

Keyanah Nurse ([00:08](#)):

Hello everyone. Good afternoon. My apologies about the tech beforehand, but we wanted to give people just a few moments to be able to file in. My name is Keana Nurse, I'm the program officer of IDEA Programs, which is a very new unit at A C L ss, which stands for Intentional Design for an Equitable Academy. I'm joined by my colleague Katie Rice, whose program associate of IDEA Programs who will be managing the tech behind the scenes. My remit within IDEA programs includes working with emerging scholars and academic society directors in the Intention Foundry with folks in academic administration and our leadership institute for a new academy, and finally in supporting the librarians, archivists, publishers, and scholars who comprise our digital commission for fostering and sustainable scholarship. But I'm also the program lead for this program, the Digital Justice program, and I'm very happy to be with all of you who have registered to hear some information today about some of the big picture aspects of the program, including its core mission and values, as well as hearing some of the nitty gritty details such as application components and eligibility requirements. So this session will be recorded and we're recording it so that people with scheduling conflicts or perhaps even other members of your team who can join us today, are able to access this at another time.

Keyanah Nurse ([01:40](#)):

So, as I mentioned, today's session encompasses a mix of discussion about the ethos of the Digital Justice Grants program and what we mean at A C L S when we invoke that term, but also explaining some of the finer details of the competition. So we'll start by defining the term digital justice and explain how it manifests in this program. After that, I'll then explain some of the key details about eligibility, particularly the difference between seed and development grants. Then give an overview of the application components, highlight some dates on the competition timeline, and then hopefully leave some time at the end for Q and a. Given the volume of participants that we have today, we will use Zoom's q and a feature, which my colleague Katie will be monitoring. So please post your questions there throughout the session and be sure to upvote the questions that you would like to see answered.

Keyanah Nurse ([02:43](#)):

Obviously, we won't have time to get to everyone's individual inquiries, but I do hope that I can answer questions that many people have in. So let's begin with what I like to call the deceptively simple question of what is the Digital Justice Grants program, and more importantly, what does digital justice mean at A C L ss, as I'm sure you've all read plenty times over by now, the Digital Justice Grant program supports projects that pursue the following four activities. First projects that engage with the histories and interests of people of color and other historically marginalized communities. We have selected some select groups on our site. We've highlighted those, but please note that that list is not exhaustive. Two, we support projects that if you receive project projects that experiment with new materials, prototype new tools, asking questions, right? And for development projects, those projects who have advanced beyond the prototyping phase and can articulate their next phases of development, we support projects that also cultivate a greater openness to new sources of knowledge and strategic approaches to content building and knowledge dissemination. And finally, and this is the newest edition, we're supporting projects that engage in some form of capacity building that is appropriate for both the scale of the project and also for the institutional or organizational context in which it lives.

Keyanah Nurse ([04:25](#)):

But I wanna spend just a few minutes talking about why, you know, we've structured and designed the program in this way so that you have a better sense of the ethos that will ultimately guide the

evaluation process. It goes without saying that all grants and fellowship competitions engage in the work of field building, that's their purpose. And the projects and scholars, those competitions devote resources to signal the priorities of that program. For the Digital Justice grant program, we intentionally support projects that engage with or center historically marginalized communities, both in method of practice and in the knowledge produced because those areas have been historically underfunded. And to address that underfunding the very structure of the program. And here I'm referring to the bifurcation between seed and development grants that's intended to further redistribute what we like to think of as the privilege of experimentation and risk taking, redistributing that to those who have had to do that work with far fewer resources in the past.

Keyanah Nurse ([05:33](#)):

Right? Innovation and advancements in scholarly fields, especially in digital humanities, happen precisely through that experimentation and that risk taking. And these are two activities that we see as fundamental, even if they're not properly recognized, you know, in the demand for return on investment, especially within the genre of grant writing. So in this way, our practice of digital justice is one that really starts with the historical inequities that have made this redistribution necessary in the first place. So when we invoke the term digital justice, at least at A C L S, at least, we are talking about process as much as we are talking about outcome. You know, we're talking about the recognition of context and its historicity, how it has created this uneven landscape between different types of fields and distributed more resources and less resources across institutions. We're talking about the intentionality of the resources that we design and how we sort of create and craft our programs. We're talking about the redistributive methods, and we're also talking about the potentially reparative outcomes that we hope come outta a program like this.

