

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

I want to spend some time before I introduce our interlocutors, highlighting that this webinar is part of a fall series of webinars that I've curated to provide additional resources to applicants during the active competition period as they're drafting their application materials. And the inspiration for this really came out of conversations with former reviewers of both the ACLS Digital Justice program and also our DEXT, our digital extension program around applicant engagement and what we were doing to support applicants during the active competition. And so, in a lot of ways these webinars are our attempt at, you know, unveiling the so-called hidden curriculum that goes into grant writing by inviting back former reviewers from these programs in order to engage with prospective applicants in real time. Now this is the third of such webinar. There are six totals. The first was a general information session where I discussed program parameters and the ethos of the program. I dove a little deeper into the eligibility requirements and the application components, and also had a discussion around the differences between the Seed and Development grants. The second session was on data ethics and I invited Professor Kim Gallon from Brown University and archivist La'el Hughes-Watkins from the University of Maryland- College Park to discuss strategies for how you can best articulate your data ethics plan throughout your proposal narrative. So if you missed either or both of those sessions, you can find both of the recordings and the transcripts as well as any slides on the ACLS website on the Digital Justice grants, uh, supplementary materials webpage. And so my colleague Katie is going to pop that into the chat for you right now just so that you can have that for your reference. Today. We are tackling the topic of capacity building, given that it is a new priority of the program. So, unlike in the pilot year of Digital Justice, in this new iteration of digital justice, we are specifically looking to support projects that engage in some kind of capacity building activities. And what we mean by that is simply thinking about the conditions, whether they be institutional, financial, technological, or related to personnel that allow you to do your work.

Keyanah Nurse ([02:29](#)):

And so to give you a clear sense of how we'll spend our time today, we'll start with a general discussion with our interlocutors around capacity building, what we mean by that, and sort of discuss the wide range of activities that can fall under that umbrella for digital humanities projects. After this general discussion, we'll transition into smaller breakout rooms, and in each room there'll be one interlocutor and one ACLS staff member. So, the purpose of these smaller breakout sessions is to give you all the opportunity to talk more extensively about some of the issues raised in the general discussion, if you have any questions or, um, sort of thoughts that you want to continue working through. And you can also use that space to get feedback on the parts of your application that are related to this particular topic. So I want to flag again that the general discussion will be recorded so that folks can look at this asynchronously, but the part of the sessions where we go into the breakout rooms will not be recorded just to respect people's privacy if they are going to talk about their works in progress or things that they're still considering as they map out their proposal narrative. So we'll then reconvene in the breakout room for closing remarks and also just a little bit of housekeeping in terms of important dates that are coming up, um, and also a post webinar survey to get your thoughts on your experience today. And now that I have gotten through a bit of the housekeeping, I have the pleasure of introducing our very esteemed interlocutors for today.

Keyanah Nurse ([04:06](#)):

So we are joined by Dr. Lorena Gauthereau, who is the Digital Programs manager for the US Latina Digital Humanity Center at the University of Houston, and a rare book school Mellon Foundation Diversity, Inclusion and Cultural Heritage Fellow. She received her PhD in English and her Masters in

Hispanic studies, both from Rice university. We are also joined by Professor Morimoto, Ryo Morimoto, who is a first-generation college graduate and scholar from Japan and an assistant professor of anthropology at Princeton University. His scholarly work addresses the planetary impacts of our past and present engagement with nuclear things. He is the author of "Nuclear Ghosts, Atomic Livelihoods" and "Fukushima's Gray Zone." And Ryo is the facilitator of the native undergraduate student-led project, "Nuclear Princeton", and a former manager of the Japan Disasters Digital Archive. So I wanna give a kind of virtual clap for our interlocutors and thank them for being here today. So with any kind of discussion like this, I think it's really, really important that we're all operating from a shared vocabulary and a common framework around the topic that we're talking about. And so the first question is always the basic question of, what do we mean by capacity building? Especially when we consider that it can take many forms and is very much informed by one's institutional context. So I want to start there by asking both of our interlocutors, how would you define capacity building? What kinds of activities constitute capacity building?

