Decolonizing Libraries to Foster Community Well-being
Abstract

The Saginaw Chippewa Tribal Libraries, in collaboration with community partners, propose a three-year project grant to: 1) **Assess** the cataloging and classification systems currently in place through a decolonizing lens, 2) **Create** a system of organization for cataloging and classifying library materials according to Anishinaabe ways of knowing and being, 3) **Implement** this system to decolonize and indigenize the Tribal Libraries collections, and 4) **Analyze** results and share documentation that outlines how this project was conducted, providing a framework that other libraries could use as a template for decolonizing the knowledge organization of their collections. Throughout the entire project, we will share information widely with both the local community and the library industry.

This grant will address the question: How can tribal libraries use traditional ways of knowing and being to break free of the colonialist epistemology of existing library organizational systems that reinforce a damaging worldview? As part of the dominant power structure, libraries carry symbolic weight, even for those who do not use them. In order to benefit from and use a library, one must feel comfortable and know the protocols; when those protocols contain derogatory nomenclature and logic, how can it be possible for the target of that disrespect to feel comfortable? Taking into account the ways in which libraries have been complicit in marginalizing Indigenous people, it is incumbent on us to make positive change, to be a place of community recovery, restoration, and resurgence. Continuing to use colonialist systems only maintains the power structure, and this project is an opportunity to, through a community-driven process, elect not to maintain that structure but instead deepen community commitment, investment, and engagement in the libraries. Throughout Tribal Operations we are often reminded that embrace of traditional culture leads to resilience, and this project is a way for the libraries to put that into action.

The Saginaw Chippewa Tribal Libraries (Tribal Libraries) include the public Saginaw Chippewa Tribal Library, the preK-5th grade Saginaw Chippewa Academy elementary school library, and the public two-year community college Saginaw Chippewa Tribal College library. Currently, the former two use DDC, the latter uses LCC, and all use LCSH. All of these systems employ colonialist logic to classify and describe items relating to Indigenous people. This project will focus on the creation of a functional system and disseminating information about that process and system, and will begin to implement the new system to ensure its viability by converting a portion of the Tribal Libraries' holdings to the new system.

This project is scalable and of national significance to libraries and information science. What is now known as the United States sits on traditional Indigenous land, land which holds all libraries located in the U.S. Members and descendants of the over 500 federally recognized Indian Nations located throughout the U.S. are users of these libraries, the majority of which use DDC, LCC, and LCSH. The process and outcomes of this project will be shared and may be used as a template or example for how other libraries might take on their own decolonization projects. While this project will focus on Anishinaabe lifeways specific to this community, the project structure and lessons learned may translate to other communities. Information will be disseminated throughout the project through articles, conference presentations, and other opportunities. Because it will involve three types of libraries (public, K-12, and academic), it will be useful to many.

This project aligns directly to the IMLS agency-level goal to *build capacity* by making the Tribal Libraries a community catalyst to improve the well-being of the community. The projected outcomes of this project are that community members are more invested in the libraries, library materials are easier to find, the systems are easier to learn and navigate, the libraries are used more and are known as a trusted, respectful source for quality resources, and community members are satisfied with the system of organization. Outcome-based evaluation using surveys will be used to assess the success of this project.

Decolonizing Libraries to Foster Community Well-being
Full Proposal Narrative

The Saginaw Chippewa Tribal Libraries, in collaboration with community partners, propose a three-year project grant to: 1) **Assess** the cataloging and classification systems currently in place through a decolonizing lens, 2) **Create** a system of organization for cataloging and classifying library materials according to Anishinaabe ways of knowing and being, 3) **Implement** this system to decolonize and indigenize the Tribal Libraries collections, and 4) **Analyze** results and share documentation that outlines how this project was conducted, providing a framework that other libraries could use as a template for decolonizing the knowledge organization of their collections. Throughout the entire project, we will share information widely with both the local community and the library industry.

NOTE: Throughout this proposal, we will use terms including Native, Native American, Indigenous, American Indian, and Indian. We want to acknowledge that these terms have problematic histories, and note that "the terms 'Native American,' 'American Indian,' and 'Indian' are all terms of conflation designed for governmental racial and class management. Tribal peoples recognize themselves not by race or class, but by the names of their tribe" (Duarte & Belarde-Lewis, 2015). When speaking generally, we will use the terms Native and Indigenous, as these are the terms this local community uses in that manner, but wish to recognize that conflating hundreds of groups of people is in itself problematic and an enactment of settler colonialism.

