University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa Library and Information Science Program

Premised on Care: Redescription as Restorative Justice in American Archives

The Library and Information Science Program at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa (UH) respectfully requests $357,536 for a three-year Laura Bush 21st Century Early Career Development Grant to study emerging redescription and descriptive remediation practices in US archival repositories. This research will identify existing—and make recommendations for future—best professional practices for archival redescription and descriptive remediation projects resulting in: 1) improved redescription project design, methods, workflows, and outcomes; 2) improved descriptive remediation interventions at the digital threshold; and 3) improved trust in institutional and organizational archives.

Statement of Broad Need: Archives are tools that people use to look beyond the present and understand the wider context of their families, communities, and societies. Archival repositories, as the stewards of the primary source material needed to maintain and understand this context, routinely create detailed inventories, registers, indexes, and guides to represent the materials in their care. This process, known as *archival description*, plays a role in how people and their activities are represented in the historical record and shapes whether and how archival collections are discovered, navigated, and understood. Archival description determines, in part, which people and activities will be included in or omitted from the historical record, and what language and terminology is used to represent and contextualize them.

The first substantive articulation of foundational ideas around archival description dates over 100 years ago to the 1898 publication of the *Manual for the Arrangement and Description of Archives*, also known as the *Dutch Manual*, penned by Dutch archivists Muller, Feith, and Fruin., The *Dutch Manual* (and its more commonly refernced 1940 English translation) is almost entirely devoted to the processes involved in archival arrangement and description; it was, for archivists, an early identification of descriptive practices as the core of professional archival work. Today, for most archivists and archival institutions, description remains at the center of both professional practice and, often, theoretical discourse. Over time, research on description in the archival literature has attended to the development of descriptive standards (Weber 1989; Bunn 2013; SAA 2013) as well as the challenges and opportunities presented by new technologies (Pitti 2006; Dow 2009). However, the research questions being posed around descriptive theory and practice have remained largely the same: they have mainly focused on the nature and purpose of description (Bearman 1989; Duranti 1993; Duff and Harris 2002; MacNeil 2005), units of descriptive measure (Ellings and Waibel 2007; Niu 2016), standardization (MacNeil 2009; Gracy and Lambert 2014), and notions of descriptive control (SAA 2013).

Recently, however, the field of Archival Studies has undergone several important shifts: centering diverse communities and their unique voices, needs, and recordkeeping practices; expanding how archivists understand context to challenge the idea that context is always bounded and easily knowable; re-examining the role of the archivist and the possibilities and challenges inherent in archival intervention; and, importantly, developing practices with an eye toward harm-reduction such as archival redescription and descriptive remediation.[1] For example, in a 2019 article published in *Archival Science*, Alicia Chilcott suggested moving towards protocols for describing racially offensive language in UK public archives, while Sam Frederick, writing for *iJournal* that same year, urged archivists to focus on restorative justice efforts in archives by beginning with daily processes, such as description. A recent study conducted by the PI along with an MLISc student collaborator also put the spotlight on archival description, finding that current descriptive practices often serve to erase the identifiable existence of unique Indigenous voices (Sutherland and Purcell 2021). In a similar vein, the Society of American Archivists (SAA)’s Summer

[1] The term “harm” is used here—and throughout this proposal—in a restorative justice context. Restorative justice views community decline (in this instance a decline in community and stakeholder trust) and fear-based responses (in this case, a move away from archives as trusted sources of information and accountability) as indicators of broken relationships. Restorative justice aims to repair these harms to people, relationships, and communities and works to reduce future harm.

2019 edition of *Descriptive Notes*, the newsletter of the SAA Description Section, focused entirely on accessible, diverse, community-centered description. The newsletter includes references to Archives for Black Lives in Philadelphia's work around community-centered description and a piece by UCLA archivist Courtney Dean (who will serve on the Advisory Board for this project) that reports on a pilot project to survey and redescribe archival holdings documenting the incarceration of Japanese Americans during World War II. The project at UCLA was undertaken with the stated aim to audit archival description in finding aids for "euphemistic language not in line with the preferred terminology advocated for by the present-day Japanese American Community (Dean 2019)." Alongside more informal conversations that are happening on social media, this turn in the professional literature towards rethinking description and developing redescription practices signals a growing urgency in the field to grapple with the challenges of archival redescription and to find the best ways to remediate the injustices caused by existing descriptive practices. While this theoretical shift and the factors that have influenced these changes in archival practice are wide-ranging, engaging redescription and descriptive mediation as a form of transitional justice has become an important aspect of archival work in the United States.

What are some of the existing practices around archival redescription? When, why, and how are redescription and other descriptive remediation practices being engaged? A pilot study conducted by the PI of this proposal found that archival redescription and other descriptive remediation decisions are frequently triggered by a specific event; are often fraught; and sometimes have very serious consequences. At one small Midwestern liberal arts college, for example, an archival exhibit featuring blackface photographs from student scrapbooks was contested, resulting in the exhibit's closure and the temporary removal of the Library Director from their position. The exhibit was shuttered due to the archives' failure to provide "appropriate educational context," and raised larger questions such as who should determine the appropriate remediative action for racist and other contested materials in library and archival collections, and at what point such determinations should be made. In February 2019, another small university conducted an audit of its archival materials—specifically its yearbook collection—at the direction of the university President's office. The audit was triggered when the university's central administration was notified that web traffic to the archives' yearbook pages had increased tenfold in the in the wake of a national controversy in which Virginia governor Ralph Northam was found to have appeared in blackface in his college yearbook photos. The yearbooks were temporarily removed from the campus digital archives after blackface photographs and other racially insensitive imagery were discovered in their pages. Roughly a week later, the yearbooks were returned to the archives' digital collections with new educational context statements accompanying the blackface photos. This case became even more complicated, however, after the addition of the educational context statements. Although PDFs of the yearbooks in question were updated to include educational context statements as a form of descriptive remediation, portions of the yearbook could still be accessed as individual PDF files that did not have the educational context statement. In other words, researchers could still directly access the blackface sections of the yearbook—bypassing the educational context statement—because during the digitization workflow, remediative text was added to the archives' website and to the yearbook file as a whole, but not to the individual yearbook pages or subsections (which remained readily discoverable through the library's search interface).