Keyanah Nurse ([06:47](#)):

And this is also why we have added the dimension of capacity building to this new iteration of the program. And by that I simply mean that we're thinking about the conditions, whether those be institutional, financial, technological related to personnel that allow you to do your work. Now, we don't expect applicants to articulate, you know, how their projects will solve all the problems at their respective institutions, or you know, how their new project is going to eventually become the seeds for an entirely new digital humanity center at their university or at their college. We wanna be attentive to and respectful of scale here and realistic about scale as well. It's rather our hope that the prompts around capacity building can give our reviewers a more granular understanding of the context within which applicants pursue their work, so that we can then better funnel resources where they have the potential to do the most good. And by most good, I mean bolstering the capacity for pursuing digital scholarship in the us.

Keyanah Nurse ([07:58](#)):

So this thread of capacity building, I'll also quickly note, emerges from our commission on fostering and sustaining diverse digital scholarship throughout fall of 2022 and winter of 2023. A C L S S convened a variety of focus groups of different constituencies throughout the realm of digital humanities in the commission's focus groups featuring former and current dt, which is the digital extension program, um, that has been somewhat sunsetted at A C L S S and Digital Justice grantees. These participants in those focus groups noted that project teams are actually well positioned to articulate what capacity building could look like within the specificity of their institutions. And this insight pushed us to consider what a prompt around capacity building might look like, and one that respected the diversity and specificity of institutions, and that didn't encourage a kind of philanthropic paternalism where A C L S decides what

capacity building looks like for each project. We neither have the expertise nor the desire to do that kind of work, and are really relying on project teams through their application materials to sort of lay out the land that they're working. So that way we can pass that information onto our reviewers.

Keyanah Nurse ([09:16](#)):

And here's a, a quick sort of snapshot of all our, our commissioners. So now that I've spoken a little bit about the big picture of the program, I'll transition into reviewing some of the concrete details of the application that might be helpful as you craft your materials. So the first detail is, you know, of course, determining whether or not your project is eligible for consideration in the first place. And there are a couple of requirements that I'm gonna go through and give an overview of and also explain the thinking behind. So the first eligibility requirement is that the principal investigator must be a scholar in the humanities. Now, during the pilot year of digital justice, we received a lot of inquiries about what we meant by this, particularly whether or not we were limiting our definition of scholar to those with PhDs or those with faculty appointments.

Keyanah Nurse ([10:15](#)):

We are not given the very collaborative nature of digital work, and especially, you know, the extent to which librarians are often at the center of some of these projects and the ways in which graduate students partner with faculty members. I wanna make clear that our definition of a scholar for this program is someone with a demonstrated track record of engagement in scholarly debates and communities, whether that be by publications, conference presentations, or collaborations with other scholars both in and outside their fields. It's not limited to professional title and title, it's not limited to credential. The second eligibility requirement is about the extent to which project teams agree to make their content publicly accessible. Now, this used to be in the form of the intellectual property agreement, which was an application component, and we have since folded that into the eligibility requirement to pair down the application packets for our reviewers.

Keyanah Nurse ([11:20](#)):

But I also wanna flag a, a key phrase here, which is that the project teams agreed to the most liberal, open source and creative common license that is appropriate for the underlying content. So that the phrase that is italicized appropriate for the underlying content is what I wanna lift up here. We're in the process of developing much more culturally sensitive and updated guidelines here. Ones that take into account that not all materials can or should be widely accessible, especially when they belong to communities who have historically been subject to plunder and are currently subject to various kinds of harassment, both online and off for now, however, we are deferring to project teams and encouraging them to articulate to us in their dissemination plans, in their proposals, you know, how people will be able to access their content, which parts of the project will be publicly accessible, if there will be parts that won't be. Why is that the case?

Keyanah Nurse ([12:20](#)):

And the final eligibility requirement that I like to review now is that an institution of higher education in the US must administer the awarded grant funds. So in the pilot year, we required that these institutions needed to host the proposed projects, but it's not actually the case that we required institutions to provide the servers on which the content lives, right? You can certainly use those if you have easy access to them at your institution, but digital ownership doesn't need to belong to your institution. We've since changed the language here to reflect a financial relationship, which is really what we were getting at,

that a larger institution has to administer the grant funds. Now, if you're not formally affiliated with an institution, I recommend partnering with someone who is, and after all, in many cases, the strongest application always feature a project team rather than individual scholars.

Keyanah Nurse ([13:20](#)):

But I would also like to flag that this stipulation is something we are working towards changing and in conversation with our larger funder Mellon about changing it. You know, a C L S does have a precedent of distributing award funds directly to scholars through our central fellowship. And I have discussed with my colleagues what kinds of financial processes we already have in place that would give us more flexibility with funding, distribution models, models, there's some additional complexity that comes with distributing funds to project teams rather than just to an individual scholar that we're still working through. And we'll spend much of this year sort of thinking through what that would look like. But I did wanna flag that it's very much on our radar.

