

Appendix A:

Datasets

Table 1. Regent Park Film Festival Staff members

Project Team
Ananya Ohri, Artistic Director, RPF, Executive Director (until June 2018)
Elizabeth Mudenyo, Special Projects Manager
Safia Abdigir, Special Projects Coordinator
Mandeq Hassan (2018), Weeda Azim (2018), Marina Fathalla (2019) Special Project Assistants
Shannon Gagnon, Evaluations and Archiving Coordinator
Regent Park Film Festival Team
Tendisai Cromwell, Executive Director (June 2018 - Aug 2019)
David Osubronie, Festival Manager
Shafia Shaikh (2019) Celine Moore (2017-19), Marketing and Outreach Managers
Jennifer Su (2018), Camille Johnson (2017), Outreach Coordinators
Emieke Geldof, Bookkeeper

Table 2. Tour breakdown by event type¹

	BRANCH	E	W	I	S
Jan					
	TPL - Toronto Reference Library	X	X	X	X
Feb					
	Halifax Central Library		X		X
	TPL - Spadina Road Library		X	X	
	Thunder Bay Library - Waverley Resource Library (workshop and screening) Thunder Bay Library - Brodie Resource Library (exhibition)	X	X		X
Mar					
	Sioux Lookout Public Library		X		X
	TPL - Albion Library	X		X	
	Skawenniio Tsi Iewennahnotahkhwa - Kahnawake Library	X	X		
Apr					
	Fredericton Public Library	X	X		X
	Brampton Library - Chinguacousy	X	X		X
May					
	Vancouver Public Library - Central Library	X	X		X
	TPL - Scarborough Civic Centre Library	X	X	X	
	Thompson Public Library	X	X		X
June					
	TPL - Don Mills Library	X	X		
	Edmonton Public Library - Enterprise Square (Downtown)	X	X		
	Whitehorse Public Library - Yukon Public Library	X	X		
July					
	TMAC (Toronto Media Arts Centre)	X	X	X	

¹ Note: (E) Exhibition, (W) Workshops, (I) Installation, (S) Screening

Table 3. Home Made Visible Activities

Type	Event Name	Date	Region
External	Reel Heritage Symposium (TIFF) - The Vital Role of Libraries, Archives and Museums in the Arts,	Nov 20 + 21	Toronto, ON
External	Myseum – Motion Pictures: Immigration Films from the Vaults of Toronto’s Archives	Mar-8	Toronto, ON
External	Society for Cinema and Media Studies Conference	Mar-17	Toronto, ON
Regent Park Film Festival	Re:collections Symposium Day 1 (Private)	Apr-27	Toronto, ON
Regent Park Film Festival	Re:collections Symposium Day 2 (Public)	Apr-28	Toronto, ON
External	York University Department of History’s Public History Symposium	Sep-28	Toronto, ON
Regent Park Film Festival	Home Made Visible Premiere	Nov-17	Toronto, ON
Regent Park Film Festival	Toronto Reference Library - Screening	Jan-7	Toronto, ON
Regent Park Film Festival	Toronto Reference Library - Workshop	Jan-7	Toronto, ON
External	Reframe Film Festival - The Archive is Alive	Jan-27	Peterborough, ON
External	Ontario Library Association Super Conference	Jan-30	Toronto, ON
Regent Park Film Festival	Halifax Central Library - Screening	Feb-2	Halifax, NS
Regent Park	Halifax Central Library -	Feb-2	Halifax, NS

Film Festival	Workshop		
Regent Park Film Festival	Spadina Road Library - Workshop	Feb-19	Toronto, ON
Regent Park Film Festival	Thunder Bay Library - Waverley Resource Library Screening	Mar 2	Thunder Bay, ON
Regent Park Film Festival	Thunder Bay Library - Waverley Resource Library Workshop	Mar 2	Thunder Bay, ON
Regent Park Film Festival	Sioux Lookout Public Library Workshop	Mar 3	Sioux Lookout, ON
Regent Park Film Festival	Sioux Lookout Public Library Screening	Mar 3	Sioux Lookout, ON
Regent Park Film Festival	Kahnawake Library Workshop	Mar 28	Kahnawake, QC
Regent Park Film Festival	York University Screening	Apr 2	Toronto, ON
Regent Park Film Festival	Fredericton Library Screening	Apr 14	Fredericton, NB
Regent Park Film Festival	Fredericton Library Workshop	Apr 18	Fredericton, NB
Regent Park Film Festival	Brampton Library - Chinguacousy Workshop	Apr 17	Brampton, ON
Regent Park Film Festival	Brampton Library - Chinguacousy Screening	Apr 17	Brampton, ON
Regent Park Film Festival	Vancouver Public Library - Central Library Screening	May 7	Vancouver, BC
Regent Park Film Festival	Vancouver Public Library - Central Library Workshop	May 9	Vancouver, BC
Regent Park Film Festival	Scarborough Civic Centre Library Workshop	May 9	Scarborough, ON
Regent Park Film Festival	Thompson Public Library Screening	May 14	Thompson, MB

Regent Park Film Festival	Thompson Public Library Workshop	May 14	Thompson, MB
External	Association of Canadian Archivists conference plenary panel on community-driven archives	June 8	Toronto, ON
Regent Park Film Festival	Edmonton Public Library - Enterprise Workshop	June 15	Edmonton, AB
Regent Park Film Festival	Whitehorse Public Library Workshop	June 16	Whitehorse, YK
Regent Park Film Festival	Don Mills Library Workshop	June 20	Toronto, ON
Regent Park Film Festival	TMAC (Toronto Media Arts Centre) - Closing Workshop	July 5	Toronto, ON
Regent Park Film Festival	TMAC (Toronto Media Arts Centre) - Closing Event	July 5	Toronto, ON
External	Fly By Night	July 6	Toronto, ON
External	Gimli Film Festival	July 24 - 28th	Gimli, MB

Table 4. Created Partnerships

Archival Partner
York University Library Archives
Digitization Partners
Charles Street Video
Niagara Custom Labs
Atlantic Filmmakers Cooperative (AFCOOP)
FAVATV.ASM
Centre for Art Tapes (CFAT)
Videographe
Distribution Partner
VTape
Presentation Partner-Library
Toronto Public Library
Vancouver Public Library
Sioux Lookout Library
Thunder Bay Public Library
Edmonton Public Library
Thompson Public Library
Skawenniio Tsi Iewennahnotahkh - Kahnawake Library
Fredericton Public Library
Brampton Library
Whitehorse Public Library
Additional Presentation Partners
DOXA Documentary Film Festival

Documentary Futurism
Myseum
Toronto International Film Festival (TIFF)
8fest
Total Partnerships: 23

Table 5. Survey and Interview Responders

Responder	Organization
Artists/workshop facilitators	
Aeyliya Husain	
Jennifer Dysart	
Maya Bastian	
Nadine Arpin	
Faraz Anoushahpour	
Parastoo Anoushahpour	
Melisse Watson	
Library Exhibition Partners	
Elsa Ngan	Toronto Public Library
Martha Cooley	Afcoop
Meaghan Smith	Vancouver Public Library
Jesse Roberts	Thunder Bay Public Library
Colleen Andriats	Edmonton Public Library
Cheryl Davies	Thompson Public Library
Tyler	Skawenniio Tsi lewennahnotahkhwa - Kahnawake Library
Ryan Chiasson	Fredericton Public Library
Archival/Digitization Partners	
Katrina Cohen-Palacios	York University--Archiving Partner

Greg Woodbury	Charles Street Video
Andrew Scholotiuk	FAVATV/ASM
Advisors	
Richard Fung	
Wanda Vanderstoop	
Indu Vashist	
Total responses received:	21
Formal rejections:	4 (all advisors in early stages)
No response:	10
Total inquiries:	35

**Appendix B:
Raw Survey Responses**

Question 1: Did this partnership lead to any innovation or experimentation within your own institution? This can mean anything, be it technological, program curation, new methods of outreach, etc.

Yes 6 **Respondent demographics:** Library partners (8); Digitization Partners (2); Archival Partner, York University (**11 total**).

No 3

Themes

Comments

Outreach and Awareness

1. "[The] Library was able to branch out to local community networks to promote our partnership with the Home Made Visible tour. The awareness about Indigenous and visible minority archives through FREE exhibitions, screenings, and workshops was fresh and outstanding to our library, patrons & community."

Inspiring organizational/operational models

2. "This is not directly related to the programming but I was inspired by Regent Park's hiring of a PR firm to help generate media interest in the Project and I since have written a grant to help our film festival be able to afford a service of that nature. It's always inspiring to see how other organizations and festivals run and Regent Park seems uniquely organized and professional for a relatively small festival."

Inspiring Curation methods

3. "In planning the exhibition we discovered a new way to highlight videos in our digital lab, which may lead to highlighting patron content."

Spawned new ideas for programming and partnerships

4. "It illustrated some of the challenges of this kind of program and gave us some new ideas for programming and partnerships. I think it also gave us some new perspectives on an existing program (Canada 150 digital storytelling)."

Technological Growth

5. "During this partnership, I learned how to use and ingest material into Islandora (our digital repository platform for digital.library.yorku.ca), and how to configure links between our descriptive database (atom.library.yorku.ca) and the digital platform to aggregate the analog and digital donations. Our digital scholarship infrastructure department also coded the digital platform to keep the metadata publicly available, but the content locked down."

Growth of institutional mandate

6. "[We are] now going down path transcoding and digitizing, not just dubbing--reframing the institution. Artists using facility for their work, type of work they're work was great for institutional mandate. Nice how contrite Regent Park Film Festival was about thanking and acknowledging [us] was fantastic, helped with funders, reputation, very positive."

Technological Growth

7. "Yes, we were able to test technology to allow H MV to easily post and host video on their sub domain."

Question 2. Did this Project lead your institution to any long-term benefits? For example, did it lead to other partnerships, generate income, or enhance exposure?