Lorena Gauthereau ([05:41](#)):

So, when I think about capacity building, I think about the ways in which we need to ask ourselves, like, what do we need to do our work from both the day-to-day to the long-term? So, what are the things that you need in place to be successful? I can keep going, but I don't want to take everything out. So I'll pass that and we can get more granular as we go.

Ryo Morimoto ([06:10](#)):

Okay. I guess, you know, I want to kind of follow up by adding that. I want to kind of think about this particular grant, right? That is the Digital Justice grant. And I want to kind of think with you all about how this idea or the term of justice might fit into in terms of thinking of capacity building. And I think, you know, as you know, mentioned this, this capacity building can be very sort of a vague term. You know, it could mean many things, but I, I would like to sort of encourage all of us to think about what if we think about capacity building is, you know, category like justice and how, what are the kind of new things that we might be able to suggest in terms of including this particular things that is critical for this particular grant. Like for example, you know, are we thinking about justice and capacity building, thinking about like given some sort of a sense of control to the particular communities that you'd be interested in working? Or are we thinking about including some of the student body as a way to think about, you know, think of them as a capacity also, or the potential that can become something, right? Because I think, you know, later question maybe there's some dimension of sustainability that might have something to do with it. But one thing I want to mention is that, you know, because different institution might have a different understanding of, you know, what resources might be available. So do not hesitate to really explain about what are the things that missing in your institution. Because otherwise some of the reviewers like myself coming from very resourceful university might not notice or think about that kind of stuff. Right? So I would just stop there.

Lorena Gauthereau ([08:03](#)):

I'm really happy that you brought up the issue of labor. Because I think something that I've noticed in several grant applications, not just for this grant, but for other grants and other foundations is people who do not take in consideration labor and budget. And we see a disconnect between the social justice goal of the project and then the way in which they're compensating the people who are doing the labor. So students or community members who are getting paid, either not getting paid or getting paid very little whereas the PI might be getting paid a ton and then expecting these other workers to do the

majority of the job. So when you're creating your budget, that social justice part should also be a part of it, um, because this labor is going to be integral to the project as well.

Keyanah Nurse ([09:03](#)):

I want to thank both of you for lifting up, um, those issues in terms of thinking about justice as part of the work of capacity building or building that into the framework. And also, just to say a little bit even about why this theme or this thread of capacity building is a new priority of the grant, because it wasn't the case in the pilot year that, that we asked specifically for this. And you know, it comes out of conversations, um, related to the Digital Commission on Fostering and Sustaining Diverse Digital Scholarship that ACLS is currently running. Where we convened the group, we convened a lot of focus groups actually of different constituencies in the world of DH, but particularly former and current grantees of DEXT and Digital Justice, talking about just the infrastructures that were in place or not in place at their various institutions that made it difficult or easier to do their work. And so, if we are thinking about strengthening the ability for folks to do digital work across the board, you know, the prompts around capacity building really do function in service of giving reviewers a more granular sense of the context in which people are pursuing their work. And so, it's not the case that we're looking for projects that, you know, with the small 10,000 seed grant, you are going to completely create digital humanities and digital humanity center at your institution. We really want to be respectful of scale in that way, but it is an opportunity for you to tell us, you know, as Professor Morimoto sort of highlighted what things are not available to you at your university that these grant funds might complement in terms of helping you to do your work and also putting other people relative to the work to do it a little bit easier.

Ryo Morimoto ([10:47](#)):

Right. I want to follow up because one of the things I noticed from, uh, you know, sort of in the review, there are many great project, you know, many ambitious project and I can see the value of those project, but at the same time, like you have to wonder like, well, in order for this to happen, how many people have to be involved and you know, how this small amount of seed money has to be distributed across these groups, right? So I think one thing to remember is that this grant itself is really about building the capacity in order to be able to get to this bigger picture. So I think, you know, it's not a bad thing to say, here's the big picture, but we want to start with these little things, and then for this thing we need the money. Right?

Keyanah Nurse ([11:39](#)):

Right. Exactly. And I want to again lift up, uh, Dr. Gauthereau's point about labor, right? Because that serves as a good segue into thinking about, um, capacity building more specifically or getting more granular with it, of what kinds of activities constitute capacity building. And obviously thinking about labor is a significant part of that, but could you provide some, uh, concrete examples of what these efforts have looked like, either in your own digital projects or projects that you consulted or on or supervised? What, when people start to think about capacity building, not just as the framework, but as the actual work that's being done, what things could, should they be keeping in mind?