Keyanah Nurse ([14:08](#)):

The three eligibility requirements that I just described apply to both seed and development grants. But there is one requirement between the two that varies, and that's about assessing what phase of development your project is in. Seed grants, as the name implies, are for startup projects that are in the prototyping or proof of concept base. And by contrast, development grants are, they fund projects that demonstrate evidence of significant preliminary work as well as a record of engagement with public and or scholarly audiences. Now, given that distinction, you may be wondering, as many people ask during the pilot competition, well, which grant should I apply for? Should I apply for a seed grant or should I apply for a development grant?

Keyanah Nurse ([15:01](#)):

We have here some very basic, uh, but by no means exhaustive or prescriptive considerations that may help you determine which of the grants is the best fit for your project. So in terms of technology, for example, you can ask yourself about the extent to which your project has already tested the software, hardware, or any other digital project products featured in the project. If you have not, and this is your first go at it, that's a good indication that you should apply for a seed grant. If you've already done some of that testing. And you also have a clear rationale behind why you're using a specific tool or platform, that may be an indication that a development grant is a better fit. The same principle applies to the human relationships and partnerships necessary to carry out this work both on your campus or off of it.

Keyanah Nurse ([15:57](#)):

If you have identified those partnerships, what work have you all already done together towards advancing the project? And finally, you can consider the project's history with engaging public and or scholarly audiences. If you can cite and describe any publication, exhibits, events, websites, apps, or anything of the sort that has connected your project with an audience, that is a good indication that you should apply for a development grant. Largely because, and I'll get to this in a moment, there's a section in the proposal narrative that prompts you to talk about those activities anyway. So if it's easy for you to write about that, that's a good indication that you should be applying for development grant. And if you're struggling writing that section, that might be a good indication that you should apply for a C for that.

Keyanah Nurse ([16:51](#)):

So although we framed the answers to these questions of the binary sort of yes, no, I wanna recognize that most of these answers will exist on a spectrum, and you'll have to use your own discernment about where on that spectrum, the nuances and history of your project live. But of course, if you have any doubts about that, you can always feel free to reach out to us and send us an email and we can provide some feedback. But in the service of that, I'm also now going to give two concrete examples of seed grants and two examples of development grants, which you can find on the A C L S site in order to demonstrate the differences between the two. But also to sort of present the diversity of activities that go into a quote unquote digital humanities project. We often get the question of what counts as a digital humanities project?

Keyanah Nurse ([17:45](#)):

And again, I think that's a, that's a deceptively simple, uh, question, right? The short answer to that is that when we think of digital humanities at A C L S, we're really thinking of humanities projects that use digital tools in such a way that the conclusions and insights generated from the use of those tools get us somewhere new. They generate a new piece of knowledge or a way of understanding a topic, and that open up those insights to new publics. So in that way, there's a very profound and intentional relationship between form and content between the digital tools that you use and the content that you are studying. I think it's more helpful though, at least in this context, to go through some of the examples of the kinds of digital humanities projects we fund through the A C L S Digital Justice Grant program, so that I can present a sort of inductive definition of digital humanities projects rather than an overly prescriptive one.

Keyanah Nurse ([18:51](#)):

So the first example of a project that received a seed grant comes out of Virginia Tech led by Professor Taisha Thompson. And that is building an institute for empathic immersive narrative. So the institute, which proposed using VR high density loudspeaker arrays, immersive three D video, digital storytelling, and bone conduction to study empathy doesn't exist yet, or at least it didn't exist at the time that the project team applied for this funding. They were still in the, the phase of designing it. And so they used the seed grants to actually convene an advisory board of faculty members across campus and in different departments to think through what such an institute might look like. So in that way, this seed funding was used to build the partnerships that would be necessary in order to do a later phase of work.

Keyanah Nurse ([19:50](#)):

The next example of a seed grant comes out of the University of Rochester, the Rochester Digital Annotation Project led by Professor Joel Burgess. The primary activities here included prototyping by different data dictionaries, all related to black and L G B T Q communities, and also the study of those communities. The outputs were largely around developing a greater understanding of how to generate accurate and inclusive metadata. So here the seed funding was used to prototype a particular digital cataloging tool, one oriented around greater inclusivity. Now, while the previous two examples of projects that receive seed grants underscored the activities of forming relationships and prototyping digital tools, the next two examples of projects that receive development grants highlight activities that enhance or refine a preexisting platform that the project team already developed prior to applying. So this example based in John Jay College and, uh, led by professors Ned Benton and Judy Lynn, Lynn Peters, they are a part of a team that work on the Northeast Slavery Records index, their A C L S Digital Justice Development grant funded the training, supervising and support of research partners throughout the northeast who were well positioned to extend the reach of the archive by adding to it.