This important takeaway from the pilot study raises concerns about digitization workflows and the role they play in redescription and descriptive remediation efforts, highlighting the potential for planning and implementation errors to become epic at scale for repositories designing redescription or descriptive remediation projects. Additionally—in no small part because of the black- and brownface scandals that have recently caught archives off-guard—archivists have begun to name and identify a growing tendency to recreate analog problems in digital environments as one potential flaw in the design and execution of digitization workflows. These early findings then raise another important question: ***what frameworks, guidelines, and/or tools for redescription and other descriptive remediation might be needed to inform***

digitization workflows? As digitized archival records have been the topic of recent nationwide controversies, important questions are being asked about why the materials were not discovered sooner, especially during the digitization workflow. Had these records been identified sooner in the digitization process, the outcomes of these cases might have been very different: the institutions themselves might have been spared considerable embarrassment as well as loss of trust, and individuals might have been spared considerable harm. It is clear from the pilot study that in addition to studying existing local repository practices around redescription and descriptive remediation, digitization workflows are also an important site of inquiry. Building on pilot study data and anecdotal evidence, an empirical study of redescription and descriptive remediation—that takes digitization workflows into consideration—will help to determine whether 1) improved public access as a result of digitization has a role to play in redescription endeavors; 2) mass digitization results in the automation of harmful description at scale; and 3) aggregation amplifies or legitimizes problematic description in ways that may contribute to further harms.[2]

The pilot data collected by the PI of this proposal also revealed that removing access to digitized materials has been one of the primary responses to encounters with difficult or contested records. In some of these cases, access has been restored accompanied by new contextual descriptions. In other cases, however, access to the record has simply not been restored, indicating that repositories have not yet found solutions for handling these problematic digital records. Do archivists and other LIS professionals on the front lines have the knowledge, skills, and tools they require to identify problematic records before such records become matters of public controversy and trigger limitations on access? And once these records have been identified, ***what knowledge, skills, and tools do archivists implementing redescription and other descriptive remediation projects need for their endeavors to be successful—and how is success defined?*** Answering these questions is vital because archives are charged with being trusted sources of information. For researchers and for those represented in these archives, this trust is eroded when archives are found to both perpetuate historical harms—such as derogatory descriptive terminology—and create new ones, such as surprise encounters with digitized photographs of people in black- and brownface.

The PI for this proposed project has already begun to conduct, present, and publish research on redescription and descriptive remediation on a small scale with MLISc students in the SOURCE Hawai‘i Research Lab.[3] In research conducted in 2019, the PI piloted a case study analysis of five repositories with contested archival records. In each of these cases, descriptive remediation was used to address the concerns raised about the records, and in each case the inciting incident for the controversy involved analog records that had been moved to digital environments. A second study—a late-2019 informal survey of redescription projects undertaken by practicing archivists—revealed that several redescription projects have been undertaken over the past 15 or so years. Additionally, several archivists responded indicating that their repositories have more recently begun to embrace some form of redescription as archival best practice. This informal survey found that as early as the mid-2000s, staff at the Clements Library at the University of Michigan conducted a redescription project that focused on gender. More recently, the Claremont Colleges (California), as part of a Collections as Data grant from the Mellon Foundation have begun to collaborate with community partners to attach appropriate Indigenous place names to roughly 13,000 digital files of mixed archival materials, including journals, ledgers, correspondence, field notes, and maps documenting the history of water use in Southern California in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The University of Montana is reported to have done some redescription work on their Native American collections as has The Center for Native American and Indigenous Research at The American Philosophical Society. Princeton University’s Special Collections division has done important work contextualizing and offering interventions to problematic terminology in their finding aids (drawing on

[2] Aggregation here refers to projects that bring together collections from various libraries, archives, and museums to provide free global access to the materials.

[3] Please see: https://www.sourceinitiatives.org/.

Archives for Black Lives in Philadelphia's Anti-Racist Description Resources) and working to ensure that predominantly Spanish-language collections have Spanish-language finding aids. Archivists at the University of California, Riverside have experimented with using computational scripts to audit existing descriptive practices while archivists at the University of Texas Austin have argued for new redescription practices, noting that failing to provide contextual description can be harmful and that assumptions of neutrality create biases in favor of historical racism. Finally, the survey highlighted work being done by the Archives of Traditional Music at Indiana University, new redescription work being undertaken by the Brooklyn Historical Society in New York, and a small pilot project at the University of Houston Libraries focused on metadata redescription for slavery-era records.

