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UC Center for Collaborative Research for an Equitable California
The University of California Center for Collaborative Research for an Equitable California (CCREC) hosted the Unsettling Research Ethics invitational conference in February 2016. Designed to disrupt formalized approaches to research ethics, the conference facilitated critical dialogue among social scientists, ethics specialists, community-based and collaborative researchers, and community leaders. This dialogue was graphically visualized and documented in real time by a graphic facilitator, Julie Gieseke of Map the Mind, thereby providing materials used in the knowledge production of the conference itself and reworked for this report.

The Unsettling Research Ethics conference and report presents a distinctive framework for grappling with the ethics of research, surfacing ethical tensions and dilemmas through the domains of knowledge, relationality, and space and time. This framework aims to deepen ethical praxis and professional formation for researchers and collaborators. Included in this report are learning tools like innovative cases, games, heat maps, and other materials designed for deep engagement with fraught ethical matters.

The Unsettling Research Ethics conference was an intergenerational gathering, with both early career and foundational scholars in anthropology, archaeology, critical race and ethnic studies, black studies, computer science, education, feminist studies, geography, public health, sociology, and philosophy. Participating scholars identify as scholar-activists and/or engage in work related to research ethics, community-based and collaborative approaches to research, and ethics policy work at institutional, professional association, and national levels. Community leaders in attendance have collaboratively partnered with academics, and work in multiple domains of social justice activism and community organizing, including labor, race, women’s issues, immigration, and youth development.

This report provides background on the CCREC ethics research project and its conceptual and pedagogical approaches, including its notion of ‘dwelling with/in the ethics of research.’ Additional frameworks and provocative invitations for engaging the ethics of research are offered by Troy Richardson (Cornell University), Joyce E. King (Georgia State University), Rena Lederman (Princeton University), Diane Fujino (University of California, Santa Barbara), Kisha Supernant (University of Alberta), Richa Nagar (University of Minnesota), Caitlin Cahill (Pratt Institute), and George Lipsitz (University of California, Santa Barbara). The materials included in this report, generated by the CCREC ethics project and Unsettling Research Ethics conference participants, are meant to serve as resources for fostering sustained ethical reflection and strengthened professional development for scholars and research partners concerning the ethics of knowledge, relationality, and space and time.
We — Ronald David Glass, Natalie JK Baloy, and Sheeva Sabati, who are the current team on the Ethics Project of the UC Center for Collaborative Research for an Equitable California (CCREC) — must begin our acknowledgements and appreciations with recognition of the previous members of the team, Samara Foster and Anne Newman. Their contributions continue to enrich our work. We also acknowledge Megan Lucy, a research assistant on some of the preliminary studies that led to the formation of the ethics project as a foundational program in CCREC.

We extend this recognition to the many people involved with CCREC who have provided support over the eight years that the Ethics Project unfolded to the point of this conference and now report: research and administrative staff, undergraduate and graduate students, members of our Governance Council and Advisory Board, CCREC Fellows and Affiliates, and CCREC Funded and Signature Project teams. Each has been integral to the development of CCREC and to the Ethics Project, and their enduring commitments animate this report.

CCREC researchers and the CCREC Ethics Project Team conducted more than 50 in-depth interviews with community-engaged scholars and with community partners about their experience of collaborative research, and more than half of these interviews also included a set of more extensive questions about ethics. These interviews have been a rich resource for our analytic framework for the conference, and for the fictional cases we include here. Our gratitude for the honor of their stories knows no limit: thank you for your thoughtful reflections, interviewees!

Many people contributed their time and support to the Unsettling Research Ethics Conference. Thank you to Ethan Chang and Delphine Foo-Matkin for all of your help preparing for this event. Many thanks also to our volunteer team who did everything from set-up and clean-up to note taking and general back up support: Chrissy Anderson-Zavala, Linnea Beckett, Emily Borg, Ethan Chang, Samara Foster, Robin Gray, Amanda Lashaw, Rebecca London, and Saugher Nojan. The CCREC Crew is the sustenance of our work together. We also appreciate the Hotel Paradox staff for their attention in creating a hospitable space for this work.

We also want to acknowledge the Spencer Foundation, which has supported the CCREC Ethics Project with two major grants. The Spencer Foundation’s generous funding has supported two post-doctoral scholars, a doctoral student researcher, and the extended studies underlying the organization and convening of the Unsettling Research Ethics Conference.

We would also like to thank all of the participants for their presence, before, during, and after the conference. Without their powerful contributions to our experience of and thinking about the ethics of research in the social sciences, we would not have been moved to invite them nor would we have been able to design the conference with care and depth. Without their serious engagement with each other and the conference agenda during the conference itself, this report would not be possible; without their continuing commitment to grappling with the ethics of research, this report will bear less fruit. Beyond summation, we have been honored, our work made possible, by the conference participants.
# CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Summary</td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgements</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The CCREC Ethics Project</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing the Conference</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCREC Ethics Conceptual Framework</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsettling Research Ethics Conference</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivating Intentional &amp; Impactful Conversations</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convening Participants</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convening Inviters</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Constructing Knowledge</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tensions &amp; Contentions</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Production, Gathering, &amp; Sharing</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation &amp; Framings</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openings</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Glass: Dwelling With/In the Ethics of Research</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy Richardson: Tensions in Research Ethics &amp; Current Models of Theory of Mind</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention Circle</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics of Knowledge</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forecasting Knowledge</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce King: Liberatory Research Practice &amp; Ethics Beyond Epistemic Nihilation</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rena Lederman: Regulatory Double-Binds of Anti-Objectivist (or Relational) Epistemologies</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Discussions</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics of Relationality</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forecasting Relationality</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Fujino: Relationality in Research: Taken by Surprise in Developing Egalitarian Collaborations</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kisha Supernant: Dwelling in Failure: The Generative Power of Failed Relations &amp; Emergent Ethical Spaces</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationality Discussions</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics of Space &amp; Time</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forecasting Space &amp; Time</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richa Nagar: Translating Struggles Ethically</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caitlin Cahill: ‘Home Is Where Crisis Is Lived Every Day’</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space &amp; Time Discussions</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closings</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Lipsitz: Jazz Synthesis</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing Circle</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Conference Gatherings</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modes of Engagement</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-Scape of Research Ethics</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Policy</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Pedagogy</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heat Maps</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gameboard</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCREC Ethics Cases</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining Data</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give Me Shelter</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort Zones</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Biographies</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Bibliography</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The CCREC Ethics Project coalesced in 2008 to philosophically interrogate the challenges made by equity-oriented collaborative community-based research methodologies to the core principles of research ethics – informed consent, anonymity, and confidentiality – and to the traditional boundaries between ethics and epistemology. These research methodologies also raise difficult ethical questions for traditional university commitments, both institutionally and within the disciplines themselves, to ‘disinterested’ research and ‘neutrality’ in the public sphere. These challenges and questions have become urgent in recent years as collaborative research methodologies become adopted across many disciplines and fields, and as related foundational questions have been pressed more broadly in higher education, in the research disciplines, and in national debates surrounding revisions to the Common Rule.

With direction provided by the CCREC Governance Council and CCREC Fellows, leadership from CCREC PI/Director Ron Glass, and funding from the Spencer Foundation, the CCREC Ethics Project team formed in 2011. Our early work was shaped by significant contributions from Samara Foster and Anne Newman, and in recent years, it is being shaped by the contributions of Natalie JK Baloy and Sheeva Sabati. As a team, we have thus far…

examined codes of ethics of multiple professional associations and Indigenous communities

reviewed increasingly contentious debates about IRBs, the Common Rule, and research in the social sciences and humanities, particularly when that research is equity-oriented, community-based, and collaborative

catalogued a range of ethical issues raised in empirical studies across the social sciences and interdisciplinary fields such as education, public health, and urban planning

participated actively in ethics and education networks, such as the Urban Research Based Action Network (URBAN), to share the work of the project

published articles, presented our work at more than a dozen refereed inter/national conferences

conducted and analyzed 30+ interviews with engaged scholars and community activists who have utilized action research

Natalie, Ron, & Sheeva
DESIGNING THE CONFERENCE

CCREC ETHICS CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The CCREC Ethics Project emerges from the nexus of our critical philosophic investigations of collaborative forms of research with questions of research policy and practice, particularly where these come together in the preparation and formation of researchers.

Through our analysis of the literature and the interview data we collected, we began to organize our understanding of the ethics of research into three interconnecting domains: knowledge, relationality, and space and time. We were particularly interested in exploring this framework for its usefulness as both a theoretical lens and as a pedagogical approach to surfacing ethical issues in research.

UNSETTLING RESEARCH ETHICS CONFERENCE

The Unsettling Research Ethics Conference itself became a way for the team to attempt to embody this framework while also asking participants to engage with it critically. The conference structures and processes, invitations to dwell, guiding reflection questions, cases, and pedagogical and reflective tools, were all ways of trying to sustain engagement with/in the domain of the ethical. We drew on theories of critical consciousness raising from anti-racism, feminist, anti-capitalist, and decolonial theories and pedagogies to try to re-present the landscape of research ethics in ways that would provoke engagement in alternative imaginaries and forms of practice.
CULTIVATING INTENTIONAL & IMPACTFUL CONVERSATIONS

We designed the conference to cultivate dynamic conversations regarding what constitutes ethical research praxis, particularly as it pertains to justice-oriented research within and across the various intersecting domains of participants’ work. We hoped to surface and engage contested domains, working with/in complexities rather than against them or intending to offer a final resolution to them, expecting there to be remainders and frictions.

We invited each conference participant explicitly for the knowledge, perspectives and experience they would bring to the discussions; not to seek agreement, but meaningful engagement. The conference design intended to gather this collective wisdom into graphic and word representations that could be used as reflective aides within the conference space and in this report in a re-mixed form, both as feedback (again) to the participants themselves and as a resource for a wider audience.

We partnered with Julie Gieseke, a Graphic Visualizer, to develop the conference process. Julie worked with CCREC on a 2014 conference that brought together community and digital activists, community-engaged scholars, and critical media scholars. Contentious conversations surfaced in the Generating Knowledge and Building Democratic Power through Community-Based Research and Digital Media conference, as we aimed to make visible and explicit the ways in which dynamics of race, class, gender, and language shape systems of injustice, even and especially in the promise of digital media as a tool for social change.

We anticipated that the Unsettling Research Ethics conference might be even more fraught, more difficult to hold as an open space for both deep engagement and sharp difference. We wanted to be deliberate and considerate about designing the conference to focus directly on value commitments that touched core parts of people’s professional and personal identities. We wanted our encounters and discussions to be as horizontal as possible to foster focused conversations and draw directly from the full-bodied knowledges and experiences present, while also acknowledging the colonial histories haunting our actual raced, classed, and gendered interactions, and even our relation to the land and other beings. Our process emphasized ongoing attention to the relational aspects of our gathering, hoping that a slower pace, ample interpersonal and social time, and casual shared meals would open possibilities for deep dialogue. We wanted our space and time together in the conference to be ceremonially and intentionally marked as one of mutual respect and shared responsibility.
CONVENING PARTICIPANTS

Our underwriting from the UC Center for Collaborative Research and the Spencer Foundation enabled us to defray much of the travel, hotel, and food costs for all participants. This support reinforced the dialogical conference process and provided a basis to ask all participants to be fully present for the intensive two-day conference. We held it as a great privilege and honor to convene this unique group, and we wanted to foster a respectful gathering. As we planned the structure and process, we also drew up an invitation list of people whose work intersected ours, whether directly on ethical matters or on methodological, epistemological, pedagogical, or political matters.

As their biographies indicate, our intergenerational gathering included scholars from a range of (inter/trans)-disciplinary and theoretical orientations – including anthropology, archeology, critical race and ethnic studies, black studies, computer science, education, feminist studies, geography, public health, sociology, and philosophy – as well as community leaders from multiple domains of social justice work, such as labor, race, women’s issues, immigration, and youth development. We included graduate students and emerging scholars, foundational scholars in research ethics and collaborative and community-based research, members of social science research associations’ committees on ethics, scholar-activists, and community leaders who have partnered with academics in collaborative research. Some participants arrived with existing connections with one another and/or with the CCREC network, while for most, the conference offered an opportunity to engage with one another for the first time.
CONVENING INVITERS

We selected inviters who had a line of thought that we found complementary to our own, or who had grappled deeply with a topic of interest to us in ways that moved us, and whose perspectives we could imagine woven together in relation to the framework we had developed about the ethics of knowledge, relationality, and space and time. We knew that if the inviters would allow us to see their own current landscape of thought that this would surely illuminate, challenge, and improve our work and that of the others attending.

CO-CONSTRUCTING KNOWLEDGE

We designed the conference discussions and space in ways that could document, at least in some words and pictures, the perspectives, questions, and contributions of everyone participating. We knew that our own shaping of the conference and whatever was offered by the group of inviters would give general contours and through-lines to what would be generated, but we designed opportunities for all participants to add to the collective dialogue as it unfolded and take it in unexpected or new directions. Whether in jotted notes on notecards or sticky notes that were generated in small group discussion activities in response to evocative questions posed by our inviters, or in whole-group discussions represented in words and simple images in real time by Julie Gieseke (whose work you will see throughout this report), conference participants were co-constructing knowledge and at the same time producing the documentation that became the basis for this report.
TENSIONS & CONTENTIONS

In conference discussions and activities, we wanted to open up regions in the ethics of research that generally are erased or marginalized within traditional conceptions of research ethics, and we wanted people to dwell with/in that openness. We regarded the very subject matter of what has been canonized to constitute the domain of research ethics as a contested question, and asked our inviters and participants to engage with/in a project of 'unsettling research ethics.' To unsettle research ethics involves questioning the assumptions, principles, and practices that shape the codification, institutionalization, and pedagogies of conventional research ethics today. It requires rethinking the historical moments and structuring of research ethics into specific institutional processes and procedures. We sought ways to pursue this work not only through discussion and words, but also through other forms of interaction and co-creation. For example, we created a 4’ X 16’ poster of a “Time-Scape” of Research Ethics (a modified timeline) to document key texts, policies, legal cases, pivotal ethical breeches, influential historical and cultural currents within the narrative of research ethics. We asked participants to contribute to these normative understandings of research ethics, and to consider adding untold or unrecognized moments, or other factors that they understood as contributing to a deep understanding of the complicated terrain of research ethics.

It is important to note that all of our careful preparation, and our efforts to create a horizontal open space for respectful engagement of differences, could not preclude the truth that our choices had particular origins and favored modes of expression, that they embodied particular ways that power and privilege move. The latent and explicit power structure of the conference, even in disrupting many dominant ideological hierarchies, nonetheless reproduced and produced its own particular fault lines, tensions, and refusals.

The fault lines, tensions, and refusals emerged from the opening intention circle and continued to the closing intention circle. They arose in response to the silence we asked to observe in order to receive the offering of each of the discussion inviters, when Reverend Buford noted its cultural imposition on him as he wanted to respond to an elder, Dr. Joyce King, with a voice of acclamation. They arose when a professor from an elite university protested that some of the conceptions of ethics being proffered were too demanding on one's daily life, and several people in the room critiqued and challenged her position, and when a white male elder unwittingly used objectifying language about indigenous communities and a Chicano activist scholar called him in while calling him out.
KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTION, GATHERING, & SHARING

Other fault lines, tensions, and refusals emerged in relation to the conference processes of knowledge production, and specifically in relation to our insufficient transparency about the ownership of what the gathering itself would produce. That is, questions were raised about the attribution of ideas in the general framework of the conference as well as within the graphic visualizations and other documentation. These matters of citation had a specific ethical urgency and salience that we needed to attend to in the moment, a reminder of the limits of anticipatory ethics and need for an iterative praxis open to challenge and shift.

In a sense, our collectivization of attribution through our “capture” of the conversation erased important previous genealogies, and it also erased the visibility of the specific interventions and contributions of the conference participants. Our citational practices had special ethical and political force among the academics at the conference, although the valence of these issues registered quite differently among some at the conference whose locus of work was elsewhere, as when a community leader questioned the point of an extended discussion of the colonial echoes and hauntings of the word “capture” and our intentions in its use. Precisely such complex, layered, deeply historical, and conflicted ethical relations lie at the center of research for justice.

In this Collaborative Conference Report we have hoped to be true to the embodied knowledge shared and generated among a distinctive and distinguished group of discussants over two days together in Santa Cruz, CA, in late February 2016. We appreciate the critical friends and colleagues who gave of themselves to dwell with us in an effort to Unsettle Research Ethics and to reimagine the formation of more ethical researchers who would be worthy of the needs of aggrieved communities. We have tried to be faithful to what we heard and recorded in our time together, and we hope our report reanimates the synergies as well as the fault lines, tensions, and refusals that emerged. The nature of those conversations and the limits of our ability to gather what was shared means that this report can offer only uneven tracing of particular voices, but we hope that the relational knowing shared in this collaborative report does honor to the people, time, and place of our gathering.

Natalie JK Baloy
Sheeva Sabati
Ronald David Glass
Day 1
Thursday
February 25, 2016

Breakfast, Mingling, & (Un)Mapping
Welcome and Introductions
Openings - Inviters: Ron Glass and Troy Richardson
Activating and Forecasting
The Ethics of Knowledge - Inviters: Joyce King and Rena Lederman
Lunch
The Ethics of Relationality - Inviters: Diane Fujino and Kisha Supernant
Reflections and Synthesis Stations
Dinner & Dessert Reception

Day 2
Friday
February 26, 2016

Breakfast, Mingling, and (Un)Mapping
Welcome Back & Reflections on Day 1
The Ethics of Space and Time
Inviters: Richa Nagar and Caitlin Cahill
Lunch
Gallery Walk: Aha’s and Hmm’s
Table Discussions: Knowledge, Relationality, Space & Time
Afternoon Plenary: Synthesis and Futurities - George Lipsitz
Reflections & Takeaways
Closing Circle

Schedule
FACILITATION & FRAMINGS

Co-facilitators Natalie Baloy and Sheeva Sabati welcomed and thanked participants for the efforts they made to attend the conference. They expressed their enthusiasm for the gathering, highlighting the richness in the diversity of experiences and knowledges of each participant. “We see this conference as an opportunity to think together carefully.”

Natalie opened with an acknowledgement that we had gathered on occupied Indigenous lands, specifically the lands of the Amah Mutsun and Awaswas-speaking peoples. This recognition of territory and the histories that shape the present-lived experiences of ourselves and others was also an entry-point to begin to think about the conceptual framework that the Ethics Team had developed in their work and utilized to structure the conference. That is, ethical tensions, opportunities, and questions cannot be untangled from what is considered and (institutionally) legitimized as Knowledge, that ethics is negotiated within our enactments, disruptions, and critical stances towards socially constructed forms of power in our Relationality, and that ethicality is also carried through the ways we organize, work within, and in relation to Space & Time.

Natalie invited participants to think of the gathering as entering into a temporary community. “The vibrancy and creativity of our engagements will depend on our contributions into this space.” She described various modes of participation and engagement that the Ethics Team had built into the conference design, including silent and written reflection, listening and reading, small and large group discussion, graphic visualizations of the collective conversations, as well as mapping varying perspectives through interactive activities.

GROUP AGREEMENTS

These agreements were created by the CCREC Ethics Team and shared by the facilitators during the opening

Be present
• Cellphones on silent and in minimal use
• Engage with one another critically, openly and generously

Be thoughtful about how much space you’re taking and how you’re showing up
• Take turns
• Practice active listening
• Be self-reflexive about your privileges, positions, and positionality

Participate in creating an intentional AND impactful space
• Communicate respectfully and with care toward others
• Be accountable for the impacts you have on others, even if unintentional
• Respect people’s self-identity and un/gender pronouns

Care for the collective
• Minimize “But what about MY specific interest?” framings to dwell in spaces of intersections together
• Introduce yourself by name until everyone knows one another

Take care of your needs
• Take breaks as needed
• Communicate to group and/or facilitators if you feel an issue needs to be addressed

Sheeva continued to set the tone by sharing another intention of the facilitation team as, “shaping a learning environment that allows for honest, deep, difficult discussions that retain respectful relations no matter how sharp any disagreement.” She also pointed out that the conference brought together people from across disciplines, theoretical frameworks, various professional and institutional contexts, and visions of social justice. As Sheeva elaborated, “we have tried to create structures to facilitate conversations across these and many other dimensions, and we realize that this is a big ask. We hope that you’ll stay with us and each other.”

Finally, Natalie and Sheeva shared their desire to facilitate conversations that maintained generative tensions between pragmatism/strategy/practice and (re)visioning/ideals/ theory. They encouraged participants to be open to all, and to dwell along these spectra in different ways throughout the gathering. “Thank you for being present here with us and with each other, and for your critical, generous, and open engagement.”

FACILITATOR RESPONSIBILITIES

Take the time we need but also keep the process moving

Create a space for intellectual engagement, care, and mutual respect

Shape discussion format to give space to what matters to this group
OPENINGS

DWELLING WITH/IN THE ETHICS OF RESEARCH
Ron Glass

"Why have we invited you here? What do we hope to accomplish together?" Ron Glass asked at the start of the conference. "Why did CCREC set as a task the unsettling of the ethics of research, at least as it is framed within the institutionalization of the ethical review of research?"

Ron opened the Unsettling Research Ethics convening with a brief history of CCREC and the CCREC Ethics Project, situating the conference in a broader sociohistorical context within and beyond the academy. He explained that CCREC was founded in 2009 in part to provide clarification of the ethical and epistemic foundations of the coalescing field of equity-oriented, collaborative, community-based research. He noted that certain forms of this engaged scholarship appeared to run afoul of core principles of research ethics (such as the need to obtain informed consent prior to participation, and to insure anonymity and confidentiality for informants), and even of certain disciplinary epistemic standards (perhaps not even qualifying as research according to some critics). Moreover, other critics claimed that participatory or action research violated the academic values of disinterested research and neutrality in the public sphere by pursuing ideological or political agendas.

Other scholars point to the violence done to aggrieved communities by generations of researchers who have perpetuated an array of epistemic injustices through what counts as knowledge, who counts as knowledge holders, and whose interests and questions drive research agendas.

“The history of the academic disciplines is not a simple or pure one, and their descriptions of the human and of reality have the power to exclude, dehumanize, and cause widespread harms that can endure even for centuries,” Ron stated. “These kinds of concerns led many engaged scholars to pursue equity-oriented, collaborative, and community-based research as an ethical corrective to academic traditions. But this intention easily obscures the ways in which even these forms of knowledge production are ethically fraught.”