Keyanah Nurse ([21:23](#)):

And in some ways, I think this project represents a great example of what capacity building might look like, but I want to especially highlight that the grant was used to enhance an existing collection of records.

Keyanah Nurse ([21:39](#)):

Now, the final example of a development grant comes out of a collaboration between the University of Minnesota, the University of Texas, the Yoga Grande Valley, the Michal Art Museum in Austin, and the National Museum of Mexican Art in Chicago, led by professors Constance Cortez and Karen Mary DAOs. They applied to their preexisting platform, sorry about that. They applied to enhance their preexisting, um, platform called Mexican Art, Mexican American Art since 1948 by prepping over 8,000 items to be ready for publication and also enhancing and implementing the project's, uh, protocol for partnering with small budget cultural institutions. And that's, that's the name of the part of the protocol. So here, the development grant funds were used to, again, enhance an existing portal and to refine a protocol for how to navigate pre-existing relationships with community partners. Now, if you're curious about the other projects that were funded in Digital Justice's pilot year, or you'd like to see further examples of the projects funded with seed grants and the projects funded with development grants, please visit the A C L S website and our recent awardees.

Keyanah Nurse ([23:06](#)):

So now that I've spoken a little bit about big picture and also talked about the differences between the seed and development grants, I'll transition into sort of housekeeping, right? And reviewing the application components. Now, both the seed and development grants have the same application components, which include the proposal narrative, the bibliography project, timeline, project budget and budget description, project staffing, the intellectual property agreement, and the institutional verification. The required sections within the proposal narrative for STEAM and development grants have some slight variation though. So, for example, we ask development grant applicants to spend a little bit more time talking about the history of the project thus far in the proposal narrative, there's a specific section dedicated to that. You know, we obviously don't expect newer projects to have as detailed of a history. So that part of the narrative that prompt in the narrative isn't included other than some slight variations in the prompts though, I did want to sort of highlight some key reminders as you're going through the application components.

Keyanah Nurse ([24:22](#)):

The first is to be especially attentive to page counts. They're different for each type of application. So while c grants require a proposal narrative of no more than seven pages, double space development grants, applicants have a page limit of 10. So please be sure to check the page count for the specific type of grant that you're applying for as they're different for each section. And please note that this page count does also include footnotes. Now, we at A C L S, so, and by we, I mean Katie and I, we do in fact do formatting checks, uh, to make sure that folks have followed those guidelines once the competition is closed. And once we're processing all of the applications and getting them ready to send onto our peer applications outside of, unfortunately won't be passed on the committee for review.

Keyanah Nurse ([25:19](#)):

Now, there some other reminders I'd like to highlight about the application components. The first is that you'll notice that we no longer require letters of recommendation. In the previous competition, we

asked c grant applicants for one and development grant applicants for two. We're experimenting with the exclusion of letters for this competition cycle for two reasons. One, because of the ongoing challenges of legitimizing digital scholarship within academic institutions and the inability of most traditional departments and disciplines to truly get digital work. And what that means is that the number of folks available to write letters that provide useful information for reviewers and letters from folks who are not themselves also apply applying for the program or functioning as reviewers. It reduces the number of people available to do that, which then increases the burden that we, that's placed on people who have to ask for the letters.

Keyanah Nurse ([26:19](#)):

So we're sort of experimenting with excluding them for, for that reason. And the second is that, you know, this is one of many tweaks we're hoping to roll out over the next competition cycles that make the barrier to apply a little lower. Now, the elimination of letters of recommendation also brings the digital justice program into greater alignment with the standards of other A C L S programs, particularly our central fellowship, which no longer requires letters of recommendation. And that program does it as an exercise in making the application process more equitable for contingent faculty. So we are taking a page from our colleagues in US programs who administer the central fellowship and experimenting with excluding letters for this competition cycle.

Keyanah Nurse ([27:09](#)):

So the last thing I'd like to underscore with respect to the application itself is the institutional verification, which is not a former formal letter of recommendation. It's a form that should take no more than 20 minutes to complete with a series of check boxes and a little text write and field. And we note that it only takes 20 minutes to complete when we send out the instructions to the administrators who will submit this on your behalf. So the form asks administrators to confirm that the grant funds will be distributed through their institution. It also asks them to confirm that any activities done for the grant can be counted for tenure and promotion, and that grantees can use any available tech infrastructure at the institution of their projects. That's it, it is not a sort of formal assessment of the intellectual, um, contributions of the project or even the technological ones.

