

25th Mar Practical: Test 2 (Runs in two groups from 12.15-14.30)
In Week 5, we examined syn-depositional and post-depositional processes that might potentially affect lithic scatters; these can be the result of human and subaerial activity and/or a combination of both (see earlier references). Today we consider the topic in more depth and link it to the selection of pertinent excavation and recording strategies. Hominin/human alteration of knapped lithic assemblages can take many forms; from the simple collection and dumping of accumulations of lithics, through removing elements of the assemblage for other tasks, to overprinting with other activities. Sub-aerial processes include weathering, erosion and redeposition of parent soils/sediments and various forms of bioturbation. It is worth considering however that in strictly sedimentological terms hominin/human activity is just another form of bioturbation. Having taken the above processes into consideration we now turn to the third main variable that affects our understanding and reconstruction of past deposited lithic technology: the way in which it is excavated and recorded. The methodology applied by archaeologists is affected by various factors, which include some of the following:-

The perceived mode and environment of deposition of the parent sediment body.
Density of lithics with the sediment body.
The association of lithics with other archaeological and palaeoenvironmental elements such as faunal remains and features.
Time and financial constraints.

Excavation and recording methods should be commensurate with the integrity of the lithics. For secondary or residual sites this is obviously going to be less detailed than for sites where there is in situ preservation. Excavation and recording methods impose control on the sediment bodies and archaeological material therein, this is most obvious in the imposition of three dimensional co-ordinates, which are usually derived from national grid reference and sea level data sources. Following on from the recording of 3D co-ordinates other variables might include long axis orientation, or the angle of dip of the object. In any reduction event it is important to know whether the full range of debitage is still present at or around the assemblage and therefore it is germane to consider sampling for the finer lithic elements or spalls. Cut-off size parameters between flakes and spalls are arbitrary and will be dependent upon the type of site and the resources available to the excavator, somewhere around 20mm is the norm. It is axiomatic that a lot of information about the assemblage(s) will only become apparent during post-extraction analyses, for example a significant number of large flakes might be missing; sedimentological analysis tells us that the only way they can have been removed from the scatter is through selection by humans. A reduction area at another part of the site which leaves a broken convergent side-end scraper then needs to be investigated to see if this area and its stone tools provide the solution to the whereabouts of the missing flakes. Although a lot can and will be
learnt in the post excavation process it is absolutely vital and the sine qua non of this type of work that the archaeologist has extracted the absolute maximum of information from their time in the field because in most instances when the post-excavation analysis begins it is too late to go back.

There is no ideal set text for lithic excavation and recording. I suggest you look at some excavation and project reports and examine the methodology sections. I would recommend site reports on Abri Pataud, Pincevent, Wallertheim, Swanscombe, Boxgrove, High Lodge and Rob Hosfield’s work on residual assemblages (http://www.reading.ac.uk/secondarycontexts/arch-intro.htm and references therein).

To conclude today’s lecture we shall introduce the concept of style in the production of lithic artefacts, considering style in relation to artefact form and function. When can style be said to appear in the artefact record and how does it manifest itself? Does style become a progressively more important concept in lithic industries through time?

There will be no practical today as we shall be holding our second and final test.


Appendices 2019-2020

Word counts
The following should not be included in the word-count: title page, contents pages, lists of figure and tables, abstract, preface, acknowledgements, bibliography, lists of references, captions and contents of tables and figures, appendices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Past</th>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>4,750-5,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,275-4,725</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>3,800-4,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,325-3,675</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2,850-3,150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,375-2,625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,900-2,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,425-1,575</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>950-1,050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Penalties will only be imposed if you exceed the upper figure in the range. There is no penalty for using fewer words than the lower figure in the range; the lower figure is simply for your guidance to indicate the sort of length that is expected by the course co-ordinator.

In the 2019-20 session penalties for over-length work will be as follows:

- For work that exceeds the specified maximum length by less than 10%, the mark will be reduced by five percentage marks but the penalised mark will not be reduced below the pass mark, assuming the work merited a Pass.
- For work that exceeds the specified maximum length by 10% or more the mark will be reduced by ten percentage marks, but the penalised mark will not be reduced below the pass mark, assuming the work merited a Pass.

Coursework submission procedures
All coursework must normally be submitted both as hard copy and electronically unless instructed otherwise. (However, bulky portfolios and lab books are normally submitted as hard copy only).

You should staple the appropriate colour-coded IoA coversheet (available in the IoA library and outside room 411a) to the front of each piece of work and submit it to the red box at the Reception Desk (or room 411a in the case of Year 1 undergraduate work).