Statement of National Need
This project addresses the current, nationally significant challenge presented by attempting to serve all community members using the colonialist epistemology inherent in the most prominent library knowledge organization systems, Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC) and Library of Congress Classification (LCC), as well as in the industry standard controlled vocabulary Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH). Because "how we structure our knowledge shapes who, what, and how we can know," (Duarte & Belarde-Lewis, 2015), these seemingly small details have a significant impact. When we can "understand how the single term 'Native American' occludes and erases a wide range of distinctive epistemologies, philosophies, languages, and experiences, we can appreciate how our contemporary dependence on this imprecise term leads to categorical misunderstanding. When we understand how governments and elite classes of citizens continually benefit from this categorical misunderstanding, we gain an insight into a key mechanism of colonialism" (Duarte & Belarde-Lewis, 2015). This problem has been identified in the literature since the late 1960s (Knowlton, 2005) and was identified locally through interactions with patrons and in the daily process of attempting to catalog and classify library materials without using stereotypical and/or harmful terminology and classification. This project will create one example of how a community-based, Indigenous-informed library decolonization project can work, and will create documentation to assist other libraries in initiating their own projects. Crucial to this project is to share widely so that others may benefit from what is learned here. "Accurate and culturally appropriate cataloging of Native American/Indigenous materials is not just a Native American issue, but a national and international issue. It is critical for the self-determination efforts of Indigenous people to have intellectual access to collections of materials documenting their/our histories, cultures, and languages held in libraries" (Webster & Doyle, 2008). This project will build on the existing literature and projects being enacted in the field, a selection of which are briefly described here:

University of Alberta Libraries
At the University of Alberta Libraries, an effort was undertaken to decolonize metadata in response to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. A Decolonizing Description Working Group (DDWG) was formed in 2016 with the charge "to investigate, define and propose a plan of action for how UAL can more accurately, appropriately,

and respectfully represent Indigenous peoples and contexts through our descriptive metadata practices" (Laroque et al, 2017). This work resulted in the Decolonizing Description Project, which started in late 2018. This project, under the direction of project Lead Tyson Thomas, is working to start local (with students, faculty, and staff) and "ripple outward" to Indigenous communities geographically adjacent to UAL. Description in the form of subject headings is the sole focus of this project right now, though they hope to address classification in the future (Thomas, 2019).

Brian Deer Classification
The literature describes a number of libraries that have adapted Brian Deer Classification, a system developed by Canadian Kahnawake Mohawk librarian A. Brian Deer in the 1970s for the National Indian Brotherhood (now Assembly of First Nations) in Canada. He created this system to be adaptable rather than universal, so that individual Indigenous communities could customize it to fit their needs. One of the most widely-known implementations of an adaptation of Brian Deer Classification is at the X̱wi7x̱wa Library at the University of British Columbia. Brian Deer Classification corrects some of the inherent problems in industry standard systems, including expressing relationships between Native nations that are hidden by LCC due to its alphabetical arrangement. The same is true for special topics, which are addressed in a catch-all (E98) and arranged alphabetically in LCC, but are arranged by relationship in Brian Deer Classification. While Brian Deer Classification improves on industry standard systems in many ways, it does have some areas that could be described as drawbacks and merit further investigation as relates to any particular implementation. Most notable among these is that it is suited for small collections, so larger implementations like the X̱wi7x̱wa Library have noted that it "doesn't always allow for the breadth of description that librarians might like" (Gilman, 2006).

Maori Subject Heading Project (MSHP)
The Maori Subject Heading Project (MSHP) in Aotearoa/New Zealand is an example of working within the confines of a national library catalog. This project is "adding Maori terms, and therein, perspectives, to existing records" including "building authority files with Maori terms; instructions for faceting Western concepts (i.e., 'myths and legends') with Maori concepts (i.e., 'history and genealogy'); instructions for marking Maori eras alongside Western historical periodization; and rules for faceting records to include the perspectives of the relevant tribes or *iwi* elucidated in a document" (Duarte & Belarde-Lewis, 2015). It is noted, though, that the political arrangement the Maori have within Aotearoa/New Zealand differs greatly from the way federally recognized tribes (and those not federally recognized) are treated in the United States; where the Maori and Aotearoa have one treaty that defines all of Aotearoa/New Zealand as a bicultural state, there is no such overarching treaty in the U.S. (Duarte & Belarde-Lewis, 2015). This illustrates a challenge to widespread adoption of a new singular universal system that would replace LCSH in the U.S.

Mashantucket Pequot Thesaurus of American Indian Terminology Project
This thesaurus "was created in response to the inadequate use of the English Language and the exclusion of Indigenous philosophies in the description of American Indian subjects in mainstream controlled vocabularies. The Project addresses this disparity by providing an Indigenous philosophy as the structure for organizing information. By bringing together two systems of thought, the attending objective is the improvement of access for both Native and non-Native individuals conducting research on American Indian Topics" (Littletree & Metoyer, 2015). This controlled vocabulary is designed to inform the Mashantucket Pequot Museum and Research Center's use of LCSH and, hopefully, to be used by the Library of Congress to improve their subject headings (Littletree & Metoyer, 2015). This project "affirms that Native systems of knowledge can inform a knowledge organization project" (Littletree & Metoyer, 2015), which we plan to do by creating subject headings that can hopefully contribute to the improvement of LCSH, possibly through collaboration with the ongoing work of members of the American Indian Library Association.