Keyanah Nurse ([28:05](#)):

It's really just a kind of, um, administrative tick that we have to, that we have to include in the application. So finally, um, in our, again, in our ongoing efforts to provide more resources in how to apply to our grants and fellowships, the small but mighty digital justice team, Katie and I, we have compiled some supplementary materials for prospective applicants that we hope are helpful. So Katie is now gonna be posting a link in the chat to those materials, but you can also find them on the Digital Justice grants program page on the A site. Now, these materials include a budget template, which we strongly encourage all applicants to use in their application, and this template will also be linked once you go into offa and start your application. There'll be links that will also take you to this template. The other supplementary materials include sample application components from the current cohort of digital justice grantees who are very, very graciously offered to share their materials.

Keyanah Nurse ([29:13](#)):

Now, these examples are not meant to function as prescriptive blue blueprints by any means. We do hope, however, that they will be particularly useful to applicants who are new to grant writing who need some examples and who may lack access to academia's, you know, informal but influential information

sharing. Not everyone knows a former grantee who can share their materials so they can get a sense of the formatting and, and how to outline a proposal and, and do all of that work. So we're, we're hoping to make those materials available to people, which you can find in our, on our site.

Keyanah Nurse ([29:52](#)):

So the last topic for today is the competition timeline. Um, and I wanna review some important dates that should be on your radar should you decide to apply. So the most obvious date is the deadline for applications, which is in about three months on December 15th at 9:00 PM Eastern standard time. So after this date and time, specifically 9:00 PM our online fellowship application will no longer allow for submissions. The portal shuts down after 9:00 PM So this date is also the deadline by which the administrators at your, at your respective institutions should submit their institutional verification. So for that reason, if you are applying, I recommend you register in the application portal as soon as possible so that you can submit your administrator's email address. And then our portal will automatically generate instructions and send those to them on how to submit the verification form. Otherwise, the selection committee meetings will occur in March of 2024 after, you know, our reviewers have had sufficient enough time to read through all the, all of the applications, and then we'll send out decisions in May of 2024.

Keyanah Nurse ([31:18](#)):

So now I wanna highlight the schedule, uh, for the Digital Justice Fall webinar series since there is still time to register for those that are relevant to your project. Now, we developed this series along with curating the supplementary materials that you can find on the A C L S site as a way of trying to make playing the quote unquote hidden curriculum that goes into grant writing. So the general information session, which is this one, uh, is the first of six. All of these will be recorded. The first and last two sessions will be with a C L S staff. And those primarily function as an opportunity to get more information about program parameters and also to ask specific questions related to your project. So as you can see in this calendar, we'll have an applicant q and a session on November 20th and December 8th. And those are a little bit less formal, you know, they're not in the webinar style of Zoom, those are meetings.

Keyanah Nurse ([32:18](#)):

So it's a little bit more interactive with myself. The vice president of A C L S James Schulman will also be joining so that we can answer any specific questions that you have and also give us an opportunity just to interact in real time with prospective applicants. So the other three sessions are specific to specific to the topics that are newly appearing in the application prompts, particularly around data ethics and capacity building, both for seed and development grant applicants. We have invited former reviewer of both the digital justice and the digital extension program. To join the sessions on October 8th, we'll be joined by Professor Kim Gallen from Brown University and Lael Hughes Watkins, who is the associate director for engagement inclusion and reparative archiving at the University of Co of Maryland College Park. And they will discuss best practices for crafting and articulating data ethics plans in your application.

Keyanah Nurse ([33:19](#)):

A few weeks later, professor Rio Maori Moto from Princeton University and Dr. Lorena Goodrow, the digital programs manager for US Latino Digital Humanities at the University of Houston. We'll discuss, you know, the multitude of activities that can constitute capacity building within digital humanities and

they'll, they'll pay special attention to startup projects. And then finally, in early November, professor Marissa Parham from the University of Maryland College Park will join us for the same topic, although with an eye to towards projects that have moved beyond the proof of concept phase. And again, these webinars will all be recorded and posted online. So if you can't make those specific times, you'll still be able to see the conversations after we have had them. And it is sincerely my hope that these resources will be especially useful for folks who are, um, sort of newly writing their materials. And this will also give you some insight precisely because we try to invite folks who are previous reviewers of competitions of the kinds of things that will generally strengthen your application, but related also to these specific topics that are new to the application this year, this year. So with all of that, I'm gonna turn to my colleague Katie, who is gonna pull the first question from the Q and a and we will get into discussing some of your questions and concerns.

Katie Reis ([34:51](#)):

Can teams be international? Can a project include the goal of capacity building outside the US?

