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A Note from the Organizers

November 10, 2017

More than a year ago, frustrated with cultural heritage conferences, we got together to organize a gathering that was more movement than conference. We were surprised to see how quickly other organizations, associations, colleagues and companies jumped in to help make the Cultural Heritage and Social Change (CHSC) Summit a reality. The time was right, and there was real need to find meaning and action in the work of cultural heritage.

The CHSC Summit was just that for many of us: a "mountain top" experience, an exhilarating moment to connect with like-minded colleagues to work through some of the heavy, heart-wrenching, and revolutionary work of social justice and social change in our field. As the Summit wrapped up, we moved collectively with some anxiety into the presidential election of 2016, which was just two days later. Sessions that seemed like dreams and vision a few days earlier very quickly turned to critical, necessary, urgent and required.

This document summarizes some of the core findings of the Summit--themes that have also arisen in many other cultural heritage conferences and meetings over the past year:

• Safe Space for Disruptive Dialogue
• Funding for Transformative Gatherings
• Equitable and Ethical Collaboration
• Diversifying Technology Production in Cultural Heritage Spaces
• Integrating Community Archives Into Traditional Cultural Heritage Spaces
• Social Innovation and Rethinking Goals and Objectives in the Cultural Heritage Sector

Recent events have confirmed just how important many of these core findings are, and underline that they cannot, and will not be ignored. In regards to Historypin and Shift, these findings echo much of our other research in the field and have had a major impact on how we work in collaboration with communities.

We move forward from the Summit knowing that there is much work to do, but that there is a strong movement afoot of those that will continue to work at the intersection of cultural heritage and social change.

Cultural Heritage and Social Change Summit Co-founders, and 2016 CHSC Summit Organizing Committee Co-Chairs:

Jon Voss
Strategic Partnerships Director, Historypin/ Director, Shift (US)

Haitham Eid, PhD
Assistant Professor/Director
Master of Arts in Museum Studies Program
Southern University at New Orleans
What were the reasons and aims of the Summit?

Cultural heritage organizations, from public libraries and small house museums to globally recognized art and history museums, are in a unique position to foster social change in their local communities. More than ever, these organizations are both looking internally at issues of diversity, inclusion and equity, while at the same time finding their role in communities at the front lines of social and environmental justice, community development, and cultural preservation. We are at a critical juncture in which these organizations have the opportunity to support social change, and empower local communities in both time-tested and new ways.

The primary aim of the inaugural Cultural Heritage and Social Change Summit (CHSC Summit) was simple: provide the time, space, and opportunity for cultural heritage practitioners to focus on creating and implementing policy and strategy to support cultural equity in our fields.

The CHSC Summit was funded by in-kind and cash donations from different and varied cultural heritage organizations, including a $10,000 matching donation from an anonymous donor. A diverse organizing committee (see list below) helped to spread the word, assist in fundraising, and recruit potential delegates.

By holding the CHSC Summit at a Historically Black University, away from the French Quarter, and keeping the attendance costs at sliding scale up to $75, we gave people an inclusive way to participate in New Orleans culture not usually available to the conference crowd. The Summit attracted representatives from nationally recognized institutions as well as smaller, local organizations not usually present at strategy meetings for the fields. Travel grants were used to further widen that net to include underrepresented groups including: ethnic minorities, small and rural cultural heritage organizations, 2016 flood-affected organizations from Louisiana, and tribal libraries.

The CHSC Summit was the second “Summit” series that Shift/Historypin has produced. It follows the successful Linked Open Data in Libraries, Archives and Museums Summit (http://lodlam.net) that started in 2011 and has since taken place bi-annually in San Francisco, Montreal, Sydney and Venice. The CHSC Summit was in collaboration with the Museum Computer Network conference in New Orleans, and was hosted by the M.A. Museum Studies Program, Southern University at New Orleans, from November 5-6, 2016.

Jon Voss, Strategic Partnerships Director of Historypin and Haitham Eid, Interim Director of the Master of Arts in Museum Studies Program at the Southern University at New Orleans originally came up with the idea while serving on the planning committee of the 2016 Museum Computer Network. Frustrated with the lack of representation of people of color in the museum field in general, and international museum conferences in particular, they saw the opportunity to expand and improve upon the conference model while moving toward a more action-focused and inclusive convening—lowering the barriers to entry, and broadening the target audience to include all of cultural heritage.

