Points from discussion with Mary Downs: 10 Oct. 2014

MD suggested that we apply for a Foundational Grant from NEH Humanities Collections and Reference Resources (HCRR). The proposals are due in July and are 12 pages. Funding is up to $40,000. She suggested that as the project is complicated in terms of its participants, it is worth bringing together an advisory committee of the major stakeholders in the project. Thinking this through the following came up. However, the emphasis should be on humanities and how this resource will advance work in the humanities (and not language documentation or botany alone). The stakeholders that NEH seems most interested in are in the humanities:

 Cultural history

 Ecological history

 Historical linguistics

 Anthropology

 Indigenous communities.

For this purpose we need to establish or seek funding for a workshop to bring together (the following are my suggestions, taken away from what I understood MD to recommend)

 1. Botanists-taxonimists

 2. Botanical database expertise

 3. Humanities database expertise

 4. Native community representatives

 5. Linguists (working on endangered languages)

 6. Anthropologists

 7. Teachers of cultural diversity (e.g., undergraduate level?)

One key component is to make the appeal of this project as broad as possible in its appeal. Also important is that this program does not support the creation of primary data to populate a database but rather the creation of a database structure (here we can consider: input/uploading, database storage and CMS, final user interfaces). Basically, then, we need to consider this from the perspective of a "library project": what type of materials do we have that we want to make accessible, how will be catalogue/store/tag (make discoverable) this material and how will we do it in a way that is useful to our targeted audiences (humanities scholars and public interested in the humanities). We need to steer away from making this a language documentation project although language (documentation) material will be an important component of what we are doing. MD continually stressed that the sole audience should not be linguistics and native speakers. Broader audience is needed: anthropological, historical, comparative linguistics. Environmental history.

Note that if we make it a library project we can apply for funding to create a resource/catalogue for extant materials. I think we have enough material already:

 1. Language documentation: Amith, Perez-Baez, Beck, others to be determined

 2. Unpublished databases and notes: Bill Merrill

**Funding**:

DEL we can apply to DEL and split the funds between language documentation (> Amith through Gettysburg) and archiving (> Berez through Hawai'i). It is important to note that NEH also contributes through an agreement with DEL and thus if we apply for a certain amount of money NEH might contribute to the project through their committed allowance to DEL. I believe Mary Downs is in charge of this. If we apply to DEL we want to make sure that UH has the resources to accession and present the material in a timely manner. We could still do this with Darwin Core as the database for the botanical data and develop another type of relational database for the language documentation data.

NEH/HCRR: We could apply to HCRR Foundation grant. All funds ($40,000) would go to UH to establish the database resource. We would need to manage both botanical/scientific and ethnobotanical/humanities materials, best through a relational database, I think. We would apply for funds to bring together stakeholders and develop a prototype. The initial population would be of extant materials, hopefully much in unpublished sources. The target will be the audiences mentioned above. $40,000 for up to 2 years. Implementation is $350,000 for up to 3 years.

 In a Foundation grant we can set up an advisory board, carry out proof of concept. MD repeatedly emphasized the need for Humanties content. We should bring people together representing the audiences (contributors and receivers, discussing how they will use the resource. How do they search, what do they search for, what will be the impact. This grant will also develop protocols and produce a pilot. Always keep in mind what the impact on the humanities will be.

NEH/Digital Humanities: Amith applied to this and will know in March. It would be possible to reapply next year. This would be similar to NEH/HCRR though the focus would be in addition to creative use of digital technology.

ELDP/SOAS: I think it would be possible to develop an ELDP grant for ethnobotanical language documentation. We could establish a series of collaborations (e.g., $25,000/language x 8 languages) focusing on endangerment and arguing for the synergy of multiple related efforts. To do this it might be best to take a language area (e.g. Mesoamerica). We might not be able to argue immediately for archiving resources as SOAS has an archive. But even if we only get this grant we can then use the results as an additional argument for the importance of a preservation and access infrastructure through NEH.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Granting Agency** |  |
| NEH/HRCC | Apply for a $40K foundation grant in July 2015Focus on humanitiesConsider it a library grant to develop resources that will advance the humanitiesDo not ask for funds for new material.Do not stress language endangermentEngage a wide audienceDevelop an advisory board of stakeholdersFund a meeting/workshopProduce a pilot |
| NEH/Digital Humanities | Stress innovative digital technologyLibrary projectCan develop new material or work with extant materialStart-up grants can be Level 1 (30K) or Level 2 (60K) |
| NSF DEL | Can be complete and can consider web development as part of "publication"Particularly in that it aides archiving resources funds can be requested for UHCan be multiregional |
| SOAS | Focus on language documentation of ecological knowledgeStress leveraging and the production of recordings of native natural historians |