Keyanah Nurse ([34:58](#)):

So there is no restriction on, um, projects that are based in some way, shape or form outside of the us. You know, we have had project teams last year apply because they have collaborators in other parts of the world. I think what ties the project to the US is again, that eligibility requirement around projects. Um, the, the project funds being distributed through an institution in the us. And so when you think about capacity building, you can certainly tie in the impacts of that in other places outside of the us. But I think if you're able to make an argument about how the activities that you're doing also have some kind of local impact, and by local I mean within the us, um, that would make a a strong application as well.

Katie Reis ([35:52](#)):

Okay. Yeah, that kind of goes with somebody else's question. Who was asking about to what extent we consider international projects with the PI institution in the us. Is there anything that you would like to add about that?

Keyanah Nurse ([36:05](#)):

So I say we certainly consider, uh, those projects, they're still eligible for consideration. As I said, there's no restrictions on, um, sort of having international partners or inter international collaborators by any stretch. As long as the project funds are distributed, um, by an institution here in the US, then you're certainly welcome to apply.

Katie Reis ([36:32](#)):

Can development grants be used to support digital components of archival exhibitions that also have a physical gallery display?

Keyanah Nurse ([36:42](#)):

Yes. Although, could you read the question again a little slower?

Katie Reis ([36:46](#)):

Sorry. Can development grants be used to support digital components of archival exhibitions that also have a physical gallery display?

Keyanah Nurse ([36:58](#)):

Okay. Yes, absolutely. Um, and that sounds like a great use of funds. The only stipulation around that is that the, the development grants or nor neither the seed grants, they cannot fund projects whose sole purpose is, you know, creating new, uh, pedagogical tools or doing translations or, um, sort of visual performative art displays. So if the sole activity of the project are those things, then you would be ineligible to apply. But if the development grant funds are used for digital component that ties into an in-person, um, experience with an exhibit, that's certainly a, uh, a good use of funds and an exciting use of funds too, I think, because it speaks to the ways in which the general public, you know, certainly outside of the academy, you know, their entry point into the humanities is often through exhibits gonna museums. And so folding in a digital experience to that, uh, certainly sounds exciting.

Katie Reis ([38:05](#)):

Okay. Um, hello. I'm working with a project team on creating open access c r t content and teaching resources for higher ed instructors. This will be done via a new website and digital repository that we are currently working on. The website isn't live now, but it should be by this time next year. Would this be a development grant?

Keyanah Nurse ([38:32](#)):

So given that you've, it seems like you have have developed, um, sort of the content that will then go onto the site, you could certainly make the case for it to be a development grant. Um, you know, I would say that when you are trying to think about whether or not to apply for seed or development, you know, the categories that I outlined in terms of technology, relationships, audiences, those are all things that you consider together rather than isolation. So even if it is the case that you're sort of experimenting with a platform that you want to, um, sort of use for your project, but it is also the case that you have amassed the content that you want to do, you've developed a project team, the project team has met, and you sort of assess the materials and you, you have a clear plan of what you want to do, um, then that could certainly fit within, within the scope of development projects as well. So the questions that I was asking around determining if it's seed or development should certainly be taken, um, sort of as a whole rather than individually. Um, and again, they're just a starting point for thinking about which grant would be the best for your project. But based off of what you have outlined, it does seem like you can make a case for that to be a development grant.

Katie Reis ([39:53](#)):

Could you briefly speak to any reporting requirements for those who are awarded the grants?

Keyanah Nurse ([39:59](#)):

Yes. So in addition to trying to make the application itself as less onerous as possible by cutting down the page length, um, and also even the, the components on the backend of that, the reporting requirements, we have tried to sort of, um, skimm them as much as possible so that we're only getting information that's absolutely necessary for our own reporting requirements to our larger funder. But then also certain kinds of information that is helpful to us in terms of developing the next iteration of the program. So in terms of the mid check-in report, which grantees submit at the midpoint of their grant term and then the final report, it's a series of about, um, I wanna say seven to 10 questions. And

we really stress to keep each answer below 250 words. We don't expect people to submit sort of pages and pages and pages of reporting.

Keyanah Nurse ([40:55](#)):

And in some cases if you don't have a lot to report on with respect to a specific question, that the answer to that question can just be a sentence. Once we receive the reports, especially for the midterm reports, I go through those reports, check and see how you're doing, and then follow up with you about whether or not scheduling a meeting is, um, sort of helpful because I enjoy sort of hearing about the progress of the reports, but then also if there's anything that A C L S S can do to further amplify the progress that you're making on your project. We do have a small communications department that, uh, likes to collect photographs. Um, they're also in the process of developing like profiles of specific grantees who would be open to sharing their work as they're doing it. So the check-in the midpoint check-in is really just that it's a check-in.