Through these preliminary studies, the PI developed a clearer understanding of the archival redescription and descriptive remediation landscape, which has already led to public presentations (Sutherland 2020) and the abovementioned co-authored open-source publication (Sutherland and Purcell 2021). This preliminary research helped the PI develop the research questions proposed in this research study. While preliminary research has laid an important foundation, more detailed work is needed to ascertain if these early findings can be generalized to offer broad professional guidance on redescription and descriptive remediation as tools for restorative justice. The proposed study, *Premised on Care: Redescription as Restorative Justice in American Archives*, aims to do exactly this work. And, while these preliminary studies have provided an important glimpse into a rapidly developing archival practice, without support from IMLS, empirical nationwide research that could answer the proposed research questions in a meaningful way for practicing archivists will have to proceed on a small scale, done piecemeal rather than comprehensively.

Project Design: This study addresses the distinctive role archives play as trusted sources of information, particularly for users from diverse communities. Over time, standard descriptive practices have caused (often unintentional) harm to various communities represented in the archives by codifying terms, expressions, and vocabularies that are disparaging and/or derogatory; exposing communities to unexpected traumatic encounters with racist and other discriminatory archival materials without warning or context; and (re)producing dangerous narratives that affect how people are seen, treated, talked about, and understood. Because trust is formed when organizations can be seen as reliable, confidence-inspiring, and physically and emotionally safe, some existing descriptive practices have eroded community trust in archives (particularly institutional and state-sponsored archives). Using 1) social science research methods and 2) critical archival studies as a theoretical and conceptual framework, this project seeks to build capacity in archives by identifying existing trends in redescription and descriptive remediation—and the reasons that inspired them—in order to help archivists and archival repositories make informed decisions about when and how to use descriptive interventions as a tool for trust-building and restorative justice. This research asks: ***what frameworks, guidelines, and/or tools for redescription and other descriptive remediation are needed for restorative justice?***

Critical archival studies, as defined by Caswell, Punzalan, and Sangwand (2017), denotes archival research that: (1) explains what is unjust with the current state of archival research and practice, (2) posits practical goals for how such research and practice can and should change, and/or (3) provides the norms for such critique. In this way, critical archival studies, like critical theory, is emancipatory in nature, with the ultimate goal of transforming archival practice and society writ large (p 2). Framing this study around restorative justice acknowledges that prior archival practices have caused harm and centers the research on repairing that harm. Restorative justice also requires that the people most affected by the harm done be able to participate in its resolution. With this in mind, this study uses critical archival studies to examine what injustices exist in the current state of archival description and posit practical goals—redescription and descriptive remediation—for how justice might be restored. The research aims to increase the visibility and transparency of existing redescription practices and identify when, why, and how

redescription practices are being engaged. Based on preliminary research into this first question and the resulting pilot data, the study also seeks assess the role of digitization as an impetus for redescription. While digitization offers broad access to important information for many diverse communities in America—including records about birth, life, and death; social and cultural customs and norms; disease and illness; and so much more—the potential for harm caused by the reproduction of analog content and descriptive terminology in digital environments without descriptive remediation must be better understood. To begin rebuilding trust, the study will engage and support stakeholders from diverse communities who have identified a need for redescription and/or descriptive remediation as restorative justice. Finally, the research will offer guidance for archivists who seek to implement redescription and/or descriptive remediation projects as a means of restorative justice, working to repair the harms imbedded in their own collections. Based on these research goals, this 3-year Early Career Grant project asks the following research questions:

RQ1. What are the existing practices around archival redescription? When, why, and how are redescription and other descriptive remediation practices being engaged?
RQ2. What frameworks, guidelines, and/or tools for redescription and other descriptive remediation are needed for restorative justice?
    RQ2a. What frameworks, guidelines, and/or tools for redescription and other descriptive remediation are needed to inform digitization workflows (as a function of restorative justice)?
RQ3. What knowledge, skills, and tools do archivists implementing redescription and other descriptive remediation projects need for their endeavors to be successful? How is success defined?

To answer these questions, the project's PI, Tonia Sutherland, along with a Graduate Research Assistant (GRA) from the Interdisciplinary Communication and Information Sciences PhD program at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, will conduct a three-part study. In Phase I, the PI and GRA will conduct virtual semi-structured qualitative interviews at 20 research sites across the United States. The interviews will be used to collect data about existing redescription and descriptive remediation practices (*RQ1*), as well as data about decision-making with regards to redescription, descriptive mediation, and digitization workflows (*RQ2a*). The Phase I interview protocol will include questions such as: *What (if any) redescription or descriptive remediation projects has your repository undertaken? What prompted these efforts? In what ways does your repository use semi-automated or automated descriptive processes as part of your digitization workflows?* The research sites for Phase I were selected because they have identified redescription as an institutional or organizational priority; because they hold specific redescription expertise; or because they have been involved with a public encounter or concern that has resulted in descriptive remediation. Sites have also been chosen with an eye toward geographic distribution, attention to cultural diversity, and variability in organizational/institutional size and collecting missions.

Proposed research sites include:

- UCLA Library Special Collections (CA)
- University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa (HI)
- Syracuse University (NY)
- Hollins University (VA)
- Doane University (NE)
- Clements Library, Univ. of Michigan (MI)
- University of Montana (MO)
- Archives of Traditional Music (IN)
- Brooklyn Historical Society (NY)
- American Philosophical Society (PA)
- Princeton University (NJ)
- Wake Forest Archives (IL)
- Yale University (CT)
- University of Houston (TX)

- Univ. of Minnesota Archives (MN)
- Hawai‘i State Archives (HI)
- Rochester Institute of Technology (NY)
- University of California, Riverside (CA)
- Louisiana Digital Library (LA)
- Claremont Colleges (CA)

