

Decolonization and Databases:
Examining Collections Management Systems and Decolonizing Practices

Courtney E.P. Sprague

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

University of Washington

2021

Committee:

Wilson O'Donnell

Polly Olsen

Joseph T. Tennis

Program authorized to offer degree:

Museology

©Copyright 2021

Courtney E.P. Sprague

University of Washington

Abstract

Decolonization and Databases:
Examining Collections Management Systems and Decolonizing Practices

Courtney E.P. Sprague

Chair of Supervisory Committee:
Wilson O'Donnell
Museology

Decolonizing museum collections continues to be an important topic in the museum field, but limited research has been done on the efficacy of databases in terms of enhancing decolonizing practices. As such, the purpose of this study was to examine decolonizing practices in collections management databases in museums with Indigenous collections. Those selected for study included privileging of the following practices: incorporating Indigenous knowledge (perspective, language, and protocols), accepting Indigenous authority, and providing Indigenous peoples access to information and objects in museum collections. The first method in this phenomenological study used semi-structured interviews with seven collections specialists about their experiences with collections management databases and decolonizing practices in six institutions in Canada, the United Kingdom, and the United States. The second used document analysis of three institutions' collections policies and decolonizing initiatives. Findings suggest all museums had collaborated with source communities about Indigenous knowledge entered into the databases, but the extent of capabilities and utilization of decolonizing practices in collections management systems was inconsistent. None of those interviewed had discussions with Indigenous communities on the choice of the current collections management database, though a majority were in the process of seeking new collections management systems to replace those that had been in use for ten or more years in the museum. Access to the database was also

inconsistent, and particularly dependent on system features. Limitations of this study included the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on scheduling interviews, the time needed to complete the research, and the final sample size potentially not being representative of all museums.

Keywords: Decolonization, Indigenous knowledge, collections management system/database, museums

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	1
Chapter 1: Introduction	2
Purpose.....	4
Significance.....	4
Chapter 2: Literature Review	6
Decolonization	6
<i>Decolonizing Practices</i>	8
<i>Decolonization and Repatriation Frameworks</i>	11
Collections Management Databases	12
Chapter 3: Methods	19
Research Purpose	19
Research Approach and Methods	19
<i>Method One: Semi-Structured Interviews</i>	19
<i>Method Two: Document Analysis</i>	22
Sampling	23
Data Analysis	25
Limitations	26
Chapter 4: Results and Discussion	27
Method One: Semi-structured Interviews	27
Method Two: Document Analysis	46
Chapter 5: Conclusion and Recommendations	52
Bibliography	55
Appendices	58
Appendix A: Interview Instrument	58
Appendix B: Interview Coding – Highlights	61
Appendix C: Interview Coding – Complete	65
Appendix D: Document Analysis Coding	78

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to respectfully learn, work, and live as a guest on the ancestral lands of the Coast Salish peoples. It has also been my immense honor to help care for the heritage of the Indigenous peoples of Washington state for the last five years at the Burke Museum of Natural History and Culture. That work, my colleagues, and environment provided inspiration for this research, and instilled the lesson that decolonization is not an endgame, but a continued process of healing. I am indebted to the many people who made this research thesis possible, and would like to first give thanks to my endlessly accommodating chair and advisor, Wilson O'Donnell. To my committee, Polly Olsen and Joseph Tennis, I thank you as well for your continued support and your kindness dealing with the many ups and downs during a difficult 2020 and my extended thesis timeline. I greatly appreciate my candid participants, my encouraging mentors over the years for their inspiration – particularly Laura Phillips, Siri Linz, and Caroline Hartse – and my brilliant cohort for their assistance. Special thanks go to my wonderful family and friends who always showed unwavering support and optimism throughout the entire process of my thesis and academic career. I consider myself lucky to know you all.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Few museums today, whatever size or focus, are likely to have collections without also having some form of digitized system of management. A collections management database or collections management system serves such functions as a tool for organization of object records and information for museum collections, a hub to implement museum best practices, and a way in which to maintain accreditation in their institution. While databases are a practical and integral part of daily collections management, they are a functional tool and, until more recently, not necessarily viewed as a means to further implement decolonizing theory practices in museums.

Decolonization cannot be explored without first addressing the problem of colonization itself. Throughout history and the world, colonialism and the act of colonizing has been and continues to be complex, “but at its core, it emerges as a set of relationships in which one social group continually and habitually profits by exploiting the living environments, bodies, social organization, and spiritualities of another social group.”¹ Therefore in recognizing the effects and legacies of colonization upon Indigenous communities, decolonization, here defined as “a long-term process involving the bureaucratic, cultural, linguistic and psychological divesting of colonial power,” has featured prominently within the museum field in recent years, and this theoretical framework has been put into action in many institutions.² Decolonizing research entered into many parts of museum work: there is literature on the public facing components, such as decolonizing exhibits and visitor engagement.³ Behind the scenes, decolonization

¹ Duarte, Marisa Elena, and Miranda Belarde-Lewis, "Imagining: Creating spaces for indigenous ontologies." *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 53, no. 5-6 (2015): 681.

² Smith, Linda Tuhiwai, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, (Zed Books Ltd, 2012), 101.

³ Onciul, Bryony, *Museums, Heritage and Indigenous Voice: Decolonizing Engagement*, (Routledge, 2015), 72.

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

initiatives have entered research methodologies, knowledge structures, and - most relevant to this study - the collections and archives.⁴

Yet museums are still grappling with the process of decolonizing their collections, and more often than not research into such focuses on how best to serve the tangible collections. Collections management databases' in particular have long presented a conundrum in how best to decolonize, as the organizational systems used within have origins and continued ties to colonialism: "When we are cognizant of the ways colonialism works through techniques naming, describing, collocating, classifying, and standardizing, we can better appreciate, formulate, imagine, and support Indigenous approaches to knowledge organization."⁵ Thus far, limited research has been done on the efficacy of databases in terms of enhancing decolonizing practices by way of the information stored there. Though there are many ways in which decolonizing practices can be put to use in collections management, the most relevant to databases would be the following: incorporating Indigenous knowledge (perspective, language, and protocols), accepting Indigenous authority, and providing Indigenous peoples access to information and objects. With a wide range of databases in use across museums, examining the capabilities of collections management systems may help users move beyond databases' organizational functions, and look to them as also being a potential tool for decolonization. This may provide further opportunities to implement decolonizing practices in daily work, and continue decolonizing museums from within.

⁴ Prasad, Anshuman, "Toward Decolonizing Modern Western Structures of Knowledge." *The Routledge Companion to Critical Management Studies*, (London, Routledge, 2015), 161–99.

⁴ Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*, 101.

⁴ Haberstock, Lauren. "Participatory Description: Decolonizing Descriptive Methodologies in Archives." *Archival Science* 20 (2) (2020), 125–38

⁵ Duarte and Belarde-Lewis, "Imagining," 682.

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

Purpose

The purpose of this research was to examine decolonizing practices present in collections management databases in museums with Indigenous collections. The decolonizing practices in collections management systems selected for study included privileging the following: incorporating Indigenous knowledge (perspective, language, and protocols), accepting Indigenous authority, and providing Indigenous peoples access to information and objects.

The following research questions guided this study to discern its potential impacts:

RQ1: How do institutions approach collection management databases and decolonization?

RQ2: In what ways do the collections management databases in use privilege Indigenous voice and perspective?

RQ3: To what extent do collections management databases allow for authority and digital access of objects and information by Indigenous communities?

By answering these research questions, it may be possible to identify ways in which Indigenous communities can be further involved in the inner workings of collections management of the institution stewarding their collections and heritage.

Significance

The significance of this research will be to fill a gap in the literature pertaining to the efficacy of collections management systems and decolonizing practices. This study may be able to potentially identify opportunities for further collaboration in collections management with Indigenous communities in museums stewarding their collections and heritage. Relevant stakeholders in this research of the efficacy of databases in decolonizing practices are many. Indigenous source communities, collections managers, and those who practice decolonization to

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

promote further transparency in collections management in museums would all benefit from identifying another avenue to further decolonize museums from within.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

The purpose of this research was to examine decolonizing practices present in collections management databases in museums with Indigenous collections. The decolonizing practices in collections management systems selected for study included privileging the following: incorporating Indigenous knowledge (perspective, language, and protocols), accepting Indigenous authority, and providing Indigenous peoples access to information and objects.

This topic was situated within two main bodies of intersecting literature: decolonization in museums and collections management systems. First, this review will consider the decolonization movement in the museum field, including decolonizing practices and repatriation laws or initiatives relevant to the study topic. Second, this review will examine collections management systems in terms of their functionality, their organizational capabilities and their inclusion of tools that can be used for decolonizing institutions' collections. With the support of these areas of literature as a framework, this research study will be able to examine collections management systems through a decolonizing lens and identify opportunities for further/expanded collaboration with Indigenous communities.

Decolonization

“Museums can be very painful sites for Native peoples, as they are intimately tied to the colonization process.”⁶ – Ho-Chunk scholar Amy Lonetree.

The museum field has been acknowledging that the foundations of museums the world over are deeply intertwined with exploitation of Indigenous people. Institutions such as these are “undergoing a radical change in their function and in their relationships with the cultures

⁶ Lonetree, Amy, *Decolonizing Museums: Representing Native America in National and Tribal Museums*. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2012). Accessed December 6, 2020. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5149/9780807837528_lonetree.Copy

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

represented in the collections.”⁷ Truth and Reconciliation Commission in Canada deals with the “atrocities and long-term impact of the genocide of First Nation peoples, enslavement of Africans, and incongruent immigration policies towards non-white peoples,” and museums throughout the United States and beyond began looking at ways to enact these principles in their own institutions, relationships, and collections.⁸ In practice, this foray into social justice is just one small step; beyond reconciliation are the opportunities for other solutions that “Indigenous people can be aided by non-Indigenous activists and intellectuals who are dedicated and engaged in decolonizing practices that reaffirm Indigenous culture, values and worldviews.”⁹

Decolonizing research entered into many parts of museum work: there is literature on the public facing components, such as decolonizing exhibits and visitor engagement.¹⁰ Behind the scenes, decolonization initiatives have entered research methodologies, knowledge structures, and the collections and archives.¹¹ The addition of critiquing museum catalogs and documentation, digital or otherwise, to decolonization made it clear that it wasn’t just the tangible collections that needed to be considered, but that the information that gave them context was privileging Eurocentric biases.¹² To best understand the connections between Eurocentric

⁷ Simpson, Moira G., “Making representations: Museums in the post-colonial era.” (Oxon: Routledge, 2006), 1.

⁸ Merritt, Elizabeth, “Fostering Truth and Reconciliation One Generation at a Time.” American Alliance of Museums, (2017) <https://www.aam-us.org/2017/12/12/fostering-truth-and-reconciliation-one-generation-at-a-time/>

⁹ Boxer, Majel, “Indigenizing the museum: History, decolonization, and tribal Museums” (Doctoral thesis) Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database (2008), 34.

¹⁰ Onciul, *Museums, Heritage and Indigenous Voice*, 72.

¹¹ Prasad, “Toward Decolonizing Modern Western Structures of Knowledge,” 161–99.

¹¹ Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*, 101.

¹¹ Haberstock, “Participatory Description,” 125–38.

¹² Turner, “Decolonizing ethnographic documentation,” 658–676.

¹² Cameron, Fiona, “Digital Futures II: Museum Collections, Documentation, and Shifting Knowledge Paradigms.” *Collections: The Newsletter of the Archives and Special Collections on Women in Medicine, the Medical College of Pennsylvania* 1 (3): (2004), 243–60.