Yes 8 **Respondent demographics:** Library partners (8); Digitization Partnerws (2); Archival Partner, York University. **(11 total)**

No 3

Themes **Comments**

Outreach 1. "New contacts with local artists, potential programming going forward with them."

Outreach 2. "It definitely enhanced an awareness about Home Made Visible which brought exposure to the Library. Many people were intrigued to view the 6 commissioned films at the exhibition computer. The workshop with facilitator and artist Kenzie Whyte for 'Saving Ephemera: Storytelling and the Role of Archiving' was very prevalent."

Undetermined 3. "Long-term benefits, undetermined at this point. While this opportunity was the first time [we were] able to partner with Regent Park Film Festival, it was not observed to directly leading to other partnerships, generate income, or enhance exposure."

Deepened partnerships 4. "We had an amazing time working with the Project. We got to deepen partnerships with local filmmakers and gave our patrons programming that we would not have been able to do alone."

New partnerships created 5. Potentially one new partnership re: oral history (potential partnership with MacEwan university and local Indigenous communities). We're still in the very early stages of deciding if/what this might be, but it has lots of promise.

Outreach 6. This Project enhanced the archives' exposure within [York] University but also to the broader community.

New partnerships created 7. "Not financial, but a strong partnership with Regent Park [Film Festival]."

Open to long-term partnerships

8. "[Our organization] has been around for a long time, and we are always looking for ways to innovate—drawback of that small size is low resources, but that can be more fluid in opportunities as a bonus. It has been a blessing to be involved [in HMV from the] beginning—ambitions of the Project. It was a little bit of a poker game and we won, which was very positive for us.

9. We are now more inclined to sustain partnerships; [HMV] in its' nature was sustained because of the timeframe. When you work with organizations and people Like Ananya and Elizabeth, it sets a high bar for partnerships.

10. What a successful partnership entails is: holding to your end of contract, flexibility as the Project develops, and having an openness to “that wasn’t in the contract, but...”

11. The never-ending struggle to make CSV make not an oppressive place, through this partnership. Furthered us down that never ending path. Anti-oppression is more than words for us and Regent Park Film Festival put us down that path.”

Question 3. How did you find the audiences responded/engaged with the curation and/or workshops of the HMV Project? [Linear scale: 1-5, 1=Did not engage at all, 5=Extremely responsive and involved]

1: Did not engage	1	Respondent demographics: Library partners (8); Artists (7). (15 Total)
2: Low engagement	3	
3:Medium level of engagement	3	
4: Highly engaged	0	
5:Extremely responsive and involved	8	

Themes

Comments

Resonating content

1. “From the actual premiere screening to the tour, I was stunned by how our work resonated with other audiences and how much HMV worked to facilitate those conversations.”

Resonating content	2. "The audience response was frequent and sincere, from being approached after screenings to receiving e-mails from audiences across Canada who felt compelled to share their thoughts with me on the work. I had a fantastic experience working with the curatorial and the logistics team of HMMV. An inspiring group of people who managed to make an ultimately very complex Project feel very smooth, welcoming, and easy. Working with HMMV was one of the best experiences I have had working with institutions on art commissions."
Resonating content	3. "The Ontario workshops provided great interest and participants appreciated the opportunity to discuss their own personal memories. It offered space to share and was emotional for some; most people really got into it. The low numbers benefitted the workshops as it allowed people to be more candid."
High audience talk-back	4. "High level of engagement during question periods, and eager to learn more."
Resonating content	5. "Audience responded positively to the works."
Impactful workshops	6. "In the three communities I was able to attend either screenings and workshops I found the audiences to be very engaged and genuinely interested in our diverse and eclectic program of films. Although the workshop participant numbers were low I believe Overall the experience each person had sharing their archives with a larger group was quite honestly profound and significant. I feel, I believe the workshops were impactful."
Personal response to audience member	7. "[For] those that did engage with the workshops it was noted that one participant came for the workshop, wanting to see the videos. When she completed the workshop, library staff took her to the public computers to watch three of the short videos. The participant informed library staff that she loved them and that she had a great evening."
Community building	<p data-bbox="487 1360 1422 1682">8. "I Attended one workshop, and it went well (at Don Mills Library), which had 8-10 people. There was still a sense of community building [at 8-10 people]. With small turnout it is hard to come to terms with the outreach [being low]. Libraries are accessible, but there wasn't a lot of visibility [to the exhibitions and workshops]. 8-10 was good, people still got personal with their stories and it was emotional. Large workshops need time to build trust, and small workshops allowed support. It wasn't about teaching a skill, it was about the emotional experience. Teaching to a big group is not as beneficial as to a small one.</p> <p data-bbox="487 1724 1422 1858">There was not a lot of time for me to be with the work [in the exhibition]—events at beginning and end events worked [for witnessing engagement]. At libraries, it felt difficult to get people to go on the computers, and it maybe was not as accessible in the way libraries needed [to attain</p>

engagement]. I asked at humber [about the engagement], and the work was well received, and prompted thought. If anything, it gave people a chance to see that these stories are here.”

Resonating content
No participants but active sign-ups

9. “Thompson public Library had zero attendees, even though we had people sign up—free events don’t get real commitment—maybe a nominal charge would help solidify numbers”

Question 4. Does your institution have a history of working with Indigenous or culturally diverse peoples prior to this Project?

Yes 11 Respondent demographics: Library partners (8); Archival Partner, York University; Digitization Partners (2). **(11 Total)**

No 0

Themes **Comments**

Context of IBPOC engagement

1. "Our institution has a culture of working with culturally diverse peoples prior to this Project, including community Projects such as the Portuguese Canadian History Project, the Greek Canadian History Project, and the Coptic Canadian History Project which facilitates the preservation and donation of these communities' documentation. As our institution's participation was entailed receiving and tending to donations, our engagement with Indigenous or cultural diverse peoples was minimal, but hopefully the first stepping stones to building stronger relationships."

Growth of engagement 2. "Yes, and it has increased since this Project."

Question 5. Did you find the communications between Regent Park Film Festival and yourself/your institution to be constructive, thorough, and timely?

Yes, excellent communication	15	Respondent demographics: Library partners (8); Archival Partner, York University; Digitization Partners (2); Artists (7); Advisors (3). (21 Total)
Needs minor improvements	3	
The communication was suboptimal	2	
other...		

Themes	Comments
Praise of staff	1. "Yes absolutely. I felt I could reach out to Elizabeth and Ananya at any time."
Praise of staff	2. "The team at Regent Park Film Festival were always on top of all details, always professional and constructive. Regent Park Film Festival authored a presentation for the York U SSHRC collaborators conference and detailed their experiences to offer up both challenges and successes to the group, some of whom may be working toward commissioning initiatives. This really was one of the most stellar experiences I've had the pleasure of working with."
Praise of staff	3. "Communications were very good. Accommodating, generous, thankful. Acknowledging of our role."
Praise of Staff	4. "yes definitely. Liz was good at asking how they can support you. No passive aggressiveness which is great, and usually something I expect. I requested they text after they email. The communication was good, flexible, and they seemed to have a lot of space. the mentorship aspect was really great—it would have been great to keep this going. I did receive support later on with one mentor, and I created a resource for artists. The mentor helped me focus my upsets. This was a very valuable resource. "

Question 6. Were the MOUs you received from Regent Park accurate in the reflection of your partnership and the workload of your institution?

Yes	17	Respondent demographics: Library partners (8); Archival Partner, York University; Digitization Partners (2); Artists (7); Advisors (3). (21 Total)
No	3	
Themes	Comments	

High expectations	1. "I think the expectations were high for the amount of time and production resources that were available. However, I believe every filmmaker and artist involved in the Project rose to the occasion."
-------------------	--

Flexible staff	2. "We needed to update our MOU a number of times based on the changing elements of the program and Elizabeth was amazingly helpful and quick in getting everything right."
Flexible staff	3. "I thought the MOUs were thorough, Regent Park Film Festival was responsive to our suggested changes (reflective of our own limitations and what we felt we could do here with HMV). Elizabeth was really, really responsive and kept us to our timeline (thanks!)."
Change in scope of Project	4. "The scope of the Project changed from the originally signed MOU. In hindsight, the content and commitment in the MOU should have been updated to reflect the evolution of the Project. The amount of time spent coordinating the art installation and workshops exceeded expectations from the originally signed MOU. [Our organization] lead and additional branch staff time was spent on revising workshop details and promotion."
Weakness in workshop MOUs	5. "The MOUs were good for the initial Artist contracts. The MOU for the workshop was not as good. It did not accurately encapsulate the workload to be expected. It seemed to shift a lot, they would tell us one thing and change their mind, especially about money. Facilitator fee was 375\$, 300\$ for preparation, and 200\$ for material costs, with a total of 800 being communicated to us, without a need for receipts. This seemed to change half way through the course. Pay should always be clear from the beginning."
Strength in MOU	6. "The MOUs were direct and well articulated. The Regent Park team was organized and coordinated and from my perspective, planned well for the support teams."
More Install required than expected	7. "[I can't really recall] but as far as I can remember, it didn't delve into workload which was good—it was understand that I was responsible for installation, but there were not a lot of guidelines. My work was very generative, and this flexibility allowed it to shift. hands off in a good way. For the installation piece, the only difficulty there was understanding the physical labour necessary. Had to do install, and drive and do 3 site visits per installation. David Osubronie was a great help. At one library, I could only install one of three parts of the installation. There were a lot of pieces (9 total) and I could only install four because of the restrictions; the needs of the space changed and I was worried about the safety of the work, it was a two-toned thing. There was a safety concern for installing the frames on walls, the library representatives wanted to place the works on bookshelves, but they were heavy and I didn't want them to fall on someone. There was an expectation for more, and I felt an air of disappointment. I could only install the acetate pieces and it wasn't seen as what was expected."

Weakness in workshop organization	8. "There was far more time required on our part than anticipated to coordinate and facilitate the workshops."
Professionalism	9. "Regent Park was very organized and professional - simply the fact that they are engaging in this reflection is evidence of their thoughtful and conscientious approach."
Strength in MOU	10. "MOU—very strong. Even with big budget, Projects always seem to run short across all big Projects. Wonder if budget is accurate but that is something to see at the very end. But, not about profit makes this type of org. "Holding by their nails" staying afloat financially via funding."

