Guidelines for Social Justice Oral History Work

In 2019, the Oral History Association's Council commissioned a Social Justice Task Force (SJTF) to develop a document of practice, which better serves vulnerable communities and assists practitioners seeking to center the narrator utilizing ethical and procedural standards. These guidelines will add to the organization's [Principles and Best Practices](#) suite. This report, sample templates, and glossary serve as a framework to clarify the meaning of social-justice-centered oral history and its practice from start to finish.

This document serves as a mosaic of collective experiences from oral historians who work on the ground with vulnerable communities. These oral historians learned from their narrators who deeply inspired the creation of new methodologies that interrogated [standard OHA best practices](#). This occurred in four areas: project development, permission process, ownership, and protective and access measures. These distinctions became central to developing a social justice practice that took a narrator-centric focus that allowed for flexibility in project creation and completion. It also reshaped oral history into a perspective that welcomes extended timelines to reflect stronger trust relations and power sharing praxis. In short, social justice praxis "moves at the speed of trust," empowering the narrator at every step. This document condenses these experiences into a holistic piece that helps practitioners learn from this shared experience. It is also a directive that secures power and protection for narrators.

The SJTF composited a committee of oral historians who reflected diversity in race, gender, sexuality, age, region, and institutional/non-institutional affiliation. These participants translated their professional experience into a set of principles that embodied a more nuanced and complex outline of models for ethical practice. Although this outline appears to focus on a "social justice" format, it is important to acknowledge that it reflects the central nature of oral history work.

The Social Justice Task Force was guided by several essential questions which helped support its exploration of social justice oral history.

- What does it mean to conform oral history to those we learn from?
- How might our procedures, methodology, and intent change if we operate in conversation with the guiding principles of vulnerable communities and activists' ideals and missions?
- What does it mean to accept that oral history work is political, particularly with regard to social justice groups and vulnerable communities?
- How can we embrace this reality and operate accordingly?
- What are oral history ethics without accountability?

The SJTF answered these questions in two ways. First, it defined Social Justice Oral History by ethical and procedural focus on the narrator (concerns, vulnerabilities, and desires). Second, it centered on a consistent effort to co-create and share power. This approach challenged previous authority that heavily weighted the interviewers and future researchers over the narrator. This recentering process requires a flexible approach which may alter project course.

This flexibility is guided by 1) action steps that move listening beyond the audio to listening with an ear toward power sharing before, during, and after interview, 2) redirection away from institutionalized ideological methods, 3) expanded community definition, and 4) extended accountability. Specifically, SJTF defines listening as project co-creation. If desired, community members are included within structure, preservation, access, usage, text production, and multiple other areas of hidden and not hidden processes in oral history creation.

First, these action steps nullify academic monopoly. SJTF centers the beliefs and/or needs of vulnerable communities over institutional practices, which historically normalize the institution's own standards as the *only* standard. Academic validation, institutionally-driven oral history projects, funding fixation, preservation expectations, and researcher interest must be subordinate to community stipulations. Ethically-centered oral history projects avoid extraction, exploitation, and entrenched power structures.

Second, extraction includes methods that are preconceived and preconstructed toward interviewer/researcher-centric interests. For example, researcher-centric approaches create permission forms that define narrator stories as secured contracts of ownership. Instead, social justice praxis sees community collaboration as a continuing relationship with an expectation of lifetime respect, active partnership, and free access. For extended conversation on these ideas, see the SJTF reference page.

Third, these contentious power dynamics also directed SJTF's considerations in defining communities by circumstances that demand greater power sharing and protection. The Oral History Association defines community as a group of individuals who share a collective geographic space, experience, or level of ownership of the content being shared. SJTF recognizes the essential need to intentionally address vulnerable communities within these definitions to acknowledge both the insecure circumstances of many narrators and the rights of persons impacted, connected, or referenced by oral history participants.

Fourth, Black Lives Matter surveillance, the *Sabaya* and *The Infiltrators* documentaries, and the Boston College Belfast Project cases demonstrate the obvious and pernicious perils of ignoring potential risks to narrators or narrowly defining community to active project participants. The *Sabaya* documentary controversy reveals how filmmakers ignored the dangers posed by public exposure for Yazidi women brutalized by sexual exploitation, and issues around language differences. Black Lives Matter surveillance, *The Infiltrators* documentary, and the Belfast Project all illustrate how the state can use oral history to overpower institutions or target individuals. The Belfast case also demonstrates how the individual narrator is not the only consideration. All persons who knew, worked, and lived with the narrator may also face threat. In this case, and reflected in much social-justice-centered work, vulnerability is collective as much as it is individual. Oral historians who power share must actively raise questions about third-party interference as well as potentially respond to factors that may affect narrators and their communities.