Ryo Morimoto ([12:20](#)):

Well, I can, I can start. Uh, so you know, the project I work with native students, uh, I, you know, right now because of the lack of support of native students on campus, I focus, you know, uh, who I work with based on their identities and commitment to elevating the voices of, uh, native students. And as

such, students who come through my project might not have the necessary skills to be able to really produce digital, you know, stuff that I might be showcasing using websites and other means. So, to me, you know, capacity building involves identifying resources on campus that might be able to provide some training for students to be able to get some of the skills that they might be able to then use for the project, right? So that, you know, looking around talking to different, you know, consistency on campus itself to me is a building capacity for the project.

Lorena Gauthereau ([13:26](#)):

Yeah. And then in that vein, also thinking about the sustainability, because if you ask for a bunch of money for, um, like a software, but you don't have the connection to help with you sustain it or get the training, then you're missing that piece of the puzzle. So if you're going to, you know, you need this software for your group, for your team, um, do you have someone that will give you the training, the tech support, um, the, you know, you might need technical backup. So, working with your institutions, it might be important or funding a position for someone that can, uh, provide that tech support. So thinking about the ways in which this will last longer or have like longer effects than just during the grant period. So if I buy this software, if I buy this machine, will I only be able to use it for a couple of years or will I be able to build on it and use it going forward?

Ryo Morimoto ([14:32](#)):

Yeah. And also like this is more of a strategic uh, point, but uh, I highly encourage you to, uh, look at the bigger grant that ACLS offers in addition to the seed grant that you might be interested because that bigger grant is basically where you want to get to after getting the seed grant, right? So by looking at what are the things that are being asked for, the bigger one, you might be able to find the target of like, okay, in order for me to apply for that thing in the next round, what are the kind of capacities that I should be building in the context of my project? That might be a good way of thinking objectively about the, the capacity. That might be something that, you know, the reviewer will say like, oh yes, I can see that, that you are building something towards this big thing.

Keyanah Nurse ([15:29](#)):

Yeah, I think you bring up a good point about how, you know, capacity building always feels like a somewhat incomplete phrase to me because it begs the question of capacity building towards what or what are we building capacity towards, you know, what are we trying to do globally? And so I'm wondering, um, you know, you both have sort of highlighted engagement with students or even engagement with, um, other corners of one's institution, whether that be it folks who can help sort of help you build out the tech infrastructure of a project. But could you say a little bit about, um, I guess if you are interested in doing projects that involve community partners in some way or that are folks outside of your immediate institution, how does working with community partners sort of fold into one's capacity building efforts?

Lorena Gauthereau ([16:19](#)):

I think making sure you have developed trust, trust and relationships with community members or community organizations, it's really important. So it's important to do that before, you know, it's not, you can't just say in your grant, I want to form this relationship and you've never talked to these people before or this organization before, because that's making a lot of assumptions. So trust takes a very long time to establish. So it's really helpful to put in your grant if you already have, um, a relationship with an organization that you hope to work with, um, that way you are continuing that and maybe that, uh,

grant is to either fund training for a community organization you're working with, or maybe like internships if you're working with youth organizations or, you know, funding the, the labor that you're expecting, et cetera. So thinking through that I think is really, really important because you want to make sure that this is, uh, reciprocal, uh, relationship and not somewhat saying something where only your institution or your group is receiving all the benefit. There needs to be a back and forth for, for both uh, groups.

Ryo Morimoto ([17:33](#)):

Yeah, that point really reminded me of the couple of, uh, grant that we reviewed last time that really like talked about or identified the needs from the communities. You know, I think there was some project where using some of the, um, you know, um, tablets and stuff like that to go around and do stuff, but part of the grant was to basically provide those instruments for that community to be able to do X and then that was a good way of indicating, you know, that they have already established some kind of relationship. They find out, identify the needs of the communities and what they might be able to do by providing certain stuff. So, you know, I think that's another way I guess you can kind of think about, you know, showing that, you know, in fact you have already established some relationship and we know what they're looking for and then if we have this, we can make this happen. So, um, that's another thing I guess, yeah, came to my mind.