Question 7. Would you deem this partnership successful? [scale of 1-5]

1 (unsuccessful)	0	Respondent demographics: Library partners (8); Archival Partner, York University; Digitization Partners (2); Artists (7); Advisors (3). (21 Total)
2	1	
3	3	
4	4	
5 (very successful)	13	

Question 8. Did any logistic developments affect your institution's contribution to the Project?

Yes	5	Respondent demographics: Library partners (8); Archival Partner, York University; Digitization Partners (2); Artists (7). (18 Total)
No	10	
No response	2	

Themes

Comments

Express desire for more staff	1. "You always want to support the artists more; went beyond the program with [one artist--they did another program here as well, but still worked on their Project for HMV, spent more time with them. More people support is always needed, crew, staff, install, more options for editors to the artists, etc."
-------------------------------	--

Misunderstanding of necessary lines of communication with rural communities

2. "There was not enough staff to run this program. For the Ontario workshops, 3 of the artists got together to lead it as a group; the information coming out of Regent Park Film Festival was like molasses—large chunks at a time, but nevertheless slow. We would send questions for clarification, and received no answers. We felt hindered to get the questions answered. We wanted to know about the space, etc. the information came too late, and half of it was wrong [for the Thunder Bay location].

"People who only live in big cities in Canada, think differently about communication—in rural areas, there is a different way of being and the personal touch is much more valued; communication online is less accessible. [My co-facilitator] and I are both northerners—southerners don't listen to us and how it is best to communicate. This ideology stems from the history of Canada and power relationships."

With the Thompson Public Library, I had previously shown work there. The library felt the outreach [from Regent Park Film Festival] would go steadily and then fall off. Thompson was the last event on the road, and I feel like it was an afterthought, whereas we got our hand slapped in Thunder Bay [for reaching out to the library independently], in Thompson this never occurred—we [the workshop facilitators] realized there was no time left and asked the librarian if they had any clue what was going on for the event. The communication [from Regent Park Film Festival] seemed to have ended.

There was a lot of reliance on the Artist and Library Partners outside of Ontario, but no communication of this being the case."

No issue

3. "Frankly I can only remember good things. I do not recall any issues personally."

Technical issues

4. "IT staffer had issues with installing videos initially. More of an issue caused by error, not logistical."

Technical issues

"In the end, no but had we not flagged the issue of the film hard drive being formatted for a Mac we would not have been able to present the films."

Technical issues

5. "The only hurdle I encountered was technical and some personnel issue which was brought up with Regent Park Film Festival and Charles Street Video right away."

Difficult to make accessible

6. "The exhibition, slightly clunky access was challenging. I think putting the films on an open platform would have been much simpler and would have drawn more attention-- greater convenience in terms of film access would have been positive, I think."

Logistics on exhibitors' end

7. "The only logistical issue happened on our end, because we had difficulty securing a date for one of our workshop leaders, so our dates didn't make it into the professional printing, but that again was our fault."

Audience engagement positive 8. "Many artists visited our Library and enjoyed the multi-disciplinary workshop. The participants opportunity to create archival memories by writing and painting logo/tattoo to represent their own life experiences brought on a self-appreciation & joy."

Miscommunication with library coordinator "Yes. We didn't negotiate about communications, style or process. The process started before the artists were found and was already set. Im not sure if other artists had more communication because their work was finished and didn't need installation. They would talk to RPFF, RPFF would talk to library, which caused some issues. The expectations and the deliverables and the experience of the installation was different than the expectations for the library. RPFF was great with communication, understanding and flexible, although it seemed like their hands were tied and didn't have a lot of flexibility [with the exhibition locations], hence why one of my installations didn't occur. A lot of tension bubbled up from that. I would have liked to have regular check-ins, maybe 3, at the beginning middle and end of the project with RPFF and library representatives to establish what was going to work and what wouldn't. There was a high expectation for being on the ball with installation, although when I was, it wasn't recognized and it felt like there was a "Hawk in the room" if you were x minutes late. I would have preferred a more level power dynamic, rather than any changes to the communication, in-order to develop a process that worked with everyone. Also to be asked what I needed to ensure a smooth install (for example, I was in need of a ladder, and couldn't use theirs so I had to rent one).

As far as communication goes... the library reps seemed stretched. Direct communication was preferred, but library reps reinforced that it wasn't within their capacity.

Felt like the library was at the head of power dynamic, with RPFF sandwiched between us—and I understand how thats a difficult place to be. I would recommend the discussion to take place round-table style throughout the process. I didn't have much choice throughout any of it. When the library said the Don Mills installation wasn't going to happen, there was no discussion, it was just cut without any feedback. I see that it wasn't personal, but there was no sharing of the reasons for the cut. The value of community was higher than the risk of being late for installation. There was a lot of time and labour for this project and I was paid adequately for it, but there was a lot of excess expenses depending on library buildings.

The libraries were heritage buildings, hence no taping on the walls. It was communicated that there were limitations on install, but difficulties—you can't have a temporary installation that is ideal for building preservation stretched for a month long exhibition."

Lack of space and technical requirements at library

9. "Yes. There wasn't enough space or sufficient technical requirements in the library to host a fulsome art installation. At the end, [we] had to forego one installation site due to staff capacity being exceeded. More information about the pieces from Regent Park Film Festival would have been helpful for [our] staff in order to better explain the art installation to interested customers. Due to health and safety reasons, [we] could not support any additional structures to be brought in to a couple of the smaller libraries."

Question 9. Would you be open to collaborating with Regent Park Film Festival in the future?

Yes 14 Respondent demographics: Library partners (8); Archival Partner, York University; Digitization Partners (2); Advisors (3). (14 Total)

No 0

Maybe 3

Themes **Comments**

Future partnerships 1. "Hell Yes!"

Future partnerships 2. "Yes and our relationship with Regent Park Film Festival proceeds this, so we will definitely continue.

3. We have supported different films at the festival and many people who have had some relationship to SAVAC have also worked at Regent Park Film Festival, so it is a pretty clear relationship."

Future partnerships 4. "Yes, we would be open to collaborating with Regent Park Film Festival if the Project fits in with TPL's strategic priorities."

Future partnerships 5. "Simply depends on if the program was aligned with our programming goals."

Question 10. What were the major strengths and weaknesses of this Project?

Respondent demographics: Library partners (8); Archival Partner, York University; Digitization Partners (2); Advisors (3). (14 Total)

Themes **Comments**

1. "Strength = providing access to content and work that otherwise would have been inaccessible to our community Weakness = logistical and operational planning and level of miscommunication."

2. "A small group sitting was a highlight in the workshop. There was much respect and encouragement among the group. The participants were also very pleased to be in a fun and reflective space."

3. "Attendance was low - hard to say why this was really, could be a variety of factors and one-off screenings are always difficult to judge in that regard."

4. "Strengths

- The concept of collecting Indigenous and multicultural home video footages.
- The additional support provided by David Osubronie and Elizabeth Mudeny in terms of the art installation.

- Bringing together community engagement and arts creation.

Weaknesses

- Required a stronger mutually agreed upon understanding about the artist's responsibilities tied to this Project and the limitations of library space for art installation.

- The communication from Regent Park Film Festival to the artist regarding the proper materials to be used for the installation within the library space."

5. "The content of this Project was so important and moving. Our patrons had nothing but great feedback about the films."

6. "Strength-- Elizabeth herself, the hands-on Project management. Marketing materials were high quality and impactful also! Weakness-- not having a clear target for the films and/or workshop."

7. "Advertising was a problem for us. The literature did not clearly communicate the intent of the Project. I found I had to add explanations to all the advertising so people understood the purpose of the Project."

8. "Strength was The Festival's resource commitment to soliciting participation, interviewing, and translating interviews to descriptions in the community's own words. Weakness may have been the time constraint (grants!) as it takes time to build trust with underrepresented communities to donate their private and personal memories."

9. "The collection and production of new work were major strengths. It may be too soon to judge, but I'm not sure a lasting community of Indigenous and racialized people has been built--though this was not an explicit goal."

10. "The major strengths were the breadth of it, it was manageable in its size and its conception from the beginning, there was a lot of thought put towards the framework of the Project so that was really quite successful in terms of the original conception..."

its weaknesses, I think was that the quality of the work produced for the archive varied—I would be curious I think next time, if this Project were to occur again, to get a different variety of artists and see what else could be produced."

11. "This Project provides a true example of activating an archive as an act towards reconciliation. Jennifer Dysart's film involved negotiations with the NFB to use footage from her Indigenous community, in exchange of her capturing the names of individuals in the footage. This is a true example of colonialism at work—coming into a community, recording/documenting them as subjects, and not engaging with them. This activation works towards flipping the gaze of colonialism, as a reparation. This strength (IE., counter archival) brought on by the Project would not have happened without the HNV Project."

Vision, planning, communication and foresight, a core of staff management and coordination, a successful consultation team that had the experience and connections to work past some of the challenges of access (NFB footage, York). I don't feel I can speak to the weaknesses, I think any weakness would be defined by The Festival itself."

12. "The submissions to York were processed on an as-it-comes basis. If we had done one upload, there would be a pile-up of the originals in CSV; our goal was to send it off as soon as possible to return the items back to the family.

Recommendation for future Projects: follow this framework of uploads, in order to catch issues as they come, minimizing resources spent re-doing work. Make agreed upon dates with Archive.

Strengths—well organized, great personnel, sustained through the three years, built nicely overtime with increased interest, involvement, donors. It was well thought out. It built relationships outside of Toronto—power of word of mouth and arts community. Power of funding, massive Project, and they pulled it off!

Community growth

—The want to work with other fellow arts orgs. Provides a potential death trap of professionalizing through partnerships but, should keep it grass roots and small to maintain the mandate.

Weaknesses—more support for the artists, financial and personnel support. More assessment of true costs, more money into dubbing and transfer.