It is possible that this community will choose to utilize elements of the above examples. It is important that the community be able to determine for itself what fits and embodies Anishinaabe ways of knowing and being as lived and experienced by members of this community. The knowledge a community brings is "a result of an ongoing, dynamic relationship between people and place, and reflects the unique methods we as Indigenous peoples have respectively created to make sense of our bounded spaces. Understanding place-based ontologies provides insight into the naming and organizing of knowledge specific to any given community. The respect for bounded places, deep domain knowledge, storywork, and Indigenous expertise are integral to the work of creating Indigenous knowledge systems" (Duarte & Belarde-Lewis, 2015). Because we did not find examples of Anishinaabe community-based systems that are applicable nor any frameworks for using Anishinaabe ways of being to create a new system in our environmental scan, we feel that this project will both fill a need and provide a framework for other libraries' future projects.

This project aligns directly to the IMLS agency-level goal to build capacity by making the Tribal Libraries a community catalyst to improve the well-being of the community. The projected outcomes of this project are that community members are more invested in the libraries, library materials are easier to find, the systems are easier to learn and navigate, the libraries are used more and are known as a trusted, respectful source for quality resources, and community members are satisfied with the system of organization. Outcome-based evaluation using surveys will be used to assess the success of this project.

Project Design
This grant will address the question: How can tribal libraries use traditional ways of knowing and being to break free of the colonialist epistemology of existing library organizational systems that reinforce a damaging worldview?

The Saginaw Chippewa Tribal Libraries (Tribal Libraries) include the public Saginaw Chippewa Tribal Library (SCTL), the preK-5th grade Saginaw Chippewa Academy elementary school library (SCA), and the public two-year community college Saginaw Chippewa Tribal College library (SCTC). Currently, the former two use DDC, the latter uses LCC, and all use LCSH. All of these systems employ colonialist logic to classify and describe items relating to Indigenous people. At the time of this proposal, SCTL has approximately 8,400 volumes, SCTC 3,000 volumes, and SCA 17,000 volumes. This project will focus primarily on the creation of a functional system and disseminating information about that process and system, and will begin to implement the new system to ensure its viability, but we do not anticipate being able to convert the entire collection at all three locations by the end of this project. As part of the project, we will formulate a plan for how to approach that work in manageable pieces.

The Decolonizing Libraries to Foster Community Well-being core team is comprised of Tribal Librarian Anne Heidemann; Melissa Isaac (Anishnaabe), Director of Education at the Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe of Michigan; Dr. Adam Haviland, Professor of Native American Studies at Saginaw Chippewa Tribal College; and Dr. Benjamin Ramirez-Shkwegnaabi (Saginaw Chippewa), Professor Emeritus in the Department of History at Central Michigan University. Their attached resumes document their work with and for Native people. The facilitator included in the project design will be identified and engaged as part of Phase 1 (see appended position descriptions). This core team will identify community members and experts who will comprise the work group, which will be led by the facilitator.

The core team will work with the work group, which will be comprised of individuals selected for their role as community stakeholders; their traditional knowledge and experience; and their expertise in libraries, knowledge

organization, education, and/or related fields. We will aim to engage the participation of ten individuals for meetings once a month for half or full day sessions. Members of this work group will be determined as part of Phase 1, and may likely include Tribal leadership, elders, and representatives from Tribal Operations departments including Education Department, Anishinaabe Language Revitalization Department, Elijah Elk Cultural Center for Living Culture and Traditions Seventh Generation Program, Saginaw Chippewa Tribal College, and Ziibiwing Center of Anishinabe Culture & Lifeways. We will also invite selected experts to visit and work with the work group for about half of those meetings, providing presentations, information, teachings, or whatever arrangement is needed for the particular topic. These experts will be identified by the core team and may include some of the folks we consulted with during the process of creating this application, potentially including Dr. Loriene Roy (Anishinabe), Professor at the School of Information at the University of Texas at Austin; Kelly Webster (Oneida), Head of Metadata Creation & Management at O'Neill Library at Boston College; Jasmine Pawlicki (Sokaogon Band of Lake Superior Chippewa), Onsite User Services & Outreach Assistant at the University of Michigan Library; Tyson Thomas, Lead for the Decolonizing Description Project at University of Alberta Libraries; and others. We may also extend invitations to experts at Central Michigan University, located locally in the town of Mount Pleasant, at Michigan State University in Lansing, at Wayne State University School of Information Sciences in Detroit, and at University of Michigan School of Information in Ann Arbor. We approach this process with flexibility, acknowledging that experts as yet not identified may become known to us during the project.