If archives are to be seen as trusted spaces for diverse communities, in addition to understanding the archival impetus for redescription and/or descriptive remediation it is vital to have the perspectives of those communities on archival descriptive practices past, present, and future. These perspectives are crucial because the communities most impacted by any harmful practices must have a voice in determining a resolution to those harms. Restorative justice requires: (1) repair: archival descriptive practices have caused harm and justice requires repairing that harm; (2) encounter: the best way to determine how to repair that harm is to have the impacted parties decide together; and (3) transformation: encounters centered around repair can cause fundamental changes in people, relationships. and communities (Centre for Justice and Reconciliation). As demonstrated by the PI's previous work in this area, redescription and descriptive remediation have typically happened when representations of diverse cultures, languages, and geographies have been challenged, found to be inappropriate (or outdated), or failed to accurately reflect the preferences of the communities being represented or described. Building on knowledge gained about the users of archives from Caswell's (2016) *Assessing the Use of Community Archives (AUCA)* IMLS Early Career Grant, in Phase II of this study, the PI and GRA will disseminate a survey broadly aimed at the users of archives including (but not by any means limited to): scholars, genealogists, local historians, students, land rights advocates, and other researchers. The survey will be circulated using email listservs and social media as well as being strategically posted on websites and blogs.

Those who complete the survey will be asked at the end of the survey to indicate their willingness to participate in virtual community listening sessions (restorative circles) which will also include volunteers from the research sites in Phase I. To create space for diverse communities to voice any existing concerns and identify necessary restorative mechanisms, the PI and GRA will conduct a series of 3-5 (depending on rate of response and willingness to participate) combined community listening sessions with archivists who were interviewed during Phase I and users who self-selected in Phase II. These listening sessions will allow archivists and the communities represented in the collections they steward and describe to participate in facilitated discussions that collectively reflect the needs of multiple stakeholders (*RQ2*). The PI will employ a trained facilitator for these sessions and community members and other user-stakeholders will be given opportunities for ongoing engagement to ensure that restorative justice is actually occurring.

To gain a richer understanding of what knowledge, skills, and tools archivists implementing redescription and other descriptive remediation projects need for their endeavors to be successful, in Phase III of the study the PI and GRA will conduct 5-7 focus groups, using an iterative process of data analysis. Data from the research site interviews in Phase I and the Phase II listening sessions will be coded using grounded theory analysis. In grounded theory, all theoretical development is grounded in actual data, which means the analysis and development of any theory or the evaluation and naming of any phenomena happens after data has been collected. Because grounded theory is reflective of the data that has actually been collected, grounded theory analyses produce thick descriptions that allows for—and acknowledge—areas of conflict and contradiction. Once a first round of analytical coding (the process of identifying themes in the data that has been collected and finding the relationships between them) has been completed, the Phase III focus group questions will be designed based on the themes that emerge from the research site data with the general goal of establishing what knowledge, skills, and tools archivists implementing redescription and other descriptive remediation projects need for their endeavors to be successful and how success is defined (*RQ3*).

Phase III focus groups will be limited to ten (10) people per group and conducted among practicing archivists attending professional archival conferences (national and regional) in order to achieve the highest level of diversity in institutional, geographic, cultural, demographic, and

professional representation. Focus group members will be selected using purposeful and snowball sampling methods. Purposeful sampling is frequently used in qualitative research to identify and select information-rich cases for the most effective use of limited resources (Patton 2002). Purposeful sampling in this study will involve identifying and selecting individuals or groups of individuals that are especially knowledgeable about or experienced with archival descriptive practices. Snowball sampling is a sampling technique in which existing research subjects provide referrals to recruit other subjects; in this case, archivists involved in *Premised on Care* focus groups would make recommendations to include other archivists whose voices they believe should be part of the conversation. While there is the possibility for this selection process to introduce bias into the research design, it is important to ensure that focus group participants bring strong knowledge of existing descriptive practices to the conversation.

The proposed study engages both archivists, users, and the broader community in alignment with the 2018-2022 IMLS Strategic Plan to build capacity, promote lifelong learning, and increase public access. Project activities are focused in the following areas:

1) Survey existing practices around archival redescription to better understand how and why redescription practices are being engaged. (*RQ1*)
2) Determine when and how digitization acts as an impetus for redescription practices. (*RQ2a*)
3) Solicit and incorporate feedback from the community about description, redescription, and descriptive remediation. (*RQ2*)
4) Create a toolkit for archivists to implement redescription protocols for their collections. (*RQ3*)
5) Provide a forum for community engagement. (*RQ2, RQ3*)

The PI and GRA will collect interview, survey, listening session, and focus group data which will be anonymized (to safeguard participant privacy), analyzed, and disseminated via traditional academic publishing venues, open source and other freely accessible venues. All data collected will be housed in a secure, locked location at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa for the duration of the project, after which it will be destroyed, with the exception of anonymized survey data which will be retained and made available through the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa’s digital repository.