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

biases and decolonization, the complexities of colonization must be acknowledged and addressed:

Broadly, colonization—the verb, or enactment, of colonialism—is based on four overlapping mechanisms: (1) the classification of diverse Indigenous peoples as a single lesser class of sub-humans deserving of social subjugation at best and extermination at worst; (2) the theft and settlement of Indigenous lands and social spaces by an elite Settler class; (3) the articulation of institutions to support this class system and the elite control of the environment; and (4) the disciplining of elite forms of knowledge through the marginalization of Indigenous languages, philosophies, spiritualities, and modes of self-government.¹³

All of these mechanisms of colonialism are relevant and integral to decolonization work.¹⁴ However, those that manifested most in information repositories pertained to the last, the marginalization of Indigenous language, philosophies, spiritualities, and modes of self-government. According to Marisa Elena Duarte and Miranda Belarde-Lewis in their article, "Imagining: Creating spaces for indigenous ontologies," "there are approved tools, standards, techniques, languages, instructors, policies, and institutions to support the practice [of cataloging and classifying]. Yet it is precisely all of this structure that makes imagining alternative Indigenous approaches so elusive..."¹⁵ Therefore, decolonization and the practices chosen to enact it include the incorporation of Indigenous knowledge frameworks to work.

Decolonizing Practices

The decolonizing practices focused upon in this study privileged the following: incorporating Indigenous knowledge (perspective, language, and protocols), accepting

¹³ Duarte and Belarde-Lewis, "Imagining," 682.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Duarte and Belarde-Lewis, "Imagining," 687.

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

Indigenous authority, and providing Indigenous peoples access to information and objects. This focus was in part inspired by many of the principles and practices outlined in Amy Lonetree's *Decolonizing Museums: Representing Native America in National and Tribal Museums*. The first principle of decolonization chosen, Indigenous knowledge and what that represents in collections management databases (particularly perspective, language, and protocols), was derived from the Indigenous research paradigm: "Those following the Indigenous paradigm adhere to a research methodology that includes...following Indigenous communities' protocols; ...incorporating Indigenous languages, such as place-names, names of people, and proper nouns; and, finally, privileging Indigenous sources and perspectives over non-Indigenous ones."¹⁶ The second principle of decolonization chosen, sharing of authority, was derived from the concept of "the collaborative partnerships between museums and so-called source communities and interested publics; a more responsive museum practice that seeks to "share authority."¹⁷ Finally, the last principle of decolonization chosen was the accessibility of objects and information to Indigenous communities. Both tangible and intangible heritage have not always been accessible to source communities: there have long been calls for action to "make accessible pertinent Native American historical records...as the access to and assistance with tribal archives for Native Americans is an inherent human right."¹⁸ Additionally, accessibility has been a prominent critique in decolonial discourse, as many "museums, almost exclusively administered by non-Indigenous peoples...were asked to repatriate objects, facilitate access to them, or, at the least, forfeit some power over their display."¹⁹

¹⁶ Lonetree, *Decolonizing Museums*, 8.

¹⁷ Lonetree, *Decolonizing Museums*, 171.

¹⁸ O'Neal, Jennifer R., "The Right to Know: Decolonizing Native American Archives," (2015), 2.

¹⁹ Neale, Timothy, and Emma Kowal, "'Related' Histories: on epistemic and reparative decolonization," *History and Theory* 59, no. 3 (2020), 408.

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

The application of Indigenous knowledge discussed within “Imagining: Creating Spaces for Indigenous Ontologies” by Marisa Elena Duarte and Miranda Belarde-Lewis outlined another guide for understanding decolonizing practices holistically. “First we have to open our awareness to how colonization works through subjugation of Indigenous documents and knowledge artifacts. Second, we have to identify and conceptualize the tools, techniques, values, institutions and processes that shape decolonization.”²⁰ Limitations in some classification systems used in cataloging lead to perpetuated colonialism. One such an example was “how the single term “Native American” occludes and erases a wide range of distinctive epistemologies, philosophies, languages, and experiences.”²¹ The reliance on written or text based histories, and the reactionary “efforts by librarians, catalogers, archivists, classificationists, and curators to amend the glaring absence of marginalized voices...through appeals to change standard practices, adopt new terms, create new classes, and invest in linking technologies.”²² This showed that voice and authority continued to be important topics for decolonization study. These techniques helped to further focus upon decolonizing practices that had already been documented in Indigenous research, but also those which were implemented or could be implemented in collections management systems. For example, a database that included modes of information retention beyond exclusively text-based options fulfilled both awareness of colonization tactics and identification of decolonizing tools. With the colonial roots of “Western text-based systems” identified, “oral, kinesthetic, aesthetic, and communal Indigenous ways of knowing—quipu, ceremonies, dances, songs, oral histories, oratory, stories, hunting and growing practices, healing

²⁰ Duarte and Belarde-Lewis, "Imagining," 687.

²¹ Duarte and Belarde-Lewis, "Imagining," 681.

²² Duarte and Belarde-Lewis, "Imagining," 683.

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

arts, weaving, painting, pottery, carving, dreaming, and vision work” could be conveyed through more appropriate modes such as audio, video, or visual files.²³

Decolonization and Repatriation Frameworks

In the United States, NAGPRA (Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act) was enacted in 1990 as federal law to facilitate the repatriation of “Native American human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects, and objects of cultural patrimony” to their source communities with which they were affiliated.²⁴ While this systematic process provided a legal framework and regulations for Indigenous peoples to reclaim particular objects from federally funded museums and like institutions, this act only applied to a narrow scope of particular objects, which meant that much still remained in museums. NAGPRA has proven to be by no means faultless, particularly as it requires indigenous communities to prove claims of ownership and only applies to federally recognized tribes and to institutions that receive federal funding.²⁵ Though correlation does not equal causation, it has been noted that within the 30 years since NAGPRA’s introduction the decolonization movement also gained momentum, and to some extent, addressed what remains in museums where NAGPRA may not apply.²⁶

While not all Indigenous collections held in museums fall under the legal jurisdiction of objects relevant to NAGPRA, aspects of collections management of Indigenous collections are now guided by the Act.²⁷ As a large percentage of tangible Indigenous cultural heritage continued to remain in museums, the consultations and collaborations between museums and

²³ Duarte and Belarde-Lewis, "Imagining," 683.

²⁴ "Facilitating Respectful Return." National Parks Service. November 22, 2019. Accessed January 10, 2021. <https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nagpra/index.htm>.

²⁵ Malaro, M. C., & DeAngelis, I. P., *A Legal Primer on Managing Museum Collections* (3rd ed.). (Smithsonian Books 2012).

²⁶ Brenner, Sarah E. “Decolonizing Natural History Museums Through Volunteer Engagement,” (2020), 12.

²⁷ Putnam, Jennifer L., “NAGPRA and the Penn Museum: reconciling science and the sacred,” *Concept* 37 (2014), 12-13.

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

source communities which began as NAGPRA conversations has led to further dissemination of Indigenous knowledge.²⁸ Although there is now a legal obligation in American institutions to repatriate, other such countries do not have the same. Neither Canada nor the United Kingdom had passed legislation requiring repatriation or consultation. Instead, it fell to museums who intended to decolonize to adopt new decolonizing frameworks. Museums in Canada with a mind towards collaboration and consultation adopted the principles of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) as a guiding framework for repatriation where their national legislation did not.²⁹ In the United Kingdom, they did not have requirements for guiding repatriation conversations. In fact, reactionary legislation such as “the British Museum Act of 1963, [which] prohibited the museum from selling any of its valuable artifacts, even the ones not on display”³⁰ was adopted. However, this did not stop collaborations and repatriation efforts in other museums in the United Kingdom, some of whom adopted policies more in line with decolonization than the blanket retention of objects seen in the British Museum.³¹

Collections Management Databases

Even though collections management systems are an integral part of collections management in museums today, research on efficacy, scope, and function of data management systems for collections were found to be lacking. museum professionals could make only educated decisions about this key component of collections management. Carpinone’s publication from 2010, “Museum Collections Management Systems: One Size Does Not Fit All,” appeared to be the first comparative study on several collection management systems, and

²⁸ Putnam, “NAGPRA and the Penn Museum,” 13.

²⁹ United Nations. General Assembly. United Nations declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples. 2007.

³⁰ Duthie, Emily, “The British Museum: an imperial museum in a post-imperial world,” *Public History Review* 18 (2011), 48.

³¹ Georgiou, Evangelia, “The Decolonisation in British Museums: Reflection and Potential Guidelines,” Nottingham Trent University, 27-28.

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

covered system descriptions of six types of collections management systems, best practices, and the history of collections management systems. While it was a publication from ten years ago - in technology terms, a span of time that has witnessed many advancements - it comprehensively discussed the capabilities and functions of three of the six collections management systems which appeared within the sample of this study: ARGUS, KE-EMu, and Past Perfect. As the title suggested, all collections management systems were not suited to work for every type of museum.

Collections management software companies claim their product can be used for any type of collection or museum. While this is true to some extent, in actuality, they are better suited for some types of collections and do not cover the others as well, or have unnecessary features for others making the system more difficult to learn. It is almost as if the vendors had a certain type of collection in mind when designing the system, but this is not easily apparent. Particular collections management databases have aspects that are better suited for certain types of collections and an individual museum's needs. It is not that one CMS is just better than another, more that each system's particular combination of features and characteristics may make it a better fit for some museums' needs and not for others.³²

This work recognized the significant gap in the literature regarding reliable sources on collections management systems, and sought to provide information beyond that of “individual vendors' websites...[and] extremely limited information on various other software review websites,” which often left the only active source for recommendations the “American

³² Carpinone, "Museum Collections Management Systems: One Size Does Not Fit All". Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses (ETDs, 2010), 4-5.

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

Association of Museum's Registrars Committee Listserv.”³³ The paper sought to rectify this by including the history, systems functions, analysis on choice of systems, and included common best practices within the museum field pertaining to databases. It also identified the problems of lack of options available in hybrid collections management systems that provided linked catalogs and archives, and “the additional challenge of cataloging and electronically storing born-digital... collections.”³⁴ There was an identified need for collections management databases to provide more linked context to catalog records. Such capabilities would therein be able to accommodate Indigenous knowledge.

The typical functions standard for a collections management system were the following: cataloging/objects, acquisitions, deaccession, thesaurus, loans, exhibitions, shipments/transport, condition/conservation, security, multimedia, importing/exporting data, and barcoding.³⁵ All were necessary features for the responsibilities of collections management, especially cataloging/objects, acquisitions/deaccession, thesaurus (lexicon), security, multimedia, and the capability for an external public facing database. acquisitions and deaccessioning were standard features on all systems, and necessary for connection to repatriation work. For instance, the function of an associated online catalog, which manifests in an external or public facing website for those outside the museum staff who may want access to information.³⁶ A key difficulty in their research was that collections management systems did not accommodate all collections

³³ Carpinone, E. “Museum Collections Management Systems,” 5.

³⁴ Carpinone, “Museum Collections Management Systems,” 130-132.

³⁵ Carpinone, “Museum Collections Management Systems,” 26.

³⁶ Carpinone, “Museum Collections Management Systems,” 31.

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

types, and “as in most cases the perfect software product is nearly nonexistent since every institution has a different combination of needs and what they consider unacceptable flaws.”³⁷

Collections management best practices were covered in a variety of sources and included definitions of collections care, support for functions of collections management systems, and a basis for the claim that the retention of metadata in collections management was a best practice.³⁸ The staple resource for those pursuing an education in collections management is the *MRM5: Museum Registration Methods*, which included best practices pertaining to collections management systems.³⁹ A function of collections management systems in collections work has continued to be for “public accountability, access, and transparency.”⁴⁰

Another gap noted in the literature was the omission of incorporating decolonization into the choice of a collections management system: functions of the database, staffing and tech required, and the needs of the museum were all covered without this resource.⁴¹ Publications that did address decolonization were through discussions that encouraged “considering the stakeholders in data management, particularly regarding culturally sensitive collections, objects, and information.”⁴²

Five relevant collections management systems of interest included Past Perfect, Argus, KE-Emu, Filemaker Pro and MIMISY. Past Perfect included object cataloging and archive

³⁷ Carpinone, “Museum Collections Management Systems,” 131.

³⁸ Buck, Rebecca A, and Jean A. Gilmore. *MRM5: Museum Registration Methods*. Washington, DC: American Alliance of Museums, (2010),

³⁹ Buck, Rebecca, *MRM5*,

⁴⁰ Carpinone, “Museum Collections Management Systems,” 25.

⁴¹ Kozak, Zenobia. "How Do We Select a Collections Management System?" *History Associates*, (2014).