This project has several audiences. It will involve Tribal Libraries staff (one Tribal Librarian and two Library Assistants) and will affect Tribal departments that house and use the Tribal Libraries, will directly involve and serve the local community throughout the process, and will also serve the larger library community, including tribal, public, K-12, academic, and potentially other types of libraries. The core team will work with an Indigenous facilitator, guest experts, and community members as primary participants to ensure that external input is received and incorporated, and that consensus can be reached using culturally relevant methods. The participants in this work group will be a key step in the process, as "identifying Indigenous epistemic partners, those community members with deep domain knowledge—is integral to the design of Indigenous ontologies, definition of user needs, and training of non-Indigenous knowledge organization personnel" (Duarte & Belarde-Lewis, 2015). Because those who desire to undertake this type of project "must have an understanding of self-determination, sovereignty, autonomy, and decolonization, or in other words, the values and rules of law and governance in Indian Country" (Duarte & Belarde-Lewis, 2015), we expect that this project, based in a Tribal community and with primarily Indigenous players, will be successful.

The following assumptions have informed and shaped the project design:
- Existing industry standard systems including DDC, LCC, and LCSH are inherently damaging to Indigenous people through their treatment as historicized, othered, and from a settler colonialist viewpoint which undermines the sovereignty of Native nations;
- These systems are also insufficient for accurately describing and providing access to Native topics;
- It must be up to Native communities to determine what system of organization most closely embodies their ways of knowing and being;
- Incorporating Anishinaabemowin into the new system is critical because the language is inseparable from the culture;
- Because of the trauma created by colonialism, both in the past and the present, decolonizing projects must be undertaken carefully, with a mindful approach to power structures, and with Indigenous direction;

- Local partnerships have value and there is an opportunity to contribute to ongoing efforts to improve LCSH, so the project will maintain use of the Library Solution automation system using MARC records in the IC More Shared Catalog;
- All libraries should interrogate their processes and take necessary measures to ensure that all people are welcome, including and especially those who are and have been marginalized by library systems and society at large;
- In order for a larger, industry-wide change to come about, smaller-scale projects must come first, and those projects must be shared widely;
- This project is a starting point for the Tribal Libraries and will likely evolve as time passes. We recognize that we cannot create a perfect system, so we will strive to do the best we can and provide the best example we can for other libraries.

Existing industry standard systems including DDC, LCC, and LCSH are inherently damaging to Indigenous people through their treatment as historicized, othered, and from a settler colonialist viewpoint which undermines the sovereignty of Native nations. "Cataloging systems carry systemic biases; they reflect the values and perspectives of their makers" (Webster & Doyle, 2008). The "overall effect is continual subjugation of Native systems of knowledge in favor of a centralized modern Western system of knowledge, to which all other ontologies that have the potential for describing the world must cohere" (Duarte & Belarde-Lewis, 2015). Libraries have been active players in doing this harm and perpetuating these inaccuracies through library systems for classification and cataloging. Misnaming, historicization, and inaccurate terms "are not unrelated and inconvenient phenomena endemic to Indigenous knowledge, but rather the evidence of systemic colonial marginalization" (Duarte & Belarde-Lewis, 2015). Indigenous people and culture seem like an afterthought and "the E schedules in LC classification are a dumping ground for all things Indian" (Webster & Doyle, 2008). DDC is based on a "culturally determined viewpoint" in which, for example, "Christianity is privileged in the Religion class" (Rafferty, 2001). In addition to treating non-Christian religions as other and lesser than, DDC offensively puts Indigenous religion in the same section as myths and fairytales. LCSH has been widely scrutinized in the literature for its cultural bias, and while some changes have been accepted and still more proposed, this change has been incremental, reprehensibly slow, and, like LCC and DDC, moderated by gatekeepers who have repeatedly dismissed suggestions from marginalized groups. This dismissal reflects "the perception that Native people are not authorities on their own experiences" (Littletree & Metoyer, 2015), a view that privileges settler colonialism and further marginalizes Indigenous peoples. These problems do not reside only in the original systems as they were created long ago. Changes to LCSH have sometimes been regressive, such as the change of the subject heading *Indians of North America—Removal* to *Indians of North American—Relocation*. The purposefully obfuscatory term relocation seeks to hide "all the pain and betrayal and death that went along with the forced removal of tribes" (Webster & Doyle, 2008). If "the words we use and the names we choose to identify elements in our world can illuminate, educate, and elucidate," so also can they "perpetuate stereotypes and misinformation" (Littletree & Metoyer, 2015).

"Equal access to library materials is hindered by bias in subject cataloging, both in major classification schemes (Library of Congress Classification and Dewey Decimal Classification) and major controlled subject vocabularies (Library of Congress Subject Headings and Sears Subject Headings)" (Tomren, 2003). These systems are insufficient for accurately describing and providing access to Native topics. It is "clear that there is a need to faithfully classify indigenous materials – not only for the survival of indigenous tradition and culture within individual groups – but to make indigenous materials accessible to all who desire to find them" and "that schemes such as DDC, LC and LCSH are presently inadequate for the purposes of describing, and providing access to, indigenous materials that do not easily conform to the strictures of Western epistemology and language" (Gilman, 2006). The fact that LCC organizes Native nations in alphabetical order according to names imposed on

them by settler colonialism both limits access and hides the relationships that Native nations have with one another. DDC has similar limitations and both of these systems, "by separating materials that would not naturally be separated within the indigenous epistemological framework," exert "a very real measure of 'cultural authority'" (Gilman 2006). The ways in which this marginalization expresses itself are many: "the exclusion of appropriate indigenous terminology, the use of inappropriate terminology, the creation of inaccurate relationships between subjects – but the result is always the same: indigenous information is rendered inaccessible to users" (Gilman, 2006). Subject headings provide one method of access to materials, but the physical arrangement and organization of materials is equally critical. These systems "must also seek to reflect appropriate terminologies and relationships" which in turn "dictate the physical location of their materials" (Gilman, 2006).

