Dr. Keyanah Nurse (00:01):

Welcome, everyone. Welcome. Good afternoon, welcome to the third webinar for the Digital Justice Grant Program Fall Webinar Series titled: Cultivating Community Partnerships in Digital Humanities. If you missed the first webinar which was a general information session about the program, its ethos, design, and application components or the second webinar about digital tools methods and deliverables we now have those recordings available on the Digital Justice program site along with transcripts as well.

So, my colleague Katie is going to pop those into the chat just in case you need that for your reference. So, welcome everyone, my name is Keyanah Nurse. I am the Senior Program Officer of IDEA programs and also Program Lead of the Digital Justice Grant Program. I'm joined by my colleague Katie Reis, Program Associate of IDEA, who's moderating one of the breakout sessions and also keeping an eye on the tech behind the scenes. So, if you're having any trouble with sound or accessing one of the breakout rooms you can chat with her directly on Zoom chat.

So, before I introduce our very esteemed interlocutors who've joined us today, I want to say a few words about the intention behind this webinar series. As I mentioned in our most recent webinar, we started this series last year as an effort to provide a forum for applicants to directly engage with former reviewers of our digital grants program so that includes Digital Justice, our sunsetting Digital Extension program, and our Digital Commission.

Not everyone you know has access to the informal information sharing networks that can really determine whether or not one writes a proposal that gets funded, so these webinars sought to unveil some of that hidden curriculum of grant writing and to provide some specific insights into different aspects of this program. But just as other parts of the program have evolved and been refined so too have these webinars. This year's webinar series has been curated based on feedback from reviewers about areas where they see the applicant pool needing more coaching and also from applicants who expressed a desire for more advisement on specific components of their application. They attended last year's sessions, those applicants, and completed our post-webinar survey so I'm grateful that we've been able to actualize some of that feedback into a session that dives more deeply into some of the concrete aspects of digital projects that our viewers for this program evaluate and I also say that to encourage you to complete the survey that we'll pass on to you at the end of the session.

So, with that said I would like to introduce our first interlocutor, Dr. Charlotte Nunes, who is the Dean of Libraries at Lafayette College in Easton, Pennsylvania. She works closely

with library staff as well as partners across campus and beyond to build capacity for community-like collections, community-engaged scholarship, uses of experimental technologies in research and teaching, and impactful co-curricular experiential and professional development opportunities for students in archives and libraries.

Our next interlocutor is Dr. Ricardo Punzalan, who is an associate professor at the School of Information and Director of Museum Studies Program at the University of Michigan and also currently co-chair of the Archival Repatriation Committee of the Society of American Archivists and on the Board of Trustees of the Library of Congress American Folk Life Center. He also co-directs ReConnect/ReCollect: Reparative Connections to Philippine Collections at the University of Michigan, a project that develops the framework for and the practice of reparative work for Philippine collections acquired by the university during the U.S. colonial period.

So, I'm really excited about the conversation that we're going to have today as well as again offering some space for them to engage with you directly about aspects of your application. So, before we get started, I just want to quickly outline our agenda, so you have a sense of what's to come over the next hour and a half. So, as I said, we'll start this session with about 30 minutes of discussion related to the topic. So, thinking through how to sustain and maintain community partnerships in digital humanities. So, that discussion has been specifically specially curated around the application prompts that ask about those relationships with community partners as well as some of the other application component such as the statement of support, the work plan, or the budget that your partners would appear in.

We'll then transition into breakout rooms with an interlocutor and an ACLS staff member in each. This will give you an opportunity again to get some feedback on how you're approaching those two prompts. The first session where we have the general discussion will be recorded again so that colleagues who can't make it or if you want to pass this resource along to others-they can still benefit from hearing this discussion. But as we transition into the breakout rooms, those will not be recorded and I would ask that everyone respect a very strong ethos of confidentiality for those conversations as people are thinking through certain dimensions of their application, whether they're going to apply this year or apply next year. I think we all sort of want to maintain a space of integrity and sort of offer up a collaborative space where people feel safe to actually think through some ideas and get some feedback.