⁴² Emerson, Patricia, and Nancy Hoffman. "Technical, Political, and Social Issues in Archaeological Collections Data Management." *Advances in Archaeological Practice* 7, no. 3 (2019), 258-66.

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

cataloging capabilities, the latter of which was unusual for a collections database.⁴³ There were also fields for an oral history screen and audio files, as multimedia files are supported in the archival portion of the system.⁴⁴ The lexicon that came with this database system was based on *Chenhall's Revised Nomenclature*, and allowed for revisions.⁴⁵ A noted “disadvantage of the organizing structure [of Past Perfect] is that it forces the museum to choose a specific cataloging category while the same object can be considered to belong to more than one category at the same time. This may hinder museums from thinking about their collections in an interdisciplinary fashion.”⁴⁶

Argus included the selected functions of cataloging, authority control for specific data, lexicon, security (metadata), media/images, and web access modules.⁴⁷ Argus was noted to be one of the most customizable collections management systems available, in part because museums could “create an unlimited number of fields for each record.”⁴⁸ Unlike the other collections management systems discussed here, Argus did not have any particular thesaurus built into the system. Standard lexicons could be imported into the database manually or as a plug-in. This meant it would likely not be integrated into the search function as seamlessly as if it were built-in. It might also be difficult for novice computer staff to import a thesaurus without an IT specialist or requesting services from the vendor.⁴⁹

⁴³ Carpinone, “Museum Collections Management Systems,” 28-29.

⁴⁴ Carpinone, “Museum Collections Management Systems,” 29-31.

⁴⁵ Carpinone, “Museum Collections Management Systems,” 29.

⁴⁶ Carpinone, “Museum Collections Management Systems,” 69.

⁴⁷ Carpinone, “Museum Collections Management Systems,” 40-43.

⁴⁸ Carpinone, “Museum Collections Management Systems,” 94.

⁴⁹ Carpinone, “Museum Collections Management Systems,” 96.

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

KE-EMu included the functions of cataloging, phonetic searches, and a thesaurus that supported four main lexicons including Getty's Art and Architecture lexicon and others depending on discipline.⁵⁰ Security and audit trails provided authority controls, and the KE-EMu system was extremely customizable. The capabilities of the Narrative Module indicated the comprehensive nature of this collections management system: "The Narrative Module allows users to write in-depth descriptions and narratives about objects combining exhibitions, objects, people, places, multimedia, and events. It includes fields for title, author, abstract, references to EMu records, and in HTML format all narratives available online are indexed so that the public can search them."⁵¹

Filemaker Pro was a general database system, which allowed for only backend access, and required customization. It was commonly used by museums, but not considered to "be as customizable as you can potentially have with something like KE-EMu."⁵² Instead it "creates web pages in response to user input [and] require that the database be available to a host computer on the internet. This function has many applications for museums, especially museums that have their web sites hosted by an internet service provider."⁵³

MIMISY by Axiell was a database with most standard features. Axiell promoted MIMISY's other capacities as a versatile and powerful tool. The system could "manage multimedia, text files and physical objects data in one central database. The database claimed to be a way in which to manage archives and objects of all types, had security features like

⁵⁰ Carpinone, "Museum Collections Management Systems," 58-60.

⁵¹ Carpinone, "Museum Collections Management Systems," 61.

⁵² Carpinone, "Museum Collections Management Systems," 72, 76.

⁵³ Carpinone, "Museum Collections Management Systems," 72.

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

managing user permissions, access to records, authority files, and links to external thesauri and people databases,” as well as included software to publish collections online.⁵⁴

⁵⁴ "Mimsy XG." Axiell. August 25, 2020. Accessed December 10, 2020.
<https://www.axiell.com/solutions/product/mimsy-xg/>.

Chapter 3: Methods

Research Purpose

The purpose of this research was to examine decolonizing practices present in collections management databases in museums with Indigenous collections. The decolonizing practices in collections management systems selected for study included the following: incorporating Indigenous knowledge (perspective, language, and protocols), accepting Indigenous authority, and providing Indigenous peoples access to information and objects.

The following research questions guided this study:

RQ1: How do institutions approach collection management databases and decolonization?

RQ2: In what ways do the collections management databases in use privilege Indigenous voice and perspective?

RQ3: To what extent do collections management databases allow for authority and digital access of objects and information by Indigenous communities?

Research Approach and Methods

This study employed a phenomenological research approach resulting in the assemblage of qualitative data for analysis. Two methodologies were used to gather the qualitative data in this study: semi-structured interviews conducted via Zoom and telephone and document analysis.

Method One: Semi-Structured Interviews

The semi-structured interview was a qualitative data strategy in which the participants were asked a set of predetermined, but open-ended questions. Prior to the interview, the participants received a copy of the interview instrument, though questions were not always asked in the same order for each interview. This variation in order was due to the semi-structured nature of the interview.

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

Interview Instrument

The interview instrument included the following questions in its original format. See instrument in its numbered coding format in Appendix A.

RQ1: How do institutions approach collection management databases and decolonization?

Does your institution or department have a decolonization policy?

- a) If so, how does it approach decolonization?
- b) If not, how does your institution or department approach decolonization, particularly in regards to the collection?

What collections management database do you use?

- a) How long has that database been in use? Your previous one?
- b) Do you have immediate plans for utilizing a new/different database?

Is there or has there been consultation with the Indigenous communities on what databases they would like used, and what does that look like?

RQ2: In what ways do the collections management databases in use privilege Indigenous voice and perspective?

How is Indigenous voice and perspective represented in the collections management database?

Does your collections management database support Indigenous language/characters?

- a) If so, how and where is this used in the database?
- b) If not, do you have other methods of including Indigenous language into records, and what are those methods?
- c) If it is not, how would you like to see this done?

How is the information in your database indexed?

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

- a) How would you describe the nomenclature used in your database? For instance, do you find it based on anthropological terminology or Indigenous knowledge systems?
- b) Do you think that is an issue, and why? Have you consulted with Indigenous communities to discuss how they feel about the nomenclature?

RQ3: To what extent do collections management databases allow for authority and digital access of objects and information by Indigenous communities?

What type of access do the Indigenous communities have to the collections management database and the information stored there?

- a) Who makes the decisions about what is accessible to the community? Do decisions about accessibility differ between access for direct descendent community vs the wider Indigenous community?
- b) Are there different levels of access depending on one's position in the Indigenous descendent community? (An example of levels of access can be found in the online platform Mukurtu, in which one's position in the Indigenous community allows more access to digital files than other members.)

What type of authority do the Indigenous communities have over the information in the collections management database?

- a) Are they consulted about what types of information can and cannot be entered in the database?
- b) Have the Indigenous communities been consulted about authority over the metadata in the collections management database?

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

If there are specialized needs for culturally sensitive or sacred objects (i.e. gendered handling protocols, specialized storage needs, or physical access restrictions), how is that information communicated in the collections management database?

- a) What type of authority does the Indigenous community have over this information?
- b) If this information is not retained in the database, who makes the decision to omit it from the database record?

On a scale of 1-5, 5 being most important, can you rate where privileging Indigenous voice falls in your choice of collections management database?

On a scale of 1-5, 5 being most important, can you rate where sharing authority over information and objects with the Indigenous communities falls in your choice of collections management database?

On a scale of 1-5, 5 being most important, can you rate where the Indigenous communities' digital accessibility to information and objects falls in your choice of a collections management database?

End of interview instrument

(See Instrument in Appendix B, a copy of which was numbered separately for coding purposes).

Method Two: Document Analysis

Document analysis of written collections policies was chosen as a secondary method of data collection. Participants were asked to provide either departmental or institutional collections management policies at their discretion. Additional decolonizing policies or announcements were also requested from institutions that had such documents or initiatives. The following terms were coded when possible to represent and best categorize the decolonizing practices chosen for study: perspective, authority, access, language, and accountability. There were two to three

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

documents shared per the three institutions who were able to fulfill the request to do so. Key passages in the documents pertaining to collections and information that would be stored in or affect the use of the database were extracted, and then coded Y for “yes” for each of the terms the passage represented.

Sampling

Site Selection

Sites were chosen from the membership of the Reciprocal Research Network (RRN), an information-sharing platform that encouraged dialogue and collaboration between Indigenous communities and institutions that stewarded their objects. The institutions participating in the RRN all held Northwest Coast Indigenous collections. Museums in this group varied in size and in number and scope of objects. The institutions also varied in type, identifying as cultural, anthropological, and art museums. Out of 30 possible institutions of the RRN, seventeen had accessible contact information via their website. Nine interview requests were sent to eight museums located in the United States, six interview requests were sent to six museums in Canada, and two interview requests were sent to institutions in the United Kingdom. Of the museums who responded and were able to participate in interviews, five were located in the United States, one in Canada, and one in the United Kingdom. One museum in the United States yielded two interviews, as two different departments and associated collections managers participated.

Participants in this study were collections specialists consisting of collections managers, curators, and other museum professionals who dealt directly with databases and collections that held Indigenous objects. Collections managers, curators, and information systems specialists would typically have interaction and some authority over the department’s collections

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

management database: hence, their choice as a recruit for the study. Participants were recruited via email, obtained through public channels such as online staff directories or online contact information from institutional websites. While the focus was originally meant to be on Northwest Coast Indigenous communities as a constant throughout the study, the worldwide scope of Indigenous collections in the institutions recruited provided more data, but less of it specific to North American Indigenous groups.

Identification of the museums and participants in this study was referenced by their country and a number was assigned to their institution. The museum from which two interviews were conducted with separate departments within an institution were given an A and B as additional identifiers for clarity.

- **Canadian Museums**

- *Museum CA1*

- Participant: CA1

- **United Kingdom Museums**

- *Museum UK1*

- Participant: UK1

- **United States Museums**

- *Museum US1 (US1A and US1B)*

- Participant: US1A
 - Participant: US1B

- *Museum US2*

- Participant: US2

- *Museum US3*

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

- Participant(s): US3
- *Museum US4*
 - Participant: US4

Interviews

Participants were provided a list of questions prior to the interview. During the interview, the participants were encouraged to answer the questions and expand upon their answers with their own experiences in collections management. Interviews were audio recorded via Zoom for transcription purposes. In compliance with RCW 9.73, verbal consent was obtained by having the participant state their name and affirm their consent to the interview and subsequent recording. Seven interviews were conducted with collections specialists from six different institutions. Museum US4 included two participants (dual interview was conducted with the collections specialist and information specialist). The data collection was conducted from August 11th to September 11th, 2020, and interviews ranged from approximately 30 minutes to one hour.

Data Analysis*Analysis Plan for Interview Data*

Automatic transcripts were created from the semi-structured interview recordings by the software Zoom. These files were cleaned up by listening to the interview while following along with transcription: thus, correcting any transcription errors made when converting from audio to text. The information was then broken down into relevant extended quotes and key points from transcripts and were included in a coding document. (See Interview Coding – Highlights and Interview Coding – Complete in Appendices B and C). Once the information was compiled, it was analyzed for commonalities, omissions, and patterns to obtain results.

Analysis Plan for Document Analysis

Digital copies of collections policies were obtained from three of seven institutions and departments interviewed. The passages in the collections or decolonization policies that pertained to decolonization and collections management systems were coded when possible by phrases, words, or themes; otherwise, relevant extended quotes and key points from the documents were included in coding. (See Document Analysis Coding in Appendix D). Once the information was coded, it was analyzed for commonalities, omissions, and patterns to obtain results.

Limitations

There were three significant limitations to this study. The first limitation was the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on implementing and completing both methodologies in a timely fashion. The second limitation was the small sample size. Thus, the results might not be representative of all museums with Indigenous collections and collections management systems. The final limitation was the potential biases of the author stemming from an academic, professional, and personal background based in white privilege, and therefore, might not represent the views of Indigenous source communities.

Chapter 4: Results and Discussion

The purpose of this research was to examine decolonizing practices present in collections management databases in museums with Indigenous collections. The decolonizing practices in collections management systems selected for study included privileging the following: incorporating Indigenous knowledge (perspective, language, and protocols), accepting Indigenous authority, and providing Indigenous peoples access to information and objects.

For ease and clarity, the results found in this chapter were structured according to methods used in this study – interviews and document analysis – with discussion following each research question section.

