All right, good afternoon, everyone. My name is Keyanah Nurse, and I am the Senior Program Officer of IDEA Programs, a very new unit at ACLS which stands for Intentional Design for an Equitable Academy. I'm joined by my colleague, Katie Reis, who is the Program Associate of IDEA Programs, and she'll be managing the tech behind the scenes.

As the program lead for the Digital Justice Grant Program, now entering its third competition year, I am very happy to be with all of you this afternoon. I'll be discussing some of the big-picture aspects of the program, its core mission and values, as well as some of the details, such as the application components and eligibility requirements. Additionally, I am eager to share how this program continues to evolve, primarily motivated by the generous feedback we receive from our primary constituency—you all.

In that spirit, I will also highlight some substantial changes to this year's application and explain the rationale and aspirational vision behind them. As always, this session will be recorded. So, if you or any of your project team members have scheduling conflicts, you can still share these materials with them.

As I mentioned, today's session will include a mix of discussion on both the ethos of the ACS Digital Justice Grant Program and an explanation of some finer details of this year's competition. After defining the vision for the program, I will highlight how and why it is designed in its current form, while also uplifting some of the currently funded projects. I will then explain key details about eligibility, particularly the difference between seed and development grants, provide an overview of the application components—restructured for this year's competition—highlight some important dates on the competition timeline, and leave time at the end for a Q&A session.

Given the volume of participants today, we will use Zoom's Q&A feature, which my colleague K. will be monitoring. Please post your questions there throughout the session, and be sure to upvote the questions you would like to see answered. While we won't have time to address everyone's individual inquiries, I hope to cover questions that many people may have in common. I would also encourage you to frame your questions as generally as possible. If you have very specific concerns about your project, I'll explain at the end of the session how you can best get in touch with us to receive feedback.

So, let's begin with the program parameters and ethos of the Digital Justice Grants Program. It's important to start here because I want to underscore the specificity of what the term "Digital Justice" means at ACLS and within the context of this program. This isn't an exhaustive definitional effort. I'm not defining the incredibly complicated and multifaceted term "Digital Justice" or discussing how it is used in other spaces. Rather, I want to make plain why we invoke the aspirational and reparative spirit of justice in the very

name of this program, so you can better assess whether your project aligns with its objectives.

When we invoke the term "Digital Justice," again within the context of this program, we are referring to an intentional grant-making design process. This process is meant to support digital projects in the humanities and interpretive social sciences that critically engage with the histories and interests of people of color and other marginalized groups through the ethical and intentional use of digital tools and methods. In that framing, you'll notice we position digital justice as both a process and an outcome, with a specific thematic and methodological focus. While the general contours of this process apply to our other programs within the IDEA unit, its application here is attuned to the specific needs and challenges associated with supporting historically underfunded topics of study—particularly when they are made digital.

Here's a quick visual that captures how we understand the four modes of iterative and interconnected activities that constitute this intentional design process. But what do these activities look like concretely within the context of the Digital Justice Grant Program? The first is, of course, the recognition of context and history.

We begin by asking the question: How did we get here? Why do certain realms within digital scholarship have easier access to funding than others? These are mostly rhetorical questions. We know the answers and understand why the landscape is uneven. We grapple with ongoing histories and legacies of settler colonialism, white supremacy, and heteropatriarchy, as these forces manifest in our institutions. Our current educational landscape was never designed to support fields like Black Studies or Trans Studies. Those inequities in funding and institutional prioritization have extended into the digital sphere. This context drives our decisions on how the Digital Justice Grant Program is designed and administered.

Next, we focus on the intentionality of resource design. For example, the very structure of the program—the bifurcation between seed and development grants—aims to redistribute the privilege of experimentation and risk-taking to those who have had to work with fewer resources. Innovation and advancements in scholarly fields, especially for digital projects, happen precisely through experimentation and risk-taking. These activities are fundamental, even if they are not always recognized within the genre of grant writing.