"The integrity of an indigenous scheme is wholly dependent on the involvement of indigenous peoples in its creation" (Gilman, 2006). Libraries "should ensure that in their actions as stewards they affirm that indigenous peoples have the primary say in how expressions of their cultures are held and used" (Roy, 2013). There are over 570 tribes recognized by the United States federal government (Salazar, n.d.), and hundreds more that have not been recognized (List, 2019). Each of these has "unique epistemologies, ways of knowing, languages, and histories" (Duarte & Belarde-Lewis, 2015), and only people affiliated with one of these groups can truly say what is accurate to that group. "Respect for Indigenous holism, political realities, long-term relationship-building, and patience with timelines are essential" (Duarte & Belarde-Lewis, 2015) to decolonizing work. The literature makes it clear that "for indigenous materials to be made accessible to indigenous users, the materials must be described and organized in a manner that is consistent with the individual indigenous epistemology (Gilman, 2006).

Since the new system will be based on Anishinaabe ways of knowing and being, it is understood that Anishinaabemowin will be part of that system. Anishinaabemowin, like any language, is expressive of the values of the people who use it, so its use as directed by language speakers will increase the likelihood of a system that most fully represents the community. Language revitalization is an ongoing effort in communities across Indian Country and libraries, including the Tribal Libraries, are "important partners in language recovery efforts" (Osborne, 2004). In addition, "supporting native languages is an expression of social justice that recognizes that all peoples have a right to survive and thrive on their terms" (Roy, 2013). The limitations of industry standard systems are "seen in the lack of appropriate indigenous language to represent indigenous knowledge; indigenous language is spurned for 'more accessible' English translations (or, more aptly, mutations)" (Gilman, 2006). Incorporating the language correctly is only possible by involving language speakers in the creation of the system, which will also ensure that any translation of Anishinaabemowin words into English for increase of access does not negatively impact the original language and epistemology.

It is important to recognize that "what often happens for Indigenous peoples when discussing colonialism is a reopening of brutal historical traumas, in which non-Indigenous actors are often caught in a guilt/shame/blame cycle with Indigenous actors once again taking on the role of mute noble listeners, while at the same time metabolizing the pain of recognizing that much of our ways of knowing have been lost, subjugated, censored, and stolen from our communities" (Duarte & Belarde-Lewis, 2015). It is necessary for White library workers, including the Tribal Librarian in this project, to "step outside their comfort zone, sensitize themselves to Indigenous histories and political realities, learn to listen in new ways, and position themselves as followers in collaborative projects with Indigenous specialists leading the way" (Duarte & Belarde-Lewis, 2015). For these reasons, the project will seek out an Indigenous consultant to facilitate the discussions and proceedings of the work group, and Indigenous experts to provide information, teachings, and training for the work group. The

work group itself will be comprised of community members who will bring to the table knowledge of traditional culture, language, and community values and expectations.

While a wholly community-based system has strong appeal, it is necessary and in some ways desirable to rely on some existing systems, at least at the present moment. The Tribal Libraries' partnership in the IC More Shared Catalog, which uses MARC records through the Library Solution automation system, is part of a tri-county library partnership which includes public, school, and post-secondary libraries. This partnership extends beyond the shared catalog and holds high value for all partners including the Tribal Libraries. Maintaining records in the shared catalog benefits library users from all partners as they search for library materials, and will provide an opportunity for partner libraries to easily utilize subject headings created during this project. These local headings also transfer to the MeLCat statewide shared catalog, thus introducing them to libraries (Michigan libraries often use MeLCat records for copy-cataloging) and library users all over the state. This also allows this project to seize the opportunity to build on existing efforts to improve LCSH with headings created by Indigenous communities. Experts have noted that "the use of OCLC standards for creating records" in combination with "community-based categories and descriptors" (Duarte & Belarde-Lewis, 2015) can be suitable for this type of project (Baldridge, 2013). To be realistic and make the most of a locally created system, "the use of indigenous-authorized subject headings to provide access to indigenous materials appears to be the most viable option" (Gilman, 2006). As has been put in practice at the X̱wi7x̱wa Library, using standard MARC record fields to include names in both the individual's own Indigenous language as well as the English translation, for example, is likely to be a successful practice. Like the Mashantucket Pequot Thesaurus of American Indian Terminology Project, we hope to contribute to modifications of "the most widely used controlled vocabulary in the world" (Littletree & Metoyer, 2015), which will have benefit not only for our local community but also for the larger library community.