Recommendation: keep it grass roots! That's where mandate will be fulfilled"

13. "I thought the focus was fantastic, strongly support."

14. "Workshop was strong. Clarity of idea, in terms of being able to explain the Project as a whole quickly and succinctly would be weakness."

Question 11. What were your hopes of participating in this Project? Would you say they were achieved?

Yes 17 Respondent demographics: Library partners (8); Archival Partner, York University; Digitization Partners (2); Artists (7); Advisors (3). (21 Total)

No 3

No response 1

Themes **Comments**

Low engagement 1. "We had hoped for a high level of engagement within the community based on the indicated levels of support and promotion from Regent Park Film Festival. These hopes were not achieved."

Interesting programming	2. "Interesting programming, and yes."
Increased exposure	3. "The Library's hope of this Project was to bring an awareness and appreciation for media works which was very well achieved."
Increased exposure	4. "To support in the sharing of stories from Indigenous and multicultural communities. Yes."
Interesting programming	5. "My hopes were achieved as we were able to provide amazing programming and Regent Park Film Festival helped do amazing things with our library."
Increased exposure	6. "I think bringing the experience to [library] customers-- in which we were successful, bringing the films to all [our] branches/customers-in-branch."
Low engagement	7. "I hoped it would bring people into my library. Sadly, only 2 people viewed the videos and nobody came for the workshop."
Interesting programming	8. "My hope was to work with a community to tell a story that reflected themselves with archival images. On a personal level I hoped to experiment with a new visual storytelling style for and if successful to see how it could be incorporated into my practice. I believe I achieved both goals through this program."
Create new work	9. "My intention was to make a short film that challenged newcomer stereotypes, and to do so with the help of mentors from Regent Park Film Festival. And yes, that was achieved."
Create new work	10 "My hope was to make my film and I am very proud and humbled by the wonderful reception I have had from audiences."
Increased exposure	11. "I hoped that by participating in this Project I would be able to reach a new audience for my work and feel engaged in conversations more directly related to being a person of colour/filmmaker living and working in Canada. I would say that the Project was successful and my aim was achieved."
Low engagement	12. "As the access centre for western Canada, we didn't receive any submissions to digitize, I thought HMOV could of done better at getting the word out to western Canada."
Interesting programming	13. "I was interested in the collection of home movies by racialized and Indigenous people and the production of new works based on home movie footage, and these goals were achieved."

Interesting programming	14. "I was not completely sure what the outcome would be as working with home archives is such an unwieldy proposition. I felt that working toward the completion of a number of artists productions and a public screening with a moderated presentation was ambitious, but Regent Park planned and executed a tour to libraries and community centres, I understand that archival footage/documents will be contributed to the York University SSHRC initiative "Archive/CounterArchive" collection and Vtape plans to support the Home Visible screening program with distribution to alternative screenings and educational institutions. These stories document incredible and diverse histories of new Canadians as well as First Nations and we like to do everything we can to have the program absorbed into Educational curriculum."
Supported Project mandate	15. "My hopes were simply that I wanted the Project to happen and I wanted to support the Project happening. Yes, that was achieved."
Interesting programming	16. "Hoped to increased representation of the IBPOC community, beyond anti-racism work, but their normal, everyday lives. As a Latinx archivist, it was a pleasure and so much fun working with material with people who looked like my family members (ex: Marchant family.)"
Create new work	17. "My expectations were to make a film and they were achieved."
Personal development	18. "yes definitely. My project was about going and meeting my family for the first time. Beyond the project, this was the goal, and the pieces came out of the emotional process of this. Even RPFf giving me the opportunity to do this, financially and artistically, the opportunity to do this was what I needed. It was pretty personal. Jennifer's was also like this—so intense and necessary. We got this opportunity to go to places, meet people I've never met before that are related to me. It was more than going to an archive. We were given this opportunity to build an archive outside of an institution."

Question 12. In the future, what changes would you make to the framework of this Project? What would you suggest for other Projects operating in a similar vein?

Respondent demographics: Library partners (8); Archival Partner, York University; Digitization Partners (2); Artists (7); Advisors (3). (21 Total)

Themes	Comments
Need increased communication on workshops	1. "Provide far more detail to the participating organizations, consider sending a Regent Park Film Festival representative to be on site for the workshops."

No change	2. "Overall, the framework of the Project met expectations and was well received. Planning, sharing ideas and communication is very important for other Projects operating in a similar vein."
Increase communication on expectations	3. "Communicating expectations clearly about what is possible given the scope."
Define the audience more	4. "I think having a more clearly defined target audience (both in terms of eliciting content and sharing the resulting films) would help. Workshop timing--having it earlier in the whole Project (i.e., have it at the content-gathering stage)."
Create ongoing aspect for metadata upkeep	5. "I don't know if this is a tangible suggestion, but I think it's always difficult to have Projects that engage with racialized identities because you end up, even if you don't want to tokenize, you still end up trying to be as holistic as possible. I'm wondering if there are always more ways of thinking about it, and that being an ongoing aspect of the Project."
No change	6. "Other than the changes already suggested none come to mind."
Define timeline	7. "Arriving at the definition of the Project in order to provide a significant timeline for the call for submissions. I believe that Regent Park Film Festival learned that creating parameters for the artists and budgets had complexities that could not be foreseen (though this was managed constructively and successfully), and a slush fund should always be budgeted in."
No change	8. "The framework made perfect sense to me in terms of the specificities of this Project."
Low attendance	9. "I found the attendance at some of the library screenings low, I would suggest to have more focus on outreach and marketing of the events in the future. Other Projects should look at the framework for HNV --and try to emulate it. This was the best grant/mentorship experience I've ever encountered."

- Increase mentorship 10. "—Indigenous advisory board on the Project had minimal interaction with the artists; we met them at the symposium. At the time of the symposium, we thought they would advise the artists on production, but their purpose was more for advising Regent Park Film Festival on the Project. We had no access to these people. In the future, although they it was great they were advising The Festival, it would be beneficial to suggest feedback at the half-way point of production. I had personally reached out and they were too busy and I felt bad.
- The indigenous advisory board was helpful behind the scenes, and were key players for advocating directly to the highest level to NFB, provided me free access to footage. This is absolutely indispensable. The advisor was Kerry Swanson; Lisa Jackson is on the advisory board for the NFB and may have weighed in as well.
- There should be a midway checkin with the advisory team, even if conducted in the artist's own space, independently. —The budget needed to be more locked in.
- When working with northern communities, there needs to be more commitment to engagement with these locations. Culturally they are different and don't operate in the same way. There should be more trust placed with Indigenous northerners to tell Regent Park Film Festival how to approach these communities. There should have been reversal where the northerners lead Regent Park Film Festival to the area instead of vice versa. "
- Create education plan 11. "I would suggest designing collaboration with schools such as York, OCADU and Ryerson to interface with curriculum."
- Increase promotions 12. "Better Promotions and awareness."
- Maintain anti-oppression values 13. "Work on an exhibition that you can really support. Lots of engagement, inviting, get that down.
- for other Projects: if you're doing something with goal for art and also for making a world that is less oppressive... how do you do Projects that help with that? Question this, how do we amplify it."
- Increase programming 14. "I would even appreciate more programming surrounding any Project we do in future with Regent Park Film Festival because of the level of quality of the content, and the professionalism of Elizabeth and Ananya made working with Regent Park Film Festival very nice."

Hire an archivist	15. "It is a bit of a catch 22: it may have been more beneficial to have an archivist's participation in the Project (talking to donors, explaining transfer of ownership but not copyright, providing an understanding of access restrictions, etc), but we would not have been able to provide the resources. Perhaps (in an ideal world) a budget line could be set aside for part-time professional archivist to work on the provide full-time? I also initially thought the material would be donated at the end of the Project, not as-it-was-processed, which meant changing the workflow (I wouldn't have created that massive excel spreadsheet). In hindsight, perhaps a timeline should have been created with batches donated at certain time periods with milestones for upload and/or important dates to have outputs (ex: Regent Park Film Festival in Nov)."
Increase mentorship	16. "Again I would suggest more opportunity to show work to mentors in the development stage and post production stages."
Focus more on programming	17. "For us, the programming was a success, and what we were happiest with. That being more of a focus, and less of a side benefit would be something we would enjoy."
Increase pedagogical exposure of Archives to artists	18. "We all came together with different understandings of what archives were. All my experiences previously had been archiving people of experiences, faces, portraiture. It would have been cool to have other people come to talk about what different kinds of archives could look like. when I went to the archives in Georgia, It was really difficult. Most of the information was really difficult to digest—that most Indigenous people are wiped out in Georgia, and most documents revolved around slave-ownership. It would have been great to have people who've been exposed to this research to prep us for what to expect."

Question 13. How could Regent Park improve in the future when fostering collaborative partnerships? in other words, what could Regent Park have done better?

Respondent demographics: Library partners (8); Archival Partner, York University; Digitization Partners (2); Artists (7); Advisors (3). (21 Total)

Themes	Comments
No change	1. "I don't think there was much that could've gone better. Regent Park Film Festival was very responsive and was very professional and wonderful. Elizabeth is a fantastic partner and so much fun to work with and a joy to collaborate with."