2016 CHSC Summit Organizing Committee:

- Jon Voss (co-chair), Historypin
- Haitham Eid (co-chair), Southern University at New Orleans MA Museum Studies Program
- Bergis Jules, University of California, Riverside
- Cheryl A. Eberly, Santa Ana Public Library
- Effie Kapsalis, Smithsonian Institution Archives
- Gia Hamilton, Joan Mitchell Center
- Jeff Chang, Stanford University, Author: Who We Be
- Jennifer Himmelreich, Peabody Essex Museum
- Jerald White, New Orleans Loving Festival
- Jordan Hirsch, Writer and Advocate
- Kara Olidge, Amistad Research Center at Tulane
- Kerri Young, Historypin
- Lanae Spruce, National Museum of African American History & Culture
- Mark Puente, Association of Research Libraries
- Mia Henry, Arcus Center for Social Justice Leadership, Kalamazoo College
- Miriam Langer, Center for Cultural Technology at New Mexico Highlands University
- Rachel Frick, Digital Public Library of America
- Rebecca Cooper, Lower 9th Ward Living Museum
- Sharon Leon, Roy Rosenzweig Center for History and New Media
- Traci Taylor, Southern University at New Orleans
The CHSC Summit took place at the Leonard S. Washington Memorial Library on the campus of Southern University at New Orleans November 5 and 6, 2016. The first day went from 9-5pm with a social event on Frenchman Street that evening, and the second day went from 9-3pm, with an ad hoc social event at Preservation Hall, thanks to the generous support of delegate Ron Rona.

The Summit was organized using a technique known as Open Space Technology, which is based on principles of self-organizing. Using a “community marketplace,” the conference is planned in the first hour of each conference day, with sessions proposed by the delegates. While the process is lightly facilitated, much of the work is done ahead of the conference to recruit the delegates, set the tone and intention of the Summit, provide the tools to delegates to make it successful, and then open the space for delegates to create in.

In addition to our collaboration with the Museum Computer Network conference, we chose New Orleans because we felt it was important to gather in an inspiring location and create an environment that takes delegates out of a sense of normal or everyday thinking. The food is of critical importance, and the way chairs are arranged in a circle makes it clear that knowledge comes from the group instead of a hierarchical selection, and there is ample room for outdoor space and walks. The delegates shaped the conference to meet their needs, and because there is no pre-planned agenda, they were free to address pressing and up-to-the-minute issues.

Who Attended?
The CHSC Summit attracted a diverse audience from across the cultural heritage and academic fields. You can see a list of all delegates who chose to publicly share their information online here, and Appendix II contains a list of how delegates self-identified by sector or area of concentration.
1. Safe Space for Disruptive Dialogue

Throughout the summit, delegates expressed their appreciation for a safe space to discuss issues that could potentially be sensitive topics in their home workspaces. Some of the topics discussed during the sessions revolved around the harmful impact of traditional practices in the cultural heritage sector on communities of color and other marginalized people, and how we might go about confronting those practices. Other topics focused on how cultural heritage workers, through their collections and practices, can acknowledge the trauma that marginalized people already face in a society that sees and treats them as other. Sub themes emerged within the safe space discussion around the ethic of care that should be adopted, and practiced, when dealing with these communities and their histories. Several delegates talked about how the trauma communities faced cannot be separated from the records about their lives which is why a commitment to care is necessary. The framing of the summit as a safe space allowed these conversations to flourish. It was vital for the delegates to feel they had the freedom and protection to be as disruptive and vulnerable as they wanted to be in their sharing.

Part of the importance of a safe space was also an opportunity for members of affected communities to speak truth without fear of judgement, and without the traditionally unfair responsibility of being concerned with how those truths affect people already benefiting from power and privilege in society. To that end, in some sessions delegates agreed beforehand against attributing comments to individuals in public spaces, and posting people’s comments on social media during sessions. Several also committed to being open to hearing historical truths without passing judgement. These simple rules for engaging with each other were essential for the impactful discussions that eventually took place at the summit.