You can also see this intentionality in our webinar series. The topics are curated based on feedback from both viewers and applicants. This helps us identify areas where the applicant pool might benefit from additional coaching and where applicants have expressed a need for more advising on specific components of the application. I'll discuss

the webinar series further later in this session, but I wanted to highlight the reasoning behind why we choose specific topics.

Then, we move to redistributive methods. This is a relatively new priority we have built into the Digital Justice Program, reflected in our emphasis on capacity building, which we introduced last year. The prompts around capacity building are geared towards providing applicants a more granular understanding of the context in which they pursue their work. This helps reviewers allocate funds where they can have the most impact in terms of bolstering the creation of digital scholarship. I want to be clear, though: we don't expect applicants to articulate how their projects will solve all the problems at their institutions. When we ask about capacity building, we are mindful of scale. But we hope these prompts give our reviewers a better understanding of the applicant's context, so they can allocate resources where they might do the most good.

Lastly, these redistributive methods aim for reparative outcomes. These outcomes are always aspirational and grounded in the question: How can we support and fund restorative, reparative, and sustainable experimentation with technology that opens avenues for transformative relationships to the past, present, and future? These four modes of activity constitute the intentional grant-making process that shapes the Digital Justice Program.

Now that I've spoken a little about the big-picture vision and intention of the program, I'll transition into reviewing some concrete details of the competition and application. These details might help as you prepare your materials.

The first detail is determining if your project is eligible for consideration. The primary eligibility requirement is that the principal investigator must be a scholar in the humanities. During the pilot year, we received inquiries about what this means, particularly whether we limit our definition of "scholar" to those with PhDs or faculty positions. We do not. Given the collaborative nature of digital work—where librarians and graduate students often partner with faculty members—our definition of a scholar is one who has a demonstrated track record of engagement in scholarly debates or communities, whether through publications, conference presentations, or collaborations. It is not limited to a professional title or credential.

The second eligibility requirement is that project teams agree to make their content publicly accessible. This used to be in the form of an intellectual property agreement, but we have since folded it into the eligibility requirements to simplify the application process. I also want to note the phrase "the most liberal open-source and Creative Commons license appropriate for the underlying content." We are currently developing more culturally

sensitive guidelines that consider that not all materials can or should be widely accessible, especially when they belong to communities historically subjected to exploitation. For now, project teams should articulate in their dissemination plans how people can access their content.

The final eligibility requirement is that an institution of higher education in the U.S. must administer the awarded grant funds. During the pilot year, we required these institutions to host proposed projects, but that does not mean they need to provide the servers where your content lives. We have changed the language to reflect more about a financial relationship rather than digital ownership. If you are not formally affiliated with an institution, we recommend partnering with someone who is. Strong applications typically feature a project team rather than an individual scholar.

The three eligibility requirements I just described apply to both seed and development grants. The one distinction between the two is assessing what phase of development your project is in. Seed grants are for startup projects in the prototyping or proof-of-concept phase, while development grants must demonstrate evidence of significant preliminary work and engagement with public or scholarly audiences.

We often get the question of what counts as a digital justice project. In short, we think of digital justice at ACLS as digital projects in the humanities and interpretive social sciences that critically engage with the interests and histories of people of color and other marginalized groups through the ethical and intentional use of digital tools and methods. This involves a specific thematic focus on centering the histories of people of color and a methodological focus on the ethical use of digital tools. All ACLS Digital Justice projects demonstrate a profound and intentional relationship between form and content. This relationship clearly informs the project's intellectual contributions and advances equity and justice.

It might be helpful to go through some examples of funded projects, so you get a sense of what a digital justice project looks like thematically and methodologically. I'll share two examples, one from a seed grant and one from a development grant.

The first example of a seed grant is the "Trans Games Digital Zine Project." Professors Rachelle Amara at Drexel University and Teddy Pozo at Occidental College lead this project, which brings together transgender, non-binary, gender-fluid, and gender-nonconforming game developers, scholars, and gamers. This web-based publication will share interdisciplinary scholarship and public humanities work on how trans game designers and communities of play shape the gaming landscape. Here, I'm pulling from the abstract on our webpage. I want to say that this is a great example of a seed project. The seed funding

will be used to develop and prototype this digital publication, which will be created through a co-creative process with the trans creators at the center of the project. While this team has already done some preliminary work to identify which partners they will work with, the proposed activities ultimately funded were for piloting a new publication platform.