Workshop restructuring	2. "I think the HVM Project afforded us more latitude and customization than was helpful-- i.e., if HVM had been more prescribed (e.g., a more ""canned"" workshop or suggesting a partner group for us to work with) we might have had a better response to the workshop itself. If the workshop had occurred earlier in the process (e.g., when collecting the videos) that might have directed more attention to the Project."
Change in funding strategies	3. "I believe some further financial support would have been beneficial. the Projects were commissioned works and this made my Project ineligible for some completion funding from Canada Council for the Arts. I'm not sure how this can change to help filmmakers to access some additional funding to off set some costs. "
Increase mentorship	4. "For myself personally I would have liked more contact with the original mentors who were at the first symposium in 2018. Feedback, when time is permitting, is vital for a successful and film. I believe because the production funds were modest we all ended out working alone with only minimal feedback from region park during the development and editing stages. Perhaps more contacts with mentors could help shape even more successful final films."
No change	5. "I felt very supported during this Project."
Underfunding for staff	6. "There should be improvements on clarity, they didn't have all the details worked out, figuring it out as they went. There was a lack of staff—I respect them being busy, they were just underfunded staff-wise. There could have been a more consistent communication in regards to the workshop and screening locations, standardizing the protocol and timeline instead of rushing off. We did three workshops, at each of the three the librarian had different paperwork to what we [the facilitators] had received. Maybe less personalization in that regard would have been more beneficial and less confusing when delegating responsibilities. There was an ASL Interpreter at the Thunder Bay Library; the Facilitators didn't know about this and had to give her prep-notes on the day of. There was also a high media presence at this location; these two factors were both unexpected distractions on the day of. When it came to the commission of the work, there were no issues of communication."
No change	7. "I was really happy with the level of engagement and I don't think I have anything to add to it."

Increase awareness 8. "One thing, not exclusive to Regent Park Film Festival, regarding the exhibitions, in general... how do you get people here? Numbers were low, a problem in general across most arts exhibitions... one idea is getting more groups in, organized tours, with educational, enhance reach. Can't expect when it opens people will come..."

Quality over quantity of participation is something to bear in mind as well.

---Symposium---great place to know the artists, get to put your own two cents."

Praise for communication 9. "As someone that has previously worked on the programming committees, I have long been involved with Regent Park Film Festival and the lines of communication are direct. With regard to other partnerships and outreach to communities, I think this Project has provided a great learning curve. The terms of Home Made Visible expanded as the consultation process evolved and that delayed the call out to artists a little. I think developing timelines are always the biggest challenge, but that said, this Project was very successful."

Recommendations for communications 10. "have more circle conversations where all stakeholders are together in the room to speak evenly.

have more room for mental health and disability. I needed more support in this.

Would be cool as a residency, and it wouldn't have been much more work. The only time this happened it was so great, it was so neat to hear everyone's ideas. Their passion was there—for us too we don't often see each others stories. It would foster a bit more collaboration and provide more feedback on the work, the process would have been good."

Question 14. Has your involvement with this Project shaped your desire and capacity to participate in similar Projects or institutional collaborations in the future?

Yes 12 Respondent demographics: Archival Partner, York University; Digitization Partners (2); Artists (6); Advisors (3). (12 Total)

No 0

Themes **Comments**

Project highlights need for research 1. "Yes I think I would—the reason why we supported this Project was because we noticed a trend around family photography, [of] a desire amongst communities of colour to populate archives with their own materials [...] I continued to see the need for that, and I was really happy with what was being produced from that archiving—it wasn't just archiving for archivings' sake. It was also activating the archive, and I'm really glad that was built into [the Project]. If I was asked to be on any kind of advisory [again] I'd be interested in not just the collections but the activation."

Shaped by this experience

2. "Ananya Ohri and Elizabeth Mudeny were so organized and on track, that they made this Project a pleasure and point of pride to be a part of. I would love to be a part of future Projects for any consultation expertise I have to offer as well as have to gain from collaborating with a stellar group of people."

Shaped by this experience

3. "It definitely helped and gave me a great experience. It was pretty much a practice install, and I've gotten much better from it. The Project gave me a lot of confidence on what I can create. Because this project was over the course of such a long time, it gave me a generative and explorative process. It expanded my understanding of working with institutions, and my value as an artist. Liz's stamina really was a real insight — and she was always so pleasant.

This is not the first institutional project I've worked with. Institutions have a lot of rules/expectations on how things should go—they like how art looks and relates to the community but they don't always know the value: art is political, especially this project.

There should have been more Indigenous people in the design process of the Project. I wouldn't say RPF was oppressive, I didn't experience this. I didn't experience this from anyone in particular at the library, it was just the institutional processes [which were oppressive]. It seemed the library representative was burnt out and overworked. When the power needs to flex, it does and when it does, you see it coming. De-colonial process really needs to happen.

[As for alternative spaces] to hold the exhibitions—libraries were a good choice for access. But another thing to consider is that you could always pair up with installations/events that are already happening in communities, which would enhance reach. You would have to diversify the events— although you may not reach people who wouldn't come out to specific events. You might not have a wide reach like at a library. "

Question 15. Do you have any other final comments you would like to share?

Respondent demographics: Library partners (8); Archival Partner, York University; Digitization Partners (2); Artists (7); Advisors (3). (21 Total)

Themes

Comments

Improve communications with northern/rural communities

1. "When working with northern communities, there needs to be more commitment to engagement with these locations."

- Congratulations 2. "I'd like to congratulate Regent Park Film Festival on a very successful Project, the resulting work is both culturally significant and artistically rigorous. Absolutely stellar!"
- Congratulations 3. "Keep up the great work!"
- Congratulations 4. "CSV would love to to sit down and talk about next steps and new ideas! Follow up!"
- Congratulations 5. "It's been an absolute pleasure working on this Project!"
- Congratulations 6. "I am entirely grateful and thank the Regent Park and the and coordinators of the home made visible commission. It was wonderful and has resulted in some incredible friendships with my co-filmmakers."
- Congratulations 7. "Thank you so much! What an incredible experience, I'm sad to see it end."
- Congratulations 8. Thank you very much for the partnership!
- Congratulations 9. "Thanks for partnering with EPL on this! We've learned lots and hope to work with you again. Thanks, Elizabeth!"
- Congratulations 10. "Congratulations on the Project!"
- Congratulations 11. "Elizabeth Mundenyo, Special Projects Manager for Home Made Visible was a great representative and a pleasure to meet. She was very professional, courteous and inspirational.
- It was a great experience to collaborate with Regent Park!"
- Congratulations 12. "Thanks for the important work that you do and I hope you keep VPL in mind for future Projects!"
- Insurance policy "A suggestion for working with artists. Any physical materials that can't be replicated (ie., digital files, CDs, etc.), should have an insurance policy. Some of my work was destroyed and can be recreated, but if the other works had been destroyed I would have been devastated."

Artist Specific Questions

Question 1. Does the work you created for this Project reflect your larger body of work? How is it similar/dissimilar? If dissimilar, will you continue to work in this style in the future?

Yes 6 Artists (7)

No 1

Themes

Comments

Artistic growth 1. "The work I created doesn't entirely reflect my body of work. I have done one other experimental documentary in addition to the one created for HMV. I have utilized archival images for most of my work in the past but the style I used for this Project was a departure. The technique is one that I would like to incorporate into my story telling style."

Artistic growth 2. "Yes it does, although it is the first time that I have featured my own story/family in my work. I will definitely continue to look at my own family stories in the future."

Artistic growth 3. "Yes it was a departure for me. I used a more traditional documentary approach. Creatively I am more drawn to experimental film making. However, I feel it was very beneficial experience and I will and I am incorporating this new approach in my next film Project."

Artistic growth 4. "The work I made in collaboration with Parastoo Anoushahpour, in many ways is the continuation of my film practice that has been evolving in the past few years, with the difference that Home Made Visible gave me the time and space to deal with much more sensitive and personal Project. We both believe that this Project is a new chapter in a series of works that we'll be producing in the future, that will deal with similar issues and concerns."

Artistic growth 5. "The work produced as part of this Project is a continuation of my practice in terms of form and genre but the subject matter is much more intimate and in that sense could be considered a slight departure from my practice, one that I am intending to continue."

6. "It is similar to my personal practice, although very personal this time—it was very interesting to explore and create an archive. It kicked off a new way of working for me that is archival, and exploring what that means outside of colonial ways of keeping."

7. "Yes, it is similar to other work with originating themes of archives and home movies. I already operated in these themes with plans to work with materials from my personal archives."

Question 2. Have you received greater engagement or exposure of your work through participating with Project Home Made Visible? If so, how?

Yes 6 Artists (7)

No 1

Themes **Comments**

Enhanced exposure 1. "Yes, my HMV film has screened at other film festivals as a result of exposure from the HMV screenings."

Artistic growth 2. "The opportunity to develop a workshop with two of my co-participants, helped me to have a better understanding of archive as a tool and memory trigger. It is a gate way to untold stories."

Enhanced exposure 3. "Yes, our work has been showing in different festivals and programs around the world. In particular, our film is playing in an outdoor screening in Hamilton tomorrow as part of SAVAC's Monitor series."

Enhanced exposure 4. "Yes. HMV Project has enabled me to reach a completely new audience, one that I had been trying to reach with my work and engage in dialogue with but was not always successful. Also through the very impressive tour I manage to show my work across Canada which I consider an unbelievable achievement at this point in my career."

Enhanced exposure 5. "This Project programmed my work in many new ways, which has been really great. Here's a list of where this work has been programmed after the tour: Pleasure Dome, Toronto; Skabmegovat Indigenous Film Festival, Finland; Reframe Film Festival, Peterborough; Montreal First People Film Festival; A potential showing and presentation in 2020 in Sydney, Australia.

The exposure was a different type of exposure than I'd previously experienced. For example, Pleasure Dome could be considered a more elite level of art in Toronto—this Project has opened up new paths."

Enhanced exposure 6. "I think so. People have seen it, but I haven't been reached out to. I was asked to be in two different shows with the work created, one of which I couldn't participate due to time, and one that took place at Humber Archive on display for a month."

Question 3. What was your experience like being a team of 50% POC and 50% Indigenous filmmakers? Did this shape your experience in any way, and if so, how?

Yes 7 Artists (7)

No 0

Themes **Comments**

Positive experience 1. "I found being part of a team of POC and Indigenous filmmakers very supportive."

Desire for more mentorship 2. "We didn't have a ton of opportunity to really be together, other than the first symposium. It was less like an artist residency, with more focus on working alone. When you were working alongside each other it was really valuable—our discussions with each other were all on the same page."

Positive experience 3. "I always feel so grateful when I am placed in such conditions which of course very rarely happens. Being part of the HVM Project and the team felt like a gift to me and I felt extremely privileged to have access to the rest of the group and the other participating artists and to have focused conversations around race, belonging and the archive."