Dia Penning shared these norms in one of her sessions on Day 1, and this served as a very important guide to having sometimes difficult or uncomfortable conversations. At the beginning of Day 2, we started the day by introducing these norms for the entire conference. This technique is used by many organizations and Monique Davis shared how [the southern arts alliance!] organized meetings with these types of tools, some of which we adapted.

Discomfort with new ideas shared in emotionally vulnerable styles was expected for those who had not had
an opportunity to experience the truths of marginalized people working in and documented by cultural heritage spaces before, but delegates were encouraged to embrace those discomforts and to learn and grow from them. Delegates who chose to share were encouraged to fully share without fear, and were reassured that they were in a safe space and in a community committed to caring for them and their ideas. All these themes were powerfully demonstrated in the session “Violence of Exclusion in the Historical Record” proposed by CHSC Planning Committee member, Bergis Jules, to discuss how exclusion from the historical record translates into real world violence against the excluded. During the session, an indigenous activist and memory worker who was active in the Dakota Access Pipeline protests at the time of the summit, shared her experience about being on the ground protesting the U.S. government’s actions to build an oil pipeline that would eventually cross Lakota treaty territory, and endanger the drinking water of the Standing Rock Sioux. She was open and vulnerable during her testimony and expressed how the safe space rules of the session, including the commitment to non-disclosure, were vital for her sharing as she was already weary of illegal surveillance by police and federal authorities monitoring and attempting to stop the protests. These conversations were vital for setting a positive and productive tone for summit.

2. Funding for Transformative Gatherings

A strong theme throughout the Summit was how we would continue the conversations into the future, and sustain the energy and networks forged during the event. Naturally this led to the question of how to solicit and secure funding for transformative gatherings such as the CHSC Summit, especially as it was a space and a group of people that sought to disrupt and complicate traditional practices in the cultural heritage sector. It was widely acknowledged that this was a difficult prospect as the cultural heritage sector had a traditionally more conservative model for support in terms of funding, and not generally prone to supporting these kinds of events. But many also acknowledged that creative solutions and models we could learn from were available and in fact, already in practice.

Several options were discussed, including crowdsourcing, seeking materials and monetary support from community members, and advocating that granting agencies be more inclusive in their priority areas and criteria for awarding funding to cultural heritage sites. A strong sub theme running through this discussion reinforced the need for a type of “no strings attached” model of funding that would enable, rather than restrict, transformative conversations and the generation of bold ideas around the capacity for cultural heritage work to lead to social change. Some of the policies and characteristics of large funding agencies were identified as having adverse effects on these kinds of conversations. One example was the practice of funders to mostly support organizations with nonprofit status. This was seen as a major barrier to smaller, and locally based organizations and community groups doing the bulk of the most transformative work on the ground around community memory. These spaces, existing mostly with volunteer labor, are resource poor in terms of funding and lack the traditional organizational setup valued by grant funders, yet their deep connections to the local community where they exist, sustain them for long periods of time, and help preserve significant histories that otherwise wouldn’t exist today without them. One such example is the Sherman Indian High School Museum and Archive located in Riverside, California. One of a few remaining federal government Indian boarding schools that has a thriving and significant museum and archive, while at the same time not having nonprofit status or adequate housing for their collections. Community owned cultural heritage spaces like the Sherman Indian Museum are typically forced to partner with other “funder approved” organizations that may have motives and values different than their own as a way to secure significant funding, or to depend on their community for support in labor, materials, and money. Advocacy on behalf of these organizations to the larger funding agencies was seen as a key area for new work. The nature of grant funds being mostly short term, and generally not covering key activities such as operations, was also seen as a major barrier and another key advocacy area.

Developing new models of funding was also a rich vein of discussion and several powerful ideas emerged around communities supporting their own institutions of cultural memory. The South Asian American Digital Archive was brought up as a model for this kind of community supported structure. The South Asian American Digital Archive (SAADA) was founded by Dr. Michelle Caswell and Samip Malik. It is an online archive of stories of South Asians who settled in the United States. Their main avenue to raising funds is leaning on the South Asian American community to donate to their campaign each year. This has been an extremely successful model for the organization, helping it raise most of its operational funding this way for the past 9 years. This model was
discussed as a promising avenue for community archives funding while most delegates agreed that in order to get to these models we first need to be in spaces where these inclusive conversations can happen.