The next project is "Sounding Data Justice for Environmental Liberation in Southeast Queens." This is a collaboration between faculty members at CI York College, part of the City University of New York, and the nonprofit organization Eastern Queens Alliance. This project is an art-science initiative that transforms data into sound to develop new ways of sharing air quality and aircraft noise data that the Eastern Queens Alliance already collects. The ultimate goal of the project, which is community-run yet university-based, is to grow data literacy and foster environmental equity through liberation science and ecological art.

Just as in the previous project, the partnerships between the faculty and community partners were already in place when the teams applied. However, the funded activities are oriented toward exploring a new method—in this case, data sonification. The project will test how sonification, as opposed to more familiar visualizations, might better facilitate data sharing by community organizations with outsiders for advocacy purposes.

Both examples of seed grants I've presented already had existing partnerships with community members outside of their institutions. However, there were new methods or platforms that the teams wanted to experiment with and pilot, which is what their proposed activities were funded for.

Moving on to the development grants, which are for more established projects, the first example I want to highlight is the "Freedom and Captivity Archive Project." This is a collaborative project between Colby College, the Maine Prisoner Advocacy Coalition, and the Maine Historical Society. Since 2020, the larger Freedom and Captivity initiative has curated and facilitated community conversations in Maine, envisioning alternatives to incarceration while centering those with the most direct experience with the carceral system.

Previous activities before this project, which began in 2020, included 15 art exhibitions in galleries throughout Maine, an online exhibition, and a podcast series, among other activities. These efforts supported and defined the project well before they applied for a development grant. Thus, they were a well-established project when they applied for their Digital Justice development grant. They will be extending this project to build out a publicly accessible digital archive of the experiences, insights, knowledge, and hidden stories of

Maine's incarcerated and formerly incarcerated community members, which will then form the basis for community storytelling events throughout the coming year.

The last example of a development grantee is "The Personal Rights, the Political Securely: Rendering Black Lives Legible through the Application of Advanced Machine Learning to Anti-Apartheid Solidarity Letters." This team is a transnational team stretching from Kentucky to Washington, DC, to Cape Town, South Africa. I wanted to highlight this example because this team actually won a Digital Justice seed grant back in 2022. Through that work, the team used machine learning models to identify relationships, recognize handwriting, and redact sensitive information from about 700 letters written by family members of imprisoned anti-apartheid activists.

The seed funding really helped them think through what this new tool would look like. Now that the team has won the development grant, they'll use those funds to implement solutions based on the project's first phase and hold training sessions at the Mayibuye Center archive in South Africa, which is the collection's home archive in Cape Town.

Now that I've spoken a little bit about the big picture of the program and discussed the differences between the seed and development grants, I'll transition into reviewing the application components. This year, we've made some important changes from last year's competition.

Both the seed and development grants have the same application components, which include elements such as the bibliography, project timeline, project budget, budget description, staffing, and institutional verification. These elements haven't changed. However, there are some key differences between last year's application and this year's, which I've highlighted here in orange.

For those of you who applied last year or the year before, you may remember the 7- to 10-page proposal narrative that comprised the bulk of the application. This was the section where you described your project, the tools you planned on using, and, for development grants, your project history, among other details. This year, we've replaced that model with a series of discrete prompts that have word count limits instead of page count limits.

There are a few reasons why we shifted to this structure. First, this past spring, our reviewers offered critical feedback about the application structure and the type of information they wanted to access more readily. The most significant insight they shared was that applicants often spent too much time in the proposal narrative discussing the intellectual underpinnings of the project—how it engages with certain subfields or bodies of literature—and didn't spend enough time on the project's mechanics, such as the tools and methods that would be used.