SJTF sees accountability as a protective pre-measure for vulnerable communities or cases that may involve state or societal harassment and violence. Black, Indigenous, and LGBTQ communities are example groups which grapple with issues of protection around identity and activism. Some storytelling can make groups further susceptible to surveillance, harassment, and other forms of violence. As oral historians, we must enter this work with that consideration and understand the potential consequences. Having transparent conversations with narrators and community members will help center on their safety and well-being. Finally, this decision-making occurs within the context of an evolving relationship and recognizes how changing social and political contexts may invite a revisiting of these decisions.

Fundamentally, we believe that oral history must not only center the narrator, but that oral history work itself must be transformed and guided by the most vulnerable. Social-justice-based oral history reminds us to enact ethical oral history. As asserted by task force member Sherrie Tucker,

> "We seek narrators not from the idea that their stories must be included in the historical record, but that the paradigms that excluded them in the first place are challenged and reshaped as a result."

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE ORAL HISTORY

INTRODUCTION:

Recommendations follow a similar structure to Oral History Association's Principles and Best Practices documents. The SJTF is not fanatically attached to this formula but utilized the most familiar framework to the institution's online instruction and arrangement. It is important to note that SJTF views social justice oral history as much a *process* as an ideological standpoint. This process starts before a project idea and inculcates within project outcomes space for fluidity, flexibility, and timelessness. To that end, these categories are not hard boundaries. We also provided supporting documents that model social justice practice.

PROJECT PLANNING:
Self-Reflection and Self-Interrogation:
Positionality is more than an individual background. There are fundamental questions regarding an interviewer's status in relation to the narrator, which may include issues around sensitivity, power, and intent. Each project coordinator must ask the essential question, "Are we the best people for this project?"

Other issues to consider: what harm might emanate from doing this project; what are the interviewer/institutional limitations within this project; how does this project empower, improve, or preserve community participants; have we crafted a mutually beneficial relationship with the

community before starting the project; and in what ways do community participants support this project?

Pre-Permission

Interviewers should confer with potential participants to receive feedback on planned oral history projects and try to incorporate narrator ideas on methodology, timeline, and output. Consider how the narrator might need or require labor compensation, public acknowledgment, and/or other forms of support. Finally, review with participants how they conceptualize final presentation form, distribution of information, oral history as a form of advocacy, and archival preservation.

Outreach/Relationship Building:

Outreach may take many forms, but interviewers should avoid moving from idea to implementation with little attention to relationship cultivation. Interviewers should also formulate and sustain consistent relationships. Interviewers can build relationships with community members over an extended period or share tools and strategies for community members to be their own oral historians. If interviewers lack such extended relationships, it is incumbent upon each person to immerse themselves in the literature, community, history, and/or culture of the designated narrators.

The outreach and relationship building process must address community concerns that oral historians authentically collaborate and work for mutual benefit, and it must clearly communicate to interviewees and other participants that oral history is not a transactional experience in which an interviewee gives and an interviewer receives.

Pre-Protection Planning

Interviewers must consider the possible elements of conflict, danger, or harassment associated with both the narrator and narration. Does the narrator's story potentially cause physical or mental harm or trauma to the interviewer, the narrator's network, or the narrator? We must review risks with the narrator and consider potential availability of individual and/or institutional support. Along with evaluating protection needs, the interviewer should construct or review procedures on narrator anonymity safeguards.

Additionally, interviewers should recognize that trauma is not only situated in the present but follows from the past. It is important to read and process historical context to understand the powerful ways history informs the lived experiences of communities. This awareness helps to avoid assumptions that misconstrue historical trauma as failures of individuals or the community. Otherwise, the lack of awareness can act to recreate trauma and cause harm.

Language and Translation

Interviewers should work with participants to determine interview and translation language format and discuss how to ensure accessibility of interviews in the language of participants.

Additionally, interviewers should consult with participants about translator choices and the final linguistic form(s) of the transcript.

BEFORE THE INTERVIEW:

***Informed Consent*:**
Informed consent plays a key role in ensuring transparency. Here we suggest a more full-bodied approach to informed consent, which includes mutual understanding, review of privacy/access, shared power, and rolling consent, all of which are detailed below. However, it's also important to recognize that not all communities view the consent process, particularly the utilization of forms, as an acceptable format for establishing agreement or partnership. In these circumstances, oral historians and institutions must work with vulnerable communities to determine how to formalize oral history usage and preservation.

Mutual Understanding:
Narrators may not share similar notions about oral history, terminology, and/or the processes around its creation, usage, and preservation. This ALL must be explained, including but not limited to verbal description or written glossary of terms. (See attached for example template.)