So, once we transition out of those breakout sessions we'll then reconvene as a larger group and I'll offer some closing remarks, offer some housekeeping details about the subsequent webinar sessions that are still in the pipeline, and then also just some dates

that you should keep in mind in terms of the application deadline and the like. So, with that I'm going to stop sharing my screen so we can all see each other. All right and get started with our discussion.

So again, thank you Ricky and Charlotte for being here, for again, graciously offering your time to have this conversation with me and to frame it in a way that I think-that I hope is going to be helpful for applicants. And so, as I have been in the position of administering this program, interacting with prospective applicants, grantees, reviewers really try to break down these questions into three areas. So, ethics, relationship building, and also project design with respect to how folks are thinking about their community partners and also how they talk about them in their applications.

So, the first question that I want to ask, and this comes from a question that we get a lot from prospective applicants is: Do all digital justice projects need to feature community partners? Is there a way to design and execute an ethically sound digital justice project that doesn't feature any extra-external community partners?

Dr. Charlotte Nunes (07:15):

Ricky, do you want to start?

Dr. Ricardo Punzalan (07:17):

Sure, I can. I can start. I'll say well the first mantra that I have, that I'm pretty sure people on this webinar are aware of is: Nothing about us, without us, right? So, it's really important that you know you abide by this before you start. So that said, I will say sometimes there's you know there will be projects that I think would emanate from you know like an effort by the community for the community. So, in that sense it's not really partnership, this is an effort by the community, right? So, I guess, you know, my framing is more like you still have to you know define for yourselves and your project what partnership really means and what collaboration really means.

But the thing for me is when I'm let's say presented a project or doing a project myself you know like the community partnership changes when it's from the community, meaning it could be like youth within the community, or you know elders in the community. Elders and the youth in the community and things like that because you know we're doing this together, so partnership becomes within the community and members of the community and those who are outside of that community but primarily you know working with. So, to me it's absolutely necessary that you define that relationship and partnership and sometimes it means it's doing it as a community, you know, where there's no real need for external partnership but because it's initiated by the community so that's my perspective

to me there's no escape you have to work from the vantage point of community relationship.

Dr. Charlotte Nunes (09:21):

Yeah, I would agree and build on that a little bit. I really like your point, Ricky, about really defining what partnership means in the context of a given project and you know my relevant background. I think for this conversation has to do with facilitating kind of like channeling campus resources towards community-led, you know, beyond campus community-led collection building and sort of building and facilitating mutually, you know, reciprocal relationships between campus partners and community partners that are really meaningful and impactful for everybody involved and that takes a lot of getting around the table and talking with each- they're just sort of creating a space for those conversations. Talk about what the various kind of hopes, expectations, stakeholder responsibilities, etc., are and just having a lot of time and space for those types of conversations.

That said, I think also anecdotally I would say a lot of the community-led collections projects that I have been party to or involved in in any way, there's such a desire for engagement they really want to see audiences, all kinds of different audiences engaging with those materials. So, they have put a lot of effort, time, and resources into building a collection of primary sources pertaining to a certain history to sort of see engagement with those resources. I think is incredibly meaningful and impactful and I think there's a real potential for this grant program to do interesting things with collections that have already been built where the content is there and then it's about engaging with it using experimental technologies or, you know, other maybe kind of like new innovative ways of engaging with collection content.

So that's one way I look at that question and then I also think a lot, Ricky and Keyanah and I talked about this a little bit in a prep call about looking at an institution's own history and what, you know, sort of communities within that institutional history might be kind of resonant and relevant for a grant project like this. So, I think that that's also a really kind of fruitful line. So, I think you know there are ways to think about some sort of external community partnerships and then maybe a little bit more internal community partnerships all of which could fall under the umbrella of this program in really productive ways.