Method One: Semi-structured Interviews

RQ1: How do institutions approach collection management databases and decolonization?

Q1) Does your institution or department have a formal decolonization policy?

Q1a) If so, how does it approach decolonization?

Q1b) If not, how does your institution or department approach decolonization, particularly in regards to the collection? (Note: For clarity of discussion, answers were combined on Q1, Q1a, and Q1b).

Six of the seven collections specialists interviewed stated their department or institution did not have a formal decolonization policy. The institution in the United Kingdom (UK1) noted their policy was very new. It addressed the Black Lives Matters movement, the coloniality of their institution, and transgender rights in addition to Indigenous repatriation.⁵⁵ Museum US3 acknowledged that while no written policy was in place, “[we] do our best to avoid colonization practices... there's a difference between not colonizing further and doing active

⁵⁵ Interview Coding, Q1: UK1.

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

decolonization.”⁵⁶ Three of the six that did not have a formal decolonization policy did have either stand-alone policies or guidance within their collections policies for their department or institution, and the remainder abided by national Indigenous rights and/or repatriation policies (like NAGPRA or UNDRIP principles).⁵⁷ The worldwide scope of some collections and getting multiple departments on a formal policy were cited when explaining the lack of a formal policy.⁵⁸ However, all institutions represented were having conversations about decolonization, though one participant preferred to use “responding to Indigenous voices” rather than the term decolonization.⁵⁹

Q2) What collections management database do you use?

This sample of seven different departments in six museums resulted in six different collections management systems represented: Museums CA1 and US3 used MIMSY by Axiell, Museum UK1 used Filemaker Pro Software, US1A used Past Perfect, US1B used ARGUS, US2 had a custom-built collections management system by an in-house programmer, and US4 used KE-EMu.⁶⁰

Q2a) How long has that database been in use?

Museum CA1 got MIMSY by Axiell twenty-three years ago, and prior to that had used CHIN, the first Canadian digital network in the 1970's. The participant noted extensive upgrades to the system in 2006 that made it “almost like a new database.”⁶¹ Museum UK1 had installed

⁵⁶ Interview Coding: US3.

⁵⁷ Interview Coding: US1A, CA1, US4.

⁵³ Interview Coding: CA1.

⁵⁸ Interview Coding: US2, US3.

⁵⁹ Interview Coding: US2.

⁶⁰ Interview Coding, Q2: CA1, UK1, US1A, US1B, US2, US3, US4.

⁶¹ Interview Coding: CA1.

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

Filemaker Pro software less than ten years ago, making it one of the newest.⁶² Museum US1A had previously used ARGUS until 2006, and then installed Past Perfect.⁶³ Museum US1B stated that ARGUS had been in use in their department for approximately 25 years, and a major challenge of the system was “that particular software is no longer supported by any kind of company [...] there’s no software update [...], and the only reason why it functions at all is because of [IT at the museum] keeps finding ways to fix it.”⁶⁴ Museum US2 was running a collections management system program written in-house in 1993.⁶⁵ Museum US3 was the second institution to also use MIMSY by Axiell, which had been in use from at least the early 2000’s.⁶⁶ Museum US4 had previously used ARGUS, and had since been using KE-EMu for approximately ten years.⁶⁷

5 to <10 Years Old	10 to 15 Years Old	16 to 25 Years Old	26 Years Old or More
UK1: Filemaker Pro Less than 10 years	US4: KE-Emu 10 years	US3: MIMSY 16<24 years	US2: In-house Program 27 years
	US1A: Past Perfect 14 years	CA1: MIMSY 23 years	
		US1B: Argus 25 years	

Figure 1. Age of Collections Management Systems in Surveyed Museums, Interview Coding Q2, Q2a

⁶² Interview Coding: UK1.

⁶³ Interview Coding, Q2: US1A.

⁶⁴ Interview Coding: US1B.

⁶⁵ Interview Coding: US2.

⁶⁶ Interview Coding: US3.

⁶⁷ Interview Coding: US4.

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

Q2b) Do you have immediate plans for utilizing a new/different database?

Five of the seven collections specialists interviewed were either in the process of installing a new database, anticipating a new collections management system within a year, or actively seeking a new collections management system within the next five years to replace or expand current databases.⁶⁸ Museum US2 was within weeks of upgrading to “a web based database created by programmers that produce collective access” at the time the interview was conducted in September 2020.⁶⁹ Museum US1A and US1B were different departments in the same museum with different collections management systems, and had been meeting to discuss “a database that meets our needs more, and part of that is providing much easier access for communities.”⁷⁰ Museum UK1 anticipated a new database within a year, as there were “other museum projects underway to marry all the [university affiliated] museums, so maybe by next year should all be integrated.”⁷¹ Two museums that had no plans to change used MIMSY and KE-EMu.⁷² Those that were not seeking to entirely replace their databases had robust systems - KE-EMu and MIMSY - and also felt their public facing databases were user friendly. However, it was noted by the participant that while the system was “robust,” working from home due to the COVID-19 pandemic had been somewhat difficult as more logins or seats were needed to access the database remotely, and this was an additional cost.⁷³ Museum US3 that used MIMSY said upgrade or expansion to the database was possible within five years, as the prospect of Axiell Archives, a combined collections and archives system, would replace the need to have an outside database for their archives.⁷⁴

⁶⁸ Interview Coding, Qb2: CA1, UK1, US1A, US1B, US2, US3, US4.

⁶⁹ Interview Coding: US2.

⁷⁰ Interview Coding: US1A, US1B.

⁷¹ Interview Coding: UK1.

⁷² Interview Coding, Qb2: US3, US4.

⁷³ Interview Coding: US4.

⁷⁴ Interview Coding, Qb2: CA1.

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

Q3) Is there consultation with the indigenous communities on what databases they would like used, and what does that look like?

When asked if the institutions or departments had consulted with indigenous communities about the selection of the in-house collections management system currently in use, all but one gave responses in the negative.⁷⁵ The museum that did not respond in the negative had not been a part of the selection process of the database when the database was chosen, and therefore did not want to say there had not been discussion on the current system.⁷⁶ A difficulty noted in the potential process of consultation about database choices was how to go about it fairly: “How do you get to choose them and who gets to be part of that conversation? It’s a lot to consider... but it doesn’t mean we shouldn’t do it... I don’t know how you would get members of every single community represented in the collection.”⁷⁷ However, the input of the source community does have precedent in collaborative efforts for a database, as was a participant’s experience with the Hopi community.⁷⁸ Concepts for a democratic framework like input depending on the percentage of source communities’ objects in collections was agreed to be a problematic solution. Museum US1A noted that during consultations, discussions about the organization and design of the databases had occurred, and that it might “contribute to what the future might look like for that database.”⁷⁹

RQ1 Findings:

Only one museum had what they considered a formal decolonization policy. Three of the six that did not have a formal decolonization policy had either stand-alone policies or guidance

⁷⁵ Interview Coding, Q3: CA1, UK1, US1A, US1B, US2, US3, US4.

⁷⁶ Interview Coding: US3.

⁷⁷ Interview Coding, Q6b: US1B.

⁷⁸ Ibid.

⁷⁹ Interview Coding, Q6b: US1A.

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

within their collections policies for their department or institution, and the remainder abided by national Indigenous rights and/or repatriation policies. It is of note that the only one considered to be a formal policy was located in the United Kingdom, where there are no legal frameworks like NAGPRA.

Consultation between Indigenous communities and museums in the choice of a collections management system had not occurred in the current databases in use, but the collections specialists interviewed were more willing and interested in having the conversation for their next system than not. In addition to age and obsolescence of a system, lack of database capabilities for a user-friendly public-facing version of the system was noted to be an issue of access for communities. The databases themselves ranged from less than ten years old to more than twenty-five years old. Those who were likely to stay with their systems had either MIMSY or KE-Emu, both of which have good public-facing capabilities.

RQ2: How is indigenous voice and perspective represented in the collections management database?

QS4) Does the collections management database privilege indigenous voice and perspective?

Inputting self-identification terms by the Indigenous communities into the collections management system was cited specifically by CA1, UK1, and US3 as projects or initiatives in their museums, and the remaining participants had been adding to or updating group names and incorporating Native words in their databases through consultation visits.⁸⁰ Individual artisans' names, when they could be attributed, were also cited as instances of perspective and authority.⁸¹

⁸⁰ Interview coding: CA1, UK1, and US3.

⁸¹ Interview Coding, Q4: US2.

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

Q4) Does your collections management database support indigenous language/characters?

Q4a) If so, how and where is this used in the database? (Note: For clarity of discussion, answers were combined on Q4 and Q4a).

Of the seven participants interviewed, only those running MIMSY (CA1 and US3) affirmed that the system supported written indigenous language through linguistic alphabet, syllabic writing, or symbols.⁸² Museum US2 had the oldest system, an in-house created program, and believed that the database supported some diacritical marks, but not syllabic or symbols.⁸³ Museum US4 believed that KE-EMu supported languages, as other departments used them, but suspected that it was “an add-on... and not part of the package we bought.”⁸⁴ The remaining three museums did not speak to any support of language beyond “the Roman alphabet.”⁸⁵

Q4b) If not, do you have other methods of including indigenous language into records, and what are those methods?

The capabilities in the representation of language through multimedia - image and audio files - in the collections management systems varied. Representation of language through scanned images or audio files in multimedia tabs was capable in three of six collections management systems, but were not widely in use or had the information digitized at this time. Two different systems that were capable of supporting audio files did not have any currently uploaded to the database. Having associated documents in programs like Word that supported linguistic alphabet was cited as one such workaround solution when a database could not support language.⁸⁶ Museum US2 current system did not support audio files, but believed the new

⁸² Interview Coding, Q4: CA1, US3.

⁸³ Interview Coding, Q4: US2.

⁸⁴ Interview Coding, Q4: US4.

⁸⁵ Interview Coding, Q4: US1A.

⁸⁶ Interview Coding: US1A.

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

system would. The inconsistency of utilizing media did not always stem from a database's capabilities, as seventy percent of those interviewed did have audio files in their physical archives. Instead, the wider issue was that much of this form of information was still in physical or analog, non-digitized formats.⁸⁷

Q5a) If it is not, how would you like to see this done?

Museum US2 was keenly interested in interviews (AV recordings) to be included, and also spoke of a collection of syllabaries from the 1930's: an [university affiliated] “anthropologist wrote down Cherokee syllabary and English on accession cards, and those could only be available as an image on the multimedia tab.”⁸⁸

Q6) How is the information in your database indexed?

Q6a) How would you describe the nomenclature used in your database? For instance, do you find it based on anthropological terminology or indigenous knowledge systems?

Q6b) Do you think that is an issue, and why? Have you consulted with indigenous communities to discuss how they feel about the nomenclature? (Note: For clarity of discussion, answers were combined on Q6, Q6a, and Q6b).

Museum US1A using PastPerfect had information indexed by material type in the database, and the lexicon was archaeological focused.⁸⁹ Museums CA1 and US3 with MIMSY used lexicons from the Getty AAT (Art & Architecture Thesaurus), and US3 categorized objects by Native American art and region “with cross categorization as, for example, photography or modern and contemporary art or all three.”⁹⁰ Both UK1 and USB1 mentioned “colonial” or an

⁸⁷ Interview Coding: US2.

⁸⁸ Interview Coding, Q5a: US2.

⁸⁹ Interview Coding: US1A.

⁹⁰ Interview Coding: CA1, US3.

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

iteration thereof regarding the lexicon in their respective databases.⁹¹ As for discussions with Indigenous communities about the nomenclature of the database, UK1 and US1A noted such instances during consultations; the former regarded “group name change... [and] talked with the community that the language affects,” and the latter about “[items] are categorically sort of defined in an indigenous manner and often explain[ed] how they're organized in the database,” which then led to conversations about collections management system designs.⁹² Museum CA1 explained the in-depth process of community consultations involving correcting nomenclature in displays throughout the museum, but had “focused more on the public view...because the database is really only used in-house... nobody outside the staff sees MIMSY.”⁹³

RQ2 Findings:

One decolonizing practice found arguably most often in use through the databases in these museums was the incorporation of Indigenous knowledge, history, and names. Involvement with decisions about the information being input into the database - for example, names, terms, or protocols - varied in extent and many of these collaborative efforts happened during collections visits by the source communities, but was a step towards giving back authority. The Indigenous perspective – pertaining to information, names, and objects histories – was the most represented decolonizing practice in the database in terms of capabilities and practice, and appeared to have the most overlap in all museums. Consultation visits were often cited as the source of information, terminology, and protocols, particularly those visits that happened in person. Indigenous language was unable to be accurately represented in some databases without the feature of linguistic alphabet or associated media files present, except those with MIMSY.