At CCREC, Ron recalled, “We were interested in this constellation of issues not only because of the light cast on the ethical issues in research more generally, but also in light of their connection to increasingly urgent challenges to the entire regime of Institutional Review Boards and the apparatus constructed with the stated aim of protecting human beings from the research predations of the powerful.”

Examining this situation closely, Ron argued, “one can discern ethics ‘all the way down’ and ‘all the way out’. In fact, even the traditional distinction between ethics and epistemology becomes problematic. One sees that the ethics of research does not begin or end in some sort of transaction that gets memorialized in a document, but actually the ethics of research is embedded in ongoing relationships that extend beyond any moment of decision or agreement. These remaining and persisting ethical relations point to the ways that research takes place in specific places and times, with particular bodies and peoples. The ethicality of the practice is not found in the righteousness of decisions or actions, but in the open engagement with the thickness of our ethical predicaments.”

Ron continued, “We have asked you here to dwell with us with the findings of our research.” He explained that CCREC researchers had conducted more than 50 in-depth interviews, reviewed research articles across the social sciences and other fields, and considered the issues raised in relation to philosophical ethics and traditional forms of protection of human subjects of research.

“Our analysis of this material led us to organize the ethics of research into the ethics of knowledge, relationality, and time/space,” Ron explained. “Our understanding of ethics led us to consider how we might draw researchers into a sustained staying with ethical issues, rather than seeing them as matters only to be addressed periodically, or ‘when there’s an issue’.”
“We have invited you here to think, feel, and be with us as we try to imagine and create a new approach to teaching the ethics of research. We know that little guidance will come from institutional review boards, as shown by the continuing gaps and false assumptions in the revisions to the Common Rule. We have asked you here as friendly and knowledgeable critics, colleagues, allies. We want to explore a pedagogy of ethics.”

Ron offered and outlined “dwelling with/in the ethics of research” as an alternative approach for ethical formation and praxis (see inset). He invited participants to dwell together in the ethical domains of knowledge, relationality, and space and time.

Ron concluded by inviting participants to collectively reflect on pedagogies of ethical formation. “Clearly ethical cultivation is not straightforward. Good parents do not guarantee children who are good. Good teachers do not guarantee students who are good. Our own good judgments and intentions do not even guarantee that we do the good we know to be the good.” He asked, “What elicits ethical formation?”

He outlined three views on ethical formation from classical Chinese philosophers:

- **Meng Tzu**: humans have a weak natural tendency toward goodness that must be cultivated through self-reflection and practice, respecting parents, elders, teachers, and ritual

- **Hsun Tzu**: humans have a strong natural tendency toward badness that must be forcefully corrected by parents, elders, and teachers through strict enforcement of rules and rigid adherence to ritual

- **Chuang Tzu**: humans can individually attend to and pursue the dao or ordered Way of the universe and when this alignment is sufficiently attuned in skilled practices then goodness emerges naturally

“Where do you stand?” Ron asked. “Where should we stand as professionals responsible for preparing new generations of scholars? Thank you, again, for coming here to provide guidance for us as we seek to develop a pedagogical framework and approach to enable researchers to stay with the ethical in their persons and work.”

**DWELLING WITH/IN THE ETHICS OF RESEARCH**

This staying with, tarrying, lingering over… this thinking, speaking, writing, being with in a sustained way… This is the dwelling we seek.

It is not dwelling in the search for certainty, but rather in the search for clarity, for understanding. The ethical practice we seek does not bestow righteousness. It only provides a way in, a way to stay with, a way to find direction enough to carry the work forward a bit…

Dwelling with ethics is no guarantee of any sort. In fact, some dwelling might even be ethically problematic. One meaning of dwell is to reside or live in a specified place. We will dwell here in this Paradoxical space over the next two days. But this can convey a false neutrality to dwelling, when dwelling itself has an ethical valence; we can dwell where uninvited, where we don’t belong.

One can also dwell too long with something that is a source of pain, which can provoke unhappiness, anxiety, dissatisfaction. Sometimes we need to move on.

Sometimes dwell can be used in the sense of seeking refuge. This perhaps captures the ethical seeking we are after, if you can imagine a refuge that does not provide comfort exactly. This is an ethical refuge that stays with the nearly unbearable burdens of history, of our own limits and shortcomings. This is a refuge of compassion, for ourselves and others so caught up in so much that is so unethical, violent, and so far short of our ideals.

There is another sense of dwell that comes from mechanical engineering, and it defines a regular moment of motionless in the midst of a motion.

This is the stillness while still moving we seek in this time and space with you, in this dwelling with you for the next two days.
TENSIONS IN RESEARCH ETHICS & CURRENT MODELS OF THEORY OF MIND

Troy Richardson

Ron introduced Troy Richardson by expressing his appreciation for Troy’s contributions in some recent collaborative writing on the ethics of research, particularly his engagement with the burdens of being human through Gayatri Spivak’s notion of the ‘native informant.’ Ron also expressed his appreciation for Troy’s willingness and capacity to speak with the group despite his exhaustion, having just arrived at the conference after a night virtually without sleep because of delayed flights and missed ground transportation connections. Tired as he was, Troy generously gathered himself and his thoughts, and we have presented his comments as filtered through more elaborated reflections that he later wrote.

Troy entered the task of unsettling research ethics through a juxtaposition of the philosophies of human relations embedded in much of the philosophical canon to recent theory of mind (ToM) research in neuro-psychology and cognitive neuroscience focused on brain states and empathy. He wondered if this research could contribute to creating conditions for ethical relationships. How should philosophical approaches to ethics concerned with research with minoritized communities engage with ‘hard’ sciences insofar as they study how neural networks process information activated in ‘making sense of others?’ Troy noted his own initial skepticism about the assumptions underlying this sense of ‘human’ ‘mind’ and ‘others’ but nonetheless worked to systematically analyze a ToM approach to social relationships, the formation of justified true belief, and the emergence of ethics.

Troy observed that “clinical research on empathy can obscure and work against a historical perspective that names and elaborates contexts of trauma based on discrimination due to race, class, gender, sexual orientation.” In other words, to enable empathy and the ethical relations among people that empathy seems to imply, Troy thus calls for engagements with the historical experiences, inherited legacies, and negative outcomes that emerge from the social hierarchies that are produced and organized through the colonial/modern period. Yet clinical ToM research does not attend to such histories.

Troy also worried that the enormous financial and institutional resources consumed in ToM research does not attend to such historical structures, and thus maintains very specific patterns in the production of legitimate knowledges whose intended and unintended effects delegitimize alternative conceptions of ethics and diminish the specific, historically concrete situations of social and economic inequality. Even so, Troy thought this clinical research was worth considering more closely since it raised important questions for some overly speculative philosophical discourses on epistemology and ethics, and also revealed the dynamics of the coloniality of power and how it reinforces positions of historical marginalization.

In ToM studies, researchers using functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) (see: Saxe, 2005, 2006, 2009, 2012) investigate the regions of the brain most active when a person is provided narratives and asked to interpret the beliefs of a character and the subsequent actions the character takes based on those beliefs. There are several regions of the brain most active in responding to these tasks and they have collectively become known as the ToM regions. More specifically the ToM regions are used when people “infer and reason about another person’s state of mind” (Saxe, 2009, 401), and thus may “offer a rare window through the brain to the mind” (2009, 407). Perhaps most interesting, from Troy’s perspective, is that while language is necessary
during the development of the ToM network, it does not seem to be necessary for mature ToM functioning; moreover, Saxe further reveals how these regions are “completely distinct, anatomically, from the brain regions implicated in action execution or action perception” (2009, 407).

Troy noted that if a mature ToM network is indeed central to reasoning about other people’s minds, and it “is linked neither to language nor to concrete sensori-motor foundations” then it represents a “profound disruption of the traditions – whether Marxist, existentialist, phenomenological or theological – I have relied on in teaching, formulating or interrogating empathy or ethics.” Troy goes on to ask, “How are empathy and the implied questions of ethical relations re-situated if a mature ToM network is operating something like a background program – activated when needed and processing data apart from current ‘inputs’ of language and concrete foundations?”

Troy believes that the ToM network may be a provocative and useful locus for a research program, but to get a better sense of this potential value he echoes a longstanding concern that much greater transparency is needed about the racialized, gendered, and economic locations of the research subjects whose brains were investigated. In addition, Troy finds a lack of reflexivity in the literature about how the research apparatus of cognitive neuroscience fosters historiographies and forms of knowledge production that secure and advance dominant social and economic interests that may in fact undermine the well-being of disadvantaged minoritized groups.

In such a circumstance ToM research not only further entrenches certain forms of social and economic power, it also provides only “a paltry, even if clinically rigorous way of engaging the question of empathic relations.” He contrasted this with educational research in minoritized communities that regularly gives a historical context for and an account of the social and economic conditions that precede contemporary successes and challenges for teaching, learning, curriculum development, school achievement and so on. These accounts, Troy maintains, “provide a certain ‘structure of feeling’ wherein
empathy could have a more robust starting point than that of ToM; then, when coupled pedagogically with role playing, perspective taking and simulation, these historically situated ‘structures of feeling’ can provide rich opportunities in facilitating empathic relations.”

“From the perspective of the scholarship of decolonial theorists, what transpires in this ToM research is nothing less than an ongoing coloniality of power wherein the racialized, classed, gendered and normalized sexual orientation hierarchies that mark the colonial/modern era are further entrenched precisely through knowledge production that elides its responsibility in naming and situating its accrued socio-political and economic power to create the normative discourse of empathy and by extension ethics.”

Troy used this example of the ToM research to bring conference participants into understanding how the “coloniality of knowledge” is reenacted through some modes of inquiry. Through concepts such as neuro-psychology, the modes of asking questions, and the analytics used to understand and interpret findings, the underlying assumptions of even some of the most legitimated forms of knowledge production obscure the very materiality of the social inequity and power they reinforce. Thus our own efforts to approach ethical issues more critically must be understood to be emerging alongside and in contention with these other emergent accounts of ethics, empathy, minds, and the human itself.

Troy asked if it was possible and what it might mean to have richer forms of ToM research that, “simultaneously lay bare how the field is located in the nexus of social and economic power, and describe how privilege and trauma do or do not impact brain region activation and the neural and other mirror networks under scrutiny in these studies.” Troy invited participants to enter into the conference by interrogating how the coloniality of knowledge structures research in these sorts of deep and complex ways, and what this means for what might even be considered as ethical research. Rather than abandoning research as an enterprise, Troy asks how we can utilize the very tools of cognitive neuro-science knowledge systems as part of decolonization. How might “we arrive at a mode of clinical research that begins to understand itself as decolonizing and disruptive of its own social and economic privilege?” How might differing understandings of being human, and the ethical burdens of our relations with others, be joined?

Troy’s References


To ritually open the conference space, Ron invited participants to stand together in a large circle. “Natalie, Sheeva, Julie, and I have shaped our time together with intention,” he said. “We want time and space for compassion and understanding to accompany deep and honest engagement across differences. We are honored that you have responded to our call to Unsettle Research Ethics with your presence. What a simply amazing assemblage of people are in this circle!”

Ron explained that we are starting from a place of ritual to mark a transition. “Each of us brings much to the circle, much in the way of wisdom and experience, and much in the way of the joys and sorrows of our days. Each of us also necessarily leaves much out of this circle, the loved ones left behind and awaiting our return, the traces and memories of our families and peoples that reside invisible and unspoken in every gesture and word. This circle marks the transition from these scattered, diverse, individual and familial pathways into this shared and collectively created experience, a new beginning. As we mark this transition together, mark it also for yourself.”

Ron then offered a series of reflective questions, prompts, and pauses to invite participants into this transitional ritual moment. “What do you need to do to be present, to be co-present, to be attentive and open to yourself and to others? … Maybe you need to breathe more deeply, or shift your stance, as you arrive here and become present, become co-present…. Now that we have focused our presence and centered our bodies, we can better sense what is in-between us, the connections and disconnections, the opportunities and the risks. Just as our own lives are fraught, but we can still find stillness and be present, so these spaces are fraught, but also open to stillness and co-presence. Settled and unsettled, and everything in between. To be still, and still moving, that is the place of dwelling. Be here and create together this space, this time together. We will be staying with, being with, each other, accompanying one another. Present and co-present. Still and still moving.”

Once everyone entered this reflective space, Ron asked a new set of questions to encourage participants to consider their intentions for the days ahead. “What intentions in your person and work move you to be here? Whom will you think of first if you have some new insight? Or feel some familiar edge or gap that opens old wounds? What wisdom of theirs guides your intentions? What intentions are you bringing to our work together, to taking responsibility for our dwelling together?” Ron paused at length, then asked participants to draw from their reflections a single word. We all paused to identify our word. “Now,” Ron explained, “We will each regard one another in turn, face to face. Each person should say to the other only your one word that you are holding. The speaking constraint is the only one in relation to how you regard one another as you move around the circle. These are words of intention that will shape our dwelling together over the next two days.” Ron then turned to his left to face Kisha, standing beside him. He shared his word and then continued around the circle, with Kisha and all participants moving around the circle to face the person on their left, until each participant had encountered every other person present. Some found it challenging to speak only their word; others asked for clarification or elaboration. Eventually, we ended up back in our circle - “a circle renewed for a new beginning.”
What intentions in your person and work move you to be here?

Whom will you think of first if you have some new insight? Or feel some familiar edge or gap that opens old wounds? What wisdom of theirs guides your intentions?

What intentions are you bringing to our work together?

Pause now to reflect on your own intentions for this beginning… Please draw from those intentions a single word.

Hold that word.

Now we will each regard one another in turn, face to face. Each person should say to the other only your one word that you are holding.

These are words of intention that will shape our dwelling together over the next two days.
Ethics of Knowledge
Forecasting Knowledge

On the morning of Day 1, the knowledge group surfaced these themes and questions for us to address in our two days together:

- Knowledge as property
  - Appropriation of knowledge
  - The transformation of knowledge into knowledge products
  - Who owns, controls, and benefits from knowledge

- Engaged research as different ways of knowing/learning

- Whose knowledge is heard?
  - Who defines what ‘counts’ as knowledge?
  - Invisibility of certain kinds of knowledges

- What is valued as knowledge?
  - Dialogo de saberes

- ‘Rules’ of knowledge
  - Who has access to teaching knowledge processes? to learning knowledge processes?

- Understanding limitations of knowledge gleaned
  - Not all knowledge to be shared or made public

- Researchers’ capital as ‘knowers’ whereas researched are to be ‘known’
  - Responsible dissemination

- Different forms of knowledge
  - Differences between ‘western’ and ‘indigenous’ knowledge

- Knowledge distinct from information

- What & whose purpose does knowledge serve?
  - Empty/uncritical or thoughtless knowledge – counted as knowledge

- When does knowledge become wisdom?

- Whose knowledge is heard?
  - Who defines what ‘counts’ as knowledge?

- Invisibility of certain kinds of knowledges

- What is valued as knowledge?
  - Dialogo de saberes

- ‘Rules’ of knowledge
  - Who has access to teaching knowledge processes? to learning knowledge processes?

- Understanding limitations of knowledge gleaned
  - Not all knowledge to be shared or made public

- Researchers’ capital as ‘knowers’ whereas researched are to be ‘known’
  - Responsible dissemination

- Different forms of knowledge
  - Differences between ‘western’ and ‘indigenous’ knowledge

- Knowledge distinct from information
Joyce King situated her invitation to unsettle research ethics historically, within the Black Studies intellectual tradition, which she personalized by discussing her scholar/activist journey toward liberatory research practice. Her intention was to draw attention to research and ethics beyond epistemological nihilation, the concept she introduced in her 2014 American Educational Research Association presidential address, as a moral obligation of liberation-oriented social science and the vocation of the emancipatory researcher.

Joyce’s invitation to dwell on the “Ethics of Knowledge” was informed by her commitment to morally engaged research-as-pedagogy, an approach to scholarly activism that challenges what Orlando Fals-Borda described as the “mask of objectivity” and the “wig of neutrality” in social research—from the perspective of her community. Thus, in Joyce’s work this means recovering knowledge to affirm racial dignity and dismantle the anti-Black Afrophobia of epistemological nihilation.

The concept of epistemological nihilation follows from Sylvia Wynter’s theoretical analyses of the predominate episteme of race. Wynter (1990) derives the term “nihilated” from the French word “néantisé” and its root “néant,” which means the total denial that something exists. Nihilation refers to the negation, total abjection or denial of one’s being; it does not mean annihilation. Indeed, the inherent duality of white supremacy racism depends for its legitimacy upon such denigration (e.g., the “nigger-ization” of the dominated and the zombification of those induced to identify with the dominators—of whatever social identity), whether intentional or not.

Joyce E. King holds the Benjamin E. Mays Endowed Chair for Urban Teaching, Learning and Leadership at Georgia State University, where she is also Professor of Educational Policy Studies and affiliated Faculty in African American Studies and the Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Institute. She holds degrees from Stanford University and a Harvard Graduate School Education Management Certificate. She served as Provost at Spelman College, and is past-President of the American Educational Research Association. Dr. King’s scholarship analyzes how dysconsciousness, a term that she introduced, is produced by miseducating mainstream curricula and resists a critically transformative understanding of race and racialized inequity.
Joyce offered several examples of racially affirming knowledge that counter hegemonic conceptual frameworks, noting Black academics who have partnered with and help to mobilize community people or who write about Black working class epistemology in Black cultural expression, and she explained how her own research functions as pedagogical activism. As an illustration, she presented her book (with Carolyn A. Mitchell), Black Mothers to Sons: Juxtaposing African American Literature with Social Practice.

Joyce’s book demonstrated the need to rewrite suppressed knowledge of struggle for human freedom from the perspective of the oppressed, culturally indigenous knowledge holders whose identity and agency are negated—epistemologically nihilated—in ideological narratives that diminish the people’s humanity. Such narratives affect the dominators and the dominated as well. As noted Mississippi Rap Artist, David Banner, said: “Our situation is more psychological than people will admit. Black kids kill black kids for the same reason cops do. They see no value” (YouTube link).

Joyce discussed the importance of the false narrative about the Civil Rights movement: “Rosa Parks was tired—and her feet hurt.” This version of the Montgomery bus boycott has long dominated school textbooks and popular consciousness.

The actual history of what happened in Montgomery contradicts the myth that Mrs. Parks was just tired when she refused to give up her seat on a segregated bus. This myth erases Mrs. Parks’ record of activism and the agency and experiences of other courageous resistance in this community — as exemplified by the teenager Claudette Colvin’s arrest for her earlier refusal to give up her seat on a Montgomery bus.

Movement planners—led by Professor JoAnn Robinson, president of the Negro Women’s Political Council, circulated their critically analytical call-to-action to engage the Black community in collective resistance to Jim Crow terror, brutalization and dehumanization (Levine, 2000).
“Another Negro woman has been arrested and thrown in jail because she refused to get up out of her seat on the bus for a white person to sit down. It is the second time since the Claudette Colvin case that a Negro woman has been arrested for the same thing. This has to be stopped. Negroes have rights too, for if Negroes did not ride the buses, they could not operate. Three fourths of the riders are Negroes, yet we are arrested, or have to stand up over empty seats. The next time it may be you or your daughter, or mother. . . We are asking every Negro to stay off the buses Monday in protest . . .” - President JoAnn Robinson’s flyer, Negro Women’s Political Council, 1955

Joyce talked about how this call challenged epistemological nihilation—the negation of the dignity and humanity of Black people. Yet the dehumanization continues. The Negro Women’s Political Council’s bold declaration of resistance: “This has to be stopped!” is as relevant today as it was in 1955.

However, research ethics that supports inquiry-based anti-colonial knowledge production that affirms racial dignity and consciousness is complicated by Afrophobia, the particular ways our...
society responds when Black people assert our cultural heritage and group identity as a human right. This includes the history of scholarly denial and marginalization that activist scholars like DuBois, Woodson and others have experienced (Morris, 2015). The historical record demonstrates that this essentially anti-African epistemology is deeply implicated in the societal thought, in the social sciences, as well as education at all levels, including educational preparation for research, teaching and academic scholarship (Dagbovie, 2012; King, 2011). As Go (2016) notes: "the cost of such marginalization is not simply an ethical one, it is an epistemic one. And it is one that sociology cannot afford."

Another example Joyce presented is research on traditional knowledge about Puluwat navigation and identity in Micronesia. When she served on the California Curriculum Commission, she suggested including this extraordinary example of traditional knowledge of ocean-going navigation in California's science curriculum and textbooks. This knowledge (worldview and ontology) is explored in the documentary film, “Sacred Vessels: Navigating Tradition and Identity in Micronesia,” produced by Micronesian scholar, Vincent M. Diaz:

... [Sacred Vessels] follows a new generation of traditional outrigger canoe builders and navigators from Polowat, Central Carolines, Federated States of Micronesia, and Guam in their respective efforts to continue and resuscitate an ancient tradition of outrigger canoe carving and sailing in the late twentieth century. Like the motif of water that flows through the documentary and blurs lines between surface and depth, and between water, land and air, an indefatigable tradition and aesthetic of seafaring is shown to also challenge pat and problematic distinctions between past and present, tradition and modernity, indigenous and Christian religiosity and spirituality, that prevail in conventional understandings of Micronesian culture and history... (https://youtu.be/I7nXev2Jt7g).

However, her suggestion to include this knowledge tradition in the California science curriculum was forcefully rebuffed with a culturally nihilating Eurocratic response: “That's not science; it's religion!” In response, Joyce offered Bonilla-Silva’s observation for us to contemplate: “When whiteness becomes normative, it works like God, in mysterious ways” (Bonilla-Silva, 2008, p. 12).

"It is the racist who creates his inferior." (Fanon 1965:93)

While it may not have occurred to the neo-plantation school of social science, working-class Blacks have their own epistemology, their own theory of social change, and their own theories of class and ethnic depravity. In order to construct societies based on social and economic [and racial] justice, a new form of consciousness must emerge.”

Clyde Woods on the Blues Epistemology in Development Arrested
Joyce concluded her discussion with several questions and invitations to dwell, emphasizing Charles Mills’ insistence on thinking “against the grain”:

> [O]ne has to learn to trust one’s own cognitive powers, to develop one’s own concepts, insights, modes of explanation, overarching theories and, to oppose the epistemic hegemony of conceptual frameworks designed in part to thwart and suppress the exploration of such matters, one has to think against the grain. (*Mills 1997: 119*)

What kinds of inquiry methods and approaches can enable community research partners not just to participate in describing social reality, but also to foster the historical consciousness, collective memory and group belonging that oppressed people, and Black people in particular, need in order to challenge and transform societal oppression?