One might argue that it is not possible to overcome the immense presence industry standard systems have in the library world, that these systems are in place because they function sufficiently, but that is to ignore those for whom they do not work, and indeed, those they oppress. Many things in libraries are constantly changing, and "as information settings are expanding their services, so they should also challenge their traditions in how they handle, and provide access to indigenous content" (Roy, 2013). Libraries operate in service to their communities and indicate their values and beliefs through their systems, and since Indigenous people use libraries all over, all of those libraries must be concerned with making these changes. The work of this project will be a benefit to libraries in all settings, not just tribal libraries.

In the literature, it has been noted that smaller-scale projects can translate to change on a national level (Farnel et al, 2018). We recognize that "the level of work needed for Indigenous peoples to define their own epistemological universe is significant" (Duarte & Belarde-Lewis, 2015), and this project would contribute to that work. Because the limitations of industry standard systems "are especially obvious when working with a collection that is heavy on materials about Native Americans, whether it is a tribal library or a special collection in another type of library," (Webster & Doyle, 2008) the Tribal Libraries are an ideal setting for this type of project. We approach this project knowing that "practice, experimentation, identifying commonalities and specificities, and sharing our results are essential aspects to this ongoing work" (Duarte & Belarde-Lewis, 2015). We plan to share the progress and results of this project as widely as possible, through conference presentations; articles for scholarly, community, and other publications; and any other opportunities that can be identified through this project. Starting as we mean to go on, we have been in communication throughout the process of preparing our Phase 1 and Phase 2 applications with other libraries, community members, and other interested parties and potential collaborators. We will continue this open attitude toward possibility and input throughout the process.

While we may not be able to create a perfect system, to "overhaul generations of social inequalities," if we can at minimum adopt and include "terms that reflect the experiences and perspectives of the marginalized," it will be "a step toward the redress of colonial power" (Duarte & Belarde-Lewis, 2015). The risks involved in this project are that it may be a time-consuming process to develop a new system, it may be challenging to come to consensus on what that system should look like, and the creation of a new system represents significant change from the status quo. The Tribal Libraries are committed to this project, and trust that by inviting an Anishinaabe consultant to facilitate, involving Indigenous experts, and engaging community stakeholders to form the work group, success will be possible.

This project will include four phases:

Phase 1 (July – December 2019) – **Assess** the cataloging and classification systems currently in place through a decolonizing lens. This phase will begin by assembling a work group including representatives from the Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribal community, library and information professionals, and a facilitator who will lead the work group using Anishinaabe-informed facilitation techniques. This work group will contextualize the project using current research and practice in combination with traditional ways of knowing, including visits with experts (both in-person and via remote conferencing). This work group will meet monthly for half- or full-day sessions, during which they will learn about the structure and deficiencies of the current systems (DDC, LCC and LCSH) in place at the Tribal Libraries, tour the three library sites to become familiar with the spaces, review other decolonization work to contextualize their charge, and begin to identify applicable elements of Anishinaabe ways of knowing and being that may inform or contribute to the new system. We will evaluate by starting with work group and library user surveys that can be used as a baseline, and then using follow-up surveys to assess progress and elicit feedback. We will continue this evaluation process throughout the project.

Phase 2 (January – December 2020) – **Create** a system of organization for cataloging and classifying library materials according to Anishinaabe ways of knowing and being. This new system will include classification, physical organization/arrangement, and subject headings, and will be implemented while maintaining use of the Library Solution automation system using MARC records in the IC More Shared Catalog. It will include and unify the organization of the three Tribal Libraries. The work of creating this system will utilize an Indigenous approach, the specifics of which will be determined by the work group as part of their charge. During this phase the work group will identify existing subject headings they wish to address and nonexistent subject headings they wish to create, determine what elements of Anishinaabe epistemology are applicable and can be used to create a system of classification (e.g., subject areas and how they relate to one another), determine other contributing factors that are of importance to the classification system (e.g., the current system at the Tribal Library labels items as 'Ojibwe' or 'Native American' if they are by or about people or topics that fall into one of these two categories; it is expected that the new system may wish to incorporate something along these lines, or perhaps to note the tribal affiliation of the author or lack thereof – the specifics of this will be up to the work group to determine), determine the actual classifications for categories of items and what call numbers and/or spine labels will look like, determine a plan for physical arrangement of items that will suit the new classification system including advisory on wayfinding and signage, create documentation that can be used in Phase 3 for implementation, and will determine the scope of Phase 3 (which portions of the Tribal Libraries collections will be included in Phase 3 and how much the work group expects can be accomplished during that phase).