⁹¹ Interview Coding, Q6a: UK1, US1B.

⁹² Interview Coding, Q6b: UK1, US1A.

⁹³ Interview Coding, Q6b: CA1.

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

Indexing and nomenclatures were rooted in material types, region, art, and anthropology, with two participants specifically referring to their origins as “colonial.”

RQ3: To what extent do collections management databases allow for authority and digital access of objects and information by Indigenous communities?

Q7) What type of access do the indigenous communities have to the collections management database and the information stored there? Q7a) Who makes the decisions about what is accessible to the community? Do decisions about accessibility differ between access for direct descendent community vs the wider indigenous community? Q7b) Are there different levels of access depending on one’s position in the indigenous descendent community?

(Note: For clarity of discussion, answers were combined on Q7, Q7a, and Q7b).

The accessibility and navigability of public-facing databases were varied. MIMISY users felt their public facing database was easier to use and had the most of the collections accessible in this manner: up to fifty-five percent of the collections were online.⁹⁴ Museum CA1 had published “pretty much the entire set of information” from their in-house collections management system to their public facing database.⁹⁵ Museum US1A felt the public-facing online version of Past Perfect was “quite inaccessible to most people, other than people who have an archaeological background,” in part due to terminologies and site location protections; the main database and information in [PastPerfect] “is not accessible, except onsite.”⁹⁶ Museum US2 had the option of “Advanced Research Access” that could be granted, and that allowed access to most of the collections.

⁹⁴ Interview Coding, Q7: US3.

⁹⁵ Interview Coding, Q7: CA1.

⁹⁶ Interview Coding, Q7: US1A.

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

Inaccessibility, or restriction to information or objects, could apply with regards to NAGPRA objects, but otherwise access was not considered to be limited. The legality of restricting access in the museums, particularly those that were either State or City maintained in some manner, posed its own share of difficulties.⁹⁷ Research access requests directed to the department, legal department, or requesting permission from the Indigenous communities themselves prior to access had been implemented in at least three of the museums interviewed, in part to protect intellectual property rights.⁹⁸ As NAGPRA was not applicable to UK1's collection, "where we've been told [by source communities] that its inappropriate to share info about objects, we've restricted that access to things that have those sensitivities."⁹⁹ Access dependent on one's position within the Indigenous community had so far not been requested in the experience of the interviewees, but the participant from US1B stated "that is a decision that is made by the community."¹⁰⁰

Q8) What type of authority do the indigenous communities have over the information in the collections management database? Q8a) Are they consulted about what types of information can and cannot be entered in the database? (Note: For clarity of discussion, answers were combined on Q8 and Q8a).

Authority and access could be either a curatorial call or the decision of the Indigenous communities. During consultations or visits, permission to enter the information being shared into the database would be asked before inputting the information into the system.¹⁰¹ Three of the participants noted that changes might occur to records or website regarding information or

⁹⁷ Interview Coding, Q7: US1A, US3.

⁹⁸ Interview Coding: Q7a, Q7b: CA1, US1A, US1B.

⁹⁹ Interview Coding, Q7b: UK1.

¹⁰⁰ Interview Coding, Q7b: US1B.

¹⁰¹ Interview Coding: US1A.

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

objects through communications with the community or public.¹⁰² UK1 gave an example of photographs [in the collections] being taken to Australia, and the [Indigenous source communities] were asked if they should be restricted or not.¹⁰³ Museum US4 also affirmed consulting with communities for advisement if they were contacted or during a visit. US4 acknowledged they were not proactive in contacting every group on what to do.¹⁰⁴

Q8b) Have the indigenous communities been consulted about authority over the metadata in the collections management database?

Museum best practices dictated the retention of collections management records and changes, as well as the retention of original documents. “We have strict guidelines about that, and no one is allowed to delete anything and that can be a problem, because some words can be problematic or offensive. [For example] lots of creeks have very offensive names in [redacted] State. But because that information is often crucial to helping to interpret that material, we don't delete that information, we just add to it. And [when] we annotate we might say, this is no longer acceptable.”¹⁰⁵ Two museums in the study had projects ongoing or in the recent past that were dedicated to better recording and supporting this information.¹⁰⁶ While much of these pertained to physical metadata (digitization of accession and catalog records), supporting the digital metadata was noted as needing to be supported and funded.¹⁰⁷ However, no interviewee spoke directly to consulting with the Indigenous communities about authority over the metadata, rather through consultations about updating self-identifications, group, or cultural names, and hoped for

¹⁰² Interview Coding: US3, US2, CA1.

¹⁰³ Interview Coding, Q8a: UK1.

¹⁰⁴ Interview Coding, Q8a: US4.

¹⁰⁵ Interview Coding, Q8b: US1A.

¹⁰⁶ Interview Coding, US1B and UK1.

¹⁰⁷ Interview Coding, Q8b: UK1.

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

more of an exchange about it in the future.¹⁰⁸ Museum US4 stated that the subject of authority over metadata “had not come up.”¹⁰⁹

Q9) If there are specialized needs for culturally sensitive or sacred objects (i.e. gendered handling protocols, specialized storage needs, or physical access restrictions), how is that information communicated in the collections management database?

Deferring to the indigenous community members about information from their perspective and protocols for culturally sensitive objects was practiced in most of the museums interviewed. However, only three of the seven institutions had a dedicated field or flag in the collections management system by which to alert users to the sensitivity of an object.¹¹⁰ Three of the participants had to add it to the notes section of the digital record as their systems did not have a dedicated place otherwise, and one participant did not communicate that information at all in the database.¹¹¹ Culturally sensitive objects that required specialized care, such as feeding, gendered handling protocols, or separation from other collections, were encountered by four of seven participants.¹¹² Instances of feedings and cleansings were added to record data, in part to maintain best practices in IMP (Integrated Pest Management), and maintaining requested proximity of collections to one another were also cited as reasons for the addition of communicating protocol information in the database.¹¹³

Accommodating protocols on gendered handling was acknowledged to be difficult, but respected. The potential gender privacy of the staff was only brought up once when inquiring about how these protocols might be communicated. Three instances of gendered protocols were

¹⁰⁸ Interview Coding, Q8b: UK1.

¹⁰⁹ Interview Coding, Q8b: US4.

¹¹⁰ Interview Coding, Q9: CA1, US1B, US3.

¹¹¹ Interview Coding, Q9: UK1, US1A, US2, US4.

¹¹² Interview Coding, Q9a: UK1, US1A, US1B, US2, US4.

¹¹³ Interview Coding: US2.

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

described for reference: one disallowing menstruating women to handle objects even though their staff consisted only of women, one requesting the packing of crania for repatriation be done by the only male on staff, and one disallowing the study/handling of specific objects by women of a particular age.¹¹⁴ However, only one of the three had the ability in their collections management system to flag the protocols for these objects. According to two other collections specialists, they had not encountered such situations, and felt that culturally sensitive objects which required removal from exhibits or gendered handling protocols were too sensitive to remain in the collections and should be repatriated.¹¹⁵

Q9a) What type of authority does the indigenous community have over this information?

Q9b) If this information is not retained in the database, who makes the decision to omit it from the database record? (Note: For clarity of discussion, answers were combined on Q9a and Q9b).

Authority over information entered into the database and the prevalence of sensitive information appeared in practice to be mostly split down the middle. Of the six interviewees that answered, half stated that the authority for omission of information in the database was the decision of the curator or collections manager, and half said it would be the call of the Indigenous community consultant.¹¹⁶ US1A related an instance during a collections move in which the necessity for retaining sensitive information – specifically the need for certain materials to remain separate per the request of the source community – would need to be communicated in the database so the next collections manager would be able to adhere to the protocols of the community.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁴ Interview Coding: UK1, US4, US1B.

¹¹⁵ Interview Coding: US2, US3.

¹¹⁶ Interview Coding Q9b: CA1, UK1, US1A, US1B, US2, US3.

¹¹⁷ Interview Coding, Q9b: US1A.

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

Q10a) On a scale of 1-5, 5 being most important, how much would a decolonizing practice such as privileging indigenous voice factor into your choice of collections management database?

Museums CA1, UK1, US1B, and US4 rated this decolonizing practice as a 5 (very important or high priority). However, US4 acknowledged there might be disconnect between what was wanted and what was happening: “Perfect world? 5. Real world - we're not there yet. Voice is generally there.”¹¹⁸ US1A rated this practice a 4, and US3 did not rate this as a high priority for choice in collections management database if they would choose a new system, as it was for a “broad category of objects...its different because Native American art is just part of a bigger collection.”¹¹⁹

Q10b) On a scale of 1-5, 5 being most important, how much would a decolonizing practice such as sharing authority over information and objects with the indigenous communities' factor into your choice of collections management database?

UK1, US1B, and US4 rated this decolonizing practice as a 5, or very important. US1B recognized the benefits of creating records collaboratively, particularly as they “certainly can’t make the decision about what’s appropriate to share” as they were “not from that [source] community.”¹²⁰ US4 considered sharing authority of high importance, but noted the difficulty of determining who in the community had such authority, specifically in the cases of online correspondence: “then the issue [is] you don't know if that person has the authority. We wait until physical visits to make [that call].”¹²¹

¹¹⁸ Interview Coding Q10a: US4.

¹¹⁹ Interview Coding Q10a: US1A, US3.

¹²⁰ Interview Coding Q10b: US1B.

¹²¹ Interview Coding Q10b: US4.

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

Q10c) On a scale of 1-5, 5 being most important, how much would a decolonizing practice such as the indigenous communities' electronic accessibility to information and objects factor into your choice of a collections management database?

US1A, US1B, and US4 considered a decolonizing practice like accessibility a 5, or very important, in the choice of collections management database. US1B pointed out greater accessibility for source communities would “only help us... these types of things can free us to then do other things than creating a report to send to someone... It's very important to me to be able to have people access that information on their own.”¹²² UK1 rated this lower, at a 3 or 4, stating that they had “many stakeholders” to consider, such as “academic stakeholders” and the affiliated universities and other museums when it came to decisions about a collections management database.¹²³ US3 rated this as a low priority, noting “access directly into our system [was] not something that we're doing now and I don't think ... it would fall into that decision making process. ...trying to get it to a point that would be accessible directly to an indigenous community would be a huge haul.”¹²⁴

RQ3 Findings:

Digital accessibility was acknowledged to be linked to a couple of factors: in-house databases are not easily navigated or accessible. The public-facing online databases could be accessible, but this privileged those with good internet access. Authority over information entered into the database and the prevalence of sensitive information or protocols for culturally sensitive objects appeared to be split down the middle in practice. Three interviewees stated the final authority for inclusion and/or omission of information in the database was the decision of

¹²² Interview Coding Q10c: US4.

¹²³ Interview Coding Q10c: UK1.

¹²⁴ Interview Coding Q10c: US3.

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

the curator or collections manager, and four said it would be the call of the Indigenous community consultant. All appeared willing to consider or had discussed such requests, though omission of sensitive information was less automatically enacted due to legalities. Metadata was also less directly addressed, though perhaps in part because museum best practices prohibits the removal of records. A couple common issues in the process to the final questions of decolonizing practices and their choice of a collections management database were apparent (10a-10c). First, it seemed in the interviews conducted that the clarity of questions 10a-10c was lacking. It appeared the questions themselves did not translate well into a verbal Likert scale during the interview, and the attempt to quantify the complex decolonization concept unclear. Second, there was inconsistency in answers regarding what was happening and what they would like to see happen, which skewed the scale process.