Can research ethics and practice contribute to liberation from the epistemological nihilation and “white logic and white methods” (*Zuberi & Bonilla-Silva, 2008*) embedded in mainstream social research?

What is the role for allies in epistemological liberation? Are there implications for graduate student education and research training, as well as the orientation community researchers need to participate with academics as full-fledged partners in societal transformation?
Rena began her invitation by connecting to Joyce’s evocation of Colombian sociologist Orlando Fals Borda, who used the “mask of objectivity” and the “wig of neutrality” as metaphors to describe mainstream sociological research. Conventional social science claims to objectivity and neutrality are themselves neither neutral nor objective. Instead, those claims reflect often-unstated (masked, bewigged) judgments concerning better and worse ways of knowing; and making them is not just an “epistemic intervention, but an ethical intervention,” Rena stated, as it “changes the valences of our knowledge-making relationships.” By relocating “our intellectual centers and margins,” we might move “beyond what Joyce terms ‘epistemological nihilation’” towards more pluralistic ways of knowing.

But this is “easier said than done!” Rena exclaimed. “The ‘mask’ and ‘wig’ are Super-Glued in place by the typical approval processes of Institutional Review Boards (IRBs),” which reassess objective and neutral knowledge-making as the “ethical standard,” constraining the contexts in which academically-based researchers do their work. As Rena argued, IRB regulations could exclude the review of certain social research methods, particularly those that, “identify their intellectual value and ethical legitimacy with intersubjective communication among social agents.” Instead, these boards often construe such relational methods of knowledge production as “intellectually incompetent or ethically bad (or both),” and press for changes that align the research with the “objectivist ideal.”

That is, “research-ethics regulators are ‘set up’ to privilege objectivizing epistemologies; consciously or not, their oversight activities epitomize ‘epistemological nihilation,’” Rena thus invited participants to consider the “ethical and epistemological double-binds that research ethics regulation imposes on the already exquisitely challenging ethics of engaged social-justice research.” Those challenges are shared with a broader “landscape of humanistic research and writing styles that variously acknowledge the relational sources of our understanding of human experiences,” and that take seriously the task of not objectifying research collaborators.

For the past two decades, Rena Lederman has conducted comparative research on academic disciplinary cultures and hierarchies, focusing on ethico-methodological differences and similarities. A sociocultural anthropologist by training, Dr. Lederman also studies the impacts of federal research ethics regulations on the conduct and teaching of ethnographic fieldwork specifically. Dr. Lederman has served on Princeton University’s Institutional Review Board for many years representing ethnography, and co-chaired the American Anthropological Association ethics committee in the 1990s. She teaches a wide variety of graduate and undergraduate courses, and has developed ethics-in-context courses at both levels utilizing feminist/critical pedagogies.
Rena asked participants to “reflect on how you normally use the term ‘knowledge,’” in order to dwell within what she described as a “doubled question: (who says) what counts as knowledge?” For Rena, “what counts as knowledge” signals the need to “pluralize the very idea of epistemological standing as a step in countering ‘epistemological nihilation.’” The “who says” part of her question is a reminder “not to treat ‘knowledge’ as an externalized object, a fetish (in the Marxian sense).” Rena offered the social science idea of ‘data’ as one “key example of fetishistic knowledge,” that is, values whose usefulness depends on detachment from their sources, and knowledge in which the stripping of specificity (a barrier to “generalizability”) is not only desired but prioritized.

For Rena then, asking “who says?” is a shorthand “for keeping the socially-embedded, relational sources of knowledge in view, along with related questions about authorship, control, and agency.”

And who is Rena Lederman? To be consistent with her own prompt, Rena situated herself as a sociocultural anthropologist who initially conducted fieldwork on “gender, exchange, and sociopolitical relations in highland Papua New Guinea.” Her first publication in 1980 was entitled “Who speaks here?” resonating with the questions with which she continues to engage, despite the new sites where she focuses this analysis. Her research on IRBs was an unintended shift, emerging in part from her IRB service, when she observed how “specialists in one field would all too readily misrecognize the conventions of other fields as actionably lousy versions of their own, instead of something “other” about which to be respectfully curious.” Rena’s IRB service became a site for fieldwork into the “ethico-epistemological differences and engagements among academic knowledge cultures.”

For around 15 years, Rena has focused her study on the “processes and impacts of ethics regulation itself, and a basis for advocacy on behalf of ethnography and other relational knowledge practices.” Since IRBs must also engage with these doubled questions, and researchers must seek IRB approval for their research, Rena understands IRBs as both knowledge and ethics gatekeepers. Too often, IRBs encourage researchers to reduce the “messily uncontrolled intersubjective relations of knowing to researcher-controlled, abstractable ‘data.’” Rena is concerned with “the destructive double binds faced by anti-objectivist researchers of all kinds,” as they must work within these conditions to get their own projects approved and as they struggle to communicate “an ethics of engaged knowing to the next generation.”

Rena invited participants to consider how institutional regulations thus come to shape the teaching of ethics to future researchers. She asked college and university- affiliated participants to reflect on “how we’ve accommodated, or by-passed, or confronted” the constraint of IRBs in “our own work and in the education of researchers-in-training.”
Rena believes that critical social researchers need “our own means for research ethics oversight if we’re ever to have space to focus squarely on the knotty dilemmas of engaged and relationally implicated research, particularly when it comes to our students.” This has not always been Rena’s position, and she attributed this shift to her experiences on several scales, from work on her own and other campuses, as well as from her service on national policy-writing panels and other work on behalf of her professional association. For Rena, these “policy-oriented encounters have convinced me that ethics boards are too fraught a forum for cultivating mutual understanding across paradigmatic epistemological differences.” She advocated instead for autonomy, appealing to “the widely respected principle of professional self-regulation.”

Rena described the task of “defending ethnography and engaged, critical knowledges” as the cultivation of “skillful mutual translation” or what she’s also described as “ethico-epistemological multilingualism.” At minimum, she believes in resisting the “ultimately self-contradictory goal of settling on any one true standard for warranting knowledge claims.” She closed with a note of critical self-reflexivity, acknowledging that, as an anthropologist, it may be “easy” for her to make such statements. But in Rena’s words, “learning to trade peacefully and productively in a world of plural academic and public knowledges is a challenge worth struggling for.”

**RENA LEDERMAN’S INVITATION**

I invite you to reflect on how you normally use this session’s key term — “knowledge” — to dwell with a doubled question: (who says) what counts as knowledge? (That is, “what counts as knowledge?” and “who says?”)

**Rena’s Invitations to Dwell**

How have you accommodated, by-passed, or confronted the constraints of IRBs, in your research and in the education of researchers in training? What can we learn from the various impacts we in this room have experienced in our critical social research (and education)?
Following Joyce and Rena’s invitations, participants continued to engage in conversations regarding the ethics of knowledge in small groups at each table. Participants were assigned new tables for the Knowledge, Relationality, and Space & Time discussions to circulate participants for new perspectives and sharing.

Rather than offering answers or resolutions, these conversations were structured to open up space for participants to engage the invitations and raise additional questions.

Each small group table had the opportunity to share a few key words and questions from their conversation to the entire group in the collective discussion at the close of the ethics of knowledge session.

Here are some of the questions that emerged...

- How to use enclaves to change structures?
- What would substantive principled practices look like?
- How do we bring our values to make intentional policy shifts?
- Can we start with a question that comes from community?
- Who determines what knowledge is?...Power & evidence...What counts as research?
KNOWLEDGE WITH COMMUNITY

How do we not romanticize the community and stay true to the heterogeneity?

What are overlaps of empathy and solidarity in terms of doing research with, and/for, communities?

Do Institutional Review Boards protect institutions and researchers, perhaps preventing community engagement with ethics?

TENSIONS OF THE ACADEMY & INSTITUTIONS

How do we make ourselves, as academics, irrelevant over time?

How can we cultivate an ethical culture of knowledge production in view of competing professional demands?

How do we fracture/fissure institutional constraints to create space for the legitimacy of various knowledge systems?

KNOWLEDGES IN PRACTICE AND IN POLICIES

How can we unsettle assessment mechanisms and disrupt hierarchies of knowing? Should this even be a goal? Will hierarchies always re-present themselves?

How can communities be directly involved in deciding and translating ethical research policies and practices to declare what is ethical?

What can get ignored or foreclosed when we talk about Institutional Review Boards too soon?

THEORIES OF KNOWLEDGE

What is the ontological status of numbers?

Is community-based engaged research even more rigorous than other forms of research, or is it merely different from it?

What is the distinction between knowledge, information, data, and propaganda? What constitutes evidence and evidence-based research?

What are the roles of using refusals and not capitulations to imagine what is beyond ethics of epistemological nihilation?
On the second day, participants distributed themselves into three large groups around the ethics of knowledge, relationality, and space and time.

Participants in the ethics of knowledge group engaged in a challenging and intimate conversation, grappling primarily with the tensions around the colonality of western knowledges that dominate the academy, the settler colonial logics of the university as institutions, and still, the inability of some participants to understand how these materialities might impact their research and teaching.

The conversation moved across many domains substantively. Some of the themes that might characterize aspects of the conversation include: desires for critical understanding and engagement, inability to let go of white or normative epistemologies, radical patience, vulnerability, the complexity of translating across disciplines, intergenerational dialogue, and respectful critical engagement.

The following points were offered in the large-group share outs to synthesize the group’s conversation as the salient points regarding considerations of the ethics of knowledge:

The who of knowledge production: these structures are within us. How do we come to embody different epistemologies?

To whom are we answerable, in and outside academia?

Context & particularities of knowledge: knowledge is not about abstraction. Specificity of histories, lands, people, matter.

Decolonization of knowledge requires centering white normative, epistemologies and (bio)ethics.
Ethics of Relationality
On the morning of Day 1, the relationality group surfaced these themes and questions for us to address in our two days.
Diane Fujino invited participants to consider the importance of developing relationships in ways that allow us to be surprised in our collaborations. She also explored how conceptualizing constructs such as race and gender, or the academy and community, as relational opens up possibilities toward understanding constructs as mutually constitutive, rather than oppositional. Reflecting on relational race and gender analysis, Diane referred to Natalie Molina’s focus on a relational approach that recognizes race as a social formation developed with attention to the ways that power shapes knowledge production. Racial representations should not be regarded as developing in isolation, but rather always in relation to other groups, thus distinguishing this analytic from views that “compare and contrast groups, treating them as independent of one another.”

Based on her teaching and writing on Afro-Asian radicalism and solidarities, Diane discussed how newsmagazines in 1966 depicted Chinese and Japanese Americans as “success stories” in the same moment as the turn from civil rights to Black power. “The message?” Diane asked: “Hard work and non-dissent trumps political protest as pathways to upward mobility. The production of Asian Americans as ‘model minorities’ thus exists in relation to the racial formation of Black militancy and serves to disavow the necessity of collective organizing and protest.” Diane also linked the racial formation of the ‘model minority’ to Cold War expansionism and US exceptionalism.

Gender formation is also relational, Diane noted: “racialized masculinities arise in relation to racialized femininities.” Citing Kimberle Crenshaw, Diane stated that attending to relationality involves addressing intersectionality: how race, class, gender, nation, and other constructs are formed in relation to one another and shape people’s experiences. How do we account for relationality and intersectionality when conceptualizing the relationship between the academy and communities? “How can we think of mutual and egalitarian relations between the academy and community without acting as if scholars are separate from the community activists, artists, and everyday life?” Diane asked, “Or as if community members aren’t thinkers and critics? How do we talk about having community knowledge and scholarly knowledge influence one another in our thinking and research and social justice endeavors – without creating an artificial divide between community and scholarship?” Citing Karen Sacks, she offered the notion of “centerleadership” or “centerpeople,” asking what role institutional agents can play in making new relations possible.
Diane offered several examples to reflect on these questions. First, she described Padres Unidos, a parent group comprised of predominantly Spanish-speaking, working-class, Chicano/Latino immigrant parents. Padres Unidos works with parents who are advocates on behalf of their children to counter inequalities related to language, race, economics, and immigrant status that affect educational opportunities and resource allocation in schools. Their parent programs have had tremendous results. One brings parents together to discuss how to interact with their children. They emphasize active listening and collaborative problem solving to counteract feelings of inadequacy that arise when parents or outsiders attempt to “fix” an issue. The second program explores how parents can get more involved in their children’s schooling, aimed toward building parents’ leadership and advocacy skills. Over 1,600 Spanish-speaking parents have completed the program, with many reporting major changes in their parenting styles, relationships with their children, and improvements in educational outcomes.

Of interest to today’s discussion, Padres Unidos implemented an evaluation process whose main source of information came from interviews with the parents based on questions that the parents themselves determined were aligned with important domains of change. They also used grades, attendance, disciplinary records, and other “objective measures.” They further expressed discomfort with responses based on a Likert scales, recognizing the ways that such measures miss cultural nuances and understandings. Upon reflection with quantitatively trained scholars, they came to recognize that the problems with Likert scales, with their fixed choices and limited abilities to convey social meanings, were inclusive of but also went beyond cultural differences to reflect a problem with measurement itself.

As Diane reflected, “Their model of fostering the agency and leadership of Spanish-speaking, working-class parents promotes the kinds of participatory democracy and collaborative civic engagement that we at the Center for Black Studies Research see as most crucial for transforming communities.”

Diane also shared a dilemma she faced when researching and writing a book on Asian American activism in the 1960s. An activist in the movement had committed suicide and, even though this was publicly documented, his friends and comrades did not want Diane to write about it in her book. “While one could take the approach that this is my book and my decision, my way of doing research on Asian American movements takes seriously the intellectual and political analysis as well as the personal attachments and affiliations of the activists and movements themselves.” Her research depends on the willingness and generosity of former activists to share their stories, and this requires “mutual trust.” Diane believes the book that resulted from the difficult deliberative process that blended knowledge emerging from communities of color with scholarly ways of knowing was a much stronger book. This work, she said, “requires a higher, not lower, level of ethical consideration and relationality in research.”
Like being invited to dance, relationships involve being open to new directions. “There’s often a dance when you come together – you might move quickly and deliberately. At other times you might move slowly and in parallel in ways that aren’t planned or coordinated. The sounds might be harmonious or cacophonous as in free jazz,” Diane reflected. “We don’t always know in what directions we’ll go. We might not know whether the music will speed up or slow down, be melodic or clashing, but we continue to build and practice our work. By doing so, when opportunities arise, we are positioned to move forward quickly based on trust and mutuality in relationships. We are planned and disciplined in order to be creative and improvisational.”

In these ways, Diane noted, “The work of engaged scholarship is often harder and more time consuming. You have less control and more messiness.” So why and how do we do it? For Diane, her projects start with asking, “How can we support you?” followed by listening and improvising together. “Neither group dominates nor follows – the desired goal and work gets shaped in the interaction between engaged scholars and the community around us. It takes hard work, a comfort with having less control over design and outcomes, a way of working that gains the community’s or organization’s trust in us as scholars.”

Diane suggested that building deep relationships can enhance collective work, allowing important opportunities for surprise: “both the unexpected and a kind of amazement, astonishment, wonder.” She asserted, “If we do truly horizontal collaborative research and do so ethically, I think there’s much to be gained in not only saying we want a participatory democracy, but in actually striving to enact it. And that just might get us a little closer to freedom.”

How can we think of mutual and egalitarian relations between the academy and community without acting as if scholars are separate from the community activists, artists, and everyday life? Or as if community members aren’t thinkers and critics? How do we talk about how community knowledge and scholarly knowledge influence one another in our thinking and research, and in our social justice endeavors – without creating an artificial divide between community and scholarship?

**Diane's Invitations to Dwell**

What differences emerge in ways of knowing and ways of doing between community organizations and research units?

How do we listen and do the work the community wants, when we face competing pressures to publish, write grants, and so forth?

Under what conditions can we foster better and more relevant work precisely because it involves collaborating with, listening to, and respecting the knowledge emerging from communities? Under what conditions do the differences in approach, process, and goals lead to negative outcomes?
Kisha Supernant’s invitation opened questions about the generative possibilities of failure, our commitments to people and communities beyond our immediate relationships and research partnerships, and the ways our identities are embodied and embedded in context.

Kisha introduced herself as “an Indigenous woman, a settler, an archaeologist, a mother, a daughter, a partner, a friend, and educator, and myriad other identities.” These identities, she explained, are embodied and embedded in spatial and temporal contexts. “The past, the present, and the future are interwoven in any collaborative relationships within which I am situated,” Kisha stated.

Inviting all of us to imagine an ideal ethical research relationship, Kisha offered her own list of characteristics (see textbox graphic above and on page 36). Reflecting on these characteristics, Kisha acknowledged that her own concept of an ideal ethical relationship might differ from others’ or from her collaborators’ ideals. After all, she noted, ethical relationality “involves many voices, many standpoints, many epistemologies.” There must be space to disagree, to compromise, and to negotiate.

Kisha experienced these tensions firsthand during her PhD research. Working on an archaeological project with a First Nations community in British Columbia, she observed how a long history of research relationships concentrated in one community had significant impacts on other nearby communities. Kisha emphasized that differential access to research and researchers can have significant effects: “academic knowledge continues to carry capital and power within a settler colonial state.” For example, archaeological and anthropological analyses demonstrating historic use of a particular tract of land can support a community’s land claim in court or contest another community’s claim. These are high stakes impacts. “The boundaries of our ethical relationships do not end with the individuals or communities within them,” Kisha stated. “Rather, our work touches many outside of our established relationships, including other marginalized communities.”
“How might we account for indirect harms to other communities beyond our research relationships? How can we be attentive to the reverberations of our collaborations beyond our immediate relationships and context?” These considerations are currently beyond the purview of ethical guidelines, and Kisha encouraged conference participants to dwell with/in these questions.

Kisha concluded by discussing recent directions in her life and work. Since giving birth to a daughter last year, she has been thinking about her own body and self in relation to colonial structures and questions around ethicity, standpoints, and decolonization. “My many standpoints create an ethical space which is sometimes fraught,” she said. “I am an Indigenous woman but I embody settler colonialism.” Kisha explained that her father was removed from his community of birth – a colonial act separated him from “understanding what it meant to be Indigenous.” Kisha also explained that she has “benefitted from her phenotypic whiteness” as a woman not visibly marked as Indigenous.

Kisha’s embodied identities inform her ethical praxis. She worked to build collaborative relationships with descendant communities during her archaeological research in British Columbia. “My identity as an Indigenous person carries some capital in descendant communities, but my lack of knowledge of my own history has made even the claiming of Indigeneity a precarious ethical space,” Kisha commented.

Understanding her own body as a site of colonization, Kisha is reframing her ethical relationship to her self. “I have come to understand the act of reclaiming and reconnecting with my ancestral roots and my living relatives as an act of decolonization of my own body and my self.” She stated, “My first ethical relationship is with myself.”

While we may all strive to meet our ethical ideals as informed by our standpoints, we don’t always pause to consider the consequences of our ethical relations outside of the boundaries of our research. What happens, for instance, to those outside of our relationships? How are they impacted by our research?

**Kisha's Invitations to Dwell**

What is the role of failure in the ethics of relationality?

What is the role of emotion in our work with communities and how do those emotions inform our ethical standpoints?

How can we build ethical relations and create research spaces in ways that undermine the ongoing patriarchal, white, colonial frameworks of knowledge in which the academy and society at large are embedded?
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“I conceive of respect as a verb, an action that is ongoing, constantly earned and never assumed.”

“Ally is an imperfect term. I use it here to explain an aspect of relationality that considers the disparities in power that exist between academics and community partners and works against the structures that create inequity.”

“Honesty is built on another T word – trust. Only in situations of trust can truth be told and also heard.”

“Openness includes a willingness to share knowledge, power, credit, and to have difficult conversations when necessary.”

“The needs of partners within the relationship change, so a strong ethical relationship includes a willingness to reframe, reconstruct, and renegotiate roles, research, and other aspects of the relationship.”

“A supportive relationship recognizes those needs and fosters a culture of nurturance.”

“KISHA SUPERNANT’S INVITATION”

“Openness includes a willingness to share knowledge, power, credit, and to have difficult conversations when necessary.”

“Ally is an imperfect term. I use it here to explain an aspect of relationality that considers the disparities in power that exist between academics and community partners and works against the structures that create inequity.”

“Honesty is built on another T word – trust. Only in situations of trust can truth be told and also heard.”

“The needs of partners within the relationship change, so a strong ethical relationship includes a willingness to reframe, reconstruct, and renegotiate roles, research, and other aspects of the relationship.”

“A supportive relationship recognizes those needs and fosters a culture of nurturance.”

“KISHA SUPERNANT’S INVITATION”
Following Diane and Kisha’s invitations, participants continued to engage in conversations regarding the ethics of relationality in small groups at each table.

Rather than offering answers or resolutions, these conversations were structured to open up space for participants to engage the invitations and raise additional questions.

Each small group table had the opportunity to share a few key words and questions from their conversation to the entire group in the collective discussion at the close of the ethics of relationality session.

Here are of some the questions that emerged…

- **What core capacities are needed?**
  - Self Awareness
  - Accountability
  - Responsibility
  - In Community

- **We need to create community accountability in relation to ethical practices.**

- **Relationality is about connection.**
  - Often the most constructive groups may not be the ones we like to work with.

- **We need to understand materiality of relationships… the actions.**

- **Research relationships are not all relationships if not, why?**

- **It’s a negotiated process…**

- **We work in existing systems… how to make change?**

- **Transformativé Politics will be enacted outside of the academy. This requires explicit rigor.**
How can we think of ethics as a process? Ethics as a verb? Subversion can happen when we make unauthorized connections.

Who are we answerable to? Not just humans but to other nonhuman persons - to land, stolen people, stolen things.

How does responsibility function as a call from the inside – how do we respond to those who have been othered? How are we using responsibility in our conversations?

Who is a worthy audience for deeply relational projects?

Can audiences always – or ever – be trusted?

Writing and representation can be productive prisms that reflect back on dimensions of relationality.

How can we think beyond the project as a unit of analysis? How can we envision a very different kind of relationship?

Failure is a concept that accompanies a project mentality – in long-term relationship work, there is no such thing as a ‘failure’.

How can we think of ethics as a process? Ethics as a verb?

Ethics as a process that materializes through relationships?

Who is a worthy audience for deeply relational projects?

How are we using responsibility in our conversations?
On Day 1, after Kisha and Diane’s invitations, small groups raised a series of questions to delve into the ethics of relationality. During the afternoon on Day 2, participants formed three groups to reflect on these conversations and to identify three things to deeply consider when dwelling with/in this domain.