***Project Background Information*:**
Funding: Corporate, academic, and philanthropic funding shape oral history projects. These funding sources can direct narrator focus, geographical location, political impact, and they bring up many other issues that create power conflict between funder, institution, narrator, and interviewer. Narrators and oral history project participants should be informed of participating funding entities involved in projects.
Project: Interviewers should provide professional, experiential, and project background and should inform narrators of intended and potential usage.
Outcomes: Interviewers should review with narrators possible unintended third-party outcomes, dangers, or complications. They should also discuss preservation processes and detail short- to long-term access options for interviewees.

Privacy and Access:
Narrators need a precise understanding of what access to their interview will look like, as well as consideration given to any third parties discussed within the recording. Anyone conducting or storing oral history interviews should take practical steps to guard interviews from unauthorized uses. Interviewers should also provide explanations on the security and preservation protection measures in place for interviews.

***Shared Power*:**
The standard Deed of Gift both inherently assumes that the item should be given away rather than being a shared enterprise and presupposes a shared definition of "gift," dictated by the receiver versus the giver. A narrator-centered oral history agreement shares power. Additionally, it follows a praxis of "giving" that is neither fixed nor an instrument that obviates the interviewer or institution from further responsibility to the narrator. SJTF recommends

incorporating a higher degree of shared power along with what SJTF member Amaka Okechukwu termed "rolling consent."

Rolling Consent:

Rolling consent restructures the fixed nature of the permission form by inserting checks and balances that reestablish or change consent as requested by the narrator. These circumstances might occur, for example, due to technological and exhibition decisions not referenced or explained in the earlier mutual understanding. A changing social and political context may also influence a decision to limit or expand interview access. Outreach is repeated and reconfirmed. See sample alternative form here.

Participatory Power:

Shared power introduces a thorough partnership, highly focused on narrator decision-making and concerns. This full-bodied agreement might exercise participatory power in multiple areas, including:

1. Co-constructed consent and preservation form
2. Automatic shared copyright
3. Co-determined interview usage (rolling consent requires reconfirmation for interviews utilized outside mutual understanding)
4. Co-created access levels centered on narrator, narrator family and associates, community, and then researchers
5. Co-admittance (no firewalls) to all interview forms/outcomes for narrators, heirs, and other designated parties

Translations:

All documents, particularly permission forms and other key documents, should be translated into the participant's language.

DURING THE INTERVIEW:

Interviewers should reiterate mutual understanding expectations and avoid jargon or academic rhetoric. If needed, provide a copy of glossary terms related to the shared consent for the narrator's records (See SJTF glossary as template). Interviewers should also provide primary and secondary contact information to the narrator should they have immediate or future questions.

The narrator may share information which they initially intended to exclude. Interviewers should always remind narrators that aspects of the recording can be withheld temporarily or permanently, along with the process for opening or closing private information.

AFTER THE INTERVIEW:

Interview Notes, Time Log, Transcripts:

Interviewer notes contain both the reflections of the narrator and the presumptions and/or assertions of how the interviewer understands the conversation. Though these materials are normally considered confidential and the possession of the interviewer, they ignore how the interviewer might act to usurp or ignore the narrator's own understanding of themselves and what they say. Narrators should receive a copy of audio, transcript, associated notes, time log, and proposed index to allow for clarification, challenge, and alteration to incorrect or unclear information or perspectives. While interviewers may wish to highlight or focus on a particular subject matter, the incorrect structuring of the log outline might mislead the researcher about the narrator's point, focus, or intent. Translate these documents as necessary.

Preservation

Decisions regarding preservation and archiving practices occur *before* the interview. Follow-up after the interview involves confirmation of these choices and a review of access policies both long-term and on a revolving basis. Considering that circumstances change for both parties (oral historians and institutions), a framework should be created which allows for free accessibility despite changes among persons or spaces.

Digital preservation is another tool for communities and organizations to maintain oral history interviews. Preservation will require long-term planning for the physical and financial maintenance of digital collections. Independent, community-based preservation will also require plans for sustainability. One way to address the issue is to have collective ownership of the material with requirements for each person holding the collection. In all cases, flexibility and creativity will be key for long-term independent preservation. Plan preservation of oral history interviews with an eye toward maintaining your collection well into the future.

Interpretation

Other considerations include community stakeholder collaboration on interpretation, dissemination, and presentation of oral history interviews. Work to create exhibit locations, types of media, and final projects that best suit access for narrator communities. Considerations should also include how oral history projects operate not only to preserve history but also as a working tool for aiding community efforts for social justice.