3. Equitable and Ethical Collaboration

"Nothing about us, without us." — @_BlackMuses

A strong theme throughout the two days of the summit was discussion around the value of collaboration between community based archives and more traditional, resource rich cultural heritage organizations, but several delegates also shared their views that these collaborations needed to be equitable and ethical. We heard testimony from several representatives from smaller cultural heritage spaces about unbalanced collaborations, and the harm they can do to communities. Equitable collaborations mean that every aspect of the partnership from the development, planning, budget allocations, and implementation of the work are shared by all parties and each organization’s voice holds equal weight no matter their size or their resource profile.

Equity in the labor of the project allows the smaller institutions that are traditionally outside of our professional cultural heritage networks to contribute in ways that protect their communities and it also allows for new and diverse perspectives to influence cultural heritage work in ways that may not have been possible if these spaces were not involved. Delegates brought up the fact that the equity standard is frequently ignored by the larger institutions in collaborative projects because there is often a savior mentality by those organizations that ignores potential contributions from organizations with less resources. One of the frequently overlooked contributions is the deep knowledge and connections these smaller community based cultural heritage organizations have with their local communities. Denying them a chance to have real impact in collaborative projects can be a detrimental act of erasure for the people represented in their collections and communities. As one delegate tweeted during the summit, "If you’re telling the story of a community, the community should be part of that conversation."

Ethics in collaborative projects is imperative for protecting traditionally marginalized groups from exploitative practices of larger cultural heritage organizations. A good example that surfaced during the discussions was that as university libraries begin to partner more with community based organizations, awareness of potential ethical landmines become more important. One area where the ethical line frequently get crossed is when university libraries are not completely open about their motives, for example, if they are not open that the grant funding for a collaborative project could be part of a university fundraising campaign, or if a successful project could eventually be used in advertising and other publicity efforts on behalf of the university. These omissions could be harmful to community based organizations, and their local supporters, because they may not want their participation in the project to be seen as wholesale support of the university’s goals and mission. Another ethical landmine could be when organizations overlook the needs of the people represented by some of the organizations in a partnership, for example, when the cultural protocols governing access to Native American collections are ignored. The discussions made it clear that equity and ethical considerations were crucial to protecting marginalized people in collaborative efforts.

4. Diversifying Technology Production in Cultural Heritage Spaces

In order to work on system enhancements that speak to specific requirements in regards to rights, privacy, and cultural sensitivities, delegates discussed the need to diversify the labor around technological development in the cultural heritage sector. Technology that supports digital collection building, produces content management systems, manages metadata ingestion, or supports preservation and access systems, all have the potential to erase people from marginalized groups from our historical records if they are not designed and developed

In order to work on system enhancements that speak to specific requirements in regards to rights, privacy, and cultural sensitivities, delegates discussed the need to diversify the labor around technological development in the cultural heritage sector. Technology that supports digital collection building, produces content management systems, manages metadata ingestion, or supports preservation and access systems, all have the potential to erase people from marginalized groups from our historical records if they are not designed and developed
with the needs of these communities in mind. Delegates voiced that the best way to do this was to make sure that members of marginalized communities are involved in designing and developing the various technologies that support all these activities. Several ideas were discussed including advocacy to granting agencies, encouraging them to request grant recipients adhere to digital ethics in all funded projects and asking funded programs to commit to and demonstrate that they consider diversity in hiring for the project. These ideas were seen as good checks against the continued trend of a lack of diverse people in cultural heritage technology positions.

Several delegates, led by CHSC summit planning committee member Sharon Leon, took action to address this issue further and began drafting a document for addressing these issues in a more deliberate way. The Framework of Guidance for Digital Projects that Deal with Human Communities is a living document that the public can contribute to, and it addresses a holistic set of issues around representation in the technology labor within cultural heritage organizations. The needs statement in the document addresses two main points:

a. An ethics plan for both funders and technologists to highlight understanding of why nuance is necessary in cultural heritage technology work. This is important to educate funders, project managers, scholars, and technologists, etc. It was stated that public pushback on the status quo was necessary.