Keyanah Nurse ([41:44](#)):

And if there's anything also that I can do as a thought partner, because some people need to adjust their timelines when they submit their their midterm report for a whole host of reasons, that's also a space where we have that conversation and sort of chart out what the path forward looks like. So ultimately we are trying to make the, um, reporting requirements a way for us to just check in with you rather than a sort of daunting process that becomes a time suck, you know, in and of itself. And I certainly recommend and encourage folks to sort of fold in the reporting as part of the activities that they, that they plan to do.

Katie Reis ([42:26](#)):

When people ask how many seed and development grants are awarded each cycle, is there a quota?

Keyanah Nurse ([42:33](#)):

So we don't have a quota, we have a, um, sort of specific pool of funds for each competition. And then depending on sort of how many applicants we get for each kind of grant, we then sort of do some math to figure out and maximize the amount of grants that we can award. So the number of grants we award really depends on what the applicant pool looks like. Um, and I have a sense that this year more people will be applying. Um, and so it is hard to say at this point how many awards that we'll be able to do, um, because it also depends on what kinds of funds that people request in their applications. So for seed grants you can apply between 10,020 \$5,000 and some people do apply for the full 25, but some people apply for 10, some people apply for 12. Likewise, with development grants you can apply between, uh, for 50 to a hundred thousand dollars and there's a wide spectrum of what people's budget looks like. So we kind of engage in a sort of Lego charting, again, in the spirit of maximizing the number of grants that we can make. So all of that depends on how many applications we get. And then also what those budgets of the, um, of the projects that are selected look like.

Katie Reis ([43:57](#)):

Can you tell us more about the nonprofit finance fund and support for helping us to find resources to sustain our project? We have a three year, sorry. We have a three year commitment for web hosting our site at an R one partner, but I am a teeny teaching institution without resources for taking this project over,

Keyanah Nurse ([44:19](#)):

Right? So our partners at the nonprofit, uh, finance fund sort of engaged with grantees once we have selected them. And so they develop a sort of plan around what the financial coaching looks like. And in this pilot year we really experimented with what was the best model of engagement because some people, um, some grantees felt like they didn't necessarily have the time for the coaching or weren't interested in it or, um, just everyone's project was at a different sort of phase. And so our partners there were really, really gracious about, um, individualizing each way that they engaged with the, with the cohort. So there's a mix of sort of cohort wide meetings where people engage in kind of information sharing, giving feedback, et cetera, and then a mix of individual consultations. So admittedly, you know, A C L S has taken a sort of, um, distanced approach in terms of how the grantees engage with N F F.

Keyanah Nurse ([45:21](#)):

We wanted grantees to have the space to be able to forge their own relationships with this. And also if there are things that are sensitive to your project that you don't necessarily wanna share with your funder, like immediately or in that forum, we did wanna give grantees the space for the partners at N F F to be true thought partners in that way to work through certain issues. Um, and so the short answer to that question is that the support very much looks like whatever you have the capacity for and whatever you are desiring. Um, but they have been especially helpful in helping people think about, um, budgeting, helping people thinking about how to more transparently and intentionally incorporate the cost of doing digital work into their budgets and how to um, sort of account for all of the labor that previously had gone uncompensated in doing this work, how to fold that in, and also how to kind of create, um, narratives, what they call financial storytelling that you can use as a resource in the hopes of being able to take that to the institutions that you're in and getting some buy-in, um, in terms of potentially getting funds from your institution to keep the product going.

Katie Reis ([46:35](#)):

Um, so

Keyanah Nurse ([46:36](#)):

I think we might have time for maybe two or three more questions. Sounds

Katie Reis ([46:41](#)):

Good. What do you classify as a purely pedagogical project?

Keyanah Nurse ([46:54](#)):

So I think that if there's no audience for the project beyond the students that you're engaging with and the tools that they are getting from doing the work, that would count as purely pedagogical. And again, we tried to structure the application prompts in such a way that if you are particularly struggling with filling one of those parts out, I would recommend that you reach out to us, you know, at A C L S to get some feedback on, you know, the eligibility of the projects and also if you're applying for the right kind of grant. One of the evaluation criteria that we'll be passing on to reviewers is the sort of intentionality around how the project team and how the project engages with audiences inside the academy and outside the academy, right? So if a project doesn't have an audience, um, and it is limited to the classroom and limited to students, then I think that that is fair grounds for it to be counted as purely pedagogical. But that also opens up an opportunity for you to think about the audiences right beyond the classroom in order to sort of fold that dimension into the project.

Katie Reis ([48:11](#)):

Does the institutional verification also involve questions about or expectations of indirect costs that the university would take out of the award?