Dr. Keyanah Nurse (11:45):

Yeah, I love that thread. Particularly, of again sort of defining specifically what the nature of the partnership looks like and then also sort of thinking about the complexities of engaging with communities outside of institutions of higher education and again and, you know, I think that part of doing that work is a sort of reparative process and we'll get to that

discussion a little bit later. And then also thinking about how communities exist within, you know, institutions of higher education and how they fit within a project. And so, you know, from both of your perspectives as you've been familiar with the program and sort of seeing how a lot of these projects do feature community partners and as I've said before it's not a coincidence that they do given the thematic focus on, you know, marginalized communities in their histories.

If projects do feature community partners what are one to two signs that the project, the project team, has built sort of an ethical partnership, you know, as you either assess applications or even as you're thinking about your own work? Like, what are some characteristics of those relationships that I think people can latch on to as green flags?

Dr. Charlotte Nunes (12:55):

I can say that I often will go straight to the budget because I think that that is very revealing of-you can learn a lot from how the budget is set up for a project. About whether there are higher, you know, whether there's kind of an ethos of equity, right? And sort of like fairness and compensation across all partners on a project both on campus and beyond. Or if there's a little bit more of a power dynamic of a higher sort of sense of hierarchy, right? I think that can come across really strongly in a budget so I find myself when I've done review work with ACLS, checking out the budget kind of first and then looking at the grant narrative again seeing, you know, kind of how those things-how those things bear out and then that's a- I like that kind of red flag, green flag framework that you use because there it can be subtle, right? And, I'm trying to think, maybe Ricky you could say a few words and maybe that'll kind of get me thinking a little bit but it's one of those things you sort of know it when you see it when you're like, 'Oh yeah, this is a good.' You reciprocally productive-like clearly the groundwork has been laid here. There's a conversation happening here that where that is and that is an inclusive conversation, that's a multifaceted conversation. That's accounting for nuance and complexity, so I'm trying to think about how to sort of put that in a nutshell in this conversation but Ricky maybe you could say a few words and maybe I can circle back.

Dr. Ricardo Punzalan (14:23):

Yeah, for me I would say yeah, I agree with you that there are subtle things, right? The first one being in a reciprocal relationship or a project like this yeah you look at the budget. You also look at, you know, positionality, like who's driving the project and who are, you know, involved and how people are compensated, right? So to me you know the sharing of resources is big, you know, like I see we don't do this-much of this anymore but before it used to be when you say I'm working with, let's say, tribal or indigenous communities and

then they are my respondents and consultants but they're not paid and there's no equivalent in terms of generosity around, you know, like in many communities, gift giving is big and I don't see in the budget that you have like a portion for gift giving I'll just start saying well how are you compensating, you know, your community partners for their time.

So, second for me is like lack of like a kind of acknowledgement of the power dynamic that happens because in a reciprocal relationship the, you know, power is still present and it flows back and forth, you know, how are you sharing that power and to me it's just like it's something that I look for like that kind of recognition that there's a power dynamic in here and this is this is how we are correcting some of the, you know, like imbalance and it is often the case I think that research is not what the community needs. So I'm also looking for some aspect where it's not always driven by your research question you know like it's you know a lot of scholars will begin by, you know, we have, you know, a significant gap in this research and by partnering with the community I will answer this research and it's all about research and I always say, you know, what if research is not the intervention that's needed by the community so how are you accounting for that? Did you come up with this research question or something, you know, like the project that you're doing with the community did you work together to, you know, answer this question or to begin with because, you know, to me that positionality and that power dynamic - especially a lot of the work is driven by people based in academic institutions I think is very crucial. So, I look for those clues.

Dr. Charlotte Nunes (17:08):

Yeah, I really like how you put that, and I would add a little like sort of build on that a little bit. That's exactly right, I mean, I think that that's what reci-ideally that's what reciprocity looks like in these processes where the there is a very clear community need, like there's a desire to kind of document or narrate that aligns with the research goals of the campus partner, research, teacher, you know, whatever the sort of like academic mission goals are. I think that the most successful projects those things are brought together in really nice alignment and they're just-there's an ease to the alignment, you know. It's-it truly is a productive, you know, productive prospect for all parties involved and it's meeting the needs of all parties involved.