Protective Considerations

State and institutional surveillance and harassment present complicated legal and ethical challenges to interviewers, organizations, and narrators. After narrators are informed of these possible implications, the interviewer and institution should address the issues of access, record keeping, potential disposal of sensitive materials, anonymity and protection protocols, confidentiality etc. These considerations should be addressed within the context of mutual understanding and participatory consent. Protective methods might include:

1. Collection Restriction - limiting or closing collections for a specified period of time.
2. Deploying digital firewalls - This may require specific data security procedures to ensure that the information cannot be accessed, except by the oral historian or other authorized parties. Narrators should be assured about security measures that will be employed during and after the oral history project.

3. No Protective Consideration - Oral historians and archives must communicate that they have no special legal privileges or protections. These parties may be legally required to provide narrator information. In the event of a subpoena, the institution must turn over any records in its possession.
4. Using pseudonyms - In such cases, the oral historian should use only the fictitious name when referring to the narrator during the interview or in any related materials, such as transcripts, notes, finding aids, or publications.
5. Reviewing project release dates and considering embargo time frames to reduce potential harm.
6. Discussing protections for potential impact on family members, references, associates.
7. Limiting public marketing.
8. Providing legal assistance/consultation for individual participants left open to political harassment.

Sustained Relationships
The interviewer should consider sustaining relationships with narrators. This can include inviting narrators to future events sponsored by the interviewer or group, interviewer engagement with events that are narrator-driven, participation in educational outreach related to the project, consultations, or other mutually beneficial endeavors.

CONCLUSION:
The SJTF does not presume to offer a comprehensive approach to Social Justice Oral History. Instead, we reframe oral history to embody the spirit of resistance reflected in/by those whose story we presume to preserve. We think about what it means to not only do oral history *on* social justice but also to do oral history in the *spirit* of social justice, in shared power and accountability. For continued learning on this approach, see the SJTF short list of references.

Special thanks to our reviewers: Wesley Hogan, Malinda Lowery, Nepia Mahuika, Sarah McNamara, Rozanne Gooding Silverwood, and Yuri Ramírez and copy editor Micki White. Final thanks to Voice of Witness, the New Zealand Oral History Association, and Groundswell: Oral History for Social Change, whose ideas and spirit of true oral history are reflected in this document.

Submitted by

SJTF Co-Chairs:
Nishani Frazier and Cliff Mayotte

SJTF Coordinator & Editor
Sarah Milligan

Anne Balay
Christy Hyman
Sarah Loose
Amaka Okechukwu
Sherrie Tucker
Tara White

SJTF Committee Members:

REFERENCES

SJOH is guided foremost by one essential reference: the people who are the stories we tell. The additional materials below reflect upon and in the spirit of this first reference. Accordingly, each resource reconstructs oral history's connection to preservation and intellectual production via historical/digital/creative/community informed outcomes.

Oral History Advocacy and Community Relationships

- Graham, Helen. "Oral History, 'Learning Disability' and Pedagogies of Self," *Oral History (Colchester)* 37, no. 1 (2009): 85-94.
- Lair, Liam, and Ashley Mog. "Embodied Knowledge and Accessible Community: An Oral History of "Four Rehearsals and a Performance"." *Oral History Review* 43, no. 1 (2016): 25-51.
- Henderson, David, and Christine Bigby. "Whose Life Story Is It?: Self-Reflexive Life Story Research with People with Intellectual Disabilities." *Oral History Review* 44, no. 1 (2017): 39-55.
- Dan Kerr, "Allan Nevins is not My Grandfather: The Roots of Radical Oral History Practice in the United States," *Oral History Review* 43:2 (pg. 367-391)
- Wheeler, Winona. "Reflections on the Social Relations on Indigenous Oral History," in David T. McNab, ed., *Walking a Tightrope: Aboriginal People and Representations*
- E. Patrick Johnson, *Sweet Tea: Black Gay Men of the South*
- Kevin P. Murphy, Jennifer L. Pierce & Jason Ruiz What Makes Queer Oral History Different, The Oral History Review, 43:1, (2016), pg. 1-24
- Ramírez, Horacio N. Roque. "My Community, My History, My Practice." *The Oral History Review* 29, no. 2 (2002): 87–91. (5 pages)
- Roque Ramírez, Horacio N. "Sharing Queer Authorities: Collaborating for Transgender Latina and Gay Latino Historical Meanings." In *Bodies of Evidence: The Practice of Queer Oral History*, edited by Nan Alamilla Boyd and Horacio N. Roque Ramírez, 184–201. Oxford Oral History Series. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2012. (18 pages)
- Juan Herrera, "Spatializing Chicano Power: Cartographic Memory and Community Practices of Care," *Social Justice* 42, no. 3/4 (July 2015): 46–66.
- Borland, Katharine. "'That's Not What I Said': Interpretive Conflict in Oral Narrative Research." In *The Oral History Reader*, edited by Robert Perks and Alistair Thomson, 320–32. New York: Routledge, 1998. (13 pages)