The Relationality group read the CCREC ethics case “Give Me Shelter” and discussed how Audrey and other characters in the case might critically engage and learn about the ethics of relationality. We also discussed what other research partnerships could learn from the complexities of the layered relationships described in the case.

Reflecting on the case, Diane and Kisha’s invitations, and Julie’s graphic illustrations, members of the group generated a long list of important lessons. Organizing these lessons thematically, we identified three questions that research teams and practitioners can engage to deepen ethical praxis:

1. How are we being attentive to structures of power and privilege? How do systems of power manifest in our relationships and how can we subvert these systems?

2. Living on uneven terrain, what might mutuality and honesty look like? How can we strive for these ideals while acknowledging and actively confronting systemic barriers and challenges?

3. How can we create a culture of critical reflexivity in our praxis? How can ethics policy and pedagogy shift to support and sustain a culture of reflexivity?
Forecasting Space & Time

On the morning of Day 1, the space and time group surfaced these themes and questions for us to address in our two days:

**Institutional Violence & Built Environments**
- Be where your feet are: Connect to politics and histories of artifacts and built environment
- Distributions of opportunity, livelihoods, life courses
- Urbanicity and lived violent impact on health (drugs, HIV)
- Institutional 'codes of conduct' commit violence
- Our locations or livelihoods pose barriers to being ethical and responsible in the spaces/times where we are committed and that demand our attention

**Movement**
- Migration: rural to urban, city to country
- What is ethical writing, research, that moves?
- How can writing build struggles for justice?
- How do we express resonances (across spaces and times) ethically?
- 'Responsible' disruption of time/space

**Meeting Needs & Expressing Values**
- How are needs of women, women with children, children, elderly, and other vulnerable populations met?
- What is their access to housing, food, care?
- What are aesthetics and values in designs, structures, lived places?
- How can we expand view beyond immediate needs to include long-term imaginaries?

**Silences & Absences**
- Attend to untold histories and stories that cannot/should not be told across times/spaces, in certain times/spaces
- Insure you are speaking with, not speaking on, or speaking for

**Multiple Temporalities & Power**
- Always complex materializations of time pasts and futures in the present
- Geopolitics of belonging and identity
- The power of World Traveling (Lugones) for not reinforcing colonial teleologies and development logics
- Need to do big work in small spaces

**Forecasting Space & Time**
- How is ethical writing, research, that moves?
- How can writing build struggles for justice?
Richa Nagar’s multi-genre antidisciplinary work in English, Hindi, and Awadhi has evolved over the last 20 years as an ongoing resistance to standard practices of academic knowledge production. Co-authoring Sangtin Yatra between 2002 and 2004 in Hindi with eight rural activists or sangtins in North India proved transformative for Richa. In Awadhi, sangtin refers to the closest woman companion who sees her friend through all the trials and tribulations in life. The Sangtin Writers’ collective tackled upfront some of the burning questions of NGOization and the politics of expertise and empowerment. The conversations and debates triggered by Sangtin Yatra gave birth to its English version, Playing with Fire: Feminist Thought and Activism through Seven Lives in India (2006) as well as the birth of Sangtin Kisaan Mazdoor Sangathan or SKMS, an organization of more than 6000 peasants and laborers, chiefly Dalit and more than half of them women, in Sitapur District of Uttar Pradesh. The collaborative imagining of agendas and processes in these partnerships has led to important interventions in academic conversations about the politics of epistemology and about methodologies by which authority, visions, and projects might be shared across institutional, geographic, and sociopolitical borders. Richa situated her invitation in the context of this work, while also drawing on her ongoing collaboration with Himadeep Muppidi (Vassar College) on Trans-border Conversations on 'Race, Caste and Indigeneity' and 'Writing Political Struggles.'

1 Situated solidarities, along with radical vulnerability, provide the underpinnings for the kind of ethical alliance work across borders that Richa Nagar has sought to build. She elaborates on this in her book, ‘Muddying the Waters: Co-authoring Feminisms Across Scholarship and Activism’ (University of Illinois Press, 2014).
REFUSING THE TERMS OF AN UNJUST TERRAIN

Richa Nagar stepped into her role as ‘inviter’ with a sense of humility, reminding us of all those people whose knowledges we stand on but who often remain invisible in places that give us the authority of an ‘expert.’ She said she brought with herself into the room countless such people, especially her companions and teachers from SKMS who fight for dignity and justice, and who refuse what Joyce King referred to as epistemological nihilation. SKMS emerged from critiques of casteism, heteropatriarchy, and violence in sangtins’ intimate lives as well as in the NGOs that seek to empower poor rural women whom they see as belonging to ‘the margins.’ The political controversy generated by sangtins' critique led to the making of SKMS, which has come to addresses such issues as lack of access to irrigation waters and livelihoods, state corruption in the context of development programs for the poor, upper caste violence against dalit communities, and theft of land by agribusinesses.

Given her location in this journey -- as a scribe, reporter, theatre worker, storyteller, and translator -- Richa came to the "ethics of time/ space" through another meta-level question: How do we translate political struggles in responsible and ethical ways, as people who seek to build, sustain, or deepen situated solidarities with specific struggles across time and space?

To flesh out this concern, she shared a moment of refusal articulated by the SKMS alliance during an international workshop on global climate change where Richa was in attendance with two other members of SKMS, one of whom was a dalit farmer called Rambeti. The epistemic violence inflicted by the structure, form, language and concerns of the workshop led Rambeti to state:

"They say they want to learn from us, but ... we can never be partners as long as they keep talking in the same sentence about my cow's carbon emissions and the carbon emissions of global corporations... if they remain blind to our lives and truths, there can be no dialogue on this unjust terrain."

This courageous and clear recognition of an "unjust terrain" inspired the SKMS alliance to withdraw from further conversations with their hosts on the subject of mitigating the effects of global climate change, even though this involved the tough decision of SKMS rejecting a $5000 grant from their hosts for growing drought resistant crops to gain more food security.

WRITING, RETELLING, AND ETHICAL TRANSLATIONS

In a world where local issues are increasingly enmeshed with global processes, many of our encounters with difference, inequality, and hierarchy involve simultaneous translations across uneven terrains. When that unevenness

---

2 This section draws significantly on ‘Global Justice, Local Diversity, and Ethical Translations,’ Team Proposal Submitted for University of Minnesota’s Grand Challenges Research Priorities by: Richa Nagar, Suvadip Sinha, Roozbeh Shirazi, Zenzele Isoke, and Ajay Skaria, in consultation with Himadeep Muppidi, August 2015.
is read as “unjust” by any of the parties, then dialogue or cooperation become impossible, and violence -- and epistemic nihilation--become the norm. Rambeti’s disenchantment with the "unjust terrain" as well as SKMS’s decision to withdraw from conversations with the conference organizers, therefore, raise several important challenges.

Drawing on her collaboration with Himadeep Muppidi and others, Richa Nagar framed these challenges as follows: In a world of intricate diversity, intensifying conflicts, and increasing violence, what role can researchers and teachers play as "global" translators of multiple, and often conflictual "local" diversities? Akin to processes of transference of one system of linguistic and cultural signification to another, can we reimagine this translational task as dynamic, multidirectional processes of ethical and politically aware mediation among otherwise impermeable local diversities?

In his book, Politics in Emotion: The Song of Telangana, Muppidi asks:

> Are deaths — killings, suicides, the violent destruction of bodies — the only compelling tune of global politics? Are we too trained into reading the trans local significance of an issue only as an elementary function of the corpses that it stacks up or the pain it produces? Are deaths and tangible suffering the eye candy of global political thought? . . . how do I re-direct your gaze, your ears, away from the deaths and to the life and vitality of the politics that surrounds and exceeds these deaths? (9)

Grappling with the responsibility and ethics of translating struggles requires that 'telling' and 'writing' become conscious and committed struggles across time and space. This grappling would include Richa’s role as a middle point between the organizers of the above mentioned conference and SKMS before, during, and after the meeting, and as a teller or writer who is now narrating this incident for 'unsettling research ethics.'

If some of this labor emanates from our embeddedness within academic institutions, argued Richa, then it is important to underscore the significance of translating struggles with an awareness that entails bringing into recognition the “migration” of sensibilities, textures, and social lives — including the logics, idioms, poetics, and hauntings -- of people, places, times, and communities that seem distant from our own.

This kind of migrancy insists on a multi-directional and ongoing engagement with practices of translation, where translation includes: meanings that can be largely conveyed or captured, partial translations or non-translations, as well as the ever present acknowledgement of that which may remain untranslated, and therefore, unavailable to us and to our exercises in meaning making.

For Richa Nagar and her co-authors these migratory translations require that, instead of merely traveling to other(ed) worlds that form the basis of our knowledge claims, we dwell in and entangle ourselves with those worlds. This demand is driven by a commitment to bring alive these other(ed) worlds differently in our engagements, sensibilities, and writing; and in our consciousness and conscience. It is in and through this dwelling, grappling, breathing, and creating between worlds that translations become productive of worlds, and where researchers can participate not merely as theorists,
analysts, or documenters of the world but as active creative and political beings who also participate in the ethical responsibility of helping to make that world.

This desire for a deeply aware relationship between our acts of translating and the politics of world making is not reducible to a longing for improving the quality of our research, or for producing better critical ethnographies that are faithful to the meanings of the worlds inhabited by marginalized others. Nor is this an argument about greater caring for the other: What Nagar and her co-authors demand instead, is an intense transformative engagement with social worlds and their place-specific vernacularities, through modes of telling and writing that can inspire intellectual and political agitation by remaking how we locate ourselves in relation to the worlds that we move between, and that we represent and reimagine through our words.

This responsibility of participating in and enacting migratory translations, then, is not about reinforcing a romantic idea of ‘activist scholarship’ where we do our activism outside the academy and then return to the academic mode to narrate or theorize the subjects and objects of that activism. Rather, Nagar and her co-authors argue for a mode of engagement that has a provincializing effect on our knowledge-making paraphernalia — terms, concepts, theories, methods, and epistemes. This mode of engagement insists on troubling a privileged academic gaze by redefining our ethics and responsibility as one that, in the very process of translating and marking the gaps in those translations, make our knowledges more vulnerable, more tentative, and more alive to the vitality of the politics that surrounds and exceeds the suffering — knowledges that refuse to make suffering what Muppidi calls, “the eye candy of global political thought.”

How do you grapple with the ethics of incommensurability (what Rambeti calls the "uneven terrain" that is "blind to our lives and truths") in your own multi-sited knowledge making practices as a researcher and/or alliance worker?

Richa’s Invitations to Dwell

How do you work to bring to life the political vitality of the struggles you are immersed in? How do you do justice to the epistemic agency of those with whom you create knowledge?

What kinds of 'locals' do you navigate as a researcher, alliance worker, and/or storyteller as you translate (retell) across borders? When and how does translation (as retelling)--as well as a refusal to translate--become part of your ethics?
Caitlin's invitation focused on her work with Researchers for Fair Policing, an intergenerational participatory research project of the Public Science Project (a center for participatory action research at the City University of New York Graduate Center) and Make the Road New York (a member-based organization that builds the power of Latino and working class communities to achieve dignity and justice through organizing, policy innovation, transformative education, and survival services).

Caitlin began by referencing David Harvey’s concept of time-space compression through globalization – distance collapses as capital circulates and accelerates across borders. With this in mind, Caitlin stated, “I want to suggest we might consider what an ethic of time and space expansion might look like that is both slow and urgent, as a way of challenging the erasures and violences of neoliberal global restructuring.” She asked how can we take into account the historical present and questions of materiality as they play out in our everyday lives? Caitlin also offered two additional intertwined conceptual frames to think through her work: Rob Nixon’s (2011) idea of slow violence: “a violence of delayed destruction that is dispersed across time and space, an attritional violence that is not typically viewed as violence at all,” in relation to Ruth Wilson Gilmore’s (2001) definition of racism as “the state sanctioned and/or extralegal production and exploitation of group-differentiated vulnerabilities to premature death.”

Caitlin emphasized obligations on the ground, and work that is situated and accountable to place and communities. At the same time, she urged us to “consider how the global and the intimate intertwine, how structures are shaped, produced, and negotiated and resisted in specific places, in our home communities – an ethic that takes into account structures and how they are experienced and pushed back on.”

Caitlin Cahill is an Assistant Professor of Urban Geography & Politics at the Pratt Institute. A community-based urban studies & youth studies scholar for over fifteen years, Caitlin has conducted participatory action research projects with young people in cities across the US investigating the everyday intimate experiences of global urban restructuring, specifically as it concerns gentrification, immigration, education, and zero tolerance policies. She currently works with the Bushwick Action Research Collective and the Public Science Project in New York City.
Reflecting on Researchers For Fair Policing, Caitlin noted that it began with a sense of urgency: “an urgency that’s ongoing, and at the same time nothing new, and yet it is new – a new normal.” She cited a string of temporally situated numbers: a million young people have been stopped by police in NYC over the past three years. Four years ago there were 685,000 stops in one year alone. More than 83% of those stopped were black and brown. The increase in stops and frisks was unprecedented: 600% increase over a decade. Meanwhile, 40,000 new buildings were built and one-third of the city was rezoned. “This is articulated in our research as part of an ongoing and relentless dispossession of communities of color,” Caitlin said. “There is nothing new about that.”

Sharing a slide depicting a skyline of urgent data and skylines of gentrifying Brooklyn, Caitlin began discussing the Researchers for Fair Policing project. The project focused on “young people’s everyday experiences with the police in New York City, and the relationships between carceral geographies, the everyday slow violences of neoliberal restructuring, and the criminalization of people of color.” Caitlin noted that the project has shifted over time. They began by reanalyzing the New York Police Department’s data to map a geography of stops and frisks. She presented a map with blue dots tracing the “new normal” – “the scars of the city are the embodied geopolitics of racialized policing, the dots representing the loss of civil liberties and neighborhoods under surveillance” (see the Geography of Stop & Frisk developed by Brett Stoudt: www.researchersforfairpolicing.org). The team examined the purposes of policing in relation to controlling crime, “mapping out a carceral geography of the police state.”

Youth organizers, involved in all aspects of the project, worked to create research processes and products for different publics. These included a large scale survey, video testimonials, a short documentary, and a website/archive. This research, Caitlin explained, “documents the human cost of the New York Police Department’s (NYPD) long history of broken windows policing policies, and offers key considerations for reframing what we mean by ‘community safety.’” The project revealed that young people experience aggressive policing in “the most intimate spaces of their everyday lives, including their homes, schools, and neighborhood public spaces – key sites of social reproduction” (see Stoudt et al, forthcoming 2017; Stoudt et al., forthcoming 2016; Cahill et al, 2017; Cahill et al., forthcoming).

“How might we take up the ethical imperative of unpacking the zipcode as a political economic territory that is racialized, historically produced, and embodied?”

“How might we complicate the determinism of the zipcode?”

“Home is where crisis is lived every day” (Katz, 2015). Citing Cindi Katz, Caitlin argued that one’s zipcode, the neighborhood where one grows up, has been identified as one of clearest determinants of one’s future across all sectors, from economic wealth to education, from housing to health and safety. “And where you live also informs your exposure to the police and police violence,” Caitlin said. “With this in mind, I am thinking about what might be called ‘zipcode ethics,’ or perhaps, better said, ‘unzipping-the-code ethics’ as an analytic framework. Here how might we take up the ethical imperative of unpacking the zipcode as a political economic
CAITLIN CAHILL’S INVITATION

“Broken Windows policing functions as a management strategy for structural dispossession and the collateral damages produced by poverty, wars on drugs, the slow violences of the dismantling of the welfare state. It holds all of this history. This disordering of the wreckage of capitalism.”

Caitlin stated that an unzipped ethics code assumes what Rachel Pain and Lynn Staeheli (2014) call an “intimate geopolitics” as an epistemological and ontological commitment. “But what does this look like in practice? As an ethical analytical framework collectively we want to keep in focus at once the questions of spatial relations and everyday practices, and also neoliberal global restructuring, power dynamics, historical context, the body, and subjectivity. The question is how to do so.”

Caitlin then presented an analysis of broken windows policing to trace its historical political economic production in context. Developed in 1982, broken windows policing is premised on the idea that “‘untended behavior leads to the breakdown of community controls,’” rationalizing aggressive criminalization of minor offenses to “maintain order” (Wilson & Kelling, 1982). The Researchers for Fair Policing project found, however, that broken windows policing in fact creates disorder. Situating this policy in historical context was especially illuminating for the young researchers, “whose families survived the disinvested city.” Showing slides of dilapidated buildings and crumbling infrastructure, Caitlin stated, “This is the disinvested city and here is the spectacle of a city out of control.” Caitlin presented images from the 1970s of Bushwick, the Bronx, Harlem, and more. The images are dramatic, she stated, and the conditions are extreme. “These images reflect a collusion of public policy, real estate development and financial institutions … , and document a moment of “slow violence” (Nixon, 2011) revealing the relentless ravages of racial capitalism taking aim at the heart of communities.” Caitlin contrasted this observation with stereotypical characterizations of “bad neighborhoods” as dangerous or violent, “or tropes of poor people not caring about their community … essentially blaming working class poor communities for their abandonment.”

Unzipping-the-code ethics shifts the gaze back to the state, “specifically to the collusion of the state and private capital.” And too, Caitlin reminds us, that these spaces are spaces of home, “where families of some of the young people who participated in our project grew up and survived against all odds.”
Returning to the images of urban abandonment, Caitlin stated, “These are the windows that broken windows policing policy was established on…. Broken windows policing functions as a management strategy for structural dispossession and the collateral damages produced by poverty, wars on drugs, the slow violences of the dismantling of the welfare state. It holds all of this history. This disordering of the wreckage of capitalism” (see Cahill et al, 2017/forthcoming).

Caitlin concluded her invitation to dwell with a video clip of a testimonial from Markeys, a youth researcher on the team, as he describes encounters with police. Markeys states that the police surveillance and harassment makes him feel like he “shouldn’t even come outside anymore.” By sharing his story, Markeys is participating in imagining another future, “producing power, new knowledge – knowledge produced in the struggle over the intimate global restructurings of neoliberalism, produced by young people for young people… exploring the possibility of communicating with others across traumatic boundaries. Across time and space.”

**Caitlin’s References**


Researchers For Fair Policing www.researchersforfairpolicing.org


Additional questions are raised in Markey’s story, about experiences of LGBTQ young people and “how bodies of young people of color, of homeless young people, of queer, trans youth, and undocumented immigrants function as the broken windows in the eyes of the state.”

“It’s not an easy story to listen to… Research and everyday life are sites of trauma, as Troy Richardson discussed yesterday…Hold this and take it in. This is an embodied geopolitics that includes us too. All of us are part of this process of producing knowledge collectively. Hear a moment of outrage, of grief… Markey is speaking to you and all of us. That is what he wanted to do as part of this PAR project. You are part of the action and the activism. Telling his story he is creating a social and shared context for witnessing and reliving his own private experience of violence.”

Richa joined Caitlin at the podium to share a combined set of invitations and questions to spark conversation. Small groups headed outside for their discussions, situating themselves in new spaces to discuss ethics of place, time, translation, and unzipping-the-code ethics.

**Caitlin’s Invitations to Dwell**

- How might you make explicit the structure in your work?
- How do the slow violences of racial capitalism, settler colonialism, and neoliberal restructuring take shape in your research?
- How might you make visible the historical present?

- How is your work situated and accountable to place?
- How do the global and intimate intertwine in your research? How are structures produced, negotiated, and resisted?

- How might your research reframe the politics of representation and challenge what Foucault (1980) identifies as the “subjectifying social sciences”?
Following Richa and Caitlin’s invitations, participants continued to engage in conversations regarding the ethics of space and time in small groups at each table.

Rather than offering answers or resolutions, these conversations were structured to open up space for participants to engage the invitations and raise additional questions.

Each small group table had the opportunity to share a few key words and questions from their conversation to the entire group in the collective discussion at the close of the ethics of space and time session.

Here are some of the questions that emerged...
TIME IS MONEY?
How do funds circulate in and beyond the university? How do we address disparities in distribution of funding between elite and state institutions, and beyond the university?
How do we contest and subvert institutional impulses to capitalize on intellectual property and turn knowledge production into profit?
Be thoughtful about technology use to work against fetishizing technological fixes - where does money for technology come from?
Valuing labor and compensating for time spent, especially in contexts of labor exploitation?

AGAINST ABSTRACTIONS
Space is Place: it is an actual land
We must acknowledge and grapple with specificities of places, histories, peoples, and processes
We need to address basic questions of accessibility, among many other axes of inequality that are not always seen clearly
We must have time and space in our consciousness to value people’s input - human relationships are important; data is abstracted

DWELLING IN CONTRADICTION
Beware that asking “who am I to go into this community?” can presume and reify otherness, under the guise of humility
Maybe we don’t all need to jump into the most unjust spaces or conversations first - there may be other work to do
How do we account for different vulnerabilities? Who is made vulnerable and visible, how, when, and where?

BUILDING TRUST TAKES TIME
How is space made (or not) for temporal rhythms of long-term relationship-building?
How do we focus on people and place over product and project?
Neoliberalism compresses time and space, often not leaving space for relationship building processes
During and after lunch on Day 2, all conference participants reviewed the graphic illustrations generated to that point. Everyone used post-it notes to mark their “Aha!’s” (aha! moments of insight and interest) and “Hmm’s” (issues to pause and ponder), as well as the issues to further discuss with the group. Then we formed three clusters to delve into the three central themes of the conference.

In the Space & Time group, we read the CCREC ethics case “Comfort Zones” and discussed a wide range of concerns and questions, including how seemingly time-saving technologies can risk fetishizing technology and data over attending to people, place, and relationships; how to focus on the placing and pacing of research process over product; how to fairly recognize and compensate people for their time spent on research endeavors; the significant role history and geography play in shaping relationships, access, material inequities, and research processes; neoliberal timescales that put pressure on people’s time and emphasize individualized productivity; and where research questions originate — in or beyond the university?

It was challenging to consolidate these questions into a list of three things to deeply consider, and members of the group emphasized that the list below is only a partial representation of the wide range of issues that are relevant when dwelling deeply with/in the ethics of place and time:

(1) How can we maintain a focus on centering and staying present in our relationships while attending to how these relationships are situated in/by time and place?

(2) How can we be attentive to constraints and possibilities for access and participation in our research processes?