The final outcomes of this project are expected to be: *improved redescription project design, methods, workflows, and outcomes; improved descriptive remediation interventions at the digital threshold; and improved trust in institutional and organizational archives*. Project deliverables include a website to host a downloadable open-access toolkit for archivists who seek to implement redescription and/or descriptive remediation protocols in their collections; guidelines and/or best practices for redescription and descriptive remediation; published research to improve knowledge about redescriptive practices and redescription project design; webinars and a research symposium to disseminate research findings and results; and the creation of ongoing forums for community engagement. While the exact contents of the toolkit and the nature of the forums will develop from iterative feedback from archivists, users, and other community stakeholders as best practices and stated needs for restorative justice emerge, it is envisioned that the toolkit will include—at a minimum—a downloadable and printable resource with guidelines and/or best practices and an instructional unit and/or training content. The forum for ongoing community engagement will include—at a minimum—a dedicated listserv (to be hosted by the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa), periodic webinars, and community summits through which knowledge and resources might be shared and resources (such as the toolkit) might be updated. Additional project activities are expected to include creating a project website; designing, posting, and circulating an open-source printable visual resource focusing on redescription as restorative justice; presenting findings at conferences for additional iterative feedback and further development; sharing findings and the toolkit in academic and non-academic venues (such as listservs, blog posts, website updates, social media outlets, and professional newsletters); creating a network for archivists working on redescription and engaged community-members invested in

descriptive practices; and the creation and maintenance of a social media outreach campaign (to be managed by students affiliated with the SOURCE Hawai‘i Research and Community Engagement Laboratory of which the PI is Director). These activities will take place over a 3-year period culminating in a symposium on redescription hosted by the Research Committee of the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa Library and Information Science Program. Research findings will be disseminated (via means articulated above) throughout the duration of the project funding—including two webinars, one each at the end of Years 1 and 2—and guidelines/best practices will be included as part of the final project report.

- In Year 1, the PI and GRA will secure IRB approval for the GRA (IRB application is in progress); conduct Phase I interviews (*RQ1, RQ2a*); analyze interview data; plan Webinar I; and present preliminary research at AERI (academic conference) and SAA (professional conference). The project website and social media outreach campaign will also be established in Year 1.
- In Year 2, the PI and GRA will disseminate the survey to archival users (*RQ2*); analyze survey data; conduct 3-5 facilitated community listening sessions (*RQ2*); and analyze community listening session data. Webinar I will be held in September and Webinar II will be planned during Year 2. The project website and social media campaign will continue. Research-in-progress will be presented at conferences as appropriate throughout Year 2.
- In Year 3, the PI and GRA will create two forums for community engagement; conduct 5-7 focus groups; analyze focus group data; design and make available a downloadable redescription toolkit; hold Webinar II and plan a research symposium (to be held September 2024) to disseminate project findings. Research findings will also be presented at conferences and published as appropriate throughout Year 3. The stakeholder listserv, project website, and social media campaign will continue as future plans take shape based on community and other stakeholder feedback.

At each stage of the research study, the project will be evaluated for indicators of success including effectiveness, efficiency, quality, and timeliness (based in part on adherence to the Schedule of Completion). In addition to these measures, during Phase I, interview protocols will be regularly revisited and updated as needed based on the responses of practicing archivists. Indicators of success in Phase I are high quality interview data that provide insights into existing policies and procedures as well as motivations for same. In Phase II, community stakeholders engaged in the project will be given a forum for ongoing engagement (the listserv or another preferred platform) as a place to voice ongoing concerns and enact practices of care as they participate in what may be difficult conversations about identity and representation in the historical archival record. The listserv will be moderated and monitored by the PI and the GRA so that community healing will be centered in this particular discourse rather than the needs of institutional archives. Indicators of success in Phase II are high-yield survey and high-quality survey responses that also result in volunteer participants for the community listening sessions. An important indicator for success in the listening sessions is that everyone leaves the session feeling that their concerns have been heard, taken seriously, and will be acted upon. The PI will work with the facilitator for these sessions to ensure that this success indicator is met and/or exceeded. Because it is based on grounded theory and is an iterative process that will determine how each subsequent phase develops, data analysis also offers an opportunity for internal evaluation. The Phase III focus group questions will come directly from data gathered in Phases I and II, allowing for internal consistency in study design and results. Indicators for success in Phase III include active focus group participation with diverse representation from archivists across cultural, identity, institutional, geographic, and other categories.

The PI and GRA will work closely with an eight (8) member Advisory Board who are all either archival practitioners or archives faculty. Advisory Board members were selected because of prior

experience with redescription and/or descriptive remediation policies and practices; because they represent diverse cultural identities, geographies, institution/organization types; and for their ability to work as intermediaries between the project and the profession (for example, offering guidance on data collection). The Advisory Board is comprised of: Dr. Sumayya Ahmed, Assistant Professor at Simmons University; Gailyn Bopp, Assistant Professor and Associate Archivist at Brigham Young University Hawai‘i and President, Association of Hawai‘i Archivists; Dr. Ellen-Rae Cachola, Archives Manager, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa Law Library; Jasmine Clark, Digital Scholarship Librarian at Temple University and Reviewer, Archives for Black Lives in Philadelphia Anti-Racist Description Resources; Courtney Dean, Head of the Center for Primary Research and Training at UCLA and author of "Redescribing Japanese American Collections at UCLA (2019);" Sony Prosper, Emerging Archival Scholar (IMLS RE-20-16-0110-16) and PhD student at the University of Michigan; Ka‘iulani Kauihou, Hawaiian Language specialist, community storyteller, and Director, Hi‘ohia; and S.L. Ziegler, Head of Digital Programs and Services at the Louisiana State University Libraries.

In addition to support and guidance from the Advisory Board, *Premised on Care: Redescription as Restorative Justice in American Archives* will employ a GRA from the Interdisciplinary Communication and Information Sciences PhD program at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa. The GRA will receive tuition remission, health insurance, and a stipend as well as valuable mentoring and experience in designing and conducting empirical social science research. The project also enjoys the broad support of the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa's Library and Information Science Program (please see Organizational Profile) through course offerings, basic administrative support, and the necessary existing infrastructures for listservs, dedicated email addresses, and an institutional repository. The project will also be supported and engaged by MLISc students working with the PI in the SOURCE Hawai‘i Research and Community Engagement Laboratory (please see Organizational Profile). MLISc students and students working with SOURCE Hawai‘i will be offered educational credit through LIS 693: Special Topics and LIS 699: Directed Reading and/or Research course offerings to work on aspects of the research project such as redescription and descriptive remediation research, website design, social media outreach, and toolkit development.