Dr. Keyanah Nurse (17:54):

Yeah, I love that! And I want to skip around a little bit in terms of the order of the questions because of where we've landed in terms of thinking about like the budget or the extent to which the community partners are sort of leading or framing the line of inquiry. Which leads me to ask about other components of the application where you would assess that

relationship. So, as you know we have now a sort of brief statement of community support that if folks do have extramural community partners that we ask them to provide that letter of support. So someone from the community writes that letter to give us a different perspective of what that relationship looks like and so I'm wondering like as you think about some of the other components of the application again that kind of red flag/green flag what are like different types of information that you could convey with those other components?

That's a question that I wanted to pose and then just also add as someone who is kind of like a fly on the wall with the deliberations and then also reads applications sometimes and then managing grants after they're awarded- the question of time appears consistently in terms of working with community partners because the way that we think about working the academy through semesters like doesn't really align to the cadence of work with the community partners that you operate or that you work with. So just also thinking about that in terms of like how you develop a work plan? So I wanted to offer that as a kind of fly on-the-wall perspective from a Program Officer but again to this question of different components of the application what kinds of things would you say are red flags/green flags that you would assess in terms of how people are talking about or articulating their relationship.

Dr. Ricardo Punzalan (19:40):

So, for me most of the projects that I see is, you know, out there creating something like a like a digital tool or you know something that you're creating and co-creating right and so sometimes you know I sit back and think about whether, you know, the project has considered that indeed this tool is the answer or you know that it's elevating certain - whether it's elevating certain narratives that's not there. But you know who will be the audience and how will this carry forward for the community because I just think that, you know, maybe it'll be more tangible if I give examples, right? For instance, you know, let's say you're saying oh we have an Indigenous collection like close to my heart in the Philippines that we need to, you know, share to community members and we heard that there's a community buy in and things like that and then we will create this magnificent you know website that features this this and this and this right, you know. Then I will ask about like practical logistics like, okay I want to know like whether you know there's broadband in that community that's reliable, whether they will-people will actively interact, will teachers use them in the classroom, you know, you know, all those like, you know, deep knowledge of the realities, you know, like that audiences and the communities you're serving because you know like not all institutes - not all communities will have the same robust digital infrastructure like we do, you know, so to me I begin to wonder if it's like I know that in that

space, electricity is only 12 hours a day, like in an entire university there's only probably five computers, you know, in that space.

Like, how are you - how is this the answer right so I'm not saying that we should avoid digital projects because you know that's the point right? But have you considered other things, you know, like that's just outside of this conversation normally and this is where like I look for that in in a narrative right, you know, I look for that kind of awareness because for me sometimes, you know, if you cannot articulate that maybe you should invest more towards relationship building and community work or maybe that should be reflected in the budget. But by saying, you know, in this place though there's let's say the cell phone is what people use so we're designing something that's, you know, more useful in a cell phone so don't judge this based on- and, you know, like so the design and, you know, like consideration of many other facets to, you know, what it means to provide access and, you know, and that could only be developed by co-designing the project with community members so I'm looking for those, you know, like those symmetry and alignment and then consideration.

Dr. Keyanah Nurse (23:14):

Yeah, I think that's - I just want to jump in and say that's like really wonderful insight for how to approach the specific question that we are asking about like capacity building and about what the general infrastructure ecosystem you exist in. What does that look like and how are the grant funds going to sort of complement that? Because again it's not sort of meant to put pressure on folks to say like with $25,000 I'm going to solve all of these problems but again it does like you said it gives you as a reviewer more context around like the ecosystem whether that be within your institution but also the ecosystem that your community partners are existing in and the interaction between the two so that when folks are reading the materials they have like a concrete sense of that. Charlotte, sorry to jump in front of you but I just wanted to connect that to the specific part of the application.