b. An understanding that open data is not a black and white issue. Data is people, and the humans building tools and developing new technology around it need to be representative of our diverse society. Data isn't just data. It is a social asset that represents people. Data is a community and a conversation.
5. Integrating Community Archives Into Traditional Cultural Heritage Spaces

Delegates discussed ideas around integrating community archives into traditional cultural heritage spaces, whether that was a good idea, and how we could go about doing it respectfully and responsibly, if it had to be done. The most important consideration for many of the delegates was that the cultural practices and protocols of the communities represented in the collections be respected when traditional cultural heritage spaces attempted to house community archives. This sentiment was well stated in a tweet by delegate @_BlackMuse: “If you’re telling the story of a community, the community should always be a part of that conversation.” Delegates were adamant that if community archives were to be incorporated into traditional spaces, then those communities needed to be part of the entire process. While some saw a possibility for successful models for community archives to be able to exist in traditional spaces, others contended that those relationships may not be beneficial to community archive collections or the communities they represented, and they instead called for those spaces to remain independent. In their view, the risks for community archives losing their independent identities, and also their historical materials to poorly planned or predatory partnerships, was too high. Together we all talked about ways we could more effectively support independent community archives spaces with shared resource and programming partnerships whether that was through an official non-profit, or some other type of less formalized collaboration. No matter what form it took, many agreed that some type of national or international community archives network that could support the long term sustainability of independent cultural heritage sites would be a game changer.

6. Social Innovation and Rethinking Goals and Objectives in the Cultural Heritage Sector:

One of the important discussions that took place during the Summit is the need for cultural heritage institutions to rethink their goals and objectives. Many of the delegates argued that cultural heritage institutions have a bigger role to play in today’s troubling world, especially when we look at the huge challenges our societies are facing, including issues related to poverty, unemployment, social justice, environmental changes, racism and human rights.

In many cases, cultural heritage organizations get caught up in daily activities caring for their collections, planning new programs, and engaging their audiences. While all of these activities are extremely vital, our discussion here is a reminder that the ultimate goal for cultural heritage institutions is to improve their communities by creating a sustainable social value. Within this context, Haitham Eid, the Summit’s Co-Chair, and Director of the M.A. Museum Studies Program, Southern University at New Orleans convened a session on his Museum Innovation Model, and how social innovation can help museums and cultural heritage institutions streamline their goals and objectives. The Center for Social Innovation at Stanford University defines social innovation as “the process of developing and deploying effective solutions to challenging and often systemic social and environmental issues in support of social progress.” Haitham stated that no one expects cultural heritage institutions alone to find solutions to all the social and environmental challenges that face humanity, or to approach them the same way other sectors tend to do, but the cultural heritage sector is certainly positioned to make a great contribution. Some of the mentioned examples were the UK’s Social Justice Alliance of Museums, led by National Museums Liverpool and the Coalition of Museums for Climate Justice in Canada.
What have been some of the direct outcomes?

Since the onset, we’ve been purposely vague on outputs and outcomes in order to let it be shaped by delegates. But that in and of itself says a lot about our objectives: that this is about movement building across cultural memory fields, and in essence to begin moving toward cultural heritage in a diverse, inclusive and welcoming America.

We invited particular delegates that are organizing around cultural equity in the museum, library, archive, and scholarly fields; focusing on issues ranging widely from curation to hiring, and moving toward policy and strategy, and measurable impact.

While we did not and don’t want to ascribe particular outputs to the delegates, we invited delegates to push toward: 1. policy and strategic directives that can be broadly applied to a wide variety of cultural heritage organizations large and small; 2. formation of new cross-field collaborations that pledge to work together toward agreed goals; 3. new creative initiatives that create and highlight best practices and new standards for curatorial and participatory cultural heritage practice.

As far as outcomes, we expected to see increased communications and stronger networks across the cultural heritage fields, as well as the creation of metrics to start benchmarking equity in cultural heritage, building off of some of the quantitative research coming out of the museum field looking at diversity in arts institutions. Based on the outcomes specified below that can be directly attributed to the Summit, we have definitely seen increased communications and stronger networks across the cultural heritage fields. However, metrics to benchmarking equity has not been a direct outcome, through continued research in this area is something that was considered during the sessions.