Semi-structured Interviews Discussion

This study found all institutions had collaborated with Indigenous communities about Indigenous knowledge information entering into their databases: particularly names, terms, and history of objects. Consultations, done in person or otherwise, were cited most often as the means of collecting information and verifying accuracy with Indigenous representatives. However, the extent of capabilities and utilization of decolonizing practices in collections management systems was still varied. The capabilities of databases (i.e. the ability to support linguistic alphabet, audio files, etc.) were definitely a factor in how much Indigenous language was incorporated into digital records. Language capabilities were found to be simultaneously important and lacking in representation in current collections management systems. Representation of language through scanned images or audio files was possible, but were not always widely in use or digitized at this time. This inconsistency did not always stem from a

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

database's capabilities, as seventy percent of the museums surveyed had audio files in their archives. The wider issue was that much of the information was still in analog or physical format. When linguistic alphabets were not an available feature, the alternative of audio or other media depicting Indigenous language was not necessarily available either, or being utilized to full capacity at present. Alternative workarounds, such as having the information in other formats like Word documents and photographs, were used when possible. However, in understanding the inherently colonial nature of text-based histories and classification systems, the continued reliance and privileging of written records over other modes of information made dissemination problematic. Methods such as visual or audio recordings, which were more in line with Indigenous knowledge transmission, were not widely utilized, even when the collections management system was capable.

Collections management systems installed in the interviewed institutions varied in age between 5 and 27 years old: two were installed within the last 5-10 years (UK1: <10, US4: 10) one was within the last 11-15 years (US1A: 14), three were installed likely within the last 16-25 years (CA1: 23, *US3: 16<24, US1B: 25) and one installed in 1993 (US2: 27). As the ages of the databases were given as approximate, the most conservative estimate of average age of the databases sampled was seventeen years old, with a median age of sixteen years old. If the oldest possible age for the database was counted, the average age of the sampled collections management systems in use could be as high as nineteen with a median age of twenty-three years old. Five of the seven collections specialists interviewed were either in the immediate process of installing a new database, anticipating having a new collections management system within a year, or actively seeking a new collections management system within the next five years to replace the current database. Obsolescence in addition to age were factors compounding needs

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

not being met by existing systems. Most of these museums wanted to upgrade or get an entirely new collections management system. Some of the needs not being met by the current databases in use were public accessibility or a navigable public facing component to records, capacities for languages, and media capabilities. Those museums with MIMSY and KE-Emu, which both have strong online public facing databases, were less inclined to change their collections management systems.

No consultation had been done with Indigenous communities about the current collections management system in use. There was interest from the participants in including source communities in discussions of new databases. However, the biggest challenge cited was the logistics of having representation of all source communities, as collections from all institutions were not from a single Indigenous community, but from many across the world to reflect many stakeholders represented in the collections. However, those participants representing museums who were actively looking to get new collection management systems appeared keen to include consultation in some respect. Museum best practices regarding collections meant that the metadata of information was retained, as changes to records did and continued to include who was giving the information and who was authorizing the changes. Unfortunately, the question regarding metadata did not yield the insight desired, particularly in regards to authority over the information. This could have been due to the need for further clarification in the interview process, and without consulting the interviewees again on the subject, it would be unlikely to draw more nuanced information from their answers without speculation. While there were metadata policies and projects in play, whether this was a specific decolonizing choice, or if the affected Indigenous groups wanted the deletion of colonial terminology was unclear. Accountability presented itself in the acknowledgment that

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

classification systems, nomenclature, or the history of the institution and disciplines were colonial in origin. This did mean that potentially offensive terms or names might still be retained in the record, but it appeared there were attempts to correct them when possible.

Consultations were cited most often as the means of collecting information, verifying accuracy, and deferring to the Indigenous communities' members about information from their perspective and protocols. Authority over information entered into the database, and the prevalence of sensitive information or protocols for culturally sensitive objects appeared in practice to be evenly split: three stated the final authority for inclusion and/or omission of information in the database was the decision of the curator or collections manager, and four said it would be the call of the Indigenous community consultant. All appeared willing to or had discussed such requests, though omission of sensitive information was less likely to be enacted. Digital accessibility was acknowledged to be linked to a couple of factors for conversation: in-house databases are not necessarily easily navigated or accessible, and public facing databases were accessible depending on the source communities' access to the internet. Finally, only one institution had an official decolonization policy that addressed activity in their database, and that was in the United Kingdom where there was no legal framework for repatriation like NAGPRA in the US. All other participants had unofficial decolonization policies, collections policies referencing Indigenous rights, or stood by national guidelines of repatriation and relations.

Method Two: Document Analysis

Decolonizing practices in collections management databases focused on Indigenous knowledge (perspective, language, and protocols), Indigenous authority, and Indigenous access to information and collections. These seemed to be concepts that were not easily quantified in writing, and these documents were intersecting, overlapping, and ambiguous. In the initial

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

recruitment email and as part of the interview, participants were asked if their museums had any written collections policies or decolonizing policies that could be shared for document analysis. Three of the seven participants were able to share either museum policies or publicly accessible decolonizing initiatives via their institutions' website. The shared collections documents for analysis included links to their own institutions' policies on legal and ethical repatriation issues. These documents were available to the public, either through online access from the institutions' websites or through a research request to the department.

The following terms and concepts were coded when possible to represent and best categorize the decolonizing practices chosen for study: perspective, authority, access, language, and accountability. The passages in the collections or decolonization policies that pertained to decolonization and collections management systems were coded by these words or themes, and then coded Y for "yes" for each of the terms or concepts the passage represented. Otherwise, the relevant extended quotes and key points from the documents were included in the coding.

Museum CA1 provided two documents, UK1 provided three documents, and US1A provided two documents. Museum CA1 provided links to their Indigenous Access initiative and their Guidelines for the Care of Culturally Sensitive Objects. Three passages from each CA1 document were selected and analyzed for practices that represented instances of perspective, authority, access, language, and accountability. In the six passages, there were five instances of perspective, four instances of accountability, two instances of language, five instances of access, and two instances of authority that could be connected to decolonizing practices with the collections management system.¹²⁵ A project that most closely aligned with decolonizing

¹²⁵ Coding Rubric, Document Analysis: CA1.

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

practices and incorporating Indigenous knowledge paradigms was “providing training in the preservation of digital assets and the conversion of audio materials on cassette to digital preservation formats. Indigitization also seeks to promote enhanced and appropriate access to those recordings for communities.”¹²⁶ CA1 also invited decolonizing discourse regarding “all concerns about Museum practices expressed to them by First Nations or others.... Respondents will then receive a response from [redacted] either inviting further discussion or informing them of the steps the Museum has or is taking regarding the issue.”¹²⁷

Museum UK1 provided links to their Committed to Change initiative, their Strategic Plan, and their Collections Care and Conservation Policy. Seven passages from the documents were selected - one from the Committed to Change initiative, three from the Strategic Plan, and three from the Collections policy - and analyzed for practices that represented instances of perspective, authority, access, language, and accountability that could be involved with the collections management system. In the seven passages selected, there were two instances of perspective, seven instances of accountability, three instances of language, four instances of access, and three instances of authority that could be connected to decolonizing practices with the collections management system.¹²⁸ Most indicative of a direct connection between decolonization and databases was found in UK1’s Committed to Change document – which essentially outlines their decolonizing policy – was the commitment to address “colonial... language... in database description:”¹²⁹

¹²⁶ Coding Rubric, Document Analysis: CA1.

¹²⁷ Coding Rubric, Document Analysis: CA1.

¹²⁸ Coding Rubric, Document Analysis: UK1.

¹²⁹ Coding Rubric, Document Analysis: UK1.

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

We are updating cultural group names to work towards using antonyms ... as the current list of names is woefully out of date and based either on donor or collector's information or on Ethnologue language group attributions. As a result, it often contains dated, incorrect, derogatory and/or racist terms. Not only are we hoping to create a primary list of appropriate terms...we would also like to be able to link smaller cultural groups to larger confederations. The Museum is working with First Nation and other experts to update the list.¹³⁰

Museum US1A provided links to their Collections Policy and their Native American Collections policy. Two passages from the Collections Policy and four from the Native American Collections Policy were selected and analyzed for practices that represented instances of perspective, authority, access, language, and accountability. In the six passages, there were three instances of perspective, five instances of accountability, and zero instances of language, six instances of access, and five instances of authority that could be connected to decolonizing practices with the collections management system.¹³¹ While little of the documents shared touched on decolonization in relation to the collections management system, one passage in the Native American Collections Policy stated the “Museum will distribute periodic summaries or inventories to potentially affiliated tribes. Tribal representatives are always welcome to review collections and any data associated with them.”¹³²

Discussion

The comparison of the different documents provided proved to be difficult, due to the limited presence of information in the documents that could be analyzed as directly connected to the collections management systems. The most in-depth decolonization document provided, that

¹³⁰ Coding Rubric, Document Analysis: UK1.

¹³¹ Coding Rubric, Document Analysis: US1A.

¹³² Coding Rubric, Document Analysis: US1A.

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

by UK1, explicitly discussed changes and updates to the database regarded names and terms, while the document provided by CA1 regarding their Indigenous Access initiative inferred database updates through the digitization and accessibility of audio materials.¹³³ The policies and documents were from the last six years: UK1's documents were from 2015 to 2017, and US1A from 2016.¹³⁴

While three museums hardly represented a large enough sample to make many solid findings, it was of note that the two more in-depth documents – and those which specifically addressed decolonizing practices and collections management systems – were from Canada and the United Kingdom, which as previously stated did not have the same legal framework as the United States with NAGPRA. It seems that this subject had not been widely written about in official policies and documents of these museums. There were a limited number of passages found to be appropriate for analysis – those that actually addressed the databases directly – within the lengthy documents provided. In the interviews, Museum US2 considered the broad scope of their museum's collections, and the lengthy process of getting an official agreement amongst all department curators across the museum, as a potential reason why they did not have an official decolonization policy document.¹³⁵ Further study would be required to determine if those were valid reasons for the absence.

This study proved more lucrative in the semi-structured interviews rather than document analysis. While far more detailed and relevant information was extracted from the interviews, specifically regarding decolonization and the collections management systems in use at their museums, the nature of directed interviews versus published documents may lend to more

¹³³ Committed to Change: UK1; Indigenous Access: CA1.

¹³⁴ Coding Rubric, Document Analysis: CA1, UK1, US1A.

¹³⁵ Interview Coding, Q1: US2.

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

individualized viewpoints than institutional and field practices. There appeared to be a disconnect between the decolonizing practices actually being implemented in these museums and the existence of official written policies dictating decolonization practices, particularly those around the collections management systems. This further supported the existence of the problem outlined in the introduction: there has been very little research – specifically the type that was written, peer-reviewed, or published – connecting decolonization and collections management systems.

Chapter 5: Conclusion and Recommendations

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to examine decolonizing practices in collections management databases in museums with Indigenous collections. Those selected for study included privileging of the following practices: incorporating Indigenous knowledge (perspective, language, and protocols), accepting Indigenous authority, and providing Indigenous peoples access to information and objects in museum collections. While all of the participants were open and willing to discuss current decolonizing practices in their databases, there were inconsistencies between what was ideal and what was being utilized in their current collections management systems. It was clear that the collections specialists understood the need for decolonizing tools in collections management systems, were working with what they had, and were looking for systems that better incorporated those tools into their software so that decolonization of Indigenous collections could continue.

This study resulted in three major conclusions. First, all institutions in the study collaborated with source communities about Indigenous knowledge - like names, terms, and information - entered into their databases, but the extent of capabilities and utilization of these decolonizing practices in collections management systems was inconsistent. Even with the variation between museums in terms of Indigenous knowledge incorporation, inclusion of perspective and the authority to self-identify by Indigenous communities were the most common decolonizing practices found in this study. As discussed in the literature, it was clear that museum terms and classification systems in use were based in colonial history, so inclusion of alternative Indigenous approaches for naming was promising to see in action. The findings of this study also pointed to the capabilities of current collections management system as one

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

reason for variances in practice, as the majority of participants' museums were actively seeking new databases to update those currently in use.