Keyanah Nurse ([18:41](#)):

Yeah, both of those comments sort of remind me of the really wonderful conversation, um, that I had with the interlocutors for the data ethics webinar. So again, I just wanna flag that for folks, um, if you haven't watched it, but really the importance of, um, building relationships prior to applying for a grant so that you can talk about some of the pre-work that you've already done. And also so that at every instance of project design and implementation, if you are working with community partners, they're part of the project design. And so I think, you know, again, to lift up Dr. Re's point about the labor of this, right? And doc and Professor Marie Mo's point about what community assets are needed so that you get a good sense of that, um, sort of being in dialogue with folks even as you are drafting your application is critical. And so, you know, if you're constantly straddling this line between sort of thinking about, um, what is available to you outside of your institution in terms of the relationships that you have to cultivate with community partners to do your work and also the resources that are available to you within your institution, whether those be, um, students that you would want to work with or it folks that you want to work with or folks in libraries, what are some just very concrete questions or considerations that might provide insight into the different kinds of infrastructures that are already available to people. And so another way of thinking about this question is how can I survey the landscape that I currently inhabit to talk about that in a grant application? Because I think doing that sort of institutionally reflective work might not be immediately apparent, um, in terms of drafting the application materials. And so if you were, um, prompted in that way, what kinds of questions would you ask yourself around, you know, figuring out what's available to you?

Lorena Gauthereau ([20:41](#)):

So I think there's probably certain departments that you want to target first, libraries, archives, um, tech might be some of the ones you're going to think of off the top of your head. You might also look into media. So if you want to do professional photo photography or videography or even recording that might be available at your institution. So that's kind of outside the typical things you might think of. And so, you need to sit down and have conversations about how much time they can dedicate, how many people they can dedicate to your project, how they would like to be included. So, you know, are they a

full project partner? Um, are you gonna have named partners from their, um, department? And each department might have rules on like how much a percentage of the time that someone can commit. So, you know, if you're working with the library and you want, uh, I don't know, like a metadata, uh, librarian to work with you as a consultant, uh, they might say, okay, I can work like 10% of my time, or I can give you a workshop that lasts this long. And so just identifying the very concrete things that you want someone to do what you need help on, I think is really important. And asking how long this commitment will last. Is it just going to last for the grant or are they committing to continuing this collaboration as, you know, kind of like in the future, is there sustainability? Is there money that other groups can offer? So, you know, can the dean offer to continue to pay for, you know, maybe like an internship or if you bring in somebody new, can they commit to paying maybe half or that full salary from now on so that that is part of that capacity, right? And if, you know, maybe they wanna pay half and then you say, we're gonna fundraise the other half from now on or seek other grants. So I think those are important things that come to my mind.

Ryo Morimoto ([22:55](#)):

Yeah, so I mean, I guess covered a lot of ground. So I guess I'll try to approach this question a little bit differently as an anthropologist that is that it's a daunting work to try to talk across, you know, different parts of the campus and, you know, find out who has what, who can do what kind of stuff. But I will, I want you to kind of have this attitude of like each individual you might go and then inquire about, you know, the availability of resources or, you know, tools and other stuff you, I want you to kind of think of it as like you are pitching your potential grant idea to these people as well and you're getting feedback as to how they might be reacting to, you know, how you're presenting your proposal. And if they're not reacting well to your proposal, maybe there's a way you have to think about how you go about pitching your project as a testing ground before you even like craft your seed grant, right? Like, you know, if your communities are not really buying your idea, the chance is that the reviewers might be, you know, asking question about, oh, is this possible? Whatever. So one way to think about it is like, yes, this is like a very, um, hard work, but it could be beneficial for you to really think about how you might go about selling your project to, you know, your neighbors, so to speak first. And then you can, if you can convince them and say, well, that sounds like an exciting project, we might be able to stretch a little bit to, you know, give you these resources we have, then the chance is maybe your project is very, uh, attractive for those outside as well. So I think, you know, this is a slightly different way of answering the questions, but I kind of want all of you to remember this task actually could be very helpful for you to imagine crafting your, um, proposal.