From Natasha Varner, Communications and Public Engagement Manager at Densho.org:

- In January, Densho hired Dia Penning to serve as a consultant on the anti-racist history curriculum we’ve been developing. Her input, combined with input I received from workshopping the curriculum at CHSC, helped shape the project in critical ways. We later introduced that curriculum to teacher workshops in Birmingham, New York, Seattle, Spokane, and Evergreen State College and received overwhelmingly positive feedback. It is currently being developed into a free online course for teachers. I’m certain it wouldn’t have been so successful had I not attended CHSC and connected with Dia there.

- Densho has partnered with Cheryl Eberly of the Memories of Migration project to propose a session on “activist archives” at the 2018 meeting of the National Council on Public History.

- Densho is also in conversation with Michelle Magalong, Executive Director and President of the Asian and Pacific Islander Americans in Historic Preservation, about ways we might support her when she brings the bi-annual APIAHIP meeting to Seattle next year.

In New Orleans, CHSC Summit participants started a local meetup in the Spring of 2017 called Cultural Heritage & Social Change New Orleans, meeting monthly to discuss various topics. Their first two meetings covered Beyond Copyright: Exploring Moral Rights in the Digital Age, and Removing the Confederate Monuments: Cultural Heritage Debrief & Discussion.

A group of scholars and cultural heritage practitioners came together to begin work on a transparency statement about the field. The idea was to be very open about the challenges of the cultural heritage field, including salaries and institutional/community culture, for people considering careers in cultural heritage.

A draft Framework of Guidance for Digital Projects that Deal with Human Communities was created in a session led by Sharon Leon. The framework tackles some of the important issues and complexities of digital work in a variety of communities, including compensation, privacy, sustainability and more.

Participants in the CHSC Summit presented a panel at DPLA Fest in Chicago in April, 2017 entitled Cultural Heritage and Social Change: Libraries Measuring Social Impact. Panelists included Diego Merizalde (National Library of Colombia), Emily Plagman (Public Library Association), Jennifer Himmelreich (Peabody Essex Museum), Jessica Bratt (Grand Rapids Public Library and Libraries4BlackLives), and was moderated by Jon Voss (Historypin).

Keir Winesmith, Director of Digital at SFMOMA mentioned the CHSC Summit in an article he published on Medium in May, 2017, After AAM: Recent readings on diversity, equity and inclusion in museums.
Several CHSC Summit delegates wrote a successful proposal for an Andrew K. Mellon planning grant in scholarly communications to explore ways to bring communities and scholars together for collaborative, community-focused research. The planning project, *New Deal Then and Now*, led by New Mexico Highlands University, included eight CHSC Summit delegates and further expanded the network while tackling issues and themes that were central to the Summit. While not yet published, much of the work ended up looking at the values of community archiving, and how to share and collect stories and histories within the context of historical trauma in colonized communities.

Donna Graves, an independent historian/urban planner based in Berkeley, CA, published an essay for the National Council on Public History, *In Praise of Multi-Story Places*, that began to develop thoughts and conversations around representation and historic places that she explored at the Summit. Using examples from San Francisco such as The Women’s Building and Civic Center, she posits that many places holding powerful histories have been unrecognized because they represent marginalized communities, and also offer the promise of coalition building today.

Bergis Jules, a member of the CHSC Summit organizing committee, published *Let the People Lead: Supporting Sustainability vs Dependency Models for Funding Community-Based Archives*, which outlines specific ideas for how grantmakers can better support and fund community archive efforts.

**What’s next?**

In addition to the continued networking of delegates, there are several possibilities for continued activities following the Summit:

- **2018 Cultural Heritage and Social Change Summit.** One possibility is organizing a second gathering in November of 2018. We have started to look into this possibility and are considering several sites.

- **Smaller, outcome specific convenings.** Another option is convening a smaller meeting to focus on very specific outcomes and objectives relevant to the findings of the Summit, such as the creation of funding models for community-based archiving.

- **Action Retreats.** Using the model of *artist-activist retreats* run by RPM (formerly ATC) would be an effective way to work with smaller groups of delegates to build capacity in the field and equip a growing number of cultural heritage professionals to make social change. By having a creative retreat experience, we would help delegates focus on specific interest areas and projects that forward the aims of the Summit. The target demographic would be a mix of senior professionals and emerging leaders across libraries, archives, and museums.