Second, consultation had not been done with Indigenous communities about the current collections management system in use. There was interest from the collections specialists interviewed to include source communities in discussions of new databases, but the logistical challenges were cited as a potential barrier. However, seeking and respecting the interest and input of Indigenous communities about large scale decisions in collections, such as the choice of a database, and taking the initiative to practice active rather than passive collaboration are important decolonizing techniques.

Third, access to the collections management database was also inconsistent, and particularly dependent on system features. In-house collections management systems were not considered easily navigated or accessible for source communities and public facing databases were dependent on access to the internet.

By identifying these three main findings, this research might provide opportunities for further collaboration between Indigenous source communities and collections specialists in developing decolonizing collections management practices in museums stewarding Indigenous collections and heritage.

Recommendations

Five recommendations have emerged from this study. The first recommendation would be to *privilege* Indigenous knowledge, Indigenous authority, and Indigenous access to information and objects in museum collections from Indigenous communities.

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

A second recommendation would be the including source Indigenous communities' input around future collection management system choices. Having this discussion without source communities' input results in only one already privileged perspective.

A third recommendation would be to update collections management databases with Indigenous self-identification terminology.

A fourth recommendation would be to integrate audio and visual files of Indigenous ways of knowing into collections management systems.

Finally, a future study needs to be launched to address financial questions of budgeting, costs, and maintenance of collections management systems that include tools of decolonization of Indigenous collections.

Bibliography

- Applegate et al. "Holistic Approaches to Collection Management: A Collective Research Project and CMS Tool Recommendation." University of Iowa, East Central Intergovernmental Association.
- Brenner, Sarah E. "Decolonizing Natural History Museums Through Volunteer Engagement." (2020).
- Boxer, Majel. "Indigenizing the museum: History, decolonization, and tribal Museums (Doctoral thesis)." (2008): Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database.
- Buck, Rebecca A, and Jean A. Gilmore. *MRM5: Museum Registration Methods*. Washington, DC: American Alliance of Museums, (2010).
- Cameron, Fiona. "Digital Futures II: Museum Collections, Documentation, and Shifting Knowledge Paradigms." *Collections: The Newsletter of the Archives and Special Collections on Women in Medicine, the Medical College of Pennsylvania* 1 (3) (2004): 243–60.
- Carpinone, Elana C., "Museum Collections Management Systems: One Size Does Not Fit All" (2010). Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses (ETDs). 2366. <https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations/2366>
- Duarte, Marisa Elena, and Miranda Belarde-Lewis. "Imagining: Creating spaces for indigenous ontologies." *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 53, no. 5-6 (2015): 677-702.
- Duthie, Emily. "The British Museum: an imperial museum in a post-imperial world." *Public History Review* 18 (2011): 12-25.
- Emerson, Patricia, and Nancy Hoffman. "Technical, Political, and Social Issues in Archaeological Collections Data Management." *Advances in Archaeological Practice* 7, no. 3 (2019): 258-66.
- "Facilitating Respectful Return." National Parks Service. November 22, 2019. Accessed January 10, 2021. <https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nagpra/index.htm>.
- Georgiou, Evangelia. "The Decolonisation in British Museums: Reflection and Potential Guidelines." Nottingham Trent University.
- Haberstock, Lauren. "Participatory Description: Decolonizing Descriptive Methodologies in Archives." *Archival Science* 20 (2) (2020): 125–38.
- Johnson, Peggy. *Fundamentals of Collection Development and Management*. Chicago: American Library Association, 2009.

Kozak, Zenobia. "How Do We Select a Collections Management System?" History Associates, (2014).

Lonetree, Amy. *Decolonizing Museums: Representing Native America in National and Tribal Museums*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2012. Accessed December 6, 2020. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5149/9780807837528_lonetree.

Merritt, Elizabeth. "Fostering Truth and Reconciliation One Generation at a Time." (2017) American Alliance of Museums <https://www.aam-us.org/2017/12/12/fostering-truth-and-reconciliation-one-generation-at-a-time/>

"Mimsy XG." Axiell. August 25, 2020. Accessed December 10, 2020. <https://www.axiell.com/solutions/product/mimsy-xg/>.

Neale, Timothy, and Emma Kowal. "5." "Related" Histories: on epistemic and reparative decolonization." *History and Theory* 59, no. 3 (2020): 403-412.

O'Neal, Jennifer R, " The Right to Know": Decolonizing Native American Archives." (2015).

Onciul, Bryony. *Museums, Heritage and Indigenous Voice: Decolonizing Engagement*. (Routledge, 2015).

Prasad, Anshuman. "Toward Decolonizing Modern Western Structures of Knowledge." *The Routledge Companion to Critical Management Studies*. (London, Routledge 2015) 161–199.

Putnam, Jennifer L. "NAGPRA and the Penn Museum: reconciling science and the sacred." *Concept* 37 (2014).

Rowley, Susan. "The reciprocal research network: The development process." *Museum Anthropology Review* 7, no. 1-2 (2013).

Simpson, M. G. *Making representations: Museums in the post-colonial era*. (Oxon: Routledge 2006)

Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. (Zed Books Ltd. 2012)

Swanon, J. "The Use of FileMaker for Museum Databases (Collection, Contact and Program Databases). *Archives & Museum Informatics* (New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, 1999). https://www.museumsandtheweb.com/biblio/use_filemaker_museum_databases_collection_contact_and

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

Turner, Hannah. "Decolonizing ethnographic documentation: A critical history of the early museum catalogs at the Smithsonian's National Museum of Natural History." *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 53, no. 5-6 (2015): 658-676.

United Nations. General Assembly. *United Nations declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples*. (2007)

Appendices**Appendix A: Interview Instrument**

Numbered Instrument

Q1) Does your institution or department have a formal decolonization policy?

Q1a) If so, how does it approach decolonization?

Q1b) If not, how does your institution or department approach decolonization, particularly in regards to the collection?

Q2S: How does your institution and department approach collection management databases and decolonization?

Q2) What collections management database do you use?

Q2a) How long has that database been in use?

Q2b) Do you have immediate plans for utilizing a new/different database?

Q3) Is there consultation with the indigenous communities on what databases they would like used, and what does that look like?

Q3a) Does the collections management database privilege indigenous voice and perspective?

Q4) Does your collections management database support indigenous language/characters?

Q4a) If so, how and where is this used in the database?

Q4b) If not, do you have other methods of including indigenous language into records, and what are those methods?

Q5) How is indigenous voice and perspective represented in the collections management database?

Q5a) If it is not, how would you like to see this done?

Q6) How is the information in your database indexed?

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

Q6a) How would you describe the nomenclature used in your database? For instance, do you find it based on anthropological terminology or indigenous knowledge systems?

Q6b) Do you think that is an issue, and why? Have you consulted with indigenous communities to discuss how they feel about the nomenclature?

Q7) What type of access do the indigenous communities have to the collections management database and the information stored there?

Q7a) Who makes the decisions about what is accessible to the community? Do decisions about accessibility differ between access for direct descendent community vs the wider indigenous community?

Q7b) Are there different levels of access depending on one's position in the indigenous descendent community?

Q8) What type of authority do the indigenous communities have over the information in the collections management database?

Q8a) Are they consulted about what types of information can and cannot be entered in the database?

Q8b) Have the indigenous communities been consulted about authority over the metadata in the collections management database?

Q9) If there are specialized needs for culturally sensitive or sacred objects (i.e. gendered handling protocols, specialized storage needs, or physical access restrictions), how is that information communicated in the collections management database?

Q9a) What type of authority does the indigenous community have over this information?

Q9b) If this information is not retained in the database, who makes the decision to omit it from the database record?

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

Q10a) On a scale of 1-5, 5 being most important, how much would a decolonizing practice such as privileging indigenous voice factor into your choice of collections management database?

Q10b) On a scale of 1-5, 5 being most important, how much would a decolonizing practice such as sharing authority over information and objects with the indigenous communities factor into your choice of collections management database?

Q10c) On a scale of 1-5, 5 being most important, how much would a decolonizing practice such as the indigenous communities' electronic accessibility to information and objects factor into your choice of a collections management database?

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

Appendix B: Interview Coding – Highlights

1 Question		Code Numbers and Meanings for each question						
Respondent ID	Q1) Does your institution or department have a formal decolonization policy?	Answer	Y = 1	N=2	Maybe = 3	N/A= 4		
CA1		2		2				
UK1		1	1					
US1A		2		2				
US1B		2		2				
US2		2		2				
US3		2		2				
US4		2		2				
			1	6	0	0		
5 Question		Code Numbers and Meanings for each question						
Respondent ID	Q2) What collections management database do you use?	Answer	Mimsy XG by Axiell = 1	Filemaker Pro Software = 2	Past Perfect = 3	ARGUS = 4	KE Emu by Axiell = 5	Contracted Web-based database= 6
CA1		1	1					
UK1		2		2				
US1A		3			3			
US1B		4				4		
US2		6						6
US3		1	1					
US4		5					5	
			2	1	1	1	1	1
6 Question		Code Numbers and Meanings for each question						
Respondent ID	Q2a) How long has that database been in use?	Answer	0-4 years in use= 1	5-10 years in use = 2	11-15 years in use = 3	16-20 years in use = 4	21-25 years in use = 5	26 years in use = 6
CA1		5					5	
UK1		2		2				
US1A		3			3			
US1B		5					5	
US2		6						6
US3		5				4		
US4		2		2				
			0	2	1	1	2	1
7 Question		Code Numbers and Meanings for each question						
Respondent ID	Q2b) Do you have immediate plans for utilizing a new/different database?	Answer	Y = 1	N=2	Within weeks = 3	Get an expanded version of current system = 4		
CA1		4				4		
UK1		1	1					
US1A		1	1					
US1B		1	1					
US2		3			3			
US3		2		2				
US4		2		2				

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

		Answer	3	2	1	1		
8	Question		Code Numbers and Meanings for each question					
Respondent ID	Q3) Is there consultation with the indigenous communities on what databases they would like used, and what does that look like?	Answer	Yes = 1	No = 2	Unsure = 3			
CA1		2		2				
UK1		2		2				
US1A		2		2				
US1B		2		2				
US2		2		2				
US3		3			3			
US4		2		2				
		Answer	0	6	1			
10	Question		Code Numbers and Meanings for each question					
Respondent ID	Q4) Does your collections management database support indigenous language/characters?	Answer	Yes = 1	No = 2	Some diacritical marks = 3	Did not answer = 4		
CA1		1	1					
UK1		2		2				
US1A		2		2				
US1B		2		2				
US2		3			3			
US3		1	1					
US4		4				4		
			2	3	1	1		
	Question		Code Numbers and Meanings for each question					
Respondent ID	Q9) If there are specialized needs for culturally sensitive or sacred objects (i.e. gendered handling protocols, specialized storage needs, or physical access restrictions), how is that information communicated in the collections management database?		Not communicated in database = 1	Restrictions Flags or Specified Fields in database = 2	Input into the notes section of the database = 3			
CA1		2		2				
UK1		3			3			
US1A	No dedicated space in database	3			3			
US1B		2		2				
US2		3			3			
US3		2		2				
US4		1	1					
		Answer						
			1	3	3			
	Question		Code Numbers and Meanings for each question					
Respondent ID	Q9b) If this information is not retained in the database, who makes the decision to omit it from the database record?		Curator = 1	Collections Manager = 2	Curator & Collections Manager = 3	Indigenous Community consultant = 4	Did not answer or answer not recorded = 5	
CA1		3			3			
UK1		5					5	
US1A		2		2				
US1B		4				4		
US2		1	1					