(3) Who (and where, when) is made vulnerable by past and current social structures and our research praxis? How can we make visible the many different axes of inequality that shape our work and relationships?
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ETHICS of KNOWLEDGE

DECENTERING WHITE, HIERARCHICAL EPISDEMIOLOGIES

WHAT IS KNOWLEDGE FOR?
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STRUCTURE IS AN EMERGENCE OF DIFFERENT EPISODES

ETHICS of RELATIONALITY

ON UNRENEWABLE, WHAT DO MUTUALITY & HUMANITY LOOK LIKE?

WE MUST ATTEND TO STRUCTURED POWER & PRIVILEGE

WE NEED TO CREATE A CULTURE OF GLOBESOITY IN PRACTICE, POLICY & PEDAGOGY

ETHICS of SPACE & TIME

WE MUST MAKE A COMMITMENT TO THE PROCESSES OF RESEARCH

WHOM IS MADE VULNERABLE? WE MUST UNDERSTAND VULNERABILITIES

THINK ABOUT ACCESS, PARTICIPATION, ANALYSIS, DISABILITIES

TO BE DEEPLY CONSIDERED

Visual map: Von Nepenthesday
CLOSING

JAZZ SYNTHESIS
George Lipsitz

George Lipsitz began by reflecting on the immense opportunities for learning that had been opened up in the two days of the conference. “But of course it hasn’t all been sweet, and it hasn’t all been easy. And it shouldn’t be.” From the agreements to the disagreements that emerged in the space, George acknowledged that this in part arose from the “complicated histories we bring into this room,” and the very necessity of engaging such tensions.

“In diving you get more points if you attempt a very difficult dive.” George equated the work of the conference as an attempt at a very difficult dive into talking seriously about ethics in a society premised on deceit and deception. The “easy dives” that academics have been trained to do provide “answers that don’t answer, solutions that don’t solve” and thus “expert knowledge” has failed to address issues in the economy, the environment, or the educational system, for example.

“We’re in a moment of extraordinary crisis where equity oriented collaborative community based research is not a novelty nor a luxury.” George underscored the urgency of modes of research and knowledge production in which academics actually learn from those who witness and can’t afford to lie about low-wage labor, incarceration, displacability, disposability, and deportability. “This difficult enterprise that we’re involved in is one that is really about our own survival in every possible way.”

“I’m not here to give you the last word…it’s what the scholar is encouraged to do. We’re encouraged either to have the first word or the last word.” George described this as the “economy of prestige.” Yet in life, “we all have the middle word. Everything came through us from somebody, because of somebody else.” Surfacing the way in which knowledge is co-created through relational processes, George stated that the work of the middle word is to “be part of the conversation, to push it along since there’s no problem we can say I have the answer to, but in every problem we have to think about how we have the answer.” This means thinking about those who have been systematically excluded from the very room we gathered in for the conference, people whose histories, epistemologies, ontologies, archives, and imaginaries have been “ruthlessly and relentlessly kept from us by the segregation of this society.”

George returned to this notion of the middle word and asked participants to think of the word they had shared in the opening circle. “Those words weren’t meant to shut things down; those were aspirations; those were hopes of ways in which we could work together. Those words have done work over the last two days.” George then asked everyone to “think about the work you wanted your word to do, the work you watched it doing, and the work that still needs to be done.”

“Jazz music has no final chord,” George shared. “When you play jazz, you want people to think beyond the end of the song.” In the same way, he asked participants to think about how their words and these conversations might “go out into the world and have a life you didn’t expect. How can they imbue the universe with a possibility of making great things come to head?” In evoking futurity and possibility, George also reflected on the histories and legacies we’ve inherited: “we’re here because of the suffering and struggle, the sacrifice, the ancestors of many different races, religions, and languages.” This only underscores the responsibilities of this work for George.
“We ought to be something other than performers, something other than people with a romantic image of ourselves in the world as oppositional.”

George also reminded participants that it’s not only about the words they had spoken in this space, but those they had heard. Quoting one of his friends, George says that “academics are always scrambling for the microphone when what we really need is a hearing aid.” Calling people into a space of reflexivity, George said that we must respond to the moments that we’re in and be attentive to engage not merely in the ways that in which we are trained to respond. Recalling a 2014 book by Doris Summers on Civic Agency and the Humanities, George stated that, “in a world gone grey from habit, people have become inured to suffering and afraid of life.” For George, this “is really our challenge, above and beyond the ethical, logical issues we’ve talked about… This is what ethics is about in this moment.” Within this context, “what are the words that we’re going to use to go out there and change things?”

George reflected on his own word, accompaniment. Accompaniment is a word that comes from the work of Archbishop Oscar Romero. George recounted the story of Romero’s realization that he had only “learned the Gospel for the first time” when he began to “walk with” and learn from peasants in El Salvador in the 1970s. Turning away from decades of work in churches backed by some of the wealthiest families in the country, Romero became committed to taking the same risks as the peasant-classed community. “So this idea of accompaniment means you walk down the road together;” it is a form of being with and working in struggle and solidarity. In the Catholic tradition this is described as the “preferential option for the poor;” but George interprets this and asks “whose interests are liable to be erased? How can I walk down this road in a form of accompaniment, and think about the obligations we have to each other that get made and remade every hour, every day?”

This is no doubt hard work, and it brought George back to the “difficulty of the task we’re undertaking to actually save words like ethics from the people who’ve defined them. To save scholarship from the people who profit from it most prominently, and to save knowledge from its segregation and codification, its commodification in this society.”

Accompaniment reminds George of the difficulty of lighting a piece of charcoal with matches. Yet once the charcoal is lit, it’s almost impossible to put out. “It gives light and warmth in a way that sustains.” For George, this sustenance is the job we have to do. “So, thinking about the words that we entered the room with, what is the work you wanted your word to do? What is the work you want your word still to do? How can we have conversations that will end at some time today, but will no less have a lasting impact?”
After inviting and reminding participants to complete the evaluation forms, Ron asked everyone to gather again to become present and co-present in a circle for the last time. He invoked the closing ceremony as a marker to begin a transition back to “our lives so well woven into those of our dearer others” and as a time to consider “what new threads we might take with us to weave back into and beyond where we have been.” He asked us to recall and hold again our entering intention(s), our one word entry into the circle, and then to dwell among the memories surfacing for each of us of our two days together.

“Often what first surfaces in our memories is movement,” Ron said. “Memories of being moved,… perhaps even thrown,… even into amazement, and wonder. Or another kind of movement rises to the surface. Memories of being stopped,… of being caught up short,… of being at a loss for words,… of being in tight spaces. How have you been moved here?”

Each person then had an opportunity to share something of her or his movement.

Ron then called us to our stillness – “the kind of stillness that keeps us still moving” – and he asked each of us to center an intention from our being together, and to hold that intention in silence.

“I believe it is in the silence of the intentions we hold most deeply,… and that animate us in the most difficult circumstances,… I believe it is there, in those deep silences, that we find the strength to carry forward the intentions we now hold in this circle. We will leave this circle in silence. This time not one word. Each of us will pause in silence before each other. Our future actions will speak for the intentions we hold now in this circle. Let our passage out of this circle hold fast to the stillness of the silence that moves our intentions into being.”

Ron noted that the hotel workers had little time to prepare for the event following our conference, and he asked us to complete the ceremony and move toward the exit and the museum exhibition and dinner/reception to follow. He then turned again to his left, as in the opening circle, and began the process by which each participant had an opportunity to meet the other, this time not with a word of intention, but with a silent intention that would carry the meaning of the conference into other places and times.
After a quiet closing and then hectic clean-up, participants met one another for meals, walks, and drinks on the patio. One group attended the opening reception of the Kinsey Collection exhibit at the Santa Cruz Museum of Art and History, a short walk across the San Lorenzo River from the Hotel Paradox. Spanning 400 years of history, the Kinsey Collection reflects a rich cultural heritage and includes work by Romare Bearden, Elizabeth Catlett, Jacob Lawrence, and Richard Mayhew alongside archival material related to Frederick Douglass, Zora Neale Hurston, and Malcolm X. The collection is one of the largest private collections of African American art and artifacts, and the opening reception featured the Kinseys and other speakers. Superintendent of the Santa Cruz County Office of Education and member of the CCREC Advisory Board, Michael Watkins, had extended an invitation to conference attendees to celebrate the occasion.

Later in the evening, Ron Glass and Merle Lustig hosted a convivial post-conference reception at their home. Conference participants gathered for relaxed conversation, sharing reflections from the conference and learning more about one another’s lives and work — and looking ahead toward future collaborations.
Tools & Modes of Engagement
Developed by the CCREC Ethics Team, the Time-Scape of Research Ethics is a visual representation of the often-told narrative of research ethics formation, with space for alteration and alternative visioning. Rather than a mere linear timeline, we played with the idea of a time-scape to signal the ways in which historical moments, codifications in the form of codes and policies, and particular cases of ethical breeches, all come to inform and iteratively (re)produce the ecological landscape of research ethics.

We purposefully created this as an unfinished and uncertain time-scape, with the intention that participants would use it as a tool for conversations and questions. Some participants shared that the time-scape enabled them to release the normative narrative of research ethics and engage in different conversations with fellow participants. Pedagogically then, it held this traditional narrative while also inviting participants to disrupt and question it.

This visualization includes additions and interventions made by conference participants. Moving forward, we hope to continue utilizing the time-scape as an exercise for exploring the boundaries of the field of research ethics, as well as the bounds that shape researchers’ understanding of research ethics.
We included various disciplines and interdisciplinary fields as the frame surrounding the time-scape to acknowledge the ways in which theoretical frameworks and practices of knowledge production also shape the lenses we utilize to understand research ethics.

The sky offered a space to document the ‘atmospheric conditions’ and ‘winds of change’ that influence this process of research ethics formation and formalization - social movements, political contexts, historical events, and structural processes that may shape-shift and influence sedimentations below.

Various reports, ethics codes and policies used to interpret, guide and legally regulate research ethics.

Pivotal cases of ethical infringements that are often-cited in the US context, including the Tuskegee Syphilis study, the case of Henrietta Laks, and the Stanford Prison experiment, as well as lesser-known but useful cases for critically examining institutionalized ethics review, such as Havasupai Indigenous Community v. University of Arizona, or the Loosie Cigarette Study.

Texts about ethics or that raise questions about the ethics of knowledge production as normatively understood.

Growing from these layers are ethics practice and pedagogies, which can be cultivated and turned back into the soil, or strata, of this time-scape.
Questions to prompt engagement and intervention with the Time-Scape

How might we disrupt the history that's being told here? Are there things in these layers that you might add to unsettle this narrative?

What can this time-scape tell us about the past, present, and future of research ethics formation and formalization?

What can it tell us about research ethics pedagogy, policy, and practice? What does it not tell us?

Have these policies affected your pedagogy and practice?

Is there such a thing as effective institutionalized research ethics? What might that look like?

Are there any cases in your discipline/field you can anticipate happening that will prompt us to rethink conceptions of research ethics or that challenge current ethical paradigms?

What kinds of storms or shifting weather conditions are on the horizon that might further unsettle research ethics and/or shift or even deepen research ethics practice?
ETHICS POLICY

In our conference design, we intentionally bracketed conversations around ethics policy. It is our view that centering conversations about research ethics within the domain of institutional review boards and policy often limits consideration of broader, complex, and iteratively present questions of ethics in research. However, we also realize that the domain of ethics policy, such as professional association codes of ethics, is one modality of addressing questions regarding research ethics, and that some conference participants brought extensive experience in this domain. This page presents issues and questions illuminating the ethical dimensions of research ethics policies, as surfaced during discussions on Day 1.

**ADVOCACY, POLICY, & POWER**

- How can we decrease academics’ fear of speaking out for policy changes?
- Research as/for advocacy vs. policy
- Who sets the criteria for ‘good’ policy?
- Whose definitions of ethics should count?
- Who is authorized to assess whether research meets ethical standards?
- How can we involve the least powerful without putting undue burden upon them to do all the work?
- How can we increase community’s control of policies affecting it?

**THEORY OF RESEARCH ETHICS POLICY**

- If some proposed research might yield knowledge that might adversely affect some people or groups, is it unethical?
- Who/what purposes served by research?
- What does consent to participate mean? How to avoid making static what is processual?
- Is it ethical to require public release of data? Who owns the data in research?
- Must data be public?

**DEFINING THE SCOPE OF ETHICS REGULATION**

- What distinguishes research from other types of inquiry, and warrants its regulation?
- Does ethical review prevent all bad things or ensure a balance of research with other ethical obligations?
- What types of research should IRBs regulate?
- Can ethics policy mitigate collective/community harm via research? How?
- What risks are most pressing? Can they be limited?
- How do we work together in creating ethical policies that create paradigm shifts?
- Is framing of ethics policy inclusive in a deep way? To what extent does or should ethics policy ignore (or take into account) historical/cultural contexts and pressing (or perceived) needs of emerging society?

**POLITICAL ECONOMY OF ETHICS POLICY**

- Conflicts of interest and university appropriation of funded work
- Who funds policies and research and how do we make sure they don’t set the agenda?
- Has ethical review morphed into institutional risk management?

**ETHICS POLICY**

In our conference design, we intentionally bracketed conversations around ethics policy. It is our view that centering conversations about research ethics within the domain of institutional review boards and policy often limits consideration of broader, complex, and iteratively present questions of ethics in research. However, we also realize that the domain of ethics policy, such as professional association codes of ethics, is one modality of addressing questions regarding research ethics, and that some conference participants brought extensive experience in this domain. This page presents issues and questions illuminating the ethical dimensions of research ethics policies, as surfaced during discussions on Day 1.
QUESTIONS FOR REFLECTION

• What is the historicity, context, and community involved in teaching ethics?
• How do we teach about collaborative research and research ethics when the university rewards individual research?
• Should students become more certain or uncertain by the end of class?
• If we learn best from practice, what are the ethical implications of students making mistakes? How do we teach students not to be afraid to make mistakes when ethical mistakes can be damaging?
• How do we work against ethics training that is rigid, scarce, linear, formulaic, or from a dominant lens?
• How do we encourage students to see choices as always fraught and complex, with rarely fully ‘right’ or ‘good’ answers?
• Who teaches and who is the expert?
• How do we teach critically? How do we teach criticality?
• How do we teach about research ethics when there is a plurality of conceptions (sometimes competing) of what constitutes research?
• Do faculty have a deep relationship with the community a student enters? How do researchers enter communities through networks of trust?
• How do we model continual, ongoing ethics in our teaching and practice?
• What does it mean to be a gatekeeper?
• How do we teach white students to contend with their whiteness? How are we responsive to the directive, posed by a discussion participant, “don’t invite people of color into a space without being prepared to own your shit”?
• How do we teach tensions between disciplinary standards and university expectations?
• How can we work against disciplinary ethnocentrism? How might we decenter our disciplinary perspectives?

CONCEPTS, TOPICS, & LESSONS

• Mistakes: don’t be afraid to make them, don’t make them intentionally, what can we all learn from a mistake?
• Cultural awareness and protocols
• Methods of different social sciences (comparative summaries)
• Multiple different models of community-engaged research
• Complicating volunteerism, privilege, and other power dynamics
• Building knowledge and relationships over time
• Self-reflexivity and self-care
• Academics learning not (just) about the community but also about themselves
• The perils of parachuting and (dis)connections to what happens before and after
• Be present first

RESOURCES, STRATEGIES, & TECHNIQUES

• Mini projects and learning from each others’ real-time experiences
• Assign writings by women of color
• Mock IRBs
• Ethics bowls
• Case studies
• Critically read foundational ethics
• Undoing Racism workshops

ETHICS PEDAGOGY

Ron opened the conference with an invitation to consider practices of ethics formation, opening space to consider dwelling with/in the ethics of research as pedagogical praxis. This page presents questions and suggestions for teaching research ethics critically, as surfaced during discussions on Day 1.
HEAT MAPS

We developed a series of “heat maps” to gauge the temperature of participants’ positions on substantive questions, as well as to graphically capture some of the experiences that participants brought into the room. The heat maps were intended to function both pedagogically and as a resource, surfacing critical reflection as participants engaged with the prompts, and documenting the variance of perspectives and experiences in the room. Participants were encouraged to engage with the heat maps throughout the convening. Here we present digitized versions of the heatmap prompts and some of the participants’ responses.
Step 1: Community Involvement
- How would you describe your degree of involvement in community work?
- Use your left finger to pinpoint your level of involvement along the vertical axis.
- If you are highly involved, you would place yourself in the upper half of the graph. If less so, on the lower half.

Step 2: Research Involvement
- How would you describe your degree of involvement in research?
- Use your right finger to pinpoint your level of involvement along the horizontal axis.
- If you are highly involved, you would place yourself in the right half of the graph. If less so, on the left half.

Step 3: Intersections
- Bring your left finger across to where it is directly above your right finger.
- Now bring your right finger up to meet your left finger.
- Place a dot at this point of intersection.

HEAT MAPS
We developed a series of “heat maps” to gauge the temperature of participants’ positions on substantive questions, as well as to graphically capture some of the experiences that participants brought into the room. The heat maps were intended to function both pedagogically and as a resource, surfacing critical reflection as participants engaged with the prompts, and documenting the variance of perspectives and experiences in the room. Participants were encouraged to engage with the heat maps throughout the convening. Here we present digitized versions of the heatmap prompts and some of the participants’ responses.

Fill in the Blank:

Research is...
- Power
- Knowledge: sharing, generating, translating
- Fun!
- Hard...
- Important
- Change

Community means...
- Context
- Solidarity/Home
- Hmm... different things in different communities?
- Multiple and sometimes conflicting perspectives
- POWER
- People
The CCREC Ethics Team designed this gameboard to foster conversations across participants’ different positions related to research ethics, theories of change in research ethics, research, higher education, knowledge production, and more.

The ‘topic cards’ included university-based research, community-based research, institutional ethics review, graduate ethics training, professional codes of ethics, and blank cards for academic disciplines and methodologies. Based on conference engagement, the CCREC Ethics Team is revising and refining the gameboard for future circulation and use.

The game plays were inspired in part by “Mapping Interpretations of Decolonization in the Context of Higher Education” by Vanessa de Oliveira Andreotti, Sharon Stein, Cash Ahenakew, and Dallas Hunt (*Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education, and Society* 4(1); 21-40).

From an ethical point of view, in which space do you dwell in relation to these practices?

As you talk with others, discuss your position and move your game piece if your position changes.

Center for Collaborative Research for an Equitable California
As a conference discussion resource, the CCREC Ethics Team shared draft cases from a research ethics casebook they are developing. We hope that the Casebook, tentatively titled *Dwelling With/In the Ethics of Research*, and the specific cases we shared at the Unsettling Research Ethics conference will serve as a pedagogical tool to prompt sustained reflections and intentional practices that account for the ethics of knowledge, relationality, and space and time.

These are fictional cases based on reported events and/or documentary evidence. The CCREC Ethics Team conducted more than 35 in-depth interviews about ethical issues in research with scholars who have undertaken equity-oriented collaborative community-based research projects. These interviews were supplemented by another 30 in-depth interviews collected from fifteen pairs of researchers and community partners to get the perspective of each primary partner in the collaboration. We coded and analyzed all this interview data using NVivo, from which emerged our general frames of the Ethics of Knowledge, Relationality, and Time/Space.

We considered our findings in relation to a broad literature review about participatory research in several disciplines and fields (anthropology, sociology, education, urban planning, public health), in relation to the broad literature on research ethics and IRBs, and in relation to philosophical ethics. We then began to design and write our Casebook, intended for use with graduate students, social science researchers and research administrators, and community-based research teams.
MINING DATA

Overview: This case invites readers to consider the ethics of knowledge.
Sonia is a new assistant professor at Queen University. Leaders from the community organization Minds Over Mines reach out to Sonia to propose a research collaboration. Over time their partnership develops, and Sonia eventually heads to a major national conference to present their research for the first time.

Speaking Roles (in order of speaking time)
- Sonia: Early career scholar at Queen University
- Miriam: Co-Director of Minds Over Mines, a community advocacy organization
- Robert: Co-Director of Minds Over Mines, a community advocacy organization
- Narrator: Sets the scene and provides contextual details
- Nancy: A big name academic chairing Sonia’s conference panel
- Academic Stranger: An audience member at Sonia’s conference panel

Scene 1


Miriam: I sent an email to that new professor that Arjun told us about at the regional meeting.

Robert: Oh really? And didn’t he also say to watch out… the gains of working with academic researchers come with costs and all that?

Miriam: Yeah, but he said she’s really dedicated and she’s been showing up. We need someone like that around here. We’ve got more data than we know what to do with and I think she could boost our capacity. Besides, I trust Arjun’s recommendations… that report his group put out last year was awesome. We need to do something like that.

Scene 2

Narrator: Meanwhile, at Queen University, Sonia checks her email.

Sonia: [murmuring to herself and squinting at her screen] Who’s Miriam Brown?

Narrator: Sonia does a quick internet search and brings up the Minds Over Mines website. She skims Miriam’s bio.

Sonia: “Co-founder and director of Minds Over Mines… Former social worker… Organized with other Queen County parents to investigate the hazards of copper waste… Held workshops on youth exposure to toxins… Ten years later, Minds Over Mines continues to support the development of alternative economies and fight the harmful effects of mining in the community…” This woman sounds badass!

Narrator: Sonia forwards Miriam’s email to her grad school friend Samantha.
To: Samantha  
From: Sonia  
Subject Line: Fwd: Minds Over Mines Meeting?  
Hey Sam,  
Check this out! Maybe Queen County isn’t so indifferent to the university after all? Curious to learn more. It would be nice to have a new project underway – and get a break from reworking my dissertation to death! They’ve done some impressive things and it seems like my expertise could be helpful, too. Anyway, I’ll keep you posted.  
Talk soon,  
Sonia

Narrator: Sonia then sends a quick reply to Miriam before rushing off to teach class.

Sonia:

To: Miriam  
From: Sonia  
Subject Line: Re: Minds Over Mines Meeting?  
Hello Miriam,  
Thank you so much for reaching out. I’d love to meet you. Are you available next week?  
All my best,  
Sonia

Scene 3

Narrator: One week later, at the Minds Over Mines office.

Miriam: We could really use your help, Sonia. We’ve been doing research for years now, issuing warnings about toxic exposure and copper leaching into the river by the school. But we all know this work will have a different meaning to funders and lawmakers if it has a university stamp on it.

Sonia: Well, that’s part of the reason I got into this work… being on the academic side can have its benefits.

Robert: We have to play the game with the lawmakers and their foundation buddies – “evidence-based” and all that. As if there were any real question about how bad those mines are for us and our kids! I feel kinda dirty asking for money from some of the same sorts of folks we’re fighting, but we’ve got to do this work and take care of our people.