Sample Websites

- "It's Our Story: Of, By, and For People with Disabilities" – Oral history project series http://www.itsourstory.com/

- Voice of Witness: Amplifying Unheard Voices: https://voiceofwitness.org/
- Texas After Violence Project: https://texasafterviolence.org/
- Behind the Wire: https://behindthewire.org.au/

Oral History and Theory Challenges to Academia and Institutions
- Jennifer Denetdale, *Reclaiming Diné History: The Legacies of Navajo Chief Manuelito and Juanita*
- Nēpia Mahuika, *Rethinking Oral History and Tradition*
- Gothard, Jan. "Oral History, Ethics, Intellectual Disability and Empowerment: An Inside Perspective." *Studies in Western Australian History*, no. 26 (2010): 151–162.
- Nishani Frazier, "The Wiz Behind the Curtain" in *Harambee City: Congress of Racial Equality in Cleveland and the Rise of Black Power Populism*
- Cristy Sellers Smith. "IRB IS NOT REQUIRED: A Reflection on Oral History, Disability, and Playing by the Rules When the Rules Get in the Way." *Curriculum and Teaching Dialogue* 20, no. 1/2 (2018): 137-80.
- Eynon, Bret. "Cast Upon the Shore: Oral History and New Scholarship on the Movements of the 1960s." *The Journal of American History* 83 (1996): 560-570. (11 pages)
- Lowery, Malinda Maynor. "Telling Our Own Stories: Lumbee History and the Federal Acknowledgment Process." *American Indian Quarterly* 33, no. 4 (2009): 499–521. (23 pages)
- Rubio-Goldsmith, Raquel. "Oral History: Considerations and Problems for Its Use in the History of Mexicanas in the United States." In *Between Borders: Essays on Mexicana/Chicana History*, edited by Adelaida R. Del Castillo, 161–73. La Mujer Latina Series. Encino, CA: Floricanto Press, 1990. (13 pages)

Oral History and Digitization:
- Cohen, Steve. "Shifting Questions: New Paradigms for Oral History in a Digital World." *The Oral History Review* 40, no. 1 (2013): 154–67.
- Manning, Corinne. "'My Memory's Back!' Inclusive Learning Disability Research Using Ethics, Oral History and Digital Storytelling." *British Journal of Learning Disabilities* 38, no. 3 (2010): 160-67.
- Hannah Gill et al., "Migration and Inclusive Transnational Heritage: Digital Innovation and the New Roots Latino Oral History Initiative," *Oral History Review* 46, no. 2 (2019): 277–99.
- Christy Hyman, Hilary Greene, and Nishani Frazier, "Black Is Not the Absence of Light: Public Humanities, DH and the Problem of Black Invisibility" in Matthew Gold and Lauren Klein, eds. *Debates in Digital Humanities.*

- Mary Larson and Doug Boyd, Oral History and Digital Humanities: Voice, Access, and Engagement
- Digitization: Overview from Baylor University. Includes short bibliography. https://www.baylor.edu/content/services/document.php/79806.pdf
- Zinaida Manzuch, "Ethical Issues in Digitization of Cultural Heritage," *Journal of Contemporary Archives Studies* 4:4 (2017)

Oral History and Archives
- iArchives for Black Lives website: Archives For Black Lives in Philadelphia (A4BLiP) is a loose association of archivists, librarians, and allied professionals in the area responding to the issues raised by the Black Lives Matter movement. https://archivesforblacklives.wordpress.com/
- Antracoli, Alexis A., Annalise Berdini, Kelly Bolding, Faith Charlton, Amanda Ferrara, Valencia Johnson, and Katy Rawdon. "Archives for Black Lives in Philadelphia: Anti-Racist Description Resources." October 2020. https://archivesforblacklives.files.wordpress.com/2020/11/ardr_202010.pdf
- Bolding, Kelly. "Reparative Processing: A Case Study in Auditing Legacy Description for Racism." Midwest Archives Conference. March 24, 2018. https://drive.google.com/open?id=1MhOXx5ZlVjb_8pfvvFquMqLsUUlOHFFMT4js5EP4qnA
- Drake, Jarret M. – "RadTech Meets RadArch: Towards a New Principle for Archives and Archival Description": https://medium.com/on-archivy/radtech-meets-radarch-towards-a-new-principle-for-archives-and-archival-description-568f133e4325
- Fernheimer, Janice W., Boyd, Douglas A., Goldstein, Beth L. & Dorpinghaus, Sarah. "Sustainable Stewardship: A Collaborative Model for Engaged Oral History Pedagogy, Community Partnership, and Archival Growth," *The Oral History Review* 45 no. 2 (2018): 321-341.
- Cataloging Lab list of statement on bias in library and archives descriptions: https://cataloginglab.org/list-of-statements-on-bias-in-library-and-archives-description/
- Michelles Caswell and Marika Cifor, "From Human Rights to Feminist Ethics: Radical Empathy in Archives," UCLA. Retrieved from https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0mb9568h