Keyanah Nurse ([48:20](#)):

No, it does not. So this grant does not support any indirect costs, um, to the institutions that, you know, the money is funneling through. So the institutional verification doesn't include that, as I said, it is just a checkbox form of, um, will these grant funds be administered through the institution? Are the activities counted for tenure and promotion? Do the grantees have access to the technological infrastructure at the institution? Those are the three check boxes. And then there's a small sort of write in field that I think is about 500 words max that is completely optional. So you could very well submit the form without filling that field in. To explain a little bit more about either of those three, uh, checkpoints.

Katie Reis ([49:08](#)):

You wanna take one more?

Keyanah Nurse ([49:09](#)):

Yeah, I think we have time for one more.

Katie Reis ([49:12](#)):

Okay. Um, does geography also count under interpretive social sciences?

Keyanah Nurse ([49:18](#)):

Yes. Yes. That was an easy one. That was a low ball question. <laugh>. Okay,

Katie Reis ([49:27](#)):

I'll give you one more. Alright. Um, if the two PIs are not from the same institution, how do we decide which institution administers the grants?

Keyanah Nurse ([49:36](#)):

So I leave that up to the pro program team, I mean the project team to, to decide that. Um, you know, one thing that I might take into consideration if I were on that team is what kinds of resources are available at the institution that we could leverage, um, to the benefit of the project. You know, even, um, sort of how easy is it for you to get an administrator to um, submit the form on your behalf? And also, you know, one of the things that remains a standing question, um, in terms of this eligibility requirement around institutions distributing funds is the sort of ease of that. Some places it's very easy for, uh, folks to get access to their research funds and in other places there are more hoops to jump through. So I think being strategic around, um, sort of the ease of doing that and that's a, a question that you can sort of ask yourself. Um, but it doesn't really have any bearing on the evaluation process. Um, in terms of, you know, which bi, which institution, we have the component of project staffing, which tells us, you know, um, where people are located. So that also gives us a good sense of who's actually on, on the team and what work they're doing. And then also in the proposal itself, you can sort of talk more with a little bit more nuance, um, and more depth around sort of where this project lives, if it's sort of trans institutional.

Keyanah Nurse ([51:12](#)):

I will say though that um, at least within the constraints of the application form itself, when you're going into offa, which is our online fellowship application portal, there's only one, there's a section for one PI and that contact information that's um, sort of input there that will be where we send all of the correspondence and updates and decisions. And so whoever also wants to sort of be the touchpoint person with a C L S, you know, should fill, should fill that out, um, out. But also in the project staffing component of the application, you can highlight that the project has multiple PIs.

Keyanah Nurse ([51:55](#)):

All right, so I think that is it in terms of questions, uh, before I get to my last sort of, uh, bit here, but thank you all so much for attending. Um, I'm gonna go back to my slides here. So again, as we wrap up, I definitely want to extend a warm thank you to everyone who attended today and ask questions. You know, I think that always works in the benefit of the group because sometimes people ask questions that, you know, they think about as soon as they log off and they wish they had asked it, but someone else did. So thank you so much. You know, as I mentioned, this session will be recorded and we'll be uploading it to the A C L S S site and also to YouTube so you are able to reference it or send it to your colleagues who may have missed the sessions.

Keyanah Nurse ([52:48](#)):

The slides will also be posted to the digital justice program page and we will send a follow-up email directing you to that early next week. So before you go, however, I do wanna ask a small favor of all of you. Um, I'm a firm believer in the value of revision. You know, not just respect with respect to our writing or to our projects, but also to programs like this. I very much approach this work, iter, iter iteratively, and as much as we've changed certain parts of the program to try to make it live up to the aspiration of digital justice, you know, I recognize that there's still so much more that we can do and it's exactly with candid feedback from the folks who engage with A C L S, you know, particularly as prospective applicants, that we can then make the necessary adjustments and changes to the program so that, you know, the process of applying is a little less onerous and certainly recognize that, you know, compiling the application components, it takes a lot of time working across a team.

Keyanah Nurse ([53:50](#)):

Co-writing doubles that time. And so I very much want this process to also offer some resources for folks that they can leverage, you know, for other opportunities even if they're not selected as grantees. And also to sort of think about the ways in which, um, we can lower the barriers to entry for applying. So Katie is gonna post in the chat a link to a post-webinar survey. It's very short, five questions that hopefully give us a sense of how useful these sessions are. And finally, the survey asks you to consider whether or not you'd be open to being contacted about participating in a focus group in the spring once the competition is over. And this focus group is really about sort of your experiences navigating the competition. So the answer to this question does not lock you into participating at all by any means. It simply gives us a starting point for outreach once we do the work of inviting folks to that uh, focus group in the spring. So once again, I wanna thank you for your time. Best of luck with your application and if you have any further inquiries you can send them to digital justice at acs. Alright, take care everyone.