Keyanah Nurse ([25:09](#)):

Yeah, I think it's, so that's such a great point around, I guess surveying the landscape in terms of your immediate institutional home, right? To see if there are partners available there. And I love the point too about, you know, go to the library partner with librarians, they're really, really fantastic at doing this work and also thinking about questions of sustainability and where the project will live long after the grant term, which I think is really, really important to think about even at the, at the seed phase. And so to switch gears slightly a little bit, but since this is a webinar for capacity building for seed grants specifically, so for startup projects specifically, I wanted to ask about scale, right? And to really think through what is the appropriate balance between ambition, right? As I'm sure we're all familiar with either writing grant applications or, or sketching out, um, an idea for a project and having it be very grandiose and we want it to be ambitious and we want it to have as much impact as possible and then coming up against the practical reality of a reasonable scope of activities, uh, especially for startup projects. And so I know that that's somewhat a difficult question, but where would you locate an



appropriate balance between those two things? Or are there sort of specific things that you could sort of use as a "check balances" to make sure that you're not tipping one way or the other? You know, I think about something like the budget, for example, as a very concrete tool that can help you think about ambition versus feasibility or versus, um, the appropriate scope of activity. So, so is there anything you could share with us around that, that question?

Lorena Gauthereau ([26:53](#)):

I think, um, just really that defining what the end goal is, is really important because if you have like all these different things, then that might be an indication that you're trying to do too much. Um, also, you know what Professor Morimoto mentioned, like talking to people like, so if you're identifying and, and you can tell that person, this is what my project is, this is what I need from you, then that helps you narrow down the scope as well. Because if you don't know what you're asking people for, or if you're asking too many things of them, you might be trying to do too much. Um, you also should look at that timeline. So creating a timeline of activities is really important because it, it will help you start thinking like, is this possible to complete in this amount of time? You know, people get sick, people have babies, people, uh, go on vacation, you know, all these things need to be factored in, so you're probably not gonna be able to do too much between November and January 1st, right? So, so taking that into account is really important. There's, there's human beings, you're not machines, right? Um, you don't wanna kill yourself to complete this grant either.

Ryo Morimoto ([28:24](#)):

Yeah, no, I think those are all great points. And I guess, you know, ultimately this is about grants, right? So the reviewer probably will be, you know, evaluating based on the, you know, deliverable, right? Like, is this possible? And I think that, you know, what's possible probably depends on the capacity that institutions that you're applying from already have and the scale might change depending on, you know, the available resources. So I think, you know, it's relative to your positions and I think therefore as we discussed earlier, you know, being honest about what you have, what you don't have is a very important way to say, okay, given,, what I have this scale can make sense and makes it possible for me to deliver what I'm proposing. And I think, you know, one good metric here is to come back to our earlier point about to ask the question about is this just, you know, given what I have, what I'm proposing, is it just to those who are involved, right? That might be a good way of thinking about where to position yourself in terms of scale, because I don't think reviewers are looking for everybody to be doing like these grandiose projects and what not. I think reviewers are also abiding by this perspective of just, right. So I think meeting at where the just is within your institutions and what you have will be the great place to think about, you know, what the appropriate scale for your project is.

Keyanah Nurse ([30:09](#)):

Yeah, those are both wonderful and important reminders around maybe the pressures that we all face in terms of productivity, right? And having a, not only a more realistic, um, but also a justice-centered focus on the capacity that people have to do this work. And then I also wanted to sort of flag from what I have seen in terms of, um, you know, the outside looking in with current grantees of really thinking about the fact that when we are working with materials that have been historically under-resourced and underserved, even trying to get access to certain archives, having to travel to do things, even if your work includes some degree of collection building, all of the historic inequities that are the focus of the project will inform the very process of doing the work too. And that should be built into the timeline. And so your relationship to time and doing this work in a timely fashion, I think that's also something to interrogate in terms of the ambition versus the reasonable scale or scope of the project. And so in terms

of thinking about things like the budget or even the project staffing list, which is not a throwaway document, it's an important sort of activity and exercise in terms of thinking about the distribution of labor, as Dr. Gauthereau said, if you can clearly sort of list the folks that you're working with and know specifically what you're asking them for, that document can also help sort of clarify the scope of what you're doing.