Websites
- Tufts University – "Additional Reading: Potentially Harmful Language in Archival Description" https://dca.tufts.edu/about/policies/Additional-Reading-Potentially-Harmful-Language-in-Archival-Description

- Harvard Center for the History of Medicine (includes extensive works cited, resources and examples): https://wiki.harvard.edu/confluence/display/hmschommanual/Guidelines+for+Inclusive+and+Conscientious+Description
- Cataloging Lab list of statement on bias in library and archives descriptions: https://cataloginglab.org/list-of-statements-on-bias-in-library-and-archives-description/
- Oral History Association. "Principles and Best Practices." *Principles and Best Practices for Oral History* (blog), October 2009. https://www.oralhistory.org/about/principles-and-practices-revised-2009/. (11 pages)
- Southern Oral History Program. "A Practical Guide to Oral History," May 2018. https://sohp.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/69/2020/02/01_A-Practical-Guide-to-Oral-History_SOHP_2018.pdf. (23 pages)
- Southern Oral History Program. "Student Interviewer Guidelines," https://sohp.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/69/2012/04/Student-Handbook_not-specific-to-a-course.pdf. (20 pages)

Consent to Participate in the *hear/say* Oral History Project and Media Release Form

The **hear/say** oral history project aims to record and respectfully share the personal stories of aging people (with and without dementia), caregivers, and people working in the field of dementia. The **hear/say** project shares the stories with the public via different forms of media (written, audio, photography, and video). Sharing these narratives with the broader community can redefine and inform attitudes and action around aging, dementia, and caregiving.

The **hear/say** project is supported by the Global Brain Health Institute (GBHI) based at the University of California, San Francisco (UCSF) and Trinity College Dublin. GBHI works to reduce the scale and impact of dementia by training leaders in brain health through the Atlantic Fellows for Equity in Brain Health program at GBHI. Materials created during this project will be used in furtherance of GBHI's education and public service mission.

The steps below describe the stages of the **hear/say** project. Your initials and date at each level denote consent. We will confirm your consent at each stage. If you do not speak English, you will be provided with an interpreter who will explain this consent form in your language.

Even if you agree to participate now, you can refuse to answer any question at any time. You can withdraw permission to use a part or all of your interview for future use, but not where the story has already been published or performed. Your story will not be published without your consent, and you will be able to review the final edited draft of your narrative for feedback and final approval before publication. You can select to use your full name, your first name only, or a fictitious name in the final story.

INITIALS	DATE	
		Audio: I _____ (PRINT FULL NAME) voluntarily give my consent to GBHI to be interviewed and audio-recorded for the **hear/say** project and grant access to my location for the **hear/say** personnel to make these recordings. I may request a transcript and/or recording of my interview for my personal use.
		Video: I agree to my interview being video-recorded.
		Publication: I agree to my interview transcript being edited into a story and considered for publication (print or digital) that may include identifying images or audio.
		Multimedia: I agree to my interview recording being edited into a story and considered for a multimedia exhibit, public performance, or broadcast that may include identifying images or audio.

I and my successors waive any right to compensation or copyright. I and my successors further release and forever discharge GBHI, UCSF, Trinity College Dublin, Voice of Witness, their officers, agents, employees, and licensees from any and all claims, demands, or causes of action, at law or in equity, arising out of or in connection with the creation and use of said photographs, sound recordings, and videos, including but not limited to any and all claims for injury, invasion of privacy, defamation, or infringement of copyright.

I agree to jurisdiction of state and federal courts located in San Francisco, California and that California law shall govern this agreement, and hereby specifically waive the right to equitable relief or to enjoin, restrain,

or interfere with, the production, distribution, exploitation, exhibition, or use of any of the rights granted herein.

I understand that my contact details, signed consent form, original recordings, and transcript of my interview will be retained in a secure digital archive for the maximum duration permitted by applicable law. Access to these materials will be limited to members of GBHI and will not be used beyond the spirit of GBHI's education and public service mission. I am entitled to access the information I have provided at any time while it is in storage.

If you would like further clarification or information, please contact the **hear/say** project team at hear-say@gbhi.org. You have a right to receive a copy of this signed consent.