Phase 3 (January – December 2021) – **Implement** this system to decolonize and indigenize the Tribal Libraries collections. This will include reclassifying, relabeling, and rearranging library materials. This work will utilize the system created by the work group during Phase 2, will be directed by the Facilitator and Tribal Librarian, and will be completed by Tribal Libraries staff and the cataloger and processor included in this proposal. The goal for Phase 3 will be to utilize the new system to the extent that the work group defines in Phase 2; we expect that a subset of the Tribal Libraries collections will be identified as a starting point. During this phase, we

anticipate reclassifying items with the new classification system, which will include changing call numbers in the item records as well as relabeling the items themselves. We will also edit subject headings in MARC records to reflect the changes and new headings created during Phase 2. Throughout Phase 3, the work group will meet on an every-other-month basis to keep apprised of progress via the Facilitator and Tribal Librarian; to discuss progress, identify and address hiccups, and correct course if needed; and to view progress so far in the actual library sites. At the close of Phase 3, the work group will complete a review of the progress at each of the three sites. Throughout Phase 3, we will utilize surveys with the work group, staff, and library users to assess progress. **Phase 4** (January – June 2022) – **Analyze** results and share documentation that outlines how this project was conducted, which other libraries could use as a template for decolonizing their collections. We will share project findings in a variety of settings, including proposals to present at the Association of Archives, Libraries, and Museums International Conference of Indigenous Archives, Libraries, and Museums; Tribal College Librarians Institute; American Library Association Annual Conference; Public Library Association Conference; Michigan Indian Education Council Native American Critical Issues Conference; Loleta Fyan Small and Rural Libraries Conference; Small Libraries, Big Impact Conference; Michigan Library Association Annual Conference; and Michigan Academic Library Association Annual Conference. As budget, time, and opportunity allow, we will also look for additional conferences or workshops, including online, at which we can share project progress and findings. We also plan to use our findings to write articles for state and national publications, potentially including *Tribal College Journal*, *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, *American Libraries*, *Library Journal*, *School Library Journal*, *In The Library With The Lead Pipe*, and potentially others. We will also be alert to other modes and opportunities to share information. We are hopeful that those involved in this project will have ideas for venues for sharing that we have not yet identified, and we will actively pursue those.

The core team will be responsible for sharing out locally and via conference presentations and articles throughout the duration of all phases and after Phase 3 is complete. Progress will be shared with the community locally through monthly Tribal Libraries reporting, partnership with the *Tribal Observer* newspaper, email lists, paper communications, and any other appropriate settings that are identified. If it is feasible to include work group members in presentations, articles, or so forth, we will welcome that opportunity, but recognize that travel and/or other requirements for these will depend on work group member availability.

Evaluation and performance measurement will be incorporated throughout the three years of the project using outcome-based evaluation. The Tribal Libraries have found success in the past using surveys such as those designed by Project Outcome, and will create surveys that appropriately address the work being undertaken in this project.

Diversity Plan
This project will directly engage a diverse and underserved community and, at its core and by design, incorporates their shared experiences, worldviews, and ways of learning. This project will be based in the Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribal community on the Isabella Reservation. The Tribal Libraries have often received verbal feedback from patrons who are not pleased to find out that the industry standard systems in use are, by their nature, discriminatory and hurtful. This project represents an opportunity to utilize local input and direct contribution from Anishinaabe people to incorporate their worldview and ways of knowing and being into a revised system that will, in contrast to current industry standard systems, be representative and empowering. This need and opportunity was identified through conversations with library users over several years, through review of the literature and conversations with other library workers serving Tribal communities, and through the Tribal Librarian's own education through experience and research in attempting to bend existing systems to be less oppressive. The project is structured to utilize local community input at every opportunity, with no pre-conceived notion of what the outcome will look like. It has been noted in the literature that non-Indigenous

information workers must be receptive to learning about Indigenous ways of knowing and "employing the strengths of their communities" in order to understand knowledge experts who have the "deep domain knowledge" necessary to "embed Indigenous knowledge systems into their practice" (Duarte & Belarde-Lewis, 2015). This closely reflects the Tribal Librarian's philosophy of service which can be seen reflected in this proposal.

National Impact

This project will be an example of how cataloging and classification practice can be transformed in any library. Because it will include a K-12 school library, a public library, and a library in a higher education setting, its results will have practical application for many practitioners. The way Indigenous people are treated in these systems is problematic throughout the library world. What is now known geopolitically as the U.S. sits on traditional Indigenous land, land which holds all libraries located in the U.S. Members and descendants of the over 500 federally recognized Native Nations located throughout the U.S. are users of these libraries, the majority of which use DDC, LCC, and LCSH. The process and outcomes of this project will be shared and may be used as a template for how other libraries might take on their own decolonization projects. While this project will focus on Anishinaabe lifeways specific to this community, the project structure and lessons learned may translate to other communities.

To ensure that project deliverables are readily adaptable by other institutions and communities, all articles, conference presentations, and other information-sharing formats will be created and communicated with sharing and adaptability in mind. The goal of this project is not just to come up with a system that works here, but to create a template for other libraries to enact similar projects in their own communities. Throughout the process, we will keep in mind that we are not only creating a local system, but simultaneously creating a process that can be duplicated and modified to fit other communities.