Miriam: [laughing cynically] Going from sitting at my kitchen table trying to research the mines, to organizing protest actions, and writing up grant proposals with all this finessed language… It has been a looong, strange trip. A decade later and we’re still trying to speak truth to power and change what’s happening here. I hate having to tip-toe around our strongest critiques so we don’t further piss off donors or county agencies…
Sonia: Finessing language, hah! I’m not sure if that’s an academic’s strength or weakness, but I think I can help with that.

Robert: Great… so you have grant writing experience?

Sonia: Sure, though not always successful. Let me look at what you’re working on.

Miriam: [nodding at Robert] That would be great.

Sonia: If you want, I could also take a look at some of your data… The Lowell Foundation accepts letters of inquiry twice a year — the next deadline isn’t ‘til spring — and maybe their funding could cover some analysis, and also forums to share the data with the community.

Robert: [shrugs] Data? We have tons, not that it matters. As for Lowell, if you think you can hook it up, go for it!

Scene 4

Narrator: For the next few months, Sonia works on boilerplate language for grant proposals. Her ‘finessing language’ elevates moderate voices and tones down the trenchant rhetorical flourishes that had been used to mobilize community parents. By late spring, the Lowell Foundation proposal is finished, with Sonia as the Principal Investigator and Minds Over Mines as site and partner. It is the biggest grant any of them has submitted, and it could take the work at Minds Over Mines to a new level with funding for more core staff and research support. Sonia could hire graduate student researchers and maybe get a course leave. Sonia also submits an abstract for a major national conference in her field and is pleased when it gets accepted a few months later. She sends her friend Samantha another email.

To: Samantha
From: Sonia
Subject Line: Conference Time!

Hey Sam,

Nice job on getting another article published! I don’t know how you do it, but congrats!

I’m so sleep-deprived still, but I submitted that big proposal and finished my grading. Just found out my paper got accepted for the conference this fall. Are you going too? I’ll have to recycle the proposal language since we’re in the early data collection phase right now and the data they have is rough… we haven’t had resources to fix the gaps so fingers crossed for the grant money. But I’ll have enough data to work with for a little paper. Check out my panel lineup — I don’t know anyone? Do you? I’m excited, but a little intimidated that Nancy Robinson is chairing the panel… her book is getting a lot of traction.

Anyway, it’ll be good visibility for the project, and for me. I’m counting on the Lowell grant and this paper to make my pre-tenure review case. My publications are coming slow, and my department chair has made dismissive comments about my ‘activist project’ as if it isn’t research.

Miriam and Robert can’t join me. If you’re going, maybe we can share a hotel room? My travel budget is slim.

Sonia
Scene 5

Narrator: At Sonia’s conference presentation, Winter 2016

Sonia: [showing her last slide] So, in conclusion, this collaborative research demonstrates the potential power of community organizations like Minds Over Mines to offer robust alternatives to extractive corporate economies like copper mining. Future research will measure impacts and outcomes of the pilot projects I’ve described. Thank you.

Nancy: Thank you, Sonia. [turns to audience] We only have time for one or two questions. Ah – yes, first you there in the back.

Academic Stranger: Yes, thank you. Frankly, I’m surprised by your framings. You end on a positive note, but most of your talk advanced a familiar narrative that demonizes industry and even pathologizes the community. Surely some Queen County folks are grateful for the jobs the mines bring, which aren’t just minimum wage; and after all, the elected leaders offered incentives to open the mine there, so I don’t see anyone being victimized. You yourself pointed out the long history of low-wage work in the area. Where is your cost/benefit analysis? Some nuance is needed, or at the very least some data triangulation. Otherwise aren’t you just repeating this organization’s agenda?

Nancy: [turns to Sonia] I was a bit curious too about your emphasis on Minds Over Mines staff perspectives. Do other local residents or even people at the mine itself have anything to say? Doing some studying ‘up’ or ‘across’ might open up a more critical analysis than the usual studying ‘down’…?

Sonia: I understand your points, but this particular paper was focused differently, and I don’t think of it as studying ‘down’ but ‘with.’ As I said, it is a collaborative research project. As for the validity of the data or how other perspectives fit in, we question our data, findings and analyses all the time, but our aim is to document and understand the views of those who are usually silenced. The paper’s standpoint represents their narrative, and Minds Over Mines lifts that up. Local residents are consulted extensively through public meetings, online forums, and more, and then I work most closely with the organization’s leaders. They reviewed this presentation… few people in the community have the time to get involved at that level.

Academic Stranger: So the organization’s leaders and you get to decide how the community sees the issues? Or even what the facts are? It’s obvious that some of their health impact claims require more long-term study.

Nancy: I’m so sorry, we’re out of time. Please continue these conversations in the hall while the room is prepared for the next panel.

Narrator: People begin packing up. The audience members leave and Nancy turns to Sonia.

Nancy: Here’s my card. I’ve got to run, but let’s be in touch.

Narrator: Sonia steps out into the hallway, and stashes Nancy’s card as her phone begins ringing.

Sonia: Robert, hi. Good timing – I need to hear a friendly voice. What’s up?

Robert: I’m totally bummed, Sonia. You won’t believe it.

Robert: We heard back from Lowell – a big fat no! Of course they said we have a worthy project, blah blah blah, but then they focused on little details and rejected us. I don’t think we ever had a chance. The reviewers’ comments seem so minor, and they’re confusing to me. I’m not sure… you’re the expert, you’ll have to take a look. Apparently our data security plan wasn’t strict enough or something? And we also didn’t have a plan to make the data available to whoever else wants it… How does that even work… how do we protect the data and make it public too? If you ask me, some of our data is no one else’s business anyway!

Sonia: No… no, no, but… Minds Over Mines needs that grant to complete the research. [Sonia thinks to herself, I need that grant] Wow, this is devastating!

Robert: You got that right. I have no idea what our next option is… [sighs] Anyway, I forgot to ask – how was your talk? I’ll bet people were blown away by our work!

Sonia: Well… not exactly.
GIVE ME SHELTER

Overview: This case invites readers to consider the ethics of relationality. Audrey is a housing activist and just moved to a new city for graduate school. As she gets involved in a housing initiative, she develops new relationships and focuses her dissertation project on the local housing movement.

Speaking Roles (in order of speaking time)

- **Audrey**: PhD student in geography
- **Johanna**: Volunteer coordinator at Right to Shelter, an activist organization
- **Narrator**: Sets the scene and provides contextual details
- **Nick**: Founder of Right to Shelter, an activist organization
- **Tonya**: Director of Neighborhood House, a shelter and community services center
- **Jared**: Staff manager at Neighborhood House

**Narrator:** Audrey moved from San Francisco to Seattle in 2010 to pursue a PhD in geography. An activist in affordable housing and anti-gentrification campaigns, Audrey began making connections with the local housing organizations, and became fast friends with Nick and Johanna, lead organizers for Right to Shelter, a Housing First initiative.

During her first year of grad school, Right to Shelter was gaining momentum through a coalitional strategy with other housing organizations. The coalition was developing a plan for a new high-density social housing project in one of the city’s most impacted neighborhoods. Audrey got more involved, and used every course assignment she could to analyze both structural and local aspects of the housing crisis. In a meeting with her dissertation supervisor Dr. Abrams, Audrey pointed out how Right to Shelter’s goals and strategies compared and contrasted with arguments from some critical theorists she had been reading in her courses. Dr. Abrams was interested and noted that the coalition’s housing campaign could be an interesting case study for Audrey’s dissertation research.

Scene 1

**Narrator:** Audrey, Nick, and Johanna sit together at Bar None.

**Audrey:** I finally had that meeting with Abrams today.

**Johanna:** Was it as bad as you thought it would be?

**Audrey:** Really good, actually. I told him about that book by Samson I told you about, and how its arguments align with the Right to Shelter strategy around the housing plan. Anyway, he said maybe I could focus my research on the project. As a case study, you know?

**Nick:** [laughing] Ooh, you’re going to study us? Now we’re your lab rats?!

**Audrey:** Ugh, no. That’s not what I meant and that’s not who I am! I thought we could do some kind of action research that builds into the campaign. Like, we could interview potential residents about their housing needs and work that into the proposal? Or we could do some kind of community mapping project? I’m learning GIS methods right now. Or… something… I don’t know…. Maybe not?
Johanna: Don’t listen to him – Mr. Anti-Establishment [rolls eyes]. I think this sounds awesome! I see how some solid research could amplify the movement… no harm in having more allies. [reaches across table and squeezes Audrey’s hand]

Nick: Maybe… we don’t know if our strategy is going to get the proposal through all the hoops. We need to focus our energies on getting the community out to pressure city council and county supervisors. Adding another footnote to the plan is a distraction. People power is the difference maker.

Audrey: But we could document the process at least, which might help other campaigns. Like Johanna said, I could do research with folks that feeds back into the plan… make it stronger, you know? Good data will make it harder for the Council to dismiss. Plus, it could be a good way to check-in with the community.

Nick: Hmmmm… hard to imagine there’s something we don’t already know about our community. But okay, maybe… let’s talk it out in our leadership group at next week’s meeting. I can meet with Tonya about it too, and see if she wants to bring in Neighborhood House.

Audrey: Yes! Good idea to contact Tonya. Ahh! I’m kinda excited about this. It could be really cool… and if I can tie this back to Samson and some theory debates right now, I can get Abrams off my back about the dissertation proposal, you know? He keeps pushing me.

Johanna: Totally – win-win, right? [Johanna winks at Audrey]

Narrator: Audrey and Johanna leave Bar None together and put a few meet up times in their calendars before heading home. They begin spending more and more time together, and within a few months, rumors are circulating in the coalition that they’re dating. Meanwhile, Nick contacted Tonya, the Director of Neighborhood House, a long-time housing advocacy non-profit and homeless shelter, about adding community-based research to the work. She is skeptical, but agrees to host Audrey and Johanna at the shelter to facilitate a mapping session with staff and residents as a pilot study. The residents are excited to share their stories, and some voice powerful testimonials.

Scene 2

Narrator: Tonya and her colleague Jared are talking at Neighborhood House, the day after Audrey and Johanna’s mapping session.

Tonya: I know I had my reservations about this whole research project, but after the meeting yesterday, I can see how this might work to our advantage.

Jared: We’re stretched so thin, though. How can we take on any more work? I thought we were going to say yes initially so we could tactfully say no.

Tonya: I know, but these testimonials could actually boost our campaign. A website, a short documentary… I don’t know, something. I mean, here are the people themselves, voicing pretty clearly why we need this housing plan.

Jared: I don’t know. Sounds like poverty pimping to me.

Tonya: We’ve got to move people to move our agenda, and these stories are pretty moving, don’t you think? Way more powerful than our charts and graphs. You know we would go about it in a thoughtful way. Let’s give it some serious thought.

Narrator: After more heated discussions among Right to Shelter and Neighborhood House staff members over the next week, narrow majorities in both organizations vote to proceed with the research, but with caution.
Scene 3

Narrator: A year and a half later, in Tonya’s office at Neighborhood House.

Audrey: Did you have a chance to look at that preliminary report I sent out last week that overlaid the city’s housing numbers with the GIS data we generated?

Tonya: Yeah I saw it. [shifts papers around on desk]

Audrey: Okay… Any thoughts? Will we present it at City Council next week?

Tonya: Honey, there ain’t anything new under the sun. I’ve been in this game for thirty years. City Hall isn’t going to blink at your little report. But how’s that website coming along? Has the tech crew finished editing the digital stories about our clients?

Audrey: Both projects are getting close to done, still maybe a few weeks away. But the report — don’t you think it tells an important story? Did you agree with the analysis? Nick helped with the drafts and he thinks it’s looking good.

Tonya: Of course he does. [under her breath] It plays right into his vision. [rubs eyes, then stares squarely at Audrey] You’ve been here in town for what, two, three years now? Listen, Housing First sounds all good on paper, but as I keep telling you… we’ve got limited resources. Even if the City doesn’t back our proposal next week, we need them to keep funding our shelter, okay? They’re not going to do that if we keep up this bad press campaign. Give it a rest and focus on the website, alright? [Looks at Audrey and gestures to the door.] I’ve got a phone meeting in a minute. I’ll see you later.

Scene 4

Narrator: Another year and a half passes. Johanna and Audrey sit at their dining room table, eating dinner.

Johanna: How’d the writing go today?

Audrey: [sighing] Fine. I’m working on that chapter about Right to Shelter’s split with Neighborhood House. It’s hard to rehash it.

Johanna: Want me to take a look?

Audrey: Really? Would you mind? You already have to listen to me whine about writing. Are you sure you want to read, too? [laughing]

Johanna: Pass it over.

Narrator: Audrey opens her laptop and slides it across the table to Johanna.

Audrey: I’ll run to the store. Be back in a bit… thanks for taking a look.

Narrator: Audrey returns an hour later. Johanna is sitting quietly on the couch.

Audrey: So? What’d you think?

Johanna: You’re right. It’s painful.

Audrey: I know. It was an ugly time.

Johanna: Why did you put that stuff in there about Tonya and Nick’s argument after the housing march? You weren’t even there.
**Audrey:** It was an important moment! Nick told us all about it, remember? Besides, I don't name anybody.

**Johanna:** Just because you don't name names, doesn't mean people don't know who's who. Especially around here. And he told us about it while we were at the bar! Does he know you're writing about that?

**Audrey:** I mean, we've talked a lot about how the split revealed longstanding tensions among housing activists about strategies and tactics. And that fight really encapsulated that. Nick wants me to write about those tensions.

**Johanna:** Yeah, and you agree with his side! But does he know you want to document *this* fight, for anyone outside of the movement to read about? I mean, come on...and that part about the meeting at the shelter? I told you about it, and I made all those critiques about neoliberal city policies, and there it is, right there in your chapter, as if you're saying it.

**Audrey:** What? But we agree about those critiques! I was saying the same thing at the time. And Abrams really liked that part, where I break that down and contrast our view with Samson's framework in his new book.

**Johanna:** Abrams?... wait, so he's already read this? Was that before or after he suggested you apply for the job in Chicago? I didn't expect him to care about this community, about the housing plan. Now I'm wondering, do you? And if you get that job, you won't even be here anymore. Then what?
COMFORT ZONES

Overview: This case invites readers to consider the ethics of space and time. Rafael and Gabriela are educators committed to incorporating social justice issues into their high school teaching. They partner with Martha, a professor at a major university in the region, to develop a participatory action research project with students to investigate the connections between immigration and education in the lives of local residents. Martha received funding to study the process and has brought in David, a professor from the political science department, and his grad research assistant Aaron, to help with the survey design and a final policy brief.

Speaking Roles (in order of speaking time)
- **Martha**: Education professor at Southwest University and former high school teacher
- **Gabriela**: Math teacher at Lake City High School
- **Rafael**: Social Studies teacher at Lake City High School
- **Gloria**: EdD student and Martha’s graduate research assistant
- **Aaron**: Political science PhD student and David’s graduate research assistant
- **Helen**: Martha’s colleague in the School of Education
- **Narrator**: Sets the scene and provides contextual details

Scene 1

*Narrator: In the hallway at Lake City High School.*

**Gabriela**: So they’re finally coming back here? That’s a relief.

**Rafael**: [laughs] Well, it’s not like we could have taken all the students up there for the training. Yes, they’re coming here… and Martha worked it out to stay with her cousins, so they’ll be in town for a few days and can come to the resource fair. I’m setting up meetings with the other teachers. When they arrive Thursday night, we’ll do a trial run of the training session and a final check on the surveys and consent forms.

**Gabriela**: Can I bring Rosa?

**Rafael**: Can you get someone to watch her during the meeting?

**Gabriela**: I’ll see if my niece can stay after school to help. It’ll be really nice to have a break from driving there this month. Do we need to do anything ahead of time?

**Rafael**: I think we can mostly just show up for this one, but it’ll probably be a few hours.

**Gabriela**: Well, let’s definitely bring our big map so the Southwest folks can see where the students will conduct the surveys. Do we need to print anything? The copier still isn’t fixed.

**Rafael**: Gloria will make copies. She said they’ll give us the iPads, too – some kind of special paperwork on that. I think they’ll want the students to start conducting the surveys next month. Maybe then we’ll finally get the stipends.
Gabriela: Hah, we’ll see. Hey, I’ve been thinking – the surveys are going to be online right? So won’t we need high-speed internet access? I get a signal here and around town but beyond that and closer to the border, it’s totally hit or miss.

Rafael: Hmm, I hadn’t thought of that. We should bring it up at the meeting. And we need to fill them in on all that’s happened since last month. I talked a bit with Martha and Gloria but the rest of the team isn’t up to speed.

Gabriela: No surprise on that – those guys are never here.

Scene 2

Narrator: Meanwhile, at Southwest University, Martha and Helen exit a faculty meeting.

Helen: So your grant report deadline is coming up?

Martha: Yeah, already! I really need to finish my budget sheet… still waiting on numbers from the poli sci team. I always have to chase those guys down.

Helen: The Sponsored Projects Office takes two weeks to generate an official budget.

Martha: I don’t know how you can remember all these things. I make list after list and I still worry about what I’m forgetting. It doesn’t help that David takes forever to reply to my emails.

Helen: You’re the PI, my friend. Get used to it! [laughing] No one else is as invested… no one will get the same level of credit you do. But yes, this budget stuff is such a time sink.

Martha: No kidding. We had a whole complicated discussion about paying the community researchers… apparently going through payroll creates tax and benefits issues… total budget busters. So we set up a stipend or honoraria kind of arrangement, and had to revise the Memorandum of Understanding. It’s already so annoying – endless paperwork, checks always late, I could go on… And now the increase in tuition and health insurance for the grad assistants?! [sighs] All these hassles and shrinking funds for the actual work to be done…

Helen: Tell me about it. Can Gloria help with processing the payments?

Martha: I might ask her, but I’m already worried that she’ll end up doing the grunt work on every committee from here to retirement. I’m trying to keep her focused on writing for the project so she gets some publications before graduating. She’s always volunteering to take notes and make copies… None of the poli sci grad assistants ever volunteer, and David doesn’t insist that they share the load. Drives me crazy.

Helen: I bet. Hey, I gotta run. Good luck with all this!

Scene 3

Narrator: Two weeks later, a Thursday afternoon at Martha’s home. The Southwest University team is carpooling to Lake City. Gloria loads luggage and materials into Martha’s car.

Martha: [calling from the kitchen door] Did you print enough release forms for the iPads?

Gloria: Yeah, all set.

Martha: And in both Spanish and English? We need copies for the training session.

Gloria: Yep, ready to go.

Martha: Great, thanks. [turning and calling up the stairs] Jenna! Jaime! Mama’s leaving!
**Narrator:** After kissing the kids goodbye and a few last check-ins with the nanny, Martha jumps in the car, backs out of the driveway, and heads towards Aaron’s house.

**Martha:** Do you know if Aaron has been keeping up with his Spanish lessons? I don’t want us to have to translate for him the whole weekend.

**Gloria:** I think so. It’ll be a good time for him to practice. Do you think he’ll come to the meeting at the school on Saturday? Or the church service Sunday morning?

**Martha:** It’s important that he gets to know folks better, so he should go to both.

**Gloria:** It would’ve been nice if David had come too.

**Martha:** I know! He’s got time to rework the survey questions a million times, but not to go visit the site. Whatever. Damn, I just realized I didn’t look at his revisions yet.

**Gloria:** You can read them at the meeting, I’m sure it’s fine.

**Narrator:** Martha and Gloria arrive at Aaron’s house. He gets in the car and after a quick hello, opens his computer.

**Aaron:** I’ve got to work on this paper. I hoped to get it done before the trip but… well, you know how it goes. Will it bother you if I’m typing back here?

**Martha:** It won’t bother me, but we should check in about the weekend, go over our plans. How long will it take you to finish?

**Aaron:** Oh, I’ll be working on it all weekend, so we can check in first if you want.

**Martha:** All weekend? But we’ve got a lot to do!

**Aaron:** I know, but I’ll work on it in our downtime.

**Narrator:** Martha and Gloria exchange a look.

**Martha:** Well… we told Gabriela we’d spend tomorrow at the school to hang out with the students after the training session. We’ll need to meet with the rest of the teachers on Saturday after the resource fair, and I told my cousin we’d help prepare meals after that. And Rafael invited us to attend church service on Sunday morning, before we head out.

**Narrator:** Long pause in the car...

**Aaron:** It’s just that this paper is due Monday morning, and I don’t think I can write it all on Sunday when we get back. And I’m a bit confused… I thought my job was to enter the survey changes into the software after our meeting tonight and go over it with the students tomorrow – then done. Have fun, hang out… meet some people.

**Gloria:** [turns to face Aaron] I don’t think you really understand the concept of ‘hanging out’ there. It’s a full contact sport. We make and eat meals together, play with the kids. It’s really fun, but I wouldn’t count on too much downtime.

**Martha:** And it’s important for the project that you understand what’s going on in the community. This work is about showing up.

**Aaron:** Oh, uh, okay… It’s just that David never mentioned any of this. How am I supposed to do all that and get my own work done? I don’t know if I have enough hours this month for all that…

**Narrator:** Gloria and Martha exchange another look.
Martha: It sounds like you'll need to talk with David.

Aaron: Yeah, I guess so. I only got on this project because I needed funding this term. And David thought this study might be a good basis for the research we're planning for the Inland County area.

Scene 4

Narrator: Later that evening, Aaron, Martha, and Gloria arrive at Lake City High School. Rafael sets them up in his classroom. Gabriela and her daughter Rosa arrive a little later.

Gloria: Rosa! Hi!!

Narrator: Rosa rushes to hug Gloria, then hugs Martha too. Rosa looks shyly at Aaron.

Martha: Rosa, this is Aaron. Aaron, meet Rosa and Gabriela.

Gabriela: Pleased to meet you. [looks at Rosa] Ok, love, grab your toys and backpack and let's make a special place for you over here in this corner.

Narrator: Everyone sits around the table. Gloria passes around the survey questions.

Martha: Gabriela and Rafael, this is the latest version of the survey question set. I know you haven't had a chance to look at them, so let's spend a few minutes reading them over. Aaron, can you take notes please? Thanks.

Aaron: Uh, yeah. Sure… So, I've entered these questions into the online software. I can quickly make any tweaks. We'll create the student log-ins tomorrow and their iPads will sync automatically, so we're pretty good to go.

Rafael: Oh yeah, speaking of the iPads, Gabriela made a good point the other day – we don't get a consistent signal in a number of the survey areas. We can point some of those places out on our map if you want.

Martha: That shouldn't matter that much, should it? Maybe the tech guys can find a work around?

Aaron: [flustered] It definitely matters! The surveys are online and sync to the cloud. We've been working on this for months and you're only mentioning this now?