Positive experience 4. "Because I was partnered with two other indigenous filmmakers I believe we were able to make a greater impact on the communities where workshops and screenings were held. Working as an indigenous the front in our own territories was a great way to connect with a broader indigenous audience."

Positive experience 5. "Absolutely! It created a safe and nurturing space to develop the idea. I learned so much more about indigenous issues/film and felt empowered to continue to tell my own stories."

Positive experience 6. "This has been a crucial part of this Project for me. The spirit of both the organizing team and the artists, have been such a wonderful experience to be a part of."

Positive experience 7. "It was definitely refreshing, but we didn't work close together. It would have been nice to have regular meetings once a month to discuss our practice and have more support. I worked in isolation in studio where I met one other artist and developed a bond. Everyone's project reflected the need for these stories and archives to be imagined and created."

Question 4. This Project explicitly sought to engage IBPOC artists. Being an artist who is a person of colour and/or Indigenous, how was it being an artist involved with this Project?

Yes 7 Artists (7)

No 0

Themes **Comments**

Positive experience 1. "It was very rewarding to be a part of this Project and share stories from different perspectives."

Positive experience 2. "It was wonderful, a first for me but not the last."

Positive experience 3. "It was a fantastic honour to be able to participate in regent parks homemade visible commission. I have immense respect for the thoughtful approach to this Project development."

Positive experience 4. "I felt I had the support we needed throughout the Project. HMY gave us the space to feel safe to pursue this Project, which is very very crucial."

Positive experience 5. "I was very happy and excited to be engaged in this Project since it presented a new art scene and a completely different audience for me. Also because of the nature of the Project I felt encouraged and supported to embark on a much more personal and sensitive Project that I wouldn't have done in a different context."

Positive experience 6. "it was great, the opportunity was one of the most reasonably paid commissions I've experienced. Artists aren't really paid adequately for their work in this city, or anywhere for that matter, and this has raised the bar on valuing my time. Felt great not to work myself to the bone during the process, I was able to focus on the art. Having the resources available was big success through CSV, it felt great to be appreciated for the stories I had and wanted to share, and not having them be a method of tokenization—this project was genuine and responsible."

Positive experience

7. "It was a great opportunity to work with personal materials from home movies and to show how our voices are really relevant not just to ourselves, but to a wider Canadian audience."

Charles Street Video Specific Questions

Question 1. With this Project, there were other digitization partnerships (FAVA, Centre for Art Tapes, Videographe, Afcoop, and Niagara Custom Lab). From CSV's perspective, what was the nature of this agreement? What were some advantages/disadvantages? Would you do it this way again, or had you done it this way before?

Workflow details

1. Niagara Custom Lab did all film, and they digitized second most amount of footage. CSV did vast majority, which has ben constant in the last few weeks. We are always pleased CSV can play a substantial role [so taking on this much of the workload was no issue]. This is what CSV is about--we bought into the HMV Project right from the beginning, with helping Ananya write the grant proposal, so we wanted to play a substantial role. There was concern of falling behind, but with the addition of a summer student on the staff, time could be more focused to the HMV Project.

Question 2. What technologies are you using for digitization? What brand of equipment are you using?

Technologies

1. Black Magic capture system with 4K Capabilities. York U's standards call for uncompressed video, which would have been unrealistic for our small organization. We used ProRes422 HQ [visually lossless, still lossy].

Question 3. Any additional comments/recommendation in accordance to your workflow?

Minor time-code issue

1. "Some issues when donors time-codes did not match the time-codes on the footage, had to rely on using their descriptions of the footage.

This process was highly emotional and moving at times.

The workflow was very thought out
the Project was sensitively handled."

Advisor Specific Questions

Question 1. Now that the Project is coming to a close, could you please detail how you advised the Project?

Wanda Vanderstoop

1. "I recommended considerations for the contract agreement to be developed with artists for the Project residency and potential follow up distribution. I also recommended partner organizations and wrote a few introductory email/letters.

I continued to participate in the ongoing consultation process to problem solve in meetings and by email and phone.

At the beginning of the Project advising on dealing with creating visibility with Regent Park to maintain as archival Project as a part of Regent Park Film Festival with nonexclusive rights. Artists maintained all copyright (*which is significant for funders*)." "

Indu Vashist

2. "There were different meetings that we had in person one-on-one, and I thought that that was a really good way of doing it. That 1:1 meeting right at the beginning was a good way of getting in-depth information out of the different advisors—I think that it was a good combination of the staff relying on the different advisors guidance.

There was definitely some items done over email about budget allocations, etc., that were not just strictly about budget allocations, but about representation. I think it was the right group of people to come together and people were really thoughtful in what they provided. For me, it was a very easy process to be a part of, and that is always a thing when you're on these advisory committees, that it feels like a time suck, but this definitely didn't; I thought they approached people individually with specific questions and I thought that was really smart as well.

The one question that I remember most actively engaging with was around allocation of resources when one of the artists was from a northern community, so there was this question of equity vs. Equity—that person required more resources and how to be fair about that, so I weighed in on those ideas—how do you do all different kinds of representation, regional representation [for example] and just knowing that if you're interested in actually doing regional representation than you actually do need to put in different kinds of resources to support people who don't live in city centres."

Appendix C: Staff Interviews

Transcript of Interview with Ananya Ohri and Elizabeth Mudenyio

How did your goals shift over the course of the project?

Ananya: In regards to our original goal on engaging Public housing: we reached public housing communities through RPF festival, but through this project we wanted to engage through public libraries. Outreach had to deal with so many other specifics, couldn't engage through housing in the same way. Maybe we could have done it through the exhibition in the third section of the project. If you want to reach Public Housing, you have to do things a little differently; ie., we did do childcare but that might not be enough—its not compelling to go and watch videos with headphones, its daunting. It would have to be set up differently. That goal changed according to capacity—just getting videos in was so hard. The symposium, our goal our artists were BIPOC, not from public housing. It was taken into consideration during the jury process. That being said the aspects, free, accessible, were maintained. The goal changed—at one point we were really conscious of it. No one in [bipoc] communities could afford these recording materials, but in public housing this would be limiting even further. A whole additional goal was to engage biopic communities was to add Indigenous artists into the scope of the project. We had decided by the point of picking the artist roster that this would include Indigenous Peoples.

What is the 'roster' you refer to?

Ananya: For the grant application, the engagement of the artists was always a big part of the creation portion of the project and names were required for this grant. So Ananya reached out to 12 POC artists and confirmed a lot. According to me , they were going to be part of it, full intention of having them be involved. They were going to be paid less, which is why there were so many of them. There were going to be 12 artists, and they were going to be the commissions. We had had conversations, signed contracts which stated things could change. And then, with the advisory, as the Project was shaping up it didn't make any sense. IBPOC artists needed to be the focus, and we [the Festival] were in agreement.

Elizabeth: It also really changed because at that point we knew that the original roster only consisted of People of Colour, and we needed Indigenous artists. We decided to create an Indigenous call-out, and the advisors said we should just make a call out for *everyone*.

Ananya: and I asked, how many artists, as they would all be paid less; the advisory pointed out that \$3,000 was too little, you should really be paying \$6,000. And if that's the case, we could really hire six artists total, so that no matter *what* we would have to cut down folks in the roster, and then we would need to get three Indigenous artists, which would mean even *more* folks in the roster would get cut down, so who in the roster were we going to keep? And so, the fairest thing was to distribute a new call.

Which advisory team was this for, was it everyone or specifically the indigenous advisory?

Ananya: it was the whole advisory.

Elizabeth: because the advisory only has one Indigenous person, Ariel Smith, and Kerry Swanson came on later.

Ananya: we didn't add anyone to the advisory.

Elizabeth: We added Teresa and Deanna, who were originally on the board.

Ananya: They were just the board reps, and as they left the board they joined the advisory.

Elizabeth: I think those were the only later additions. But, clearly our advisory is predominantly POC heavy, but it was also determined early on in the project.

Ananya: the advisory was determined through people I spoke to when forming the project, including Ariel, she wasn't added later, she was added early. Because the whole part of the project was to interrogate settler/indigenous relationships of people in Canada—that intention was always there, but it was in a way that black POC people need to deal with that themselves, before they go out and start doing things about it. That was the spirit in which it was created. But, then we realized we could do this with Indigenous people. That's why Ariel was always part of the advisory.

I'm just thinking more for Kerry.

Ananya: Actually, an Indigenous consultant was always in the budget, and that was because we were going to be dealing with certain content, and the whole point of the project was to educate ourselves and we might need some help, in which case we would pay someone, that was the idea.

How were you measuring success during the course of the project?

Elizabeth: there were three parts to the project. The first part of the project had the initial goals to digitize 50 materials, not realizing with 8mm reels of film, people have seem to have like ten. So that was one way of measuring it. The other was, measuring the number of indigenous, POC and Black submissions in the nation-wide callout. The content within the home movies themselves was also reflective of regions. We did outreach for so, so long and exploring different tactics for outreach and making sure that before we even started outreach the first thing we did was look at census data of where populations were, tried to be both thorough and thoughtful with outreach; calls, postcards, just engaging people through the project. We definitely sent out thousands of posters and postcards, definitely helped with putting out the word but it didn't feel like there was a lot of traction. So, that was another way we measured outreach was that we sent it to X many people, sent out X pieces of material.

Ananya: One thing that I would add is that a lot of this project when it started, we like didn't even know if we were going to get 50—50 was ambitious for us. So part of our understanding was that this question was worth asking, and what happens when you ask this question. And we didn't formally track this, but I think it was good to see how peoples' imagination was sparked by the project, and the interesting framework. And I think that it demonstrated that the question is still worth asking.

So the first part was measured primarily quantitatively. What was the second part?

Ananya: it's important to note that there's a quantitative part to all of these.