Diversity Plan: This project centers on how people from diverse communities are represented and described in American archives. By seeking feedback specifically from members of these groups in community listening sessions, the PI seeks to attain a multivalent expression of redescription needs and practices. The project seeks to empower diverse communities by creating space to articulate the harms inherent in current practices and to identify ways to remediate those harms. Many extant redescription projects are aimed at correcting historical injury to diverse communities; this study seeks to codify and make visible that work, in the service of those communities. By centering the work of organizations such as Archives for Black Lives in Philadelphia, the project takes its lead in making recommendations from those most likely to be injured by racist or other discriminatory descriptive practices. The GRA working on the project will be given an opportunity to apply a critical theoretical archival lens to a real-life problem at a university known for its strengths in ethnic and cultural diversity, while working to create practical guidelines for archives professionals seeking to remediate historical cultural and community harms.

Additionally, all three phases of this project seek to engage archives professionals in the work of increasing diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) in their daily archival practices. This work has the added benefit of creating space for more diverse, equitable, and inclusive workplaces. Research has shown that when an emphasis is placed on DEI initiatives and adequate support is provided for such initiatives, one tangible result that people from diverse backgrounds are more likely to want to work in these environments (Espinal, Sutherland, and Roh 2019). By evidencing and articulating support for the work that undergirds *Premised on Care*, institutions are signaling a commitment to DEI projects to their staff, present and future.

Finally, the PI for this proposed project is an assistant professor in the Library and Information Science Program at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa and the Director of the Initiative for the Study of Underrepresented Cultures and Ethnicities (SOURCE) Hawai‘i. SOURCE Hawai‘i works closely with diverse communities to engage and understand their information and recordkeeping needs. Students working on *Premised on Care* under the umbrella of SOURCE Hawai‘i come from diverse backgrounds and will take the knowledge they have achieved working on this project into the field with them when they complete their MLISc and/or PhD degrees.

Broad Impact: The following broad impacts are expected as a result of *Premised on Care: Redescription as Restorative Justice in American Archives*: 1.) contributions to theoretical and practical knowledge about redescription and descriptive remediation practices; 2.) a better understanding about the relationship between digitization and redescription; 3.) community-based knowledge about the impact of descriptive practices among diverse community stakeholders; 4.) contributions to practical knowledge about harm reduction and remediation, descriptive remediation, and the practical application of critical theory to archival description in archival repositories across the US; and 5.) the provision of evidence-based, field-tested materials (guidelines, toolkit, published research) for institutions and organizations seeking to implement archival redescription programs.

Findings from this research will be disseminated through a project website which will feature an open-access downloadable toolkit for archivists (including, for example: guidelines and best practices, research outcomes and findings, key terminologies, ways to connect with other repositories, course units and other training materials, and printable one-page PDF guides); links to key redescription resources; and recordings of webinars and symposia. Two spaces for ongoing engagement will also be created: the first is a safe-space listserv for diverse community stakeholders where subscribers can continue conversations about naming and representation as well as receive updates about redescription projects and mechanisms for community feedback. The second is a broader forum for sharing information about redescription and descriptive remediation projects that will be open to any interested party, but especially those engaging in redescription or descriptive remediation work. All of these outward facing tools will be available to the general public (with the exception of the community listserv) allowing for broad access and uptake. Social media outreach campaigns will ensure high visibility of the research and its outcomes. Because these materials will be free and downloadable, they will also be adaptable; archivists and archives can amend the processes as necessary to fit within the needs of their individual repositories. The website will be maintained by the PI after the duration of the funded project and updated semi-annually as the need arises. Published works will be placed in the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa’s institutional repository (along with anonymized survey data) as well as presentations from the two project webinars and the project symposium. Research will be also be presented at academic and professional conferences, summits, colloquia, and other presentation venues as time permits. Links to presentations will be posted to the website whenever possible.

This research will change not only how archivists understand and can better serve their users writ large, but how archivists, librarians, and their institutions understand how to best work closely with community stakeholders to design and manage redescription projects that offer restorative justice to communities harmed by extant archival descriptive practices. This research also stands to impact how repositories conduct user services research and outreach to diverse populations to better provide services that are premised on care.

Premised on Care: Redescription as Restorative Justice in American Archives

Schedule of Completion

Year 1: September 1, 2021—August 31, 2022

	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug
IRB Approval (GRA)												
Advisory Board Mtgs.												
Phase I Interviews												
Transcribe Interview Recordings												
Code Interview Recordings												
Website Creation												
Social Media Campaign Launch												
Planning: Webinar I												
Present Preliminary Research: AERI, SAA												

Year 2: September 1, 2022—August 31, 2023

	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug
Advisory Board Mtgs.												
Webinar I												
Phase II Survey												
Analyze Survey Data												
Community Listening Sessions												
Transcribe Listening Session Recordings												
Code Listening Session Recordings												
Planning: Webinar II												
Present Ongoing Research												

Year 3: September 1, 2023—August 31, 2024

	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug
Advisory Board Mtgs.												
Webinar II												
Create Community Engagement Forums												
Phase III Focus Groups												
Transcribe Focus Group Recordings												
Code Focus Group Recordings												
Planning: September 2024 Symposium												
Produce Toolkit												
Present Research Findings												

DIGITAL PRODUCT FORM

INTRODUCTION

The Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) is committed to expanding public access to digital products that are created using federal funds. This includes (1) digitized and born-digital content, resources, or assets; (2) software; and (3) research data (see below for more specific examples). Excluded are preliminary analyses, drafts of papers, plans for future research, peer-review assessments, and communications with colleagues.