Lorena Gauthereau ([31:42](#)):

We, yeah, we absolutely look at that staffing list and I, I remember seeing again in like different, uh, grants I've, I read where we look at that, that staffing list and think like, well, why is this person doing this? And a lot of times I've seen like PIs say, I'm not actually a scholar in this, but I've taken this on. And then it's like, well, why, why didn't you ask someone else to head the project? Or why don't you have a co-PI? Or why don't you have, or, or why are you the pi, right? Or why didn't you bring people in who actually are experts in this? So making sure that you are picking the people who are appropriate for the job is really important. And you also should mention that they are like, why they're appropriate for that job.

Ryo Morimoto ([32:37](#)):

No, I just, just second that because that reminded me that we had a couple of conversations asking about why is this person doing this stuff, right? And I think that was a very important dimension when we were evaluating, um, various grants. So yeah, I just want to emphasize that point as well. So thank you for mentioning that.

Keyanah Nurse ([33:01](#)):

So the last question that I'd like to pose before we transition into our smaller breakout rooms is around that dreaded word attached to most grants, which is around outputs, right? What are the outputs of the grant? What are the, or the deliverables, um, is another sort of way that folks frame it. And so how would you anticipate or measure the impact specifically of the capacity building efforts? And it's sort of almost like asking folks to look in a crystal ball in some ways of how can you sort of predict the future around what capacity building efforts, like what they will generate or what you hope they generate. And so what kinds of, um, measures do you think folks are able to think about before the work starts that feel sort of reasonable and realistic in terms of, um, the capacity building efforts?

Ryo Morimoto ([33:57](#)):

So, uh, I guess that's definitely your difficult questions. But the way I would like to see or myself try to, you know, do when I, you know, apply for grant is that this is the place I think we can kind of paint a vision beyond the money or the grant you're asking for the capacity building that is like that sort of like, okay, we want to get here so that we can go to that place, kind of show the trajectory is a good way of showing that, oh, this movement makes sense, right? Because without having that kind of like, you know, mid to long-term goal deliverable might not make much sense. That is like, I can ask like, well, why are you doing this? Right? So I think one way to think about how to sort of make your deliverable convincing is to show that how this, you know, first step is connected to something where this project can go in the future. So, you know, that might be a way I would think about, you know, to say like, okay, this deliverable, given what I have makes sense because my past is here.

Lorena Gauthereau ([35:25](#)):



I think also documentation is really important. So you should be documenting how you're doing everything and the, um, the decisions that you're making, and then also think about like what type of impact this is having. So if you're having like a public workshop or even invite-only workshop, how many people attended, you know, you can get them to respond to a survey maybe where you ask very specific questions, um, that will tell you about the progress and whether or not you're achieving certain goals, right? So coming up with the goals that you want to achieve with this deliverable is really important. Um, if you have a public event, you know, trying to find out how many people attended is something concrete that you can, um, measure, right? That measurable output. Um, if you're inviting more community members to participate or more like organizations, like how many organizations or, um, if you're collect doing like archival collections, how many collections? Um, so these quantifiable outcomes are important too, but also think about like how that can inform what you do moving forward if you're creating a public-facing digital project. Like how many visitors are you getting? Like are people actually looking at it and using it? And so this, yeah, so like quantifiable is important too.

Keyanah Nurse ([37:00](#)):

Yeah, I think that point about process documenting process is so important and something that I definitely want to lift up as an output for any kind of grant that you get or any kind of project that you get, right? Because part of, you know, the efforts around capacity building is to avoid the dreaded having to reinvent the wheel every time. And that could be for projects that you do after this one that may be funded by ACLS, it could be for other projects that people project in different parts of your university or college or institution are curious about doing. It could be partners in other sort of institutions. And so I think focusing on documenting process as one of the potential outputs for thinking about capacity building or as it's related to capacity building is an easy but very, very impactful win. I think that would be really important. So now that we've spent some time sort of talking generally about capacity building in this larger group, we're going to transition into smaller breakout sessions where again, you'll have the opportunity to either delve a little bit more deeply into some of the topics we talked about in this larger session or get some concrete feedback on things that you're thinking about related to your project. So we'll stay in those breakout sessions for about, uh, 25 to 30 minutes depending on how discussion is going, and then we'll reconvene in this larger session for closing remarks. So can I ask Katie if you can open up the breakout rooms so that way we can get started? Alright. So I want to extend first a very warm thank you to our interlocutors, professor Ryo Morimoto and Dr. Lorena Gauthereau for sharing their time, their expertise, their wisdom with us today. I always get a lot out of these conversations and I learn so much from engaging with them in conversation. And so I just want to, again, virtually applause for them. I also want to extend a thank you to everyone who showed up today and ask questions, which I think always works to the benefit of the entire group. And so, as I mentioned, this session will be recorded and posted to YouTube so you're able to reference it or send it to colleagues who may have missed the session. But before we wrap up, I also want to ask for a small favor. So I am a firm believer in the value of revision and not just to our writing projects, but also for programs like this. I try to approach this work iteratively and although I've managed to make some pretty significant changes from the pilot year to this year, there's still a lot of work to be done in terms of having this program live up to the aspiration of its name of Digital Justice.