- **Co-located meetings or summits.** These could be themed meetings, retreats or summits that happen alongside existing conferences, not dissimilar to how the 2016 CHSC Summit happened just after MCN2016. The downside, we found, is that many people who had just attended the conference were already pretty exhausted coming into the additional days for the Summit. There is a potential for substantial savings as well as less need for travel grants when people are already traveling for work with their home institution.

Any of these possibilities are feasible, though they will need to have a fiscal sponsor and an organizing committee to help bring it together. Action retreats would ideally be housed with an existing non-profit. All options seem attractive to funders and the possibility of overlapping traditional cultural heritage funders with social justice funders would be good for all involved.
## Appendix I. Finances (unaudited)

### Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Type</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorship</td>
<td>$34,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Tickets</td>
<td>$4,061.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense Type</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel grants</td>
<td>$19,724.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catering</td>
<td>$6,279.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social event room rental/ent</td>
<td>$1,671.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event production staff</td>
<td>$2,260.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground transportation</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management, Administration, Production, Reporting</td>
<td>$6,777.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit card processing</td>
<td>$337.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting/processing</td>
<td>$375.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web/design/marketing</td>
<td>$387.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### In-kind donations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In-kind Donations</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Venue &amp; Security</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Appendix II. Who Attended?

### (self-identification)

Below is a list of how delegates self-identified (delegates could choose more than one, and all single counts were written in as “other”).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Museum</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other NGO or Non-Profit</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archive</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government (incl Nat’l/State libraries &amp; archives)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consortia and Networks</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For-Profit</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artist/ Activist/ Cultural Equity Consultant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arts</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State Parks</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity and Inclusion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive Cultural Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FABRIC</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freelance Writer &amp; Editor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend of SUNO</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate student—Museum Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grassroots Community Organizing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Society</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA Student</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Art</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public History</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Media</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public radio</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student SUNO MUSE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater/ LGBTQ+</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix III. List of Sessions

The following is a list of the sessions that were organized during the CHSC Summit (not all session titles were captured):

**Day 1**
- Building Buy-in for GLAM Spaces
- Building Inclusive and Representative Online Spaces in Cultural Heritage
- When the tech and best practices for digital collections act as barriers to community contributions
- Role of women and girls in creating reinforcing and dismantling culture
- Emerging technology in education through game jams
- Inclusive Social Media Practice
- Recruiting, Training, and Retaining Frontline Staff Who Serve As Race Conversations Facilitators
- Community Archives + Intersectionality and Identity Focused Collections and Sites
- New Ways of Telling an Old Story
- When IT/Data Shouldn’t be Open
- Race, Responsibility and Mindfulness
- Using Oral Histories & Archives in Anti-Racist Curriculum
- Designing Inclusive Community History
- Funding Strategies
- Political/Social Movement Support
- Virtual and Augmented Reality for Social Good
- Mainstream Leadership Skills vs. Cultural Values of Leaders
- Diversity and the Narrative of Cultural Heritage—Process, Outcomes and Change
- Compelling the Next Generation to Pursue Careers in Cultural Heritage
- Disrupting Value
- Violence of Exclusion in the Historical Record
- Five Faces of Oppression: Why Diversity and Inclusion Isn’t Enough
- Intersecting Cultural Narratives in Media

**Day 2**
- Integrating Emotional Healing
- The Reality of Our Work
- Youth Engagement and Historic Preservation
- Student Engagement, Museum-University Partnerships, Internships, Teen Community Historians, Etc.
- Working Group: Developing language/tools to help institutions shift...
- Cultural Organizing in Jackson around Welcome
- Growing Community Advocates for Cultural Heritage Organizations
- Where Next?
- The Case of Colombia: A Visual Journey to Social Change and Reconciliation
- Brainstorming New Ideas for Designing Inclusive Community History
- Libraries 4 Black Lives: Institutional Allyship Conversation
- Models of Collaboration with Community-Based Cultural Artists
- Ethics Statements for Grants
- Innovation and Creating Social Value
- Yoga
- Cultural Heritage Tech, Tech Training, Jobs in Communities
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SUNO
SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY at NEW ORLEANS
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