The digital products you create with IMLS funding require effective stewardship to protect and enhance their value, and they should be freely and readily available for use and reuse by libraries, archives, museums, and the public. Because technology is dynamic and because we do not want to inhibit innovation, we do not want to prescribe set standards and practices that could become quickly outdated. Instead, we ask that you answer questions that address specific aspects of creating and managing digital products. Like all components of your IMLS application, your answers will be used by IMLS staff and by expert peer reviewers to evaluate your application, and they will be important in determining whether your project will be funded.

INSTRUCTIONS

If you propose to create digital products in the course of your IMLS-funded project, you must first provide answers to the questions in **SECTION I: INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS AND PERMISSIONS.** Then consider which of the following types of digital products you will create in your project, and complete each section of the form that is applicable.

SECTION II: DIGITAL CONTENT, RESOURCES, OR ASSETS

Complete this section if your project will create digital content, resources, or assets. These include both digitized and born-digital products created by individuals, project teams, or through community gatherings during your project. Examples include, but are not limited to, still images, audio files, moving images, microfilm, object inventories, object catalogs, artworks, books, posters, curricula, field books, maps, notebooks, scientific labels, metadata schema, charts, tables, drawings, workflows, and teacher toolkits. Your project may involve making these materials available through public or access-controlled websites, kiosks, or live or recorded programs.

SECTION III: SOFTWARE

Complete this section if your project will create software, including any source code, algorithms, applications, and digital tools plus the accompanying documentation created by you during your project.

SECTION IV: RESEARCH DATA

Complete this section if your project will create research data, including recorded factual information and supporting documentation, commonly accepted as relevant to validating research findings and to supporting scholarly publications.

SECTION I: INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS AND PERMISSIONS

A.1 We expect applicants seeking federal funds for developing or creating digital products to release these files under open-source licenses to maximize access and promote reuse. What will be the intellectual property status of the digital products (i.e., digital content, resources, or assets; software; research data) you intend to create? What ownership rights will your organization assert over the files you intend to create, and what conditions will you impose on their access and use? Who will hold the copyright(s)? Explain and justify your licensing selections. Identify and explain the license under which you will release the files (e.g., a non-restrictive license such as BSD, GNU, MIT, Creative Commons licenses; RightsStatements.org statements). Explain and justify any prohibitive terms or conditions of use or access, and detail how you will notify potential users about relevant terms and conditions.

The PI will maintain copyright of any research published as a result of this project (as the publication venue permits). The PI will favor open access journals and venues for publications. Preprint copies of all published research will be deposited in the University of Hawai'i's institutional repository which is open access. Survey data will be anonymized and placed in UH's institutional repository. The Toolkit will be published on the project website and released under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 License International (CC BY-NC 4.0) which allows for the open use, sharing, and adaptation of the Toolkit for non-commercial purposes. A link to the Creative Commons license will be placed on the project website and will be part of the download agreement.

A.2 What ownership rights will your organization assert over the new digital products and what conditions will you impose on access and use? Explain and justify any terms of access and conditions of use and detail how you will notify potential users about relevant terms or conditions.

N/A

A.3 If you will create any products that may involve privacy concerns, require obtaining permissions or rights, or raise any cultural sensitivities, describe the issues and how you plan to address them.

N/A

SECTION II: DIGITAL CONTENT, RESOURCES, OR ASSETS

A.1 Describe the digital content, resources, or assets you will create or collect, the quantities of each type, and the format(s) you will use.

The *Premised on Care* project will create an open-access, downloadable toolkit for archives practitioners. The toolkit will include guidelines and/or best practices and an instructional unit and/or training content. The toolkit will be hosted by and made available on the project's public website.

A.2 List the equipment, software, and supplies that you will use to create the digital content, resources, or assets, or the name of the service provider that will perform the work.

The toolkit will be created on project laptops and hosted on a Wix-powered public website. The PI and GRA will create all content for the toolkit (or co-create with community stakeholders involved in the project).

A.3 List all the digital file formats (e.g., XML, TIFF, MPEG, OBJ, DOC, PDF) you plan to use. If digitizing content, describe the quality standards (e.g., resolution, sampling rate, pixel dimensions) you will use for the files you will create.

It is expected that the toolkit will be a downloadable PDF/A file or series of downloadable PDF/A files.

Workflow and Asset Maintenance/Preservation

B.1 Describe your quality control plan. How will you monitor and evaluate your workflow and products?

The website and toolkit will be checked periodically by the PI to address preservation and access concerns such as link death and download issues.

B.2 Describe your plan for preserving and maintaining digital assets during and after the award period. Your plan should address storage systems, shared repositories, technical documentation, migration planning, and commitment of organizational funding for these purposes. Please note: You may charge the federal award before closeout for the costs of publication or sharing of research results if the costs are not incurred during the period of performance of the federal award (see 2 C.F.R. § 200.461).

Individual toolkit elements will be backed up on project laptops and two project external hard drives as well as being placed in the University of Hawai'i's institutional repository. The project website will be supported by the PI's lab after the close of the project.

Metadata

C.1 Describe how you will produce any and all technical, descriptive, administrative, or preservation metadata or linked data. Specify which standards or data models you will use for the metadata structure (e.g., RDF, BIBFRAME, Dublin Core, Encoded Archival Description, PBCore, PREMIS) and metadata content (e.g., thesauri).