Keyanah Nurse ([39:51](#)):

And so I really wanted to ask for candid feedback from folks who engage with ACLS, you all as prospective applicants or as former applicants so that way we can make the necessary adjustments and changes to the program that make the process of applying a little less onerous. And that also offers some resources for folks that they can leverage for other opportunities. So that way, even if you're not

selected as a grantee, you still get something out of the process of applying and that we can lower the barriers of entry for applying so that more folks are able to do so. So Katie is going to post in the chat a link to a post-webinar survey. It's very, very short five questions that hopefully gives us a sense of how useful these sessions are. 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 about your experiences navigating the competition. So that includes attending this webinar or other webinars if you've been to them, the clarity of the application, how easy it's to even navigate the application interface, um, in the portal. And so that particular answer to the question around being contacted for the focus group doesn't lock you into participating. It just gives us a starting point for outreach once we do the work of inviting folks to that focus group in the spring. So once you've been able to access that in the chat, I'm going to spend the next couple of minutes just walking through some housekeeping issues, things to keep on your radar as you think about applying. So I want to start with highlighting the fact that the deadline for applications is December 15th at 9:00 PM Eastern standard time. After this date and time, our online fellowship application will no longer allow for submissions. So this is also the deadline by which the administrators at your respective institutions should submit their institutional verification. So as I talk about in the general information session, there is a part of the application called the institutional verification form. It is not a letter of recommendation, it is not a reference letter. It's simply a very quick 20 minute, um, form that administrators can fill out to verify that you have access to the technological infrastructure at your institution and that the work that you're doing would count towards um, things like promotion and tenure and and tenure. So that is at that date, everything has to be submitted. Other dates to keep in mind are that the selection committee will be meeting in March of 2024, and then we'll notify folks of decisions via email in May of 2024.

Keyanah Nurse ([42:44](#)):

So finally, I wanted to highlight the remaining webinars in this fall series that we have for Digital Justice. So on November 10th at 1:00 PM we'll be talking about capacity building again, but for development grants. And I think even if you are not applying to the development grants or considering applying to seed grants, as Professor Morimoto reminded us earlier, it's still helpful to think about the long-term trajectory of these projects and to even look at some of the projects that have been funded through the development grant as a way of conceptualizing where you'd like your own work to go. And I also think that given the interlocutors will be engaging during that session, which includes Professor Marisa Parham, who's at the University of Maryland at College Park, and our very own Vice President of ACLS James Schulman, they will be talking about different questions related to where projects live institutionally and how you make that decision and how you build up your project in different kinds of contexts. So that could be, you know, really interesting and relevant information for you to consider even at the beginning phases of your project. The final two webinars are a lot more casual in style. They are applicant Q&As with ACLS staff, AKA myself and Katie, where you can just drop in if you have any questions about the application, about the online fellowship portal around eligibility requirements, any sort of questions like that, you can just pop in, ask your question, chat with us, have some coffee, and then pop out. And so those will be on November 20th at 2:00 PM and then the final one is about a week before the deadline, which is on December 8th. And again, all of the recordings will be available on the digital justice supplementary materials page with the exception of the applicant Q&As. Those sessions will not be recorded. So once again, I want to thank you for your time. Best of luck with your application. If you have any further inquiries, you can send those to [digitaljustice@acl.org](mailto:digitaljustice@acl.org). Thank spending afternoon with us and thank you to Dr. Gauthereau and Professor Morimoto for joining us today.