Elizabeth: the second part was the artist commission, and I think our first thing was also looking at the different ways of measuring representation in our applications—we got so many applications, many from Toronto. WE were looking at the make of both how many indigenous, POC, indigenous-POC, looking for diversity—I think that Ananya noticed right off the bat that none of our commissioned artists were black, and it felt like we were targeting a Canadian narrative and that was a part of it, so

we decided to commission this special commission that could also incorporate a different medium which was nice, to balance off the commission differently. And then for that, the Jury balanced the POC/Indigenous representation. Quantitatively, they all had the same budget unless they requested special needs.

Ananya: I mean in some cases it was simple as 7 completed projects.

So I guess the first part was outreach, figuring out goals, and those were related to quantities in that way, but then you had the artists commissions and those were different sort of quantities.

Elizabeth: yes, and definitely more qualitative, more about reflect and trying to engage [the artists] in discussion with each other.

Ananya: yes, and one of the big things about this is the symposium and getting people to start thinking about using archival footage in their own ways, apart from [institutional methods], we invited artists to tell different stories and encouraged that discourse. And then, from the POC side, part of the internal symposium had indigenous presence and the idea was to expose some of the POC artists to lending their mind a bit more and think through, in the stories they're telling, the ideas of what it means to be here rather than just talking about migration and diaspora. And I did think the symposium was excellent in raising those questions, but the success of actually getting peoples films I'm afraid is a different story.

Elizabeth: Yeah I think it had impact for sure, Maya is a good example. But yeah, qualitatively, I think the symposium helped.

Ananya: people had those questions in mind and they didn't know how to incorporate it into their projects but we certainly talked about it.

Elizabeth: And the third part of the project was the tour and that can also be a mix of quantitative and qualitative goals. What's harder is that participant feedback wasn't something that was super guarded, in terms of people that went to the screening, or participated in the workshops, or the exhibition, or etc., so the quantitative [was measured in] attendance, numbers of libraries involved. And then you could maybe define something, or discern something from where those libraries were located in terms of the kinds of populations they might involve, but we didn't capture demographics in participants. Part of the qualitative here was in what was made, which was more anecdotal, with the workshop facilitators.

Ananya: For the project, one of the things was the nationwide nature of it, with connecting RPF to more partners and increasing the capacity of a very local organization. I'm thinking with Vancouver and DOXA

These three parts deal mostly towards the exhibition, but where did the archival fit into your benchmarks?

Elizabeth: In the second part we were very clear that you would not one engaging with the home made visible collection but we want to teach you how to meaningfully engage with archives and also your engagement can be an example to the broader Canadian public, and by touring the of works. Between January and may we were both asking for submissions while the tour was happening, like the bookmarks for example had a dual ask as an invite to the program but also submit your home movies if you have them.

So the submissions were mostly in that third stage?

Elizabeth: They were throughout, I think the tour definitely helped communicate that the submissions were ending and provided a date, whereas at the beginning there wasn't a definitive deadline and I think that does impact outreach. There was a time in the callout that we felt we were getting a lot of Toronto submissions, and that was a lot of how we changed our communications. It was part one and part three the most, and part two, not at all.

Stemming from that, how did these benchmarks fit into the Regent Park Film Festival operations ?

Elizabeth: One benchmark I actually didn't talk about was media coverage, which is a benchmark the festival has every year and obviously HMV is part of that. It was nice because I feel we were able to engage media in every part of the project, starting off pretty strong with Metro Morning to launch the project.

Ananya: but mostly, the project speaks to the vision of Regent Park Film Festival. We wanted to inspire different kinds of stories and this was how to do that, and maybe they will inspire future stories to be shared.

Elizabeth: There are three big goals of the Festival, Access, Representation, and Diversity. It takes our smaller values to a broader audience.

Ananya: I think one thing that we were hoping to engage with later through the project is increasing the engagement with the Indigenous communities. I think the project demonstrates that we have some kind of relationship with that community, and that we should really step up our game.

Were there any logistical challenges/changes/ or developments that took place over the course of the execution of this project? And if so, did they shape the outcome of the HMV project?

Ananya: number one was the adding of the indigenous community-in, which was a good thing.

Elizabeth: The ROM— there was a period in June and October where we were very eager to launch the project, but it was so hard because of all of the partners, it just felt like there was a delay on partnerships, and the ROM and Western university worked together through the family camera network, and they had shared their documentation with us to create our permissions and figure out how we were going to develop the logistics of the submissions. I think at first they were going to be a partner—Ananya, do you know exactly what happened to that partnership?

Ananya: Yes, so I had talked to Deepali about the project, and asked what he thought, he asked me questions, and then they really liked our project, and they were kind of coveting us, they truly wanted to support us and were truly very supportive and they invited us to their training night on Oral History. And then we started figuring out if we were partnered or not, we met with them. Eventually Deepali emailed me saying they were more interested in when people donate movies for digitization to have their actual artifacts in the museum; they could do that, but they were requesting maybe \$2,000 for the shelving space. I apologized saying we couldn't do that. I'm not saying that was the deciding factor but it could have been, and that we were just different, we weren't as oral histories based as they were, we were not going to put all our resources into that. Because of these differences we thought it might not be a good partnership to have. Which was funny for us because Deepali is followed by a giant network, we expected their support on the HMV webpage, specifically recognizes Deepali as being really supportive. So in that way it was just tricky because they were an important support.

Was the ROM going to be the main archival partnership ?

Ananya: No

Elizabeth: York was always going to be the main archival partnership.

Ananya: I think the ROM would have been the wrong place, they need to be publicly accessible, and the museum has strained relationships with these communities, it was never going to be the main archive. York university was a challenge, because of a lack of communication which held up the launch of the project, which was eventually addressed and resolved.

Elizabeth: I think the nationwide part of the Project—we had always had CSV in our agreement as a particular partnership and at some point we decided that we were going to get regional digitization partners. This was hard because you try to do outreach everywhere, then when people aren't biting you tell them "what if there's a regional digitization partner in their area that they can send their footage to, to make things easier". So CSV's role was to set up provincial partners, and from there we would push [outreach]. There were some instances where, for FAVA for example, they were never used.

Why do you think that is? Why don't you think people from Edmonton utilized this service?

Ananya: I think the people who submitted footage of Edmonton were actually located in Toronto.

Elizabeth: In BC, the one partner we reached out to there, had a very specific reason not to participate (VIVO). Which is weird, because BC ended up being our second highest location to receive submissions from outside of Toronto.

Elizabeth: It was nice that at FAVA we were still able to partner with them for setting up the exhibition page. It was just a different sort of partnership to what was outlined originally. Videographe had agreed to partner, but their machines broke, so CSV ended up digitizing their material and CVAC and AFCOOP there was an inactive partnership.

So that was added later, do you think that was maybe why they didn't get as many submissions?

Ananya: I think it also has to do with the vibrancy of the IBPOC community in these areas and if they will trust this random institution with their vulnerable material. Whereas we had a lot more exposure in Vancouver—we were there for longer and the partners there already knew us well.

I think that's also the nature of arts communities in Canada, somehow there's a closer relationship between Vancouver and Toronto than Montreal and here.

Elizabeth: Yeah, and I think that with aFCOOP it helped that they also had a lot of back-and-forth between Toronto and other arts organizations.

Ananya: I think there was more community building needed for those reasons.

Any other logistical challenges?

Elizabeth: The discrepancies between inquiries and submissions [should be addressed]. The fact that it turned out to be 39 people and 80 people reaching out to us over the span of the project is interesting—not all of those 80 people had submissions, but certainly a significant amount did but for some reason were unable to follow through during the span of the project. A lot of people know they have home movies but don't have them in their bedroom drawer.

We tried to stress the whole five hours, five minutes [submission to the archive] and that most of the footage was for [the donor] but there were some people who specifically said, "does it have to be in the archives?" and that was their barrier.

Ananya: And that's fair enough. One person did get it digitized and then refused to submit to the archive.

Elizabeth: They just could not get the permission of anyone who was on the tapes.

Elizabeth: [In Regards to] developments or changes to the artist commissions. I feel like the biggest one was the addition of Melisse [Watson]. It was first the six artists selected and then the Special Commission.

Ananya: On the whole, we had said we would digitize 50 materials, commission 12 artists, and we would tour to five libraries. We've done 294 objects, 7 artists, 16 libraries. The final metrics are significantly different. We've done a lot more generally speaking. With the artists, even though we had proposed 12 and ended up doing 7, the money was much more per artist.

An advisor had mentioned their participation on the distribution of funds to the artist, based on their specific needs.

Ananya: We did do that with Jennifer Dysart, her film received more than the others.

Elizabeth: She needed to go further away in order to make her film

Ananya: and it wasn't that she just needed to go there to make her film, she needed to go there to connect with her community in order to make that film. Whereas Nadine needed to go far as well, but didn't need to go anywhere.

Any other logistical developments?

Ananya: Well, I left [the Festival]. I don't think much has changed to be honest, except I wasn't in the same building.

Elizabeth: I think the need of having an assistant coordinator, I think that was a logistical challenge. I think there were times where we had to reconsider the budget

Ananya: I think we would have needed to do that no matter what. With all the things Elizabeth needed to do, we would have needed the team that we ended up with. I think given how far above and beyond we went over the original metrics, that should also be considered budgetary. More money should have gone to RPF because so much of our people put their work into it. We got the additional 30 grand from the TAC grant.

E: We already had 5 partners for libraries before the new year in 2018: we had made 5 partners and we had wanted 10 and we knew that once we knew who our artists were we would also want to engage artist communities. What that did was that of the 10 there wasn't a strong Indigenous community engaged. Ananya applied for TAC funding so that we could have exhibitions at 5 more Toronto locations, and push the rest of our funding towards more rural communities, like Whitehorse, Kahnawake.

One thing that was mentioned was that there needed to be more funds allotted to staffing. What is your response to that? CSV for example said there is always a want to have more people involved

A: yeah, they were just two people. And I think at York University Libraries it was just one person.

That seems to be an undercurrent—if there was more money it should be going to having more people. Another offshoot of that was that the artists wanted to have the advisors more accessible to them throughout the project, maybe with a midpoint critique during the creative process, more like an artist residency structure with feedback as well as the commission.