N/A

C.2 Explain your strategy for preserving and maintaining metadata created or collected during and after the award period of performance.

N/A

C.3 Explain what metadata sharing and/or other strategies you will use to facilitate widespread discovery and use of the digital content, resources, or assets created during your project (e.g., an API [Application Programming Interface], contributions to a digital platform, or other ways you might enable batch queries and retrieval of metadata).

N/A

Access and Use

D.1 Describe how you will make the digital content, resources, or assets available to the public. Include details such as the delivery strategy (e.g., openly available online, available to specified audiences) and underlying hardware/software platforms and infrastructure (e.g., specific digital repository software or leased services, accessibility via standard web browsers, requirements for special software tools in order to use the content, delivery enabled by IIIF specifications).

The toolkit will be openly available online through the project website and UH's institutional repository.

D.2. Provide the name(s) and URL(s) (Universal Resource Locator), DOI (Digital Object Identifier), or other persistent identifier for any examples of previous digital content, resources, or assets your organization has created.

N/A

SECTION III: SOFTWARE

General Information

A.1 Describe the software you intend to create, including a summary of the major functions it will perform and the intended primary audience(s) it will serve.

N/A

A.2 List other existing software that wholly or partially performs the same or similar functions, and explain how the software you intend to create is different, and justify why those differences are significant and necessary.

N/A

Technical Information

B.1 List the programming languages, platforms, frameworks, software, or other applications you will use to create your software and explain why you chose them.

N/A

B.2 Describe how the software you intend to create will extend or interoperate with relevant existing software.

N/A

B.3 Describe any underlying additional software or system dependencies necessary to run the software you intend to create.

N/A

B.4 Describe the processes you will use for development, documentation, and for maintaining and updating documentation for users of the software.

N/A

B.5 Provide the name(s), URL(s), and/or code repository locations for examples of any previous software your organization has created.

N/A

Access and Use

C.1 Describe how you will make the software and source code available to the public and/or its intended users.

N/A

C.2 Identify where you will deposit the source code for the software you intend to develop:

Name of publicly accessible source code repository:

N/A

URL:

N/A

SECTION IV: RESEARCH DATA

As part of the federal government's commitment to increase access to federally funded research data, Section IV represents the Data Management Plan (DMP) for research proposals and should reflect data management, dissemination, and preservation best practices in the applicant's area of research appropriate to the data that the project will generate.

A.1 Identify the type(s) of data you plan to collect or generate, and the purpose or intended use(s) to which you expect them to be put. Describe the method(s) you will use, the proposed scope and scale, and the approximate dates or intervals at which you will collect or generate data.

Premised on Care will collect interview, survey, listening session, and focus group data to answer the research questions posed in the Narrative. Interview data will be collected during 20 semi-structured qualitative interviews during AY 2021-2022. Survey data (from a national survey of practicing archivists) and listening session data (from 3-5 community listening sessions) will be collected during AY 2022-2023. Focus group data from 5-7 focus groups (10 participants each, maximum) will be collected during AY 2023-2024.

A.2 Does the proposed data collection or research activity require approval by any internal review panel or institutional review board (IRB)? If so, has the proposed research activity been approved? If not, what is your plan for securing approval?

The PI for *Premised on Care* is in the process of securing IRB approval for this qualitative research study.

A.3 Will you collect any sensitive information? This may include personally identifiable information (PII), confidential information (e.g., trade secrets), or proprietary information. If so, detail the specific steps you will take to protect the information while you prepare it for public release (e.g., anonymizing individual identifiers, data aggregation). If the data will not be released publicly, explain why the data cannot be shared due to the protection of privacy, confidentiality, security, intellectual property, and other rights or requirements.

Any PII collected will have individual identifiers anonymized for privacy. Survey data will be aggregated before deposit in UH's institutional repository. Interview, listening session, and focus group data will not be shared without the express permission of participants due to privacy protections and confidentiality.

A.4 What technical (hardware and/or software) requirements or dependencies would be necessary for understanding retrieving, displaying, processing, or otherwise reusing the data?

Survey data that is made public will be presented in common formats (PDF, Excel, etc.).

A.5 What documentation (e.g., consent agreements, data documentation, codebooks, metadata, and analytical and procedural information) will you capture or create along with the data? Where will the documentation be stored and in what format(s)? How will you permanently associate and manage the documentation with the data it describes to enable future reuse?

The PI and GRA for *Premised on Care* will issue and collect consent agreements for interviews and focus groups (and recordings of interviews and focus groups). Consent agreements for recording listening sessions will also be collected. The project PI and GRA will also create field notes which will be analyzed alongside other collected data and codebooks (for data analysis). These consent agreements will be stored separately from the data in a secure location on the UH Manoa campus. This documentation will not be released. Codebooks will be released alongside survey data in the UH institutional repository.

A.6 What is your plan for managing, disseminating, and preserving data after the completion of the award-funded project?

All survey data will be housed for long-term use in the University of Hawai'i institutional repository. Interview, listening session, and focus group data will be destroyed at the close of the project unless permission to retain them has been obtained as part of the consent process.

A.7 Identify where you will deposit the data:

Name of repository:

ScholarSpace at the University of Hawai'i at Manoa

URL:

https://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/

A.8 When and how frequently will you review this data management plan? How will the implementation be monitored?

The data management plan will be reviewed semi-annually and changes reported to the funding agency. The PI and GRA will monitor DMP implementation for reporting and other purposes.