Gabriela: [reading through the questions] Hold on, hold on. Forget the iPads for a minute, we need to back up. What's going on with these questions?! You've changed them a lot from what we sent you… the students had worked so hard on those… Whoa, and some of these are really a problem.

Martha: [reading silently, her eyes bulging at the new draft] What?! Yeah, I'm so sorry. To be honest, I didn't get a chance to look at the last pass that David sent along… we've been down to the wire. Let's take a closer look…

Rafael: [after a long silence, sighs] Yeah, we can't start with these questions. Asking right off the bat about immigration status? That'll make both the students and respondents uneasy. Things have been really tense around here… the sheriff's sending deputies around to check IDs. Now with the cops backing up the INS agents, everyone is on edge. I think we should start with the questions the students developed about people's day-to-day lives, experiences at school. The ones we sent in our report last month? Then work our way up to the delicate legalization issues?

Martha: Right, we agreed that was the most respectful way to approach the process… and it'll give us the richest data. This order is all switched around from our last meeting.

Aaron: I think David moved things around to prioritize the key questions… they're long surveys and responses to those questions will be most important for the policy work. That's where we're going to have real impact.
Rafael: Maybe *your* key questions, but I think we need to think about other impacts too. Listen, I know the policy component is important, and talking about how law and policy play out in people’s lives is a big part of my unit with the students… But that’s why these other questions matter too.

Gabriela: Yeah, this isn’t just about teaching my students statistics through the data. I want them to learn real stuff about their community along the way and how numbers can get manipulated in ways that might even harm them.

Aaron: Wait, aren’t we getting off track? The training session is tomorrow morning and we still haven’t talked about the internet access thing. None of this matters if we can’t actually do the surveys. And doesn’t David need to be in on these decisions?

Martha: Alright, why don’t we all take a deep breath. We can make this work… right?
Chrissy Anderson-Zavala
Chrissy Anderson-Zavala is a Xicana writer and educator from Salinas, California. She is currently the Policy and Program Management Consultant with the San Francisco Arts Commission and is pursuing her Ph.D. at UC Santa Cruz in the Social and Cultural Contexts of Education program with designated emphases in Feminist Studies and Critical Race and Ethnic Studies. Her work considers histories of capitalist and colonial productions of youth “delinquency” in the US, how schools reinscribe such figurations, and how young people and abolitionist imaginations offer alternative visions.

Natalie JK Baloy
Natalie grew up in Ohio surrounded by family and has lived on the West Coast for ten years with her partner and their dog and parrot. She is deeply curious about intertidal zones, including literal places where the ocean and land meet and also metaphorical spaces of shift and connection. She is committed to learning from histories of injustice to cultivate collective work toward feminist, decolonizing, and antiracist futures. In the first summer of her doctoral program in cultural anthropology at the University of British Columbia, she participated in an ethnographic field school designed in collaboration with the Gitxaa? Nation in northern BC. This experience inspired Natalie’s ongoing examination of research ethics, researcher positionality, and the impacts of anthropological knowledge production and settler colonialism with/in Indigenous communities. Her urban ethnographic Ph.D. research analyzed settler participation in reproducing and transforming settler colonial logics on unceded Coast Salish territories in Vancouver. As a postdoctoral fellow with CCREC, Natalie is developing research and resources that support alternative research ethics policies, pedagogies, and practices that account for historical and contemporary contexts of power and the dynamic interrelationships between peoples and places.

Linnea Beckett
Linnea is a Ph.D. Candidate in Education at the University of California, Santa Cruz. She has worked for the past six years with a collaboration of university researchers, teachers, parents, and community members on a long-term community and school change project that deploys digital storytelling as part of a pedagogy for social change. Linnea’s current research engages critical and feminist frameworks to examine the organizational formation of the community-engaged project, the stakeholder’s conceptualizations of the collaborative project, and the ethical dimensions of mobilizing digital storytelling as part of the change effort. She worked for CCREC from 2010 - 2013 as a graduate student researcher.

Kirsten Bell
I am a Research Associate in the Department of Anthropology at the University of British Columbia and have previously held appointments at the University of Northern Colorado and Macquarie University in Australia. In the latter position, I was a member of the human research ethics committee, which is where I developed an interest in the institutionalization of research ethics. Since 2010 I have consulted for the Office of Research Ethics at UBC as an ethics analyst. I have published widely in the anthropology of public health and biomedicine and am a co-editor of the journal Critical Public Health. I have publications on ethics in Research Ethics, Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics, American Anthropologist and the forthcoming book The Ethics Rupture (edited by van den Hoonoord and Hamilton). My forthcoming book is titled Health and Other Unassailable Values: Reconfigurations of Health, Evidence and Ethics (Routledge, 2016).

Chris Benner
Dr. Chris Benner is the Dorothy E. Everett Chair in Global Information and Social Entrepreneurship, Director of the Everett Program for Digital Tools for Social Innovation, and a Professor of Environmental Studies and Sociology at the University of California, Santa Cruz. His research examines the relationships between technological change, regional development, and the structure of economic opportunity, focusing on regional labor markets and the transformation of work and employment. Significant authored or co-authored books include: Equity, Growth and Community (2015), which examines diversity and dynamics of regional knowledge communities, and their relationship to social equity and economic growth; Just Growth (2012) which helps uncover the subtle and detailed processes, policies and institutional arrangement that help explain how certain regions around the country have been able to consistently link prosperity and inclusion; This Could Be The Start of Something Big (2009) which examines new regional movements around community development, policy initiatives, and social movement organizing; and Work in the New Economy (2002), an examination of the transformation of work and employment in the information economy. He received his Ph.D. in City and Regional Planning from the University of California, Berkeley.
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Emily Borg
Emily Borg is a community-based educator, activist, and graduate student with a concentration in social & cultural contexts of education in the Education Department at the University of California, Santa Cruz. Her research interests are in intergenerational critical participatory action research, criminalization and incarceration, racial justice, and community organizing to dismantle the school-to-prison pipeline. Emily works with Fathers & Families of San Joaquin (FFSJ) in Stockton, California on issues including school discipline, police on campus, childhood arrests, criminalization and incarceration, and healing justice. Through her previous work as a graduate student researcher with CCREC, Emily became involved in the NOPAL project (Neighborhoods Owning Power, Action & Leadership), a community-campus partnership to increase young adult civic engagement through culturally-rooted organizing and participatory action research. Emily is also a member of the Urban Research-Based Action Network (URBAN) Education Node planning team and graduate student workgroup.

Mary Brydon-Miller
Mary Brydon-Miller, Ph.D. directs the Action Research Center and is Professor of Educational and Community-based Action Research in the Educational Studies Program in the College of Education, Criminal Justice, and Human Services at the University of Cincinnati. She is a participatory action researcher who conducts work in both school and community settings. She recently completed work on the SAGE Encyclopedia of Action Research with co-editor David Coghlan. Other recent publications focus on the development of new frameworks for understanding research ethics in educational and community settings. She is also interested in the transformation of higher education to support community engagement and social justice.

Reverend Daniel Buford
Reverend Daniel A. Buford heads the Prophetic Justice Ministry at Allen Temple Baptist Church in Oakland, CA. He is a founding organizer and trainer of the People’s Institute for Survival and Beyond based in New Orleans, Louisiana and has conducted Undoing Racism workshops throughout the United States, South Africa, Japan and Puerto Rico since 1980. He is the past President of the Meiklejohn Civil Liberties Institute, a peace and justice law think tank organization located in Berkeley, CA. A native of Cincinnati, Ohio, Rev. Buford was educated in the Cincinnati Public School system and attended the University of Cincinnati and Xavier University. He has a B.A. Degree: “Born Again”. His graduate studies are in the belief that he can do all things through Christ that strengthens him. Reverend Buford received a license to preach in 1974 and was ordained in 1977 by the Trinity Missionary Baptist Church in Cincinnati, OH. Rev. Buford has taught Doctor of Ministry students as a faculty member of the University of Creation Spirituality and the Wisdom University since 1997 in courses on wood sculpture and the creative process, and his sculptures have been exhibited in museums and galleries in San Francisco, New Orleans, Oakland, Los Angeles, and elsewhere.

Caitlin Cahill
Caitlin Cahill, Ph.D., is an Assistant Professor of Urban Geography & Politics, Pratt Institute. A community-based urban studies & youth studies scholar for over fifteen years, Caitlin has conducted participatory action research projects with young people in cities across the US investigating the everyday intimate experiences of global urban restructuring, specifically as it concerns gentrification, immigration, education, and zero tolerance policies. Currently Caitlin works with the Bushwick Action Research Collective and the Public Science Project in New York City. In Salt Lake City, Utah she co-founded the Mestizo Arts & Activism Collective (with Matt Bradley & David Quijada), an intergenerational social justice think tank that engages young people as catalysts of change in a model integrating participatory research, arts and activism. Before that Caitlin worked with the wonderful Fed Up Honeys on the Lower East Side of NYC. Caitlin’s work has been published widely in journals and edited collections in geography, urban studies, youth studies and education.
Ethan Chang
Ethan Chang is a Ph.D. student in the Social and Cultural Contexts of Education at the University of California at Santa Cruz with a Designated Emphasis in Sociology. He is a former special educator and currently serves as a graduate student researcher at the Center for Collaborative Research for an Equitable California (CCREC). His research interests include school reform, education policy, critical policy analysis, cultural studies in education, media studies, equity-oriented collaborative community based research, and ethnography.

Lise Dobrin
Lise Dobrin is an anthropological linguist. Her field research on Arapesh, an endangered language of Papua New Guinea, has led her to explore a whole range of perspectives on language preservation, most prominently among them: how and why communities shift their allegiance from their local vernaculars to languages of wider communication; the technical and ethical dimensions of language documentation, archiving, and description; and the epistemology and politics of community-based and collaborative initiatives in linguistic research and revitalization. She also has a fascination with Arapesh ethnography as a historical construction. Dobrin is a longstanding member of the University of Virginia's Social and Behavioral Sciences IRB, where she has worked to support productive review processes for ethnographic research. She has served as ethics committee chair for the Linguistic Society of America and the American Anthropological Association.

Timothy K. Eatman
Timothy K. Eatman holds an appointment as Associate Professor of higher education in the School of Education at Syracuse University. He also currently serves as faculty co-director of Imagining America: Artists and Scholars in Public Life (IA) the national consortium of over 100 colleges, universities and community based organizations working at the nexus of publicly engaged scholarship and the cultural disciplines (humanities, arts, and design fields). Tim describes himself as an educational sociologist, survey researcher and overall "student of higher education" who advances publicly engaged scholarship that centers on equity issues in higher education. He earned an M.Ed. from Howard University, Ph.D. from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Campaign and completed a postdoctoral fellowship at the University of Michigan's Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary education. The recipient of the 2010 Early Career Research Award for the International Association for Research on Service Learning and Community Engagement (IARSLCE), Tim often consults with higher education associations, foundations, networks and institutions conducting collaborative research to address pressing public problems. He is a nationally recognized higher education leader regularly invited to offer keynotes, workshops and consultancies. He was a member of the 2015 Advisory Panel for the Carnegie Engagement Classification for Community Engagement. Tim has published in such venues as the Journal of Educational Finance, Readings on Equal Education, Diversity & Democracy, Liberal Education, The Huffington Post and has written several other book chapters and reports. Tim is currently serving as the inaugural Seletz Visiting Civic Fellow at Widener University through 2017.

Gustavo E. Fischman
Gustavo E. Fischman is professor in educational policy and director of edXchange the knowledge mobilization initiative at the Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College, Arizona State University. His work focuses on understanding and improving the processes of knowledge-exchange between educational researchers and relevant stakeholders, including other scholars, educators, activists, practitioners, administrators, policymakers, and the general public. His work contributes to the strengthening of educational scholarship as a public good and increasing the usability of educational research. Dr. Fischman has more than 100 academic publications, and has been a visiting scholar in several graduate programs in Europe and Latin America. In 2013 Dr. Fischman was elected fellow of the International Academy of Education, and in 2015 fellow of the American Educational Research Association. He serves in numerous editorial boards, and is the executive editor of Education Policy Analysis Archives and Education Review/Reseñas Educativas.
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Diane C. Fujino
Diane C. Fujino is Professor of Asian American Studies and Director of the Center for Black Studies Research (CBSR) at the University of California, Santa Barbara. The CBSR is developing engaged scholarship models and received a CCREC grant to bring together activists, scholars, and students to engage in critical dialogues about theories and strategies of organizing and leadership models that foster participatory democracy. Her work as an activist-scholar centers on teaching and researching social movements, developing praxis projects in the classroom, and working as an activist on prisons, political prisoners, public education, and Asian American and Third World struggles. Her research focuses on Asian American freedom movements, Afro-Asian radicalism, and Japanese American history, 1940s-70s. She is the author of Heartbeat of Struggle: The Revolutionary Life of Yuri Kochiyama; Samurai among Panthers: Richard Aoki on Race, Resistance, and a Paradoxical Life; and Wicked Theory, Naked Practice: A Fred Ho Reader.

Julie Gieseke
Julie works with individuals and organizations that are seeking clarity or refinement of their direction and vision. Over the last ten years her work has focused on integrating visual thinking, storytelling and creative engagement with strategic visioning. The results her clients have experienced are new insights in their current organization, shifts in direction, identifying new objectives and strategies for achieving greater results with deeper satisfaction and motivation. Julie has a master's degree in Organizational Management and Development and is certified in personal and professional coaching as well as professional training in group process design, group facilitation and visual facilitation. (mapthemind.org)

Ronald David Glass
Ron Glass is a son and brother, the father of three and grandfather of four. He is a married man with family commitments. Ron was a Civil Rights movement activist and an anti-Viet Nam War movement resister. As a radical philosopher of education, he has worked with a wide range of social justice, anti-racism, and anti-militarist organizations, and in the early 1980s he collaborated with renowned democratic educators Myles Horton and Paulo Freire. Among his honors, Ron was awarded a 2001 Martin Luther King, Jr., Living the Dream Award by the City of Phoenix (AZ) Human Relations Commission. Ron has held university appointments for 25 years (Stanford University, University of California, Berkeley, Arizona State University, and the University of California, Santa Cruz), and is currently serving as Professor of Philosophy of Education at UCSC and PI/Director of a UC system-wide research program initiative, the Center for Collaborative Research for an Equitable California (CCREC). Ron also leads CCREC’s Spencer Foundation funded project investigating the ethical issues in social science research, particularly those issues most in tension when research is community-driven and justice-oriented.

Robin Gray
Robin Gray is from the Ts’msyen and Mikisew Cree First Nations. She holds a B.A.S. (2008) in Interdisciplinary Studies from Bennett College for Women, an M.A. (2010) and Ph.D. (2015) in Socio-cultural Anthropology, and a Graduate Certificate (2015) in Indigenous Studies from the University of Massachusetts Amherst. Her dissertation, Ts’mysen Revolution: The Poetics and Politics of Reclaiming, includes an examination of the legal and ethical dimensions associated with repatriating Ts’msyen songs from archives, and an exploration of embodied sovereignty and heritage reclamation in an urban Ts’mysen dance group. Dr. Gray has been appointed a 2015-2016 University of California President’s Postdoctoral Fellow at the University of California Santa Cruz to develop her current writing project, Researching, Representing and Repatriating Ts’mysen Cultural Heritage.

Monique Guishard
Monique describes herself as a reluctant researcher and decided de-colonial ethicist. Coming from overly researched communities and penurious social class origins has influenced her complicated posture to research. Monique claims nepantla, threshold spaces, as sites of radical relational ethical praxis. Using individual interviews, focus groups, longitudinal de-colonial ethnography her recently defended dissertation explored perceptions of ethical conduct in community-engaged and participatory action research in order to articulate points of divergence and resonance with IRB centered regulatory ethical frameworks. Her post graduate work is focused on disrupting white normativity by (re)humanizing of People of Color in research ethics. This work requires substantive re-imaginings of the: literature, historical examples, vignettes, and theories of change that permeate research ethics discourse and training. Guishard is an Assistant Professor of Psychology at Bronx Community College—CUNY, a founding member of the Public Science Project and a member of the Bronx Community Research Review Board (BxCRRB).
Participants

Charles R. Hale
Professor in the Departments of Anthropology and African Diaspora Studies at the University of Texas at Austin. Author of Resistance and Contradiction: Miskitu Indians and the Nicaraguan State, 1894-1987 (Stanford, 1994); and of “Más que un indio…” Racial Ambivalence and Neoliberal Multiculturalism in Guatemala (SAR, 2006); editor of the volume, Engaging Contradictions: Theory, Politics and Methods of Activist Scholarship (UC Press), and author of numerous articles on identity politics, racism, neoliberalism and resistance among indigenous and afro-descendant peoples of Latin America. President of the Latin American Studies Association, April 2006 through October 2007. He is currently Director of the Teresa Lozano Long Institute of Latin American Studies and the Nettie Lee Benson Latin American Collection, both at the University of Texas at Austin.

Nigel Hatton
Assistant Professor of Literature and (by courtesy) Philosophy, School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts, UC Merced; Governance Council, CCREC; Contributing Editor, James Baldwin Review and the Journal of Transnational American Studies; Courses taught include “Human Rights and Literature,” “Racism and the Human Condition,” “Toni Morrison and James Baldwin,” “Afro-American Lifeworlds, Global Thinking and Human Rights,” “Cosmopolitanisms,” and “From Postcolonial Theory to Decolonial Thinking”; research focused on global human rights and world literature, literature and philosophy, 19th-21st century transnational American literature and culture; has published work on Søren Kierkegaard, Martin Luther King, Jr., James Baldwin, and others. Currently completing manuscript on the ethics of Kierkegaard and Frederick Douglass. Former visiting professional, International Criminal Court, I.F. Stone fellow, Human Rights Watch, and Du Bois Institute fellow, Harvard University; has facilitated courses on literature, writing and philosophy at San Quentin State Prison, Central California Women’s Facility, and Richmond Hills Family Center.

Joyce E. King
Joyce E. King holds the Benjamin E. Mays Endowed Chair for Urban Teaching, Learning and Leadership at Georgia State University, where she is also Professor of Educational Policy Studies and affiliated Faculty in African American Studies and the Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Institute. She holds degrees from Stanford University (Ph.D., Social Foundations of Education/B.A., Sociology, with Honors) and a Harvard Graduate School Education Management Certificate. She served as Provost at Spelman College. She is past-President of the American Educational Research Association. Her scholarship analyzes how dysconsciousness, a term that she introduced, is produced by miseducating mainstream curricula and resists a critically transformative understanding of race and racialized inequity. Two new books are: Re-membering History in Student and Teacher Learning: An African-centered Culturally Informed Praxis (2014) and Dysconscious Racism, Afrocentric Praxis and Education for Human Freedom—Through the Years I Keep on Toiling—The Selected Works of Joyce E. King (2015).

Patricia Krueger-Henney
Patricia Krueger-Henney is an assistant professor at the University of Massachusetts in Boston. With her scholarship she examines educational policies in urban school systems, and how these populate physical school space and young people’s stances towards their educational trajectories. Through participatory action research Patricia documents how young people perceive and experience social injustices produced and reproduced by current purposes of education. Past projects have outlined how youth-centered visual narratives situate purposes, ethics, and pedagogies as embodied and spatialized knowledges. Prior to joining the Department of Leadership, Patricia was a faculty member of various teacher education programs and also taught social studies in New York City public high schools.
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Amanda Lashaw
Visiting Assistant Professor, Education Department, UC Santa Cruz. My disciplines: anthropology, critical social theory, and ethnographic methodology. My research interests: political culture, education politics, reformist movements, NGO/nonprofit worlds, multiracial liberalism and progressive identities. I’m currently writing about the production of optimism through a movement for educational equity. My interests in research ethics: Studying middle-class actors and nonprofit worlds raises distinctive issues. I’ve been working with folks in critical NGO/nonprofit studies on questions like: Who are the audiences of research focused on the lives of middle-class reformers? To whom are researchers accountable when turning their experiences into objects of analysis? How can one make room for critical analysis of worlds that claim moral supremacy?

Rena Lederman
A sociocultural anthropologist with 1970s/1980s fieldwork experience in rural Papua New Guinea (e.g., on gender, non-market exchange, and non-state politics), for the past two decades Rena Lederman has done comparative research on academic disciplinary cultures and hierarchies, focusing on ethico-methodological differences and similarities and on the impacts of federal research ethics regulation on the conduct and teaching of ethnographic fieldwork particularly. She has served on Princeton University’s Institutional Review Board for many years (representing ethnography) and co-chaired the American Anthropological Association ethics committee (1990s). Drawing on experiences like these, in 2011 and again in 2016, she coauthored the AAA’s critical commentaries on federal proposals for an overhaul of “human subject research” regulations; in the interim, she was the lone ethnographer (and sole representative of humanistic knowledge practices) on a National Research Council panel authoring a “consensus report” on those proposals. She has taught graduate and undergraduate fieldwork courses, developed ethics-in-context courses at both levels, and courses on anthropology of gender, critical economic anthropology, genre differences among ethnography, journalism, historiography, and fiction, and more – always feminist/critical pedagogy-style.

Meira Levinson
Meira Levinson is Professor of Education at Harvard Graduate School of Education. A political theorist by training, Meira taught eighth grade for eight years in the Atlanta and Boston Public Schools after earning her doctorate, before returning to academia. This orientation toward combining normative theory and concrete practice, informed by relevant empirical research, defines Meira’s research and writing over the past two decades. Her current research focuses on case studies of dilemmas of educational ethics. These cases are intended to give educators tools for making ethical decisions in their own practice, and to push political theorists to develop theories of justice that are action-guiding in non-ideal contexts. Meira uses these cases as prompts for conversations and focus groups, as the basis for academic and popular articles, and the focus of two books: Theorizing Educational Justice (oriented toward philosophers and theorists) and Dilemmas of Educational Ethics: Cases and Commentaries.

George Lipsitz
George Lipsitz is Professor of Black Studies and Sociology at the University of California, Santa Barbara. He serves as president of the Board of Directors of the African American Policy Forum and chair of the Advisory Board of the UCSB Center for Black Studies Research. In his work with these institutions as well as with the National Fair Housing Alliance and the Woodstock Institute, he is engaged in equity oriented collaborative community based research in which research questions emerge from the needs of community organizations.