_____   _____
Signature of Participant or Participant's Lawful Conservator/Guardian   Date

_____
Print Name

If signed by someone other than the participant, indicate relationship: _____

Contact information:

_____   _____
Email   Phone

_____
Street Address

_____
City, State, ZIP, Country

Witness (name of person securing this form):
I believe the participant is giving informed consent to participate in this project.

_____   _____
Signature of Witness   Date

_____
Print Name

OHA Social Justice Task Force: Glossary of Terms

Rolling Consent
Agreement to participate in a project with an understanding that participants (narrators) have the right to give or withdraw consent at each step of the project's process without consequences of any kind. Some of these steps can include editing, publication, media broadcast, and future use.

Informed Consent
An agreement that documents, verbally or in writing, that the narrator has been given all the information necessary to come to a decision about whether to participate in the oral history project. Informed consent does not cover or deal with copyright. The interview process must be transparent, with ongoing participation, consent, engagement, and open discussion among all parties, from the first encounter between interviewer and narrator to the creation of end products. Informed consent plays a key role in ensuring transparency.

Educational Purposes
Educational Purposes means use for the purpose of education, teaching, distance learning, private study and/or research. When a project's stated goal is for Educational Purposes, this does not free institutions or individuals of obligations related to copyright, informed consent, fair compensation, and more.

Copyright
The exclusive legal right to reproduce, publish, sell, or distribute the matter and form of something (such as a literary, musical, or artistic work). An agreement that documents, verbally or in writing, that the narrator has been given all the information necessary to come to a decision about whether to participate in the oral history project. Informed consent does not cover or deal with copyright. The interview process must be transparent, with ongoing participation, consent, engagement, and open discussion among all parties, from the first encounter between interviewer and narrator to the creation of end products. Informed consent plays a key role in ensuring transparency.

Co-Copyright
When two or more authors prepare a work with the intent to combine contributions into inseparable or interdependent parts, the work is considered "joint work," and its authors are considered joint copyright owners. In oral history, Co-Copyright can include narrators, interviewers, and organizations/institutions.

Shared Authority
Shared authority removes the hierarchy commonly practiced within cultural institutions. Moving away from a top-down approach, shared authority is geared toward collaboration that includes dialogue and participatory engagement. The practice of shared authority creates opportunities for oral and written histories contributed by individuals outside the strictly academic community in conjunction with more traditional scholarly essays, text panels or exhibit labels.

Shared Agreements
Shared agreements are standards and behaviors that a group creates together and agrees to stick to. Shared agreements establish ways of working and being together throughout an oral history project, conference, workshop, etc. Shared agreements are meant to hold all participants accountable to each other.

Shared Accountability
Shared accountability is a model for shared leadership that stresses that all participants in an oral history project (narrators, community partners, etc.) have a "seat at the table" and are equally held accountable for decisions made before, during, and after the project has been completed. Shared accountability addresses inequities when decisions are made solely by a designated manager or leader.

IRB (Institutional Review Board)
A specifically constituted review body established or designated by an institution to protect the rights and welfare of human subjects recruited to participate in social science research. According to the Oral History Association, "Recent revisions to the U.S. Department Health and Human Services 'Policy for Protection of Human Research Subjects' (known as the Common Rule) in 2019 now exclude oral history from IRB review through a strict definition of research."

Social Justice Framework
An analysis of how power, privilege, and oppression impact our experience of our social and cultural identities. This analysis contributes to and becomes a main focus and topic of exploration, for oral historians who collaborate primarily with vulnerable communities.

Sponsoring Institutions
Any organization that may be affiliated with the oral history project, either by paying for the costs associated with oral history work (labor, travel expenses, and

so on), providing archival services for a completed project, or providing in-kind support such as relationship building within a community or sharing social capital.

Narrator-Centered
A practice or set of guidelines and principles for oral historians that centers narrator agency and power. This practice places narrator agency on equal (or greater) footing as institutions and their agents. This practice could include issues of representation, ownership, access, privacy, intent, and more.

Vulnerable Community
Understanding the power dynamics involved in any oral history interview is essential for ethical work in this field. This is especially important when working with vulnerable populations—including, but not limited to, the following: those who might be put in danger or face harm by publicly sharing their experience; legal minors, and others with limited agency and freedom; those with impaired ability to fully consent, and Indigenous and communities of color who experience social stratification and recent or intergenerational trauma. An additional example of groups of people who may fit this description includes those who discuss or describe activities, such as immigration, that could technically violate state or federal laws.

Closed Records
Archives and other repositories of oral history interviews and related records, often tasked with making records accessible, may also be able to withhold records from being used or viewed for a period of time.