Interestingly, we heard a similar concern from applicants during our Digital Justice focus groups this past summer. In those sessions, applicants generously shared their experiences navigating the competition and offered helpful suggestions on how we might change the application structure to better position them to provide the information reviewers actually want and need to advocate for their projects.

So, rather than sticking with the proposal narrative upload format, we've shifted to this prompt-based model. It asks very specific questions about the different dimensions of your project. I believe there are nine prompts for each application. With clearly defined word counts, you now have a concrete sense of how much time, so to speak, you should spend discussing the different aspects of your project.

Since this is the first year we're trying this format, I hope it will not only streamline the reading and evaluation process by ensuring that similar types of information are available in the same places across applications, but I also hope it makes completing your application more straightforward. The prompts with their word counts give you a clearer sense of how much space to allocate to different parts of your project. Moreover, you no longer have to guess or rely on unstated "rules" about where to place certain pieces of information within a proposal.

This standardized format means each piece of information will be in the same place across applications, so reviewers won't have to flip through pages to find a key sentence on page five that might have been more helpful on page two, for example.

I'd also like to take this opportunity to thank the reviewers who offered their feedback and the applicants who attended our focus groups to share their experiences. In particular, I'd like to thank independent and disabled scholar Tekla Babyak, who pointed out that word counts can make a significant difference over page counts, especially for applicants with visual impairments who have to adjust formatting while drafting. Word counts help alleviate these issues by reducing the need to switch back and forth between formats.

We've incorporated all this feedback into the new structure. Since this is our first time using it, we'll be asking folks if they'd like to participate in our focus groups next summer to share their experiences with the new application process.

Aside from the specific application components, I want to emphasize that we are continuing to exclude formal letters of recommendation from the application. None of the reviewers from last year's competition reported that their ability to evaluate applications was diminished by the absence of these letters. This was a pointed question in our post-review survey, and no one missed them. However, they did recommend asking for brief

statements of support from community partners if a project features them. This way, they wouldn't have to extrapolate the nature of those partnerships from other materials.

As an added component this year, if your project involves extramural community partners, you'll need to provide a brief letter of support, no more than one page, double-spaced, that details the nature of the partnership.

The last point I'd like to underscore regarding the application is the institutional verification. This is not a formal letter of recommendation but rather a form that should take no more than 20 minutes to complete. This is noted in the instructions sent to the administrators who will submit this on your behalf. The form asks administrators to confirm that the grant funds will be distributed through their institution, that any activities related to the grant can be counted for tenure and promotion, and that grantees can utilize any available tech infrastructure at the institution for their projects. Essentially, it's just confirming that these elements are in place.

In our ongoing efforts to provide more resources for grant and fellowship applications, prospective applicants can still access supplementary materials from last year, including the budget template, sample application materials from the 2022 Digital Justice grantees, and recordings of last year's webinars on data ethics and capacity building. My colleague Katie will now post the link to those materials in the chat, but you can also find them on the program page for the Digital Justice Grants on the ACLS website.

The last topic for today, before we get to your questions, is the competition timeline and some important dates to keep in mind. The most obvious date is the application deadline, which is December 3rd, 2024, at 9:00 AM Eastern Standard Time. After this date and time, our online application system will no longer accept submissions, and unfortunately, we cannot allow extensions. This date is also the deadline for administrators at your institution to submit their institutional verification.

For that reason, if you decide to apply, I recommend registering in the application portal as soon as possible. This way, you can submit your administrator's email address so our portal can send them instructions on how to submit the verification form. You don't have to complete your entire application in one sitting, nor do you have to finish all the prompts at once. However, if you are planning to apply, I highly recommend sending that email and entering your administrator's information as soon as possible. As you all know, people are busy, and emails can get lost, so it might take longer than anticipated for someone to submit that form on your behalf.

Due to the increased volume of applications last year—we saw a 140% increase compared to the 2021-2022 competition—we have had to restructure our review process and add an

additional round of review. The results of the first review round will be shared in February 2025, followed by the final review results in April. My hope is that, by sending out notifications sooner, we won't have people who did not receive funding waiting for months at a time to receive their decision.