Suresh Lodha
Suresh Lodha is interested in visualizing socio-economic inequalities. His co-authored books, The Atlas of Global Inequalities and The Atlas of California, investigate inequalities in multiple dimensions describing how inadequate health services, unsafe water, and barriers to education has hindered people’s ability to achieve their aspirations and live their lives to the full. His focus has been to dive into the multitude of databases, graphics, and information to design information graphics that convey the themes simply yet powerfully. He is keenly interested in examining the causality and linkages between different often cross-disciplinary variables that can lead to design of more integrative public policy initiatives. He is a professor of Computer Science at UCSC. He is interested in designing interactive visualizations on the web in collaboration with communities to create meaningful graphics with social impact.
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Rebecca London
Rebecca London, Ph.D., is Research Professor at the Center for Collaborative Research for an Equitable California at the University of California, Santa Cruz and Adjunct Fellow at the Public Policy Institute of California. Throughout her career, Dr. London’s research has bridged academia and policy, focusing on the policies and programs intended to serve low-income or disadvantaged children, youth and families. Using both qualitative and quantitative methods, she has conducted research in multiple policy areas, including: K-12 and post-secondary education, afterschool programs, welfare reform, health and wellness, the digital divide and children’s living arrangements. Dr. London collaborates with community organizations and agencies to design and conduct actionable research that is both methodologically sound and relevant to the community’s needs. She is co-editor of the volume From Data To Action: A Community Approach to Improving Youth Outcomes (Harvard Education Press), which describes how communities can leverage their existing data to identify the most effective policies and interventions to support positive youth outcomes. Her research has been published in numerous journals, edited volumes, and policy briefs as well as presented at professional conferences, in community forums and in legislative testimony.

Raquel López
Raquel López is the current Executive Director of La Casa De La Raza. La Casa De La Raza was founded in 1971 to provide a non-profit community center on the Eastside of Santa Barbara. The mission of La Casa de la Raza is to develop and empower the Latino community by affirming and preserving the Latino cultural heritage, providing an umbrella for services and by advocating for participation in the larger community. Ms. López was born and raised in Santa Barbara, attending local schools including UCSB where she majored in Political Science. Her life’s work for the past 24 years has been serving youth and families. She has worked at Santa Barbara High school as an academic advisor, the City of Santa Barbara as the first ever Director of Teen Programs, Girls Incorporated as Director of Teen Programs, and Community Mediation. She also consults with local organizations in the areas of conflict analysis and process management, small and large group facilitation and mediation, and interest-based negotiation and consensus building.

Elizabeth Marlow
Elizabeth is a co-founder of The Gamble Institute and a nurse practitioner with the San Francisco County Jail. She has affiliations with UCSF and USF Schools of Nursing. She is one of the founders of the "Heidegger Wine and Movie Club," a scholarly group that explores the health care and educational industries from a phenomenological perspective. Her work is focused on the impact of higher education on the reintegration of formerly incarcerated adults. Please visit www.gambleinstitute.org for more information.

Myrna Martinez Nateras
Myrna Martinez Nateras is the Program Director for the Human Migration and Mobility Central Valley Programs of the American Friends Service Committee (AFSC). In 1998 Myrna joined AFSC to found their Pan Valley Institute (PVI) a new center with the goal of assisting immigrants becoming active players in empowering their communities. She grew PVI from a one-person operation working from her home, to a renowned popular education institute that for seventeen years has provided new immigrants to California’s Central Valley a space for learning about each other, building interethnic relationships and organizing strategies for social change. Myrna has been actively involved in several international and national conferences for the advancement of policies on democracy and civic engagement programs for migrants. Myrna was born in Michoacán, Mexico. She graduated in Philosophy and Sociology from the University of Bucharest, Rumania.

Paula McAvoy
Paula McAvoy is the program director for the Center for Ethics and Education at UW-Madison. Her research interests include: democratic education, cultural and religious accommodations, and the ethics of teaching about politics. These interests were largely formed by her experiences teaching high school social studies in California. Paula has also worked as an assistant professor at Illinois State University and an associate program officer at the Spencer Foundation. She is the co-author, with Diana Hess, of the book, The Political Classroom: Evidence and Ethics in Democratic Education (2015, Routledge Press).
Participants

Meredith Minkler
Meredith is flunking retirement from UC Berkeley’s School of Public Health. She is involved in several community-based participatory research (CPBR) projects locally in food justice/healthy retail and criminal justice reform and globally on a community-engaged approach to infection prevention and control, developed with African colleagues in the wake of Ebola. She has written and taught extensively on ethical challenges in community-engaged research, which also is a theme of her co-edited text, *Community Based Participatory Research for Health* (3rd edition in press). Meredith is a mother/mother-equivalent of 3 young men, two of whom aged out of foster care and have lived with her and her husband for 5 years.

Michael J. Montoya
Michael J. Montoya, Ph.D., is a professor of anthropology, Chicano/Latino Studies, public health and nursing science at the University of California – Irvine. He also is faculty for The Program in Medical Education for the Latino Community (PRIME-LC), in the School of Medicine. He is the director of the Community Knowledge Project, www.communityknowledgeproject.org, which is an experimental space for communities of all kinds to learn and engage in action together. His research examines the ways life-ways become embodied in individuals and groups. Michael has written about the social causes of chronic diseases and the problems of scientific approaches that exclude the voices of those most impacted by them. His recent book, Making the Mexican Diabetic: Race, Science, and the Genetics of Inequality (2011) explores genetic science as only one among many ways to explain who gets diabetes and why. Michael is a passionate advocate of community making in all its forms and currently learns with people involved in neighborhood renewal efforts in Southern California. Michael believes that community knowledge is the missing ingredient in almost all formal problem-solving approaches. His work seeks to characterize the ways community knowledge can make academic questions more relevant and research more robust. Equally important, Michael believes that making community is a birthright and that health and wellbeing require it.

Richa Nagar
Richa Nagar is Professor of the College in the College of Liberal Arts at the University of Minnesota, where she currently holds the Bennett Chair in Excellence and the Fink Professorship in Liberal Arts. Her multi-genre antdisciplinarity work in English, Hindi, and Awadhi has evolved over the last 20 years as an ongoing resistance to standard practices of academic knowledge production. The co-authoring of *Sangtin Yatra* (2004) in Hindi with eight rural activists in North India proved transformative for Richa. The book tackled upfront some of the burning questions of NGOization and the politics of expertise and empowerment, and the conversations triggered by it (and by its translations and reproductions) gave birth to the Sangtin Kisan Mazdoor Sangathan or SKMS, an organization of 6000 peasants and laborers, chiefly Dalit and more than half of them women, in Sitapur District of Uttar Pradesh. These developments have pushed Richa to meaningfully entangle her academic work not only with the movement building efforts of SKMS but also with artistic collaborations in India and the US that seek to make social interventions through community theatre and multilingual creative and analytical writing. The collaborative imagining of agendas and processes in these partnerships has led to exciting interventions in academic conversations about politics of epistemology and about methodologies by which authority, visions, and projects might be shared across institutional, geographic, and sociopolitical borders.

Anne Newman
Anne Newman is Associate Director at the McCoy Family Center for Ethics in Society at Stanford. She received her Ph.D. from Stanford University’s School of Education in philosophy of education and was Assistant professor at Washington University. Her research interests focus on the intersection of contemporary political philosophy and education policy, with a particular focus on community and court-based education reform efforts. She is a 2009 recipient of a National Academy of Education/Spencer Foundation Postdoctoral Fellowship and the author of *Realizing Educational Rights: Advancing School Reform through Courts and Communities* (University of Chicago Press, 2013) and a co-author of *Between Movement and Establishment: Organizations Advocating for Youth* (Stanford University Press, 2009). Prior to joining the Center, she was a researcher at the University of California Center for Collaborative Research for an Equitable California working on a Spencer funded project focused on ethical dilemmas in community-based research.
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George Nicholas
George Nicholas is a professor of Archaeology at Simon Fraser University (SFU) in Burnaby, British Columbia. He was the founding director of SFU’s Indigenous Archaeology Program in Kamloops (1991–2005), and has worked closely with the Secwépemc and other First Nations in British Columbia, and Indigenous groups worldwide. In 2013, he received the inaugural “Partnership Award” from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council. Nicholas’ research focuses on Indigenous peoples and archaeology, intellectual property issues relating to archaeology, the archaeology and human ecology of wetlands, and archaeological theory and practice. He is the director of the Intellectual Property Issues in Cultural Heritage (IPinCH) project, an 8-year initiative funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council. The IPinCH project is an international collaboration of over 50 scholars and 25 partnering organizations concerned with the theoretical, ethical, and practical implications of commodification, appropriation, and other flows of knowledge about the past, and with how these may affect communities, researchers, and other stakeholders.

Saugher Nojan
Saugher Nojan is a Graduate Student Researcher for CCREC and a doctoral student in the Education Department’s Social and Cultural Contexts of Education Ph.D. program. Her designated emphasis is in Sociology. Saugher is interested in sociology of education, critical pedagogy, and community-engaged collaborative research. The ethics of collaborative work and research more generally has always interested Saugher, especially when working with marginalized communities. She hopes to use insights from this conference to practice self-reflexivity in her own practices as a novice researcher. Her current research seeks to explore how Afghan-American Muslim students make sense of their cultural identity and its (mis)representations in relation to their educational experiences and aspirations, in a post-9/11 political climate.

Rodney T. Ogawa
Rodney T. Ogawa is Professor Emeritus and Research Professor at the University of California, Santa Cruz. He is past-Vice President of Division A of the American Educational Research Association. His research examines relationships between societal norms, the structure of educational organizations, and the contexts for learning these organizations afford. His work has been published in leading journals, including the American Educational Research Journal, Educational Researcher, Harvard Education Review, Teachers College Record, and American Journal of Education. He currently directs an initiative to organize the Silicon Valley Regional Data Trust (SVRDT). SVRDT will govern a data set that will include data from schools, health and human service agencies and providers of educational technology programs and resources in San Mateo, Santa Clara and Santa Cruz Counties. SVRDT will provide data to support policy making, agency collaboration, program development and research to enhance opportunities and outcomes for children/youth and families in the region.

Dena Plemmons
Research Ethics Program
The Graduate Division
University of California, Riverside
San Diego Research Ethics Consortium
University of California, San Diego
An anthropologist by training, I made a mid-career shift to research ethics ~ 10 years ago. I investigate perceptions of ethical practice across the sciences, and design curricula for teaching research ethics, nationally and internationally.

Troy A. Richardson
I am an Associate Professor of Philosophy of Education and American Indian and Indigenous Studies at Cornell University. As both a philosopher of education and scholar in American Indian Studies, my research, scholarship and pedagogical efforts center on interrogating knowledge production in the contexts of coloniality in philosophy and the conceptual foundations of western education. I draw particular attention to how and where Indigenous peoples/scholars resist specific western philosophical frameworks (while adapting others) in specific historical and contemporary contexts. I am especially attentive to the philosophical claims for both Indigenous methodologists and likewise Indigenous "phenomenological," "genealogical," "empirical" and "post-postivist" modes of educational research and the differing kinds of philosophies of (ethical) relations they seek to establish.
Participants

Sheeva Sabati
Sheeva Sabati is a Ph.D. candidate in UCSC's Education Department, with a designated emphasis from the Feminist Studies Department. She has engaged with the ethics of community-university collaborations as a CCREC graduate student researcher for over four years. In particular, she is interested in how anti-/de-colonial frameworks raise urgent questions for research ethics. Her dissertation work examines social justice-oriented knowledge formations within the university to learn from the complexities, tensions, and possibilities of critical knowledge projects within these fraught institutional spaces. Sheeva's research has in part been animated by her own experiences as an immigrant-settler in the United States schooled in predominantly liberal/white institutions. Among many things, Sheeva is grateful for her family, loved ones, and for finding joy and expression through dance.

Janna Shadduck-Hernández
Janna Shadduck-Hernández, Ed.D. is a Project Director at the UCLA Center for Labor Research and Education. She teaches in UCLA's Graduate School of Education and Information Studies, César E. Chávez Chicano/a Studies Department and the Labor and Workplace Studies Minor. Shadduck-Hernández's research and teaching have focused on developing alternative, culturally relevant and artistically inspired educational models with 1st and 2nd generation university students, immigrant workers and parents and community youth. Currently she is the Principal Investigator of the Young Workers in Los Angeles study focused on learning about the experiences of low-wage workers ages 18-29 employed in the restaurant, fast food, retail and grocery industries. She is also the co-author of a recent report titled: Hanging by a Thread! Los Angeles Garment Workers’ Struggle to Access Quality Care for their Children with the Garment Worker Center and Research Action Design that highlights the everyday challenges that low-wage working parents face in trying to find care for their children. Presently Shadduck-Hernández’s research is also focused on the educational processes involved in developing programs for parent-workers, with school-age learners, to engage them leaders and organizers in educational reform efforts. She recently received a major 2 year W.F. Kellogg Foundation grant to focus on parent engagement and early childhood education with janitors and their children. With her undergraduate students from the UCLA course, Immigrant Rights, Labor and Higher Education, she co-edited the first student-authored publication about the experiences of undocumented students in higher education titled Underground Undergrads: UCLA Undocumented Students Speak Out! (2008). A sister publication, Undocumented and Unafraid: Tam Tran, Cinthya Felix and the Immigrant Youth Movement (2012) presents immigrant youth narratives that are shifting the debate on immigration reform. Janna received her doctorate from the University of Massachusetts Amherst’s School of Education within the Center for International Education in 2005. Her dissertation, Here I am Now! Community Service-Learning with Immigrant and Refugee Undergraduate Students and Youth: The Use of Critical Pedagogy, Situated Learning and Funds of Knowledge, examines the experiences of immigrant and refugee undergraduate students involved in a community service-learning program that incorporated critical and culturally relevant curriculum, peer-learning approaches, and creative and artistic exploration. She has published various articles on the subject including articles in Labor Studies and Ethnography and Education. Janna earned her Master’s degree from the same university in 1996.

Nancy Shore
I am an Associate Professor at the University of New England’s School of Social Work and a Senior Consultant with Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (CCPH). For the past seven years I have thoroughly enjoyed teaching online from Seattle. My primary teaching assignments are human behavior in the social environment and research. My work with CCPH primarily focuses on ethics and community-engaged research. In partnership with five community groups, we completed a two-year cross-case analysis of each of the five partner’s community-based research review process. Building off our cross-case work, we received funding to draft proposed revisions to the Belmont Report and Common Rule that included in part greater attention to community and cultural considerations.

Joan E. Sieber
I am professor emerita of psychology at California State University East Bay, and Research Associate, Center for Public Policy, University of Houston. As founder and editor of the Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics (JERHRE), which is published by SAGE and beginning its 11th year of publication, I am dedicated to evidence-based ethical problem solving and pursuit of methods and approaches to doing research that is useful to society, and especially to minority and vulnerable populations, rather than convenient to study. There is an ever-growing array of important social and biomedical issues which, by their sensitive interpersonal, social or political nature, do not lend themselves to traditional methodologies, or to approaches that IRBs, institutions, funders or communities welcome or understand. JERHRE is dedicated to understanding and resolving these problems, and also to helping researchers in developing countries to grow beyond their new-found ideas of traditional “scientific rigor.”
Randy Stoecker
I am a Professor in the Department of Community and Environmental Sociology at the University of Wisconsin-Madison with a joint appointment in the University of Wisconsin-Extension Center for Community and Economic Development. I have been doing various forms of participatory action research with various kinds of grass-roots and nonprofit groups for 30 years. My books related to this practice include Research Methods for Community Change, Liberating Service Learning, and the co-authored/ edited Community-Based Research and Higher Education, The Unheard Voices, and The Landscape of Rural Service Learning.

Celina Su
Celina Su is Marilyn J. Gittell Chair in Urban Studies and an Associate Professor of Political Science at the City University of New York. Her work focuses on how everyday citizens engage in policy-making and community development—via deliberative democracy, community organizations, and social movements. Her publications include Streetwise for Book Smarts: Grassroots Organizing and Education Reform in the Bronx (Cornell University Press, 2009), Our Schools Suck: Young People Talk Back to a Segregated Nation on the Failures of Urban Education (co-authored, NYU Press, 2009), and Introducing Global Health: Practice, Policy, and Solutions (co-authored, John Wiley/ Jossey-Bass, 2013). She co-founded Kwah Dao/ Burmese Refugee Project (www.burmeserefugeeproject.org), which employs participatory models to foster community development among Shan Burmese refugees in northwest Thailand, in 2001, and has served on New York City’s participatory budgeting Steering Committee since 2011. Her honors include the Berlin Prize and the Whiting Award for Excellence in Teaching.

Kisha Supernant
Kisha Supernant has been an assistant professor in the Department of Anthropology at the University of Alberta since 2010. Her work focuses on the relationship between archaeology, identity, the ethics of collaborative practice, and indigenous communities in Canada. She uses digital tools to think spatially about the past, using maps and digital spatial data to query the ways in which past people created and interacted with landscapes and identities. As a Métis woman, she is strongly committed to collaborative, inclusive, and multivocal archaeology and her research is informed by the growing literature on indigenous archaeology and indigenous theory. She explores how her own heritage intersects with her research practice and the politics of ongoing colonialism in Canada and beyond.

Yonette Thomas
Yonette Thomas, Ph.D., is science advisor for urban health to the New York Academy of Medicine, a member of the International Society for Urban Health board, and a senior research advisor to the Association of American Geographers. She is a faculty affiliate of the Maryland Population Research Center at the University of Maryland College Park, and a voluntary associate professor in the Department of Public Health Sciences at the University of Miami Miller School of Medicine where she teaches social epidemiology. She was formerly the associate vice president for research compliance at Howard University. Previously she served as the chief of the Epidemiology Research Branch and program director for the social epidemiology program at the National Institute on Drug Abuse, National Institutes of Health. She has held faculty appointments in the Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences and in the School of Pharmacy at Howard University. She is a member of the Consortium of Social Science Associations Advisory Committee and the Steering Committee of the National Hispanic Science Network. Her primary research and publications have focused on the social epidemiology of drug abuse and HIV/AIDS and the link with geography, including edited volumes: Geography and Drug Addiction and Crime, HIV, and Health: Intersections of Criminal Justice and Public Health Concerns. She has a Ph.D. in medical sociology and demography, with post graduate training in epidemiology.
Eve Tuck
Eve Tuck has conducted participatory action research with New York City youth on the uses and abuses of the GED option, the impacts of mayoral control, and school non-completion. Her current research is with migrant youth in New York’s Hudson Valley. Eve recently created the Land Relationships Super Collective with her frequent collaborator K. Wayne Yang. LRSC is a network of community organizations theorizing decolonizing land use. Eve’s writing is concerned with the ethics of social science research and educational research, Indigenous social and political thought, decolonizing research methodologies and theories of change, and the consequences of settler colonialism accountability policies on school completion.

Will C. van den Hooaard
Professor Emeritus at the University of New Brunswick (Canada), he has published in the field of research ethics, sociology, cartography, religious studies, resource management, Iceland, history, immigration, Bahá’í Studies, ethnography, and Scandinavian studies. A founding member of Canada’s Inter-Agency Advisory Panel on Research Ethics, he served as its first Chair of its Social Sciences and Humanities Working Committee on Ethics. His University of Toronto Press trilogy on research ethics consist of Walking the Tightrope (2002), The Seduction of Ethics (2011), and The Ethics Rupture (2016), in addition to a special issue of The Journal of Academic Ethics, entitled The Ethics Trapeze (2006) and a book Essentials of Thinking Ethically in Qualitative Research (Left Coast Press, 2013), co-authored with Deborah van den Hooaard. Awards: Lifetime Achievement by the Institute for the Improvement of Health, Bethesda, MD; honorable mention on his ethnography, The Seduction of Ethics, by committee of the Society for the Study of Symbolic Interaction.

Daniel Wikler
Mary B. Saltonstall Professor of Ethics and Population Health, Harvard School of Public Health. I’ve been involved in research ethics over several decades as an academic (where I’ve been an IRB member and also have submitted research proposals to IRBs) and as an ethicist employed by the US government and the World Health Organization. My views tend to be strongly contrarian, though not nihilist.
Citational praxis matters. Citations highlight relational dimensions of knowledge production. Citations can signal the presence of past thinkers in our current work, and can also reveal gaps and absences, opening questions about how (and whose) knowledge is codified and counted in academia. Citations offer partial stories about where we are coming from – theoretically, disciplinarily, epistemologically, ontologically – and who we are talking with and listening to. Situated at the intersection of ethics and epistemology, citational praxis has ethical intentions, impacts, and implications.

The CCREC Ethics Team continues to reflect on the ethical tensions and opportunities that our own citational praxis surfaced at the conference and in this report, particularly since our intention was to create a space of collective knowledge production that would be open for all participants to engage whether they identified as academics or not, graduate students or senior scholars. Our attempts to disrupt notions of “expert” and “expertise” however, also raised salient questions around the attribution of ideas, both to those present and absent in the room, and how to make such connections more transparent in collective knowledge exchanges such as our conference.

We include this bibliography to convey, however imperfectly, the depth and diversity of scholarship that academic participants brought into the conference space. As this list of scholarship demonstrates, some participants have written extensively on the ethics of research and knowledge production, ethics regulation, community-based and collaborative research practices, inequities and injustice, teaching and pedagogy, activist and advocacy scholarship, and many more themes that we addressed in our two days together. This selective listing has much missing from it, including the many unprinted forms of knowledge exchange that greatly influence our work and were integral to the knowledge sharing and citational practice at the conference, and now in this report.

At the conference, we hoped to disrupt some conventions of knowledge production and to enact alternatives. Moving from presentations to invitations and dialogue, and from answers to questions, we aimed to create a space for collective, creative, inter/trans-disciplinary knowledge-making. We made the sharing of meals and informal moments interwoven into the fabric of our reflections. We invited Julie to illustrate our conversations, and designed those conversations to facilitate connection and dialogue across multiple axes of knowledge and experience. Our invited list of participants itself represented a form of alternative citational practice – an attempt to bring together in one place thinkers from multiple disciplines whose work influences our own efforts to engage a spectrum of scholars across the social sciences.

Our coupling of brief biographies with the following selected list of published works cannot communicate the depth of knowledge and dimensions of relationships that inspired and enlivened this gathering. Each person brought many ideas, people, and experiences into our knowledge-making and collective conversations, and we are grateful for their contributions. We hope this report, including this bibliography, will serve as a resource for reflection and renewed commitment to think deeply about the ethics of research.
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IPinCH website (www.sfu.ca/ipinch) for community project reports, academic analyses, videos (95), podcasts, blogs, and other resources, including The “Working Better Together” Research Ethics Conference Videos (17 of them) explore the dynamic intersection of policies, procedures, practices, and philosophies of contemporary Indigenous research ethics.
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