To sustain the project beyond the funding period, we plan to incorporate the resulting practices into Tribal Libraries policies and procedures and to pursue additional project funding as needed depending on how much is accomplished during this project and what, if any, additional sub-projects arise.

Task	2019 Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	2020 Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	2021 Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	2022 Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun
PHASE 1 Assess current systems through a decolonizing lens	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓																														
--assemble and orient work group	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓																														
--assess current systems, identify opportunities	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓																														
--share progress	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓																														
PHASE 2 Create locally informed system of organization							▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓																		
--identify and engage experts							▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓																		
--meet monthly							▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓																		
--create documentation for new system							▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓																		
--share progress							▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓																		
PHASE 3 Implement new system																			▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓						
--engage processor and cataloger																			▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓						
--reclassify, relabel, and rearrange library materials																			▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓						
--assess progress, adjust as needed																			▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓						
--share progress																			▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓						
PHASE 4 Analyze results and share documentation																															▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓

DIGITAL PRODUCT FORM

Introduction

The Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) is committed to expanding public access to federally funded digital products (e.g., digital content, resources, assets, software, and datasets). The products you create with IMLS funding require careful stewardship to protect and enhance their value, and they should be freely and readily available for use and re-use by libraries, archives, museums, and the public. Because technology is dynamic and because we do not want to inhibit innovation, we do not want to prescribe set standards and practices that could become quickly outdated. Instead, we ask that you answer questions that address specific aspects of creating and managing digital products. Like all components of your IMLS application, your answers will be used by IMLS staff and by expert peer reviewers to evaluate your application, and they will be important in determining whether your project will be funded.

Instructions

All applications must include a Digital Product Form.

☐ Please check here if you have reviewed Parts I, II, III, and IV below and you have determined that your proposal does NOT involve the creation of digital products (i.e., digital content, resources, assets, software, or datasets). You must still submit this Digital Product Form with your proposal even if you check this box, because this Digital Product Form is a Required Document.

If you ARE creating digital products, you must provide answers to the questions in Part I. In addition, you must also complete at least one of the subsequent sections. If you intend to create or collect digital content, resources, or assets, complete Part II. If you intend to develop software, complete Part III. If you intend to create a dataset, complete Part IV.

Part I: Intellectual Property Rights and Permissions

A.1 What will be the intellectual property status of the digital products (content, resources, assets, software, or datasets) you intend to create? Who will hold the copyright(s)? How will you explain property rights and permissions to potential users (for example, by assigning a non-restrictive license such as BSD, GNU, MIT, or Creative Commons to the product)? Explain and justify your licensing selections.

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

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

Part II: Projects Creating or Collecting Digital Content, Resources, or Assets

A. Creating or Collecting New Digital Content, Resources, or Assets

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

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

A.3 List all the digital file formats (e.g., XML, TIFF, MPEG) you plan to use, along with the relevant information about the appropriate quality standards (e.g., resolution, sampling rate, or pixel dimensions).

B. Workflow and Asset Maintenance/Preservation

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

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

C. Metadata

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

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

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

D. Access and Use

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

D.2 Provide the name(s) and URL(s) (Uniform Resource Locator) for any examples of previous digital content, resources, or assets your organization has created.

Part III. Projects Developing Software

A. General Information

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

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

B. Technical Information

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

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

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

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

B.5 Provide the name(s) and URL(s) for examples of any previous software your organization has created.

C. Access and Use

C.1 We expect applicants seeking federal funds for software to develop and release these products under open-source licenses to maximize access and promote reuse. What ownership rights will your organization assert over the software you intend to create, and what conditions will you impose on its access and use? Identify and explain the license under which you will release source code for the software you develop (e.g., BSD, GNU, or MIT software licenses). Explain and justify any prohibitive terms or conditions of use or access and detail how you will notify potential users about relevant terms and conditions.

C.2 Describe how you will make the software and source code available to the public and/or its intended users.

C.3 Identify where you will deposit the source code for the software you intend to develop:

Name of publicly accessible source code repository:

URL:

Part IV: Projects Creating Datasets

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

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

A.3 Will you collect any personally identifiable information (PII), confidential information (e.g., trade secrets), or proprietary information? If so, detail the specific steps you will take to protect such information while you prepare the data files for public release (e.g., data anonymization, data suppression PII, or synthetic data).

A.4 If you will collect additional documentation, such as consent agreements, along with the data, describe plans for preserving the documentation and ensuring that its relationship to the collected data is maintained.

A.5 What methods will you use to collect or generate the data? Provide details about any technical requirements or dependencies that would be necessary for understanding, retrieving, displaying, or processing the dataset(s).

A.6 What documentation (e.g., data documentation, codebooks) will you capture or create along with the dataset(s)? Where will the documentation be stored and in what format(s)? How will you permanently associate and manage the documentation with the dataset(s) it describes?

A.7 What is your plan for archiving, managing, and disseminating data after the completion of the award-funded project?

A.8 Identify where you will deposit the dataset(s):

Name of repository:

URL:

A.9 When and how frequently will you review this data management plan? How will the implementation be monitored?