I also want to highlight the schedule for the Digital Justice fall webinar series, as there is still time to register for those that are relevant to your project. We developed this series alongside curating the supplementary materials on the ACLS website to make the hidden curriculum of grant writing more accessible. This general information session is the first of six webinars, all of which will be recorded and posted online so you can view them asynchronously or rewatch them if you attend live.

There are also office hour sessions with ACLS staff, one in late October and another right before the deadline in late November. These sessions provide an opportunity to learn more about program parameters and ask specific questions related to your project. The other three sessions feature invited interlocutors who have previously served as reviewers for the Digital Justice Grant program. These webinars focus on topics that appear in the application prompts, curated based on feedback from former reviewers and applicants about areas where they'd like more guidance.

On October 2nd, Professor Rachel K. from the University of Wisconsin-Madison and Tatiana Bryant from Barnard College will discuss best practices for articulating the "how-to" of your digital project. They will address topics like digital justice in practice, project tools and methods, deliverables, and how to talk about these elements in your application.

A few weeks later, on October 17th, Charlotte Nunes from Lafayette College and Ricardo Pelan from the University of Michigan will discuss cultivating community partnerships in digital projects. This session will focus on how to best capture and articulate your work with community partners in your application materials.

Our last webinar will feature André Buck and another interlocutor, whom I am still confirming, as they discuss operationalizing your digital project with a focus on crafting budgets, timelines, and work plans. This session was particularly requested by participants who wanted more insight into these practical, concrete aspects of the proposal.

As we did last year, each of the 90-minute sessions with our interlocutors will begin with a 30-minute recorded discussion on the topic, followed by 40-50 minutes of breakout sessions. These breakouts allow you to engage directly with the interlocutors and get targeted feedback on your application. Note that the breakout portion will not be recorded. I'll ask Katie to share the registration link for these sessions in the chat, so you have it for reference. We hope to see you there.

So now that I have spoken for quite a while about the general ethos of the Digital Justice Grant Program—why it's designed the way it is, how we try to administer it, some of its aspirational goals and visions, and some concrete aspects of it relative to the application and resources we're offering—I now want to open up the floor to questions. We will spend the next 10 or 15 minutes answering these questions before we conclude. I'll turn it over to Katie, and she'll read some of those questions. I will answer them.

One of the questions we received is: How does the administration of funds look at higher education institutions from ACLS's perspective? I ask because the school I work at takes 56% of the funds for administrative purposes. Should the budget include that?

This grant does not support indirect costs at those institutions. I have engaged in conversations with grant writers who actually appreciate this feature of the grant because it allows them to tell their institution that all of this money is for their project. You can build in funds toward salary allocations because we consider that a direct cost for the labor that goes into supporting the project. However, regarding the administrative fees that institutions take, this grant does not support those. I'd be happy to engage further over email if you need a written declaration from ACLS to pass on to the folks at your institution, but again, this grant does not support indirect costs.

You mentioned that most successful grants are submitted by a team of individuals rather than a single person. Is it possible for an individual researcher to win a grant?

It is not impossible. I'm just speaking from what has historically been funded. Part of the reason I suspect project teams are always more successful is that, with digital projects, the levels of technical and intellectual expertise required to support the project will necessitate a team. Even if you submit a project where you are the sole principal investigator (PI) and directing it, I would still expect or anticipate that the project engages a consultant or other individuals to help with some aspects of the work.

If you're framing it in that way, and it's reflected in the work plan and budget that you are bringing in other individuals—especially those with technical expertise—then that's perfectly fine. I definitely don't want to discourage individuals who are not working with a team from applying. I'm just being honest that, as you can see for yourself, the projects that are funded tend to be collaborative and team-oriented.

Another question is: Are community partners required?

No, they are not required. However, given the nature of this grant program, which is Digital Justice, and in terms of projects that must critically engage with the histories of marginalized populations, the spirit of the program demands that you have substantial

engagement with those communities. The reviewers who serve for this program really look for this engagement, with the ethos being "nothing about us without us."