All coursework should be uploaded to Turnitin by midnight on the day of the deadline. This will date-stamp your work. It is essential to upload all parts of your work as this is sometimes the version that will be marked.
Instructions are given below. Please note that the procedure has changed for 2019-20, and work is now submitted to Turnitin via Moodle.

1. Ensure that your essay or other item of coursework has been saved as a Word doc., docx. or PDF document. Please include the module code and your candidate number on every page as a header.
2. Go into the Moodle page for the module to which you wish to submit your work.
3. Click on the correct assignment (e.g. Essay 1).
4. Fill in the “Submission title” field with the right details: It is essential that the first word in the title is your examination candidate number (e.g. YGBR8 Essay 1). Note that this changes each year.
5. Click “Upload”.
6. Click on “Submit”.
7. You should receive a receipt – please save this.
8. If you have problems, please email the IoA Turnitin Advisers on ioa-turnitin@ucl.ac.uk, explaining the nature of the problem and the exact module and assignment involved.

One of the Turnitin Advisers will normally respond within 24 hours, Monday-Friday during term. Please be sure to email the Turnitin Advisers if technical problems prevent you from uploading work in time to meet a submission deadline - even if you do not obtain an immediate response from one of the advisers they will be able to notify the relevant Module Coordinator that you had attempted to submit the work before the deadline.

APPENDIX B: POLICIES AND PROCEDURES 2019-20 (PLEASE READ CAREFULLY)
This appendix provides a short précis of policies and procedures relating to modules. It is not a substitute for the full documentation, with which all students should become familiar. For full information on Institute policies and procedures, see the IoA Student Administration section of Moodle:  https://moodle.ucl.ac.uk/module/view
For UCL policies and procedures, see the Academic Regulations and the UCL Academic Manual: http://www.ucl.ac.uk/srs/academic-regulations ; http://www.ucl.ac.uk/academic-manual/

GENERAL MATTERS
ATTENDANCE: A register shall be taken at each class. If you are unable to attend a class, please notify the lecturer by email. Students are normally required to attend at least 70% of classes.
DYSLEXIA: If you have dyslexia or any other disability, please discuss with your lecturers whether there is any way in which they can help you. Students with dyslexia should indicate it on each coursework cover sheet.

COURSEWORK
LATE SUBMISSION: Late submission shall be penalised in accordance with current UCL regulations, unless formal permission for late submission has been previously granted.

The UCL penalties are as follows:
The marks for coursework received up to two working days after the published date and time will incur a 10 percentage point deduction in marks (but no lower than the pass mark).
The marks for coursework received more than two working days and up to five working days after the published date and time will receive no more than the pass mark (40% for UG modules, 50% for PGT modules).
Work submitted more than five working days after the published date and time, but before the second week of the third term will receive a mark of zero but will be considered complete.

GRANTING OF EXTENSIONS: Please note that there are strict UCL-wide regulations with regard to the granting of extensions for coursework. You are reminded that Module Coordinators are not permitted to grant extensions. All requests for extensions must be submitted on the appropriate UCL form, together with supporting documentation, via Judy Medrington’s office and will then be referred on for consideration. Please be aware that the
grounds that are considered acceptable are limited. Those with long-term difficulties should contact UCL Student Support and Wellbeing (SSW) to make special arrangements. Please see the IoA website for further information. Additional information may be found here:-
http://www.ucl.ac.uk/srs/academic-manual/c4/extenuating-circumstances/

RETURN OF COURSEWORK AND RESUBMISSION: You should receive your marked coursework within one month of the submission deadline. If you do not receive your work within this period, or a written explanation, notify the Academic Administrator. After your marked essay has been returned to you, please remember to return it to the Module Co-ordinator within two weeks. You must retain a copy of all coursework submitted.

CITING OF SOURCES and AVOIDING PLAGIARISM: Coursework must be expressed in your own words, citing the exact source (author, date and page number; website address if applicable) of any ideas, information, diagrams, etc., that are taken from the work of others. This applies to all media (books, articles, websites, images, figures, etc.). Any direct quotations from the work of others must be indicated as such by being placed between quotation marks. Plagiarism is a very serious irregularity, which can carry heavy penalties. It is your responsibility to abide by requirements for presentation, referencing and avoidance of plagiarism. Make sure you understand definitions of plagiarism and the procedures and penalties as detailed in UCL regulations: http://www.ucl.ac.uk/current-students/guidelines/plagiarism

RESOURCES
MOODLE: Please ensure you are signed up to the module on Moodle. For help with Moodle, please contact Charlotte Fpearson (c.fpearson@ucl.ac.uk)
Small ovate handaxe from area Q1/B at Boxgrove