Privacy (Narrator and Community Access)
The practice of preserving oral history and making it accessible in any format. Narrators need a precise understanding of what access to their interview will look like, as well as consideration for any third parties discussed within the recording. Access needs to meet local, national, and international data and privacy requirements/standards. Anyone conducting or storing oral history interviews should take all practicable steps to keep the interviews protected from possible illegal or unauthorized uses.

Confidentiality
Confidentiality is the keeping of another person's or entity's information private. Certain professionals are required by law to keep information shared by a client or patient private, without disclosing the information, even to law enforcement, except under certain specific circumstances. In oral history projects, confidentiality cannot be totally guaranteed, despite best intentions.

Anonymity
While a narrator may choose to have their name disassociated from any interview, or choose to utilize a pseudonym, there can be no guarantees toward absolute anonymity in the oral history process. Information provided to an oral historian is only anonymous if there is no way for anyone, at any time, to determine the narrator's identity from it; that is, there is no *identifiable information* (see term below). This is a very high standard of information security that oral historians are only rarely able to offer.

Pseudonym
It may sometimes be possible to record an oral history interview with a narrator using a pseudonym. In such cases, the oral historian should use only the fictitious name when referring to the narrator during the interview or in any related materials, such as transcripts, notes, finding aids, or publications. However, this does not mean that the information provided during the interview will be anonymous or confidential.

Community
Community is defined as a "group of individuals who share a collective geographic space, experience, or level of ownership of the content being shared." This definition includes individual narrators, individuals connected to the narrator, referenced by, or ancillary to narrators and other project participants.

Sample Procedural Approach: Undocumented and Asylum-Seeking Narrators

Conducting oral histories with undocumented or asylum-seeking narrators presents challenges that might not be readily apparent to interviewers, institutions, and other oral history project participants. The following is a list of practices and considerations when working with this particularly vulnerable population. It is not meant to be comprehensive but merely to open a field of inquiry into creating an ethical, legal, and moral framework for collaboration.

Project Planning: Creating a Rubric
Many potential narrators who are undocumented, have detainee status, or are asylum seekers may be willing to be interviewed for a project, knowing full well the potential risks (legal and otherwise) to themselves, their families, and other people they're connected to. As an interviewer or project lead, what ethical and legal responsibilities do you have in this situation? If they're willing to take the risk, should you be willing, also? By not providing these narrators an opportunity to be heard, are you silencing them or robbing them of their agency? In addressing these questions and more, you may want to consider creating a rubric or set of guidelines to help all project participants make informed decisions.

For example, the Australian oral history project, *Behind the Wire*, was organized around a group of interviewers wanting to shed light on the experiences of asylum seekers in mandatory detention on islands off the Australian coast. The interviewers created a legal classification system for potential narrators according to their visa status. The rubric included former detainees who had become Australian citizens up to asylum seekers currently in a detention facility. Through this process, the interview team was able to determine what they felt were "low-risk" narrators, "middle-of-the-risk-scale" narrators, and "high-risk" narrators. By creating this rubric, the project leads were better able to make ethical decisions about whom they would interview and could better articulate the potential risks to their narrators. https://behindthewire.org.au/

Pre-Interview Planning
When preparing for interviews with undocumented narrators, consider the following:

· Provide consent forms in a narrator's chosen language, but also don't insist on a signed hard copy. Many narrators may not (for good reason) want a "paper trail" with potentially sensitive information about themselves being created. In many cases, an audio recording of consent being given is an option.

· Give narrators the choice of anonymity. Many narrators may choose to employ a pseudonym to protect themselves and the people they're connected to. As an interviewer/project lead, it is your responsibility to articulate that anonymity is not a

guarantee of narrator safety and may not be able to be maintained under certain circumstances.

·   Explain to narrators and other project participants the limitations of your legal obligations.

·   In preparation for the interview, discuss with your narrator and other project participants whom the interview may impact. This could include family members, co-workers, friends, and more.

After the Interview
When project interviews have been completed, there are additional considerations for the editing and storing/archiving of the audio and text files. Many of these considerations should be addressed during project planning:

·   Altering sensitive information in the transcript. Narrators may share information during their interview that contains details that may put them or others at risk. This could include physical descriptions about location, communities, or mentions of specific people the narrator is connected to. Some of this information may need to be altered to protect narrator safety.

·   Safety and access of audio and text. For example, if the project has institutional or academic partners, how will narrators access the material? Storing the materials on a university-sponsored database or CARTA (where multiple people have access) might be the norm but does little to protect narrator safety when it comes to sensitive information needing protection. Can other storage options be explored?

·   Ensuring narrator control of public displays of information related to the project. This includes narratives or any information about the narrator and other project participants. All materials should be vetted and approved by narrators before being publicly shared.