Again, it is not required to have a community partner. There are certainly projects, particularly those dealing with very distant pasts, that may not have community partners. However, I believe it is not a coincidence that most of the funded projects do have those types of community partners.

Are letters from community partners able to be written in Spanish? Also, are foreign community partners allowed?

Community partners outside of the U.S. are certainly allowed, especially if that is the area your project is engaging with. Unfortunately, at this point, all submitted materials must be in English due to the reviewer pool we recruit. We want to ensure that everyone can access all of the materials, and this is across the board for all ACLS programs; we currently only accept proposals in English.

If you're serving as a co-PI with a tenure line at your home institution on a project with a graduate student, are there best practices for ensuring that the co-PI receives credit as an equal? How do we ensure that my CI's leadership is recognized?

I can only speak to that regarding how we amplify and talk about the project once it's selected as a grantee. If you go to our webpage, you'll see that all of the project teams have a diverse makeup of individuals presented. We include people directly in the community, graduate students, and doctoral fellows as part of the principal project teams.

Ensuring that the co-PI receives the same kind of visibility as the PI is something we strive to do. We are always happy to strategize and connect you with other project teams about how to best make that labor visible. There are many other projects that have successfully incorporated graduate students as core team members into their work, so we can connect you with those individuals and share strategies.

Somebody asked: Would it count as a development grant if the project has been tested or started with a community partner, and now a university partner is being brought in to publish digital work? Would that be considered a startup since new partners are involved?

When thinking about the difference between seed and development grants, at each phase of work, you're doing something new. However, with development grants, you are building on something you've already tested or done. Even if you're incorporating new partners, I would imagine that you're still operating from the knowledge or insights you've gained from a prior phase of the project's lifespan. If that is the case and you are building upon that

previous knowledge while working with a new community partner to generate new insights, I still think that counts as a development project.

Can you apply for both grants?

Yes, you can, but you cannot apply with the same project to both grants. If it would make sense for you to do so, you can certainly have two different projects and apply within the same year.

For community partner statements of support, would that be just for organizational partners? We are working with local artists and are wondering if we should have them write statements as well.

It can range. If you're working with an organizational partner, they would obviously be featured significantly in the statement of support. If you're working with individual artists, you need to consider their role in your project. There are other parts of the application where you can communicate that these individuals are involved as well.

In the project staffing section of the application, we give you space to talk about who's working on the project and what kind of work they are doing. If someone is co-creating the project and has ownership and stake in it, they should submit the statement of community support. It's essential to understand the difference between someone you're bringing in to complete tasks versus someone who is a true partner in the project. You can use different parts of the application to articulate both of those things.

Can collaborators be undergraduates paid by the project?

Yes.

Does the co-PI need to be a faculty member or on tenure track? Can it be a PhD candidate who's the main lead on the project?

As I mentioned earlier in the presentation, we do not define a scholar in the humanities as someone who has a faculty position or specific credentials. Increasingly, project teams feature two, three, or four co-PIs spread across different kinds of institutions and positions. You can certainly have a PI who is a graduate student.

Regarding the other part of your question, do they need to be on tenure track? No.

Can you participate as a co-PI in two groups of applicants for the same grant?

Yes, as long as they are different projects. Is that one of the assumptions built into that question?

Yes, the PI must be a scholar in the humanities, but the program description includes interpretive social sciences. Can you explain a bit more about what qualifies as interpretive social sciences?

Yes. If you go into the application on OFA, our online fellowships application, there is a drop-down pop-up that lists specific kinds of disciplines. For example, you could have the history of economics, history of law, and communications. These are all examples of interpretive social sciences.

However, I also want to underscore the importance of using humanistic methods, such as context-setting, critical reading, and empathetic reasoning. These aspects, in my mind, form the bedrock of humanities scholarship but can also be incorporated with social science methodologies or more quantitative-based methodologies.