Dr. Charlotte Nunes (24:07):

Always jump in front of me, I welcome it. Yes the, you know, your turn of phrase like carrying it for- but like carrying the work forward I feel like that relates a lot to something I'm always looking for in these proposals which is a really strong kind of digital infrastructure statement that could be partly work plan, you know, could emerge in other elements but I think demonstrating that there has been some thought exploration, discussion around what the sustainability plan is for a project is really critical. And it doesn't necessarily mean, you know, when I say sustainability, it doesn't necessarily mean it needs to be a digital project that's going to live forever. I think that's never the expectation, it's not

realistic but I think to sort of show that there has, you know, sort of what the work what the plan is, what the hope is and then, you know, working backwards from that.

Like, who have you partnered with on your campus or, you know, what kind of resources relationships do you have in place? Is there a line of communication with the library? Is, you know, the looking for those signs that there has been some careful thinking and groundwork laid to sustain a project and that there are not a lot of assumptions being made about oh the digital scholarship folks will help us or oh the librarians will help us or, you know, it's, you know, with the lens that I bring to review these proposals. I'm always looking out for that because I'm a librarian so I'm sensitive to it how people can kind of get pulled in on things that - where they weren't kind of part of the project proposal process so I think being really reflective about any kind of- under any kind of assumptions that you or others on the project might be making about resources that will - would need to be in place in order to make the project successful is important.

Dr. Keyanah Nurse (25:57):

Yeah, I think that a- that's also a helpful reminder for- if folks are interested, we did two webinars last year about this question of capacity building and sort of the different kinds of considerations that one can begin to think about as they assess their own institutional landscape and what's available to them and what kinds of questions to ask folks in their libraries or, you know, what kinds of resources to look out for. So that those webinars from last year, the recordings of them are still on the digital justice site for folks who are interested in checking that out.

I do want to sort of circle back to how we initially opened this conversation in terms of thinking about sort of community partnership and scoping out the specific contours of that because again it's very different to sort of engage in the work of building a relationship with a community that exists outside of an institution of higher education versus one that exists within it and obviously there's- there can be some overlap depending on the positionalities and the identities of those communities but I do think that, you know, given how higher education institutions have functioned historically like we do have to grapple with that history of extractive knowledge practices and then in some cases physical displacement and position and dispossession and so I'm wondering from both of your perspectives, you know, because digital justice as a program and as a whole tries to support projects that have some kind of restorative outcome: How would you sort of advise folks to think about the importance of repair or the role of repair as they're going about relationship building and relationship maintenance with their community partners?

Yeah, and I think that this is an especially important sort of topic for this grant because even as scholars if you have like a particularly marginalized identity in those moments, you still kind of function as an avatar for your institution. So having to like navigate what that looks like and take on that work of repair. Any thoughts you could offer on that would be?

Dr. Charlotte Nunes (28:10):

Great. I can start or you could Ricky either way. Okay, I'll go ahead. Yeah, I think coming at things in a spirit of inquiry is extremely important so, you know, having an understanding about what and yeah, it's hard to talk about these things in the abstract. I do feel like examples are good sort of so I'm thinking about one digital collection building project that I worked on with the Easton chapter of the NAACP and this is a very long standing, you know, this chapter has got deep history in Easton- Easton, PA. This is where Lafayette college is located and I think there have been various interactions, good and bad, with the college - Lafayette College, where I work over the course of many decades, you know, as is, you know, I think that's a common story. And so, I think it was really important to me in the beginning of that project to kind of understand like how do you see the college and like what can I do for you. Like as a - as you say, like an avatar of the college like what would you like to see out of this partnership? Like what - it would be useful for your chapter, you know kind of history- what would you be looking to get out of a partnership with the college? Kind of really starting with those questions as opposed to coming in being like, 'Hey, we're we got this really great group of faculty and students, and they want to do X, Y, and Z thing. What do you think? Want to get on board with that?' You know, it's just sort of flipping that a little bit and really starting with a lot of careful and considerate questions that are attuned to blind spots you may have about how you know certain individuals you're talking about might feel about the institution that they see you aligned with.