A: I think that's a good point. We had given them feedback, but I think feedback from artists you respect, whose work you've seen would mean something entirely different.

A lot of people said they loved the symposium but wanted more of that thought to carry the commission a bit more.

A: I think that's really great feedback that we should take. I found myself thinking, I'm giving you important feedback and you need to take it, but I have no authority from being the ED of this organization. Thankfully people were pretty open and at points they did get a chance to speak to mentors.

E: Timeline wise, it was hard. We had debated whether the advisory should give feedback on the projects but I don't think there was enough time.

A: Yes, it was too late. But the artists didn't want feedback from the advisory, they wanted it from the symposium mentors. So like Ali, Michelle, Lisa and Denise, I got the feeling that who they wanted. I think we had paid the mentors enough to ask them for that, it wasn't a thing of budget, it was more a thing of foresight to ask that question. Some of them volunteered that. Michelle and Lisa did end up volunteering that and some of the artists took them up on that. So we could have just formalized it a bit more. Ultimately they appreciated the feedback we gave them, but it would have been way easier to absorb the feedback [if it came from a mentor].

If you could, would you have hired more staff for the Project?

E: I think so. It would have been great to have the coordinator throughout the Project. I think there was a process of reacquainting new staff with the project; to have a second person in-office that I could refer to would be amazing. And it was and did happen.

A: I think this is a really important learning to take back. When I was writing this grant, and proposed one full time coordinator, I didn't allot money for an artistic director, so money for my time, which was ridiculous. Clearly this project needed a volunteer coordinator, a full-time manager, and an artistic director. Its so important to know that. Its something hard to gauge at the beginning, and im glad we were able to make it happen. Part of that was because we got the TAC grant. I think it is so easy to understaff and I do feel for Charles Street Video. I feel like any money we ultimately save on this project should go to them.

Reflecting specifically on your institutional partnerships, what were the biggest successes and challenges?

A: I would say CSV was a big success. Greg was so generous, and how willing he was to be flexible. I think all of them were a big success. Katrina's incredible—the *people* were invaluable, and now there is a tangible collection at the York, it's amazing.

E: Without expertise it would have been a useless project.

In regards to the workflow, some of the responses mentioned a conflict between York and CSV. CSV is a small organization and they wanted to get the materials off the premises and back to the donors right away. But at York, they wanted all of the materials and digitized files as one submission/batch.

E: There wasn't also a lot of conversation between York and CSV.

A: I feel like their working styles were also very different. It felt really difficult to be a go-between.

They were both suggesting to have RPF as the location where the files/objects were held. That way it could still be a mix of their working styles, where CSV could do small batches, deposited to you, and then delivered as one package at the end of the project to York.

E: I think that would be possible if it was just digitizing material, but I think the other thing is that there was so many other parts. Ideally, you want to digitize as fast as possible so that they can be interviewed and the write-up can be created, and send the materials back within the span of the project. I felt more comfortable with having the materials.

A: One thing I want to mention in regards to staffing is how out of control our expectations were initially. The first year (20 Elizabeth's title was Special Projects Coordinator, thinking HMV wouldn't be full-time, and she was in charge of all special projects at the festival. An Elizabeth did it—she ran all of Under The Stars, Program coordinating for the Annual Festival. At the time that HMV was still launching and there was a lot of waiting so thankfully it was indeed possible, but very quickly as soon as that year ended we decided to never do that again. And that does have to do with funding.

Would you be interested in collaborating with partners in the future?

A: yes as long as they're interested in collaborating with us.

Do you have any ideas of how you would like to collaborate in the future?

A: I think we could run workshops with CSV through the annual Festival. Using the Library's as locations for the festival because they're accessible. Libraries are where we should go.

E: CSV would be an amazing partnership for another artist commission, because they provided technical support to our artists as well.

How could RPPF improve in the future when fostering collaborative partnerships?

A: I wish we had more money to give CSV, and we will if we do.

E: it's always good if there's a way to anticipate/align peoples expectations more.

Most commonly it was mentioned financial support. One artist said that they wish the commission had been paid out differently, as they couldn't apply for more funding from the CCA.

A: we couldn't have changed that. That's where we got our funding, and if that money wasn't received, the commission wouldn't have been possible.

One artist said that their MOU's varied largely from the Library Exhibition partners, which allowed for some errors in communication.

E: I felt like going from Vancouver to Thompson, I was very hands-off with Thompson, I think I made an assumption about the level of communication between an artist who knew the Library staff. For Vancouver, the both of us were there, along with artists. It felt like there was a discrepancy in how the events were treated. It would be great to have physical presence at all places and have cross-partnerships across all of them. It would be nice to have three partners across everything. I think at some point, communicating with that many libraries got difficult.

A: I think having a coordinator present would have been really important

What existing organizational models aided in the deliver of this project?

E: Following the critical path within RPPF every week, MOU's which were very legible.

Do you hope that an iteration of this project will continue now that funding is complete, how so, and will this be sustained now that the funding is done?

E: I think the value of digitizing home movies is never going to go away; it would be great for someone to keep up that mantle, as long as they have that capacity. The value of the commission, keeping it available through individual distribution and through educational packages and perhaps having the collection partnered with educational institutions to carry on those discussions. And the Archive will live.

In the future what changes would you make to the framework of this project? What would you suggest for other projects operating in a similar vein?

A: Sometimes I wished that the digitization part was even more dominant than the creation part, and that there was some other way of engaging the digitized items. The longer lasting contribution is the digitization, although I was happy that the creation part was done as it led to the tour. I would have liked to intensify the workshops, into something that is actually very technical and formal, and also publicly engaged. Like we could have set up tools for people to conduct archival research, but it would have required a lot more funds.

Transcript of Interview with Safia Abdigir (Special Projects Coordinator)

Please explain your role for the HVM project

Safia: Special projects coordinator on HVM project. Position was to process intake of materials from participants, coordinate materials from digitization partners, set up interviews with participants and do write-ups and also coordinating the HVM tour, talking to facilitators, libraries, buying food for catering, coordinating events themselves. Coordinating with HVM special projects manager, coordinating w. Venue through them as well as main partners. January — August; two other people we were in the role, but they were assistants, no coordination of events.

How were you measuring success during the course of this project/role? ie., did you follow benchmarks, critical paths, etc.

Safia: Internal benchmarks continuously striving towards, reevaluated each month. Initially to reach 50 participants, but that takes a lot of resources and communications to each one. In ideal form, 2.5 months with each participants. Some were handed off which was a bit hard. Getting participants engaged at the beginning was a lot more difficult than expected, for getting people to hand over submission. Trust needed to be built. Brought down 39 but a lot more materials across them, so benchmark of initial objects was 100.... Third benchmark was 200.

Did any logistic developments affect your contribution to the Home Made Visible project?

Safia: Outreach for hmv tour—trying to engage public with the tour. That was a part that we needed to find new ways of engaging public, but also allow them to view materials in library context, took away from processing. Toronto and Ontario events easier to conduct than remote locations, no direct contact. Donors falling out—tedious task of following up; the process heavily relied on waiting to see if their commitment was genuine. Outreach in remote locations—process for participants and intake, could have been a full position. Main task at beginning of role was coordinating events, and the intake would end up on the backburner. More funds should have been allocated to digitization partners as well—relied on in-kind exchange, but that means they were left on the back burner on their end as well. Allowing time for human error, and transferring between institutions. Need central intake document, sign off between institutions. Konrad created his own internal intake document with his own workflow, but missing steps for the next step (ie., not indicating if it was sent to York). Document of transfer across all involved partnerships. A lot of time spent figuring out where the bottleneck was.

What were the biggest challenges working with donors?

Safia: Time spent building trust with donors. Also, establishing the main forms of communication and archival process for interviews—figuring out the software, should be beforehand. Didn't start doing phone interviews until this month, were relying on Skype. Should have been in place since inception. Less time spent figuring out which options are viable.

What were your hopes for participating in this project? Would you say they were achieved?

Safia: Interested in project because had a growing interest in archival functionality, but lacked formal education. Combined art and archives, got to engage with donors in an extremely moving and thoughtful way. First interview was with a participant who had father in video via Skype interview—touching to see reactions. Doesn't know if this chance will ever come up again, of doing archival work that is so personal and making it accessible so quickly (to participants to the public as well). Having this free service to donors was quite beneficial didn't feel parasitic; talking to these people, they got a lot out of it. Translation of cost is quite high, with their commitment being quite low, but outcome extremely high.

Overall, what was the lasting impact of this project on you as an individual as a whole?

Safia: It was great. Made connections with so many people I would be friends with, and professionally—everyone was committed. People did an amazing amount of work despite what they were paid, and their mandates matched RFFF. High buy-in for all partners. Answered questions about ethics and archives, helped point her into a career surrounding archives. Also, its going to have a long historical impact, and continue to look back on engaging previously forgotten communities in archives, viable on all ends of a project

Do you have any comments on workflow?

Safia: Didn't realize how much space was needed on hard drives for this project. Should have been a conversation on what digitization process looks like at the beginning of project so that the materials (like hard drives) were made at inception. Understand what CSV is saying about batch uploads—should have been a person hired who was trained about files and formats on our end... I read a lot about these things, but there was no way of catching issues on our end and that was relied on CSV. Needed more hardware like this, so that they could maybe keep it. Conversation on where things would be stored [physical materials and digital storage]. Could be tied into this sheet of tracking ownership, on where materials should be kept.

What were the major strengths and weaknesses of this project from your perspective?

Safia: Give organizers more time than you think they need. amount of time is always under estimated; allow for buffers for most deadlines, especially people from the public. You will be doing more work than you initially think you will be doing Capacity building is important within the organization. Personally felt she was never overwhelmed

Any Final Comments?

Always need more Money and time than you think you need. Re-evaluate your benchmarks. Initial planning meetings with archival partners, give time with getting used to process and waiting for the learning curve.

Appendix D: Associated documents