If you have any concerns about whether or not you fit within the realm of interpretive social science—because I recognize that departments shift and change, and things are combined with others—it's very hard to determine where you fit based on your title or the department in which you may be housed. You can always email Digital Justice and say, "This is what my work is about. These are the kinds of methods I typically use, and these are the conversations and other subfields that my work is in conversation with. Am I a good fit? Am I still eligible to apply for this program?" We can certainly discuss this over email so that you have a clear sense of whether or not you're eligible.

I think we have time for one more question before wrapping up.

Somebody asked: Do the reviewers use scoring rubrics similar to NIH reviews? Is it possible to share those scoring items or specific scores with structured feedback so that we can address grant weaknesses more intentionally?

In last year's competition, we did use a scoring rubric based on the evaluation criteria currently listed on the website. We asked reviewers to score applications from a one, zero, or 0.5, depending on the extent to which that application met the evaluation criteria. Again, that criteria is available on the website for you to review. Reviewers used those scores as a basis for deliberation, in addition to the written comments they provided, as well as the comments that emerged from the very exhaustive deliberation process.

Unfortunately, we do not share the scores that reviewers submit, but we do share the comments that people provide while reviewing the questions. Additionally, there was a designated note-taker in each of the selection committee meetings who took extensive notes on the deliberations themselves.

Part of the reason we don't share the scores is that they serve as a useful tool for structuring discussion. Often, as reviewers delve into an application and discuss it with others, their thoughts change. This, in my mind, is the beauty of peer review: someone with expertise in a different area can provide additional insights that perhaps another reviewer didn't have, causing them to change their scores in real time. Because of that, I don't think the numerical scores accurately reflect how reviewers ultimately evaluate an application. The qualitative comments they provide are much more useful.

We have done a lot of work to package those comments to pass on to applicants. We categorize them based on strengths—these are the things that the reviewers really enjoyed about this application and want to encourage you to pursue further—and another section called "Strategies for Vision," which offers some concrete, constructive feedback that you can consider as you think about either reapplying to this program or applying to other programs.

Again, we have tried our hardest to ensure that everyone receives that feedback. Sometimes, we may not have comments for specific applications, but I believe that sharing the scores can give a misleading picture of how reviewers perceive an application. The comments provide a more holistic view.

We will continue to ensure that everyone receives those comments in a structured format during the first round of review, and again for the second round of review, making sure that people receive those comments in that particular structure.

So it is 2:55. I'm going to pause here in terms of asking any more questions. If you have questions about your specific application, please email digitaljustice@acls.org. Unfortunately, due to capacity, we cannot offer individual Zoom consultations with prospective applicants. However, if you want some more "live" FaceTime, you can always attend one of the office hours to have a conversation. Otherwise, feel free to email us.

The last thing I want to go over is this:

You can email digitaljustice@acls.org if you have additional questions. I want to thank everyone who attended today and asked their questions, which I hope will benefit the group. As I mentioned, this session will be recorded and uploaded to YouTube, so you can reference it or send it to colleagues who might have missed the session. The slides will also be posted to the Digital Justice program page, and we'll send a follow-up email directing you to that early next week.

Before you go, I want to ask a small favor. I'm a firm believer in the value of revision—not just for writing or for developing projects, but also for programs like this. It's one of the primary tenets of Digital Justice's larger idea to approach our work iteratively. We're trying

our hardest to work toward that aspirational vision of justice, but we know we will inevitably get some things wrong.

We also understand that some of the changes we want to make have a long runway because they require a lot of work. We rely on the candid feedback of our constituencies to guide that iterative process.

I want to ask my colleague Katie to post in the chat a link to a post-webinar survey. It's very short—just five questions—that hopefully give us a sense of how useful these sessions are to you. The survey asks whether you'd be open to being contacted about participating in a focus group in the summer once the competition is over. During that group, we will discuss your experiences navigating the competition and your thoughts on the application structure.

As you heard earlier, we take that feedback seriously, and it does influence changes to certain aspects of the program. This survey doesn't lock you into participating; it simply gives us a starting point for outreach once we begin inviting folks to that focus group.

Once again, I want to thank you for your time. Best of luck with your application! If you have any questions, concerns, or comments, please send them to digitaljustice@acls.org.

All right, take care, everyone!