Dr. Ricardo Punzalan (30:00):

Yeah, so I would begin by, you know, I kind of got focused on the word repair. Like, you know, in our line of work what are we really repairing? You know, typically if you're in the library, archives, museum profession you will say oh I'm fixing the metadata, you know, that's why I'm doing reparative description. I would say yeah but, you know, what's the larger goal why is this, you know, why do you want to? Because you know our metadata is offensive and they contain, you know, racial language that's going to discourage community members from using because it's racist, right? So, to me then therefore what you're repairing is the harm that, you know, these metadata schema that you're using or the way you present the materials - so again you know like ask yourselves that question: What am I trying to repair?

Most of the time it's not really the object that you're repairing, it's the relationship, right? So when the relationship is not there how are you building the relationship and how is this project going to build that? Will, you know, it will, you know, like to me a digital project should begin and end in better relationships that's the bottom line for me. So, in your starting point how are you starting with relationship? How is this project or a digital product or whatever you're trying to do going to further that relationship and then better relationship that will end out of this. So to me the repair is always been these relationships that's broken the trust that's not there or, you know, if it's an existing relationship making it better right and by doing this project together or producing some- something tangible out of the project then that produces that so yeah like asking the larger question of what are we repairing?

And often to me it's a question of relationship between commun- different communities or relationship between your institution and communities, the collection and the communities that the collection represents or, you know, stories that are not otherwise collected but otherwise would be, you know, or lost if we don't do this project and will be collected and then producing those connections that otherwise will never exist and your project is enhancing those connections or creating those connections, you know, so for me it's so easy for all of us to, you know, imagine what we're repairing. Just like in a road is - like I'm repairing the potholes but actually most of the time we're repairing the potholes because we don't want - we want the - our drivers to be safe we want - we want to get to our destination - we want people not annoyed whenever they drive like, you know, community well-being and things like that. So, for me the object of repair while you are, you know, you might zero in on like I want to put asphalt in that pothole it's actually those other things that are driven towards, you know, the destination of community well-being.

Dr. Keyanah Nurse (33:40):

That is a really, really amazing metaphor because it, I think, it helps me articulate something that again as a fly on the wall I sometimes see with applications that come in where the claims that the project advances equity and justice are actually simply supported by the creation of something that doesn't exist or documenting a history that's been ignored. And to me that is not quite enough, right? Because it doesn't really take fully into like considering the context of why those things are missing in the first place, why having those things would matter to the people that the objects are about, or the tools are about in the first place. And so really moving away from this idea that like I'm doing a justice oriented project simply because like black people are at the center of it and beginning to ask those further questions of like, I have developed a project that in

collaboration with this community because of particular reasons that they've articulated to me that they're going to get to a place of repair.

And I think that that's a really important sort of centralizing sort of theme of this program that we try to aspire to as well so thank you for offering that metaphor. I'm gonna- I'm going to use it, but I will cite you. So relatedly again I think in terms of thinking about the importance of context in our last session on digital tools and methods and deliverables, we had a little bit of a discussion around how the very selection of the particular tools or methods that are at the center of your project should be thought about in consideration with the community partners that you're working with precisely as we think about, you know, one avenue of this question of accessibility. Like even if you're trying to make something that is open source and that is easily accessible if you have to save most of it on like a university server that your community partners don't have access to as you're developing the project, you know, having those considerations of how different tools and methods can mediate your relationship as something to think about and so what are again one or two considerations that applicants should consider with respect to how those specific digital tools or methods can inform or even mediate you know the relationship that they have with their with their extra communal community partners?

Dr. Ricardo Punzalan (36:23):

I'd say, you know, let's keep in mind that most of the time universities, even public libraries, and many centers where we have - where collections are housed or kept and in including academics leading, you know, the charge in some of these digital projects a lot of them are heavily focused on, you know, the - in the first place, materials were there or created - collected because of some kind of academic reason, right? Like let's say papers of an anthropologist yeah like, you know, this person did field research or let's say you know papers of someone that ended up in an archive that's an academic, you know, unit many of the things are already framed from a particular disciplinary standpoint and already coming to communities with that particular interest, right? Like very academic so I would say you know to answer this question is like, you know, you moving away from, you know, or engaging the communities based on like number one the assumption that you know community members are scholars in their own right that they have expertise right?

And, you know, I've seen projects in the past that's very I would say very driven by the scholarship of the people who created a project. Like let's say linguistic collection that's been created by linguists but nevertheless very essential and key in language revitalization, right? But if you look at the materials they're very - they were created and could only be sometimes read by linguists because you need to have that expertise, subject expertise, right? But it's necessary for language revitalization and for community building and cultural

work in community so, you know, like have understanding that nuance that the content and the collection the creation is very academic, right? But it's useful to communities how - what are the structures or procedures in place that will allow that translation to happen right?

Because I don't believe that if we digitize everything and we create a website, everybody will just download them as if they are legible to the community. So there has to be that intervention in between, but at the same time, you know, recognizing that communities need to be in that conversation because, you know, what I've seen many projects where community members are also interested in the science that created the record or let's say the, you know, the question that's driven the researcher or whoever created those materials that you have and then you know like in including them in those, you know, academic and conversations. Because, you know, like in my experience it only just enhanced the academic work that I'm doing like, you know, like recognizing that there's a lot of intellectual contribution so that- that's one thing that I would say, you know, like it's very important to me.

It's just like, you know, recognition that I'm already coming from a position of like an academic work, you know, already much of my work is predefined by the discipline that I carry that I'm embedded in, so the question I ask myself is that okay working with the community and then I explain this consciousness, the bias, the academic bias that's already embedded in the whole system like that I'm swimming in. I'll ask like so what are your interest in this? What kind of translation that needs to be done for this to be useful beyond academia, you know, so that it's more - the impact is more towards the community, you know, while recognizing that community members are also deeply interested in the science or the discipline that created these materials that we have and that they have a particular say on how those knowledge is distributed or not, right?

Like what areas of knowledge in here that you feel like we won't share that to the rest of the world because this is for us this is for the community but there are certain things that you know we can share right? Like I'm using some examples here or at least in my head from you know like more Indigenous and Native American experience, right? Like there's certain knowledge are not meant to be shared and not meant to be given to academia but remain in the community so those delicate negotiation is I think very important and then I will see it, you know, in the tools or the methods that you present right that that you have this keen awareness of, you know, a kind of respect for community knowledge and community's perspective on who gets to use and benefit from that knowledge by looking at- again going back to the first question around reciprocity and, you know, real partnership with communities.

So I think, you know, I think sometimes, you know, we make these false narratives in our heads that will say well you know that's going to be impediment to knowledge production and the seeking actually if you do this community based work long enough you will realize that it's not. We've just been conditioned to say, well you know I cannot create a project that will only benefit some people. Actually, we do this all the time in our lives- that we don't share everything why can't it be true for the academic products or tools that that we create?

Dr. Charlotte Nunes (43:41):

I think the strongest project you- the ones that have sort of stayed with me the proposals that I read there was a real um- Keyanah, you kind of got it a little bit in your comments a moment ago. There was kind of- there was the technology itself like the digital component, the digital element was saying something about the project, you know, there was some, you know, there was some way to kind of understand a sort of an additional depth or layer to the meaning of the project by the tool or the platform or, you know, whatever the sort of experimental technology, digital kind of piece what that- the kind of role of that was in the project and I think really sort of giving some thought to how is the digital piece of this enhancing engagement enhancing access of those because I think that in many cases that's kind of the highest and best use of the technology is that it is in its enhancing engagement with really important content.

So I think a little bit of critical reflection on how the technology is enhancing engagement enhancing and not just in making stuff available via a website but like actually sort of thinking about the kind of structures of the technology and how they're interacting with the content and I like what you're saying, Ricky - I - about actually, you know, ensuring that all partners on the project are part of that conversation about the technology because that's a relevant, you know, if these are digital justice grants the technology is a big piece of them and I think the more kind of perspective you can get from all - all stakeholders in a given project on the technology that's being proposed the better. Because I think they're, you know, a - different stakeholders are going to bring a different kind of perspective on the value of the technology and what their hopes and expectations are from it and I think kind of documenting and narrating some of that can be really powerful in the space of a proposal.

Dr. Keyanah Nurse (45:50):

Yeah, I think the last thing I'll say before we head into the breakout sessions is that, you know, to that end of having these conversations where people not only share, you know, their concerns or thoughts or ideas about the central line of inquiry and having that be a

driving force but also the tech that you use to get to the answers to those questions is incredibly important because again it shows up in things like the work plan, because you could read something and say this is a great idea but there's no way you could do this in 6 months or 12 months or 18 months. And it becomes very apparent that again this sort of different sense of time like how the university- how we operate according to university logics of time versus outside of that, you know, clashing within these parts of the application that get into more of the concrete nuts and bolts of that. So, I just again wanted to flag that for folks. I think obviously it's very important to work on your proposal narrative or the prompts rather but really do think about those other components: the timeline, the budget, the work plan because in my mind shows how you are actualizing those aspirational visions of justice right? How you're like literally going about doing that work and again we will have another webinar that is called Operationalizing Digital Justice that gets into those more concrete components but as you can see they've come up in this conversation, they came up in the last webinar so just wanted to flag that for people.

So, I'm going to stop recording. All right, so again I always hope that these sessions are useful for folks. As we close out just want to remind people about some concrete deadlines and dates that you should have on your radar. The deadline for applications is December 3rd, we can't offer any extensions unfortunately and again this is also the date where the administrator that you have listed as the one to be submitting the institutional verification has to submit that form. Once we receive all of the applications we'll have a first round of review. Again because of the exploded amount of applications that we got last year so now we have two rounds but we will let people know about the status of your application in February '25, whether or not it's been selected to go on to the next round or not and that will also include feedback on your application and then finally decisions around which applications have been funded will be released in April of 2025.

So in terms of the following webinar series if you have any further questions about the program whether or not your application or your project is eligible if it's a good fit if you're struggling through some of the application prompts and you just want a thought partner to think through some of these things, there'll be an office hour on October 29th. ACLS staff is me and Katie, so we will be there. It is a lot more informal than this setup so you can come in, ask your question, get some feedback, and then pop out, or you can stick around if you're interested in just hearing what other things people are working through.

On November 14th, we will again, as I said, have that session on Operationalizing DH projects. So again, digging into these more concrete elements of the project of how to go about doing the work. So how to craft a budget, thinking about timeline, thinking about

work plans, and then there'll be a final round of office hours on November 22nd so right before the Thanksgiving holiday as people are sort of thinking about hitting submit or not.

So, I want to thank Charlotte and Ricky for sort of giving us their time, their expertise, engaging in conversation, crafting this conversation with me. I'm so appreciative of the work that they do, how they exist, their enthusiasm for the program. Peer review can be a little bit of a slog but I'm trying to make that an enjoyable experience and working with them has certainly been a part of that, so I just want to, you know, give them an applause and thank them. And then the last note I'll say is that again all of this work, this sort of work of digital justice is aspirational, you know, even the very certain elements of the design, of the program, we're actively working on to lower the barriers, right? So that more people can engage in this work but in order to do that we need feedback from people.

So, I'm going to ask my colleague Katie to pop into the chat, just a post-webinar survey that's five questions just to get your take on whether or not this session was helpful. But it's also a space for you to sort of recommend different types of topics that you would want to see in subsequent competitions for this webinar series. So, as I mentioned, all of these topics that we have this year came out of the feedback that we got from the survey from last year, so we really do take those recommendations seriously. So, enjoy the rest of your afternoon and good luck with your applications if you have any further questions, please feel free to email: digitaljustice@acls.org and we will get back to you as soon as possible. Right, take care everyone.