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

US3			4				4		
US4			4				4		
		Answer	1	1	1	3	1		
	Question		Code Numbers and Meanings for each question						
Respondent ID	Q10a) On a scale of 1-5, 5 being most important, how much would a decolonizing practice such as privileging indigenous voice factor into your choice of collections management database?		Very important/high priority (5) = 1	Somewhat important (3-4)= 2	Not as important/lower priority (1-2) = 3	Does not apply = 4	Did not answer or answer not recorded= 5		
CA1		did not record answer					5		
UK1		Very important/high priority (5) = 1	1						
US1A		Somewhat important (3-4)= 2		2					
US1B		Very important/high priority (5) = 1	1						
US2		did not record answer					5		
US3	It's different because Native American art is just part of a bigger collection. So I don't think that would be a high priority. If we were going to redo the whole system Because the system is for such a broad category of objects	Not as important/lower priority (1-2) = 3				3			
US4	"Perfect world? 5. Real world - we're not there yet. Voice is generally there."	Very important/high priority (5) = 1	1						
		Answer	3	1	1	0	0		
	Question		Code Numbers and Meanings for each question						
Respondent ID	Q10b) On a scale of 1-5, 5 being most important, how much would a decolonizing practice such as sharing authority over information and objects with the indigenous communities factor into your choice of collections management database?		Very important/high priority (5) = 1	Somewhat important (3-4)= 2	Not as important/lower priority (1-2) = 3	Does not apply = 4	Did not answer or answer not recorded= 5		
CA1		did not record answer					5		
UK1		very important/high priority	1			3			
US1A		somewhat important		2					
US1B	we need to collaborate in a real way with people... We don't want to burden [them] with the responsibility of now you have to vet all of this database for accuracy. If people want to work with us we absolutely need them to but we don't want to say this is your responsibility. ...We need to collaborate with people... to create these records in a collaborative way. I don't know what everything there is to say about something to share and I certainly can't make the decision of what's appropriate to share - I'm not from that community.	very important/high priority	1						
US2		did not record answer					5		
US3		not as important/lower priority				3			
US4	"Ideally 5 Not there yet based on physical visits. Odd email rarely happened, then issue you don't know if that person has the authority. We wait until physical visits to make [that call?]"		1						
		Answer	3	1	2	0	2		
	Question		Code Numbers and Meanings for each question						
Respondent ID	Q10c) On a scale of 1-5, 5 being most important, how much would a decolonizing practice such as the indigenous communities' electronic accessibility to information and objects factor into your choice of a collections management database?		Very important/high priority (5) = 1	Somewhat important (3-4)= 2	Not as important/lower priority (1-2) = 3	Does not apply = 4	Did not answer or answer not recorded= 5		

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

CA1		did not record answer						5	
UK1	So many stakeholders, academic stakeholders	3 or 4		2					
US1A		5	1						
US1B	I think it can only help us. These types of things can free us to then do other things that are much more important than like creating a report to send to someone. Yes. So, it's very important to me to be able to have people be able to access that information on their own	5	1						
US2	it was hugely significant and being able to share it with indigenous communities.	high priority						5	
US3	I think you're asking about access directly into our systems. Since that's not something that we're doing now and I don't think ... it would fall into that decision-making process. ...trying to get it to a point that would be accessible directly to an indigenous community would be a huge haul you know.	low priority			3				
US4	"5 – may not always be out there or online database, if request is coming from collections manager then will provide"	5							
		Answer	2	1	1	0	1		

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

Appendix C: Interview Coding – Complete

Question #	Respondent ID	Q1) Does your institution or department have a formal decolonization policy?	Answer	Additional Comment
Q1	CA1		n	
Q1	UK1	If you go in our galleries although we do a lot behind the scenes with the indigenous community in the museum, what we're doing doesn't really reflect itself how we visually present ourselves. Until very recently whenever we do any kind of redisplay or change for the galleries, the focus has always been to try and keep it looking Victorian.... And actually, a lot of the collection was amassed like after from the 1950s onwards that they just kind of ... collected. It's really a bit of an illusion that the museum is this private 19th century creation. But for many of our visitors, it's a really difficult place to be.	y	we've fostered good relationships, it's taken time because indigenous communities, I think museums are sort of hostile places, or can be. So to kind of then break down the barriers and whilst we're with some cases that kind of collections management system, I think it's still failing and it does across many levels.
Q1	US1A	we do have two policies that are, I wouldn't call them decolonizing yet. But, you know, we do have Native American policy. We have a NAGPRA for Internet repatriation policy. We have an international repatriation policy	n	
Q1	US1B	So rather than being kind of proactive we unfortunately had to be a lot of reactive, which is sad and that's something that we totally take on ourselves that this is our responsibility and we need to really focus on doing this	n	
Q1	US2	getting an agreement between the curators, first of all. . .and also, we deal with archaeology as well as getting an agreement between curators and that with the museum will be a very long-term process. I know there is a discussion of it, and there have been responses, sort of ad hoc responses, to specific things that have been seen as issues. And then I as the collections manager and sort of overseer of the database, I get continuous streams of updating certain types of information. Basically, information in the database is under the auspices of the curators, they are, they have fiduciary responsibility for the collections.	n	Decolonization is a difficult term for me, but I would call it more responding to the indigenous voices. We do not at this point. I think much of it has to do. . .first of all, we have certain problems in the scope of our collections, because we do have collections from every continent except Antarctica....., and so getting an agreement between curators and that with the museum will be a very long-term process
Q1	US3	the people that have managed the database and me who currently manages the database are conscientious of this conversation and do our best to avoid colonization practices. Um, but there hasn't been enough. There has not been a formal, I think there's a difference between not colonizing further and doing active decolonization. the people that have managed the database and me who currently manages the database are conscientious of this conversation and do our best to avoid colonization practices.	n	
Q1	US4		n	
Result			Total	
Question #	Respondent ID	Q1a) If so, how does it approach decolonization?	Answer	Additional Comment
Q1a	CA1			
Q1a	UK1			
Q1a	US1A			
Q1a	US1B			
Q1a	US2			
Q1a	US3			
Q1a	US4	NO, in the works, formally in collections policy doc. Our collections span the world, part of the issue would have to address beyond the US. we've just redone our gallery of pre-Columbian materials. African galleries address decolonization in permanent exhibit. Also YouTube videos talking with curatorial staff.		
Result			Total	
Question #	Respondent ID	Q1b) If not, how does your institution or department approach decolonization, particularly in regards to the collection?	Answer	Additional Comment
Q1b	CA1			
Q1b	UK1			
Q1b	US1A			
Q1b	US1B			

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

Q1b	US2			
Q1b	US3			
Q1b	US4			
Result			Total	
Question #	Respondent ID	Q2S: How does your institution and department approach collection management databases and decolonization?	Answer	Additional Comment
QS2	CA1			
QS2	UK1			
QS2	US1A	I think that our aim with our database is primarily to have accountability for the collections, which in turn, intern should provide more accessibility for them. The constraints of funding on database software poses some challenges in that regard, especially in terms of our database and not being very accessible online. And so we've had to make some workarounds and we do have our database available online. And it's something that we've certainly talked about. [and] some of that discussion came about as a result of the RRN. That database is designed to be accessible for First Nations in particular, but the Native Americans in the US. And, It allowed our department to see how other dates databases could address some of the decolonization works. So it's certainly informative and I guess you could say that we're part of that database because we are, but it is not our primary database.		
QS2	US1B	We hope we hope one day that the whole department of culture can be in one database. And that's an ongoing discussion. We approach our database as the priority is on documentation. So we have slowly been incorporating a Decolonizing Framework to the database, but this has not always been the case, as in most databases in most collections management departments. So now we have a much greater need and desire to create a database that the authority of the collections or the material culture, however you want to state that is not on the collections manager or the museum but the voice of the Community, from which it originates. Source community...And the way that we're doing that is to put like indigenous language terms before the English term		We're going to try to come up with some kind of a plan or a program where we would bring members of those origin communities in to review these records and that information, but also to include you know anything from their own perspectives. But that's such a time consuming and you know, it's a project that is probably decades in the making, because it was over 100 years of information
QS2	US2	we also have an original manuscript catalog... as soon as we started having an organized collection. So, it's [from] the late 19th century. So that is one of the foundational documents because it's useful to have a single source to go back to that is where everything started, and relates directly then our databases are set up in such a way that we can modify information from that. But any modifications, sometimes modernizations, sometimes alternate names for cultures, places, we can then have a clear path from that original, when the object came here, to what we have now. We have extensive notes and you'll hear me refer to the notes field a lot because it's data that doesn't really fit within an object's database because the object's database, nothing changes. Notes allow us the flexibility that we need, so we annotate basically who said what, whether we have visiting researchers online, something like that. And then the curators' approval and the date for that, for when that change was made		
QS2	US3			
QS2	US4			
Result			Total	
Question #	Respondent ID	Q2) What collections management database do you use?	Answer	Additional Comment
Q2	CA1		Mimsy XG by Axiell	
Q2	UK1	The database we have is undergoing some changes at the moment. It is the Filemaker Pro database, a piece of software that like you or I or anyone can pick it out and buy Filemaker Pro. But equally at a museum information still kind of has to be classified and then press classifications systems still very much kind of embedded in how anthropology and archaeology and Museums in the UK were established as a discipline and that's still a very Western approach to how you would classify information.	Filemaker Pro Software	
Q2	US1A		Past Perfect	
Q2	US1B		ARGUS	
Q2	US2	Contracted programmers (Whirligig) that produce collective access to create a web-based database: mimics a lot of the fields we've have now, and has capabilities we don't; essentially the grant was to improve the framework, not the data.	Contracted in House	

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

Q2	US3		Mimsy XG by Axiell	
Q2	US4	We knew that the Smithsonian was doing it and there were options, what to do with the database: adding fields – that came to be very useful to use, waited until they had made those updates, probably not going to change fields. - Limits what we can do - Native terminology to objects – add in notes field, linguistics focused so have a tremendous amount of indigenous knowledge or naming. Not always translate to available online - Doesn't always translate immediately - There are certain fields that don't get put online - For instance, a group of objects online, can flag: not available to general = not online – [for instance?] active repatriation. - Not online: anything human remains, associated funerary objects - Don't want to be accused of not being transparent - By putting online/offending individual[s] o Changed mind before, flag removed	KE-Emu	
Result				
Question #	Respondent ID	Q2a) How long has that database been in use?	Answer	Additional Comment
Q2a	CA1	23 years 1997, before that a digital database from the 1970's - the first digital database in Canada - CHIN: Canadian heritage information network. Massive upgrade in 2006- almost like a new database	21-25 yrs in use	
Q2a	UK1		5-10 years in use	
Q2a	US1A	14 yrs Since 2006, previously ARGUS	11-15 years in use	
Q2a	US1B	about 25 years	21-25 yrs in use	that particular software is no longer supported by any kind of company. It's dead, there's no software update. It's a very strange thing to happen to a database that's now no longer supported. Because it's just this. It's just the same for the rest of its life, and the only reason why it functions at all is because of [IT at the museum] who keeps like finding ways to fix it.
Q2a	US2	: 1993 program written. New CMD should be in a few weeks	26+ yrs in use	
Q2a	US3	possibly since 1996 (oldest record entered) or early 2000's (the previous database manager said we'd updated/got? the software which I thought, early 2000s, so either way)	21-25 yrs in use	
Q2a	US4	10 years Previously on ARGUS	5-10 years in use	
Result			Total	
Question #	Respondent ID	Q2b) Do you have immediate plans for utilizing a new/different database?	Answer	Additional Comment
Q2b	CA1	in the next possibly five years, we may move to the Axial Archive? collections, which has been working towards merging library archives and collections in one system. So we are looking at that. Right now we have a separate library system, is separate archive system in New Jersey	expanded version of current systems	
Q2b	UK1	Yes because part of the University. There are other museum projects underway to marry all the university affiliated museums, so maybe by next year should all be integrated. Working with ethnographic collections, info that we know as an institution is from the collectors, they were the people who settled in colonized countries, so there isn't a lot of indigenous knowledge about those objects, what they were used for, their materials, so not sure how accommodating that will work.	y	
Q2b	US1A	And at the time, we had talked about actually acquiring a database that would work for our larger suite of the museum. And we've had that conversation multiple times in the last 20 years and years. And we are currently meeting intermittently with contemporary culture to try to look like a database that meets our needs more and part of that is having, providing much easier access for communities. Particularly Native communities to be able to harness that data in a way that works for them and not necessarily something that we might think of. That would allow them to do what they would like to do with that data rather than have it be organized in the way that we haven't organized. So that's that is something we're pursuing.	y	
Q2b	US1B	in the was the trends 10 to 15 even 20 years ago now that Museum's with various departments, academic type departments, go to one central database for all. Now that we are 20 year out from that model, we are seeing that like that does not work. And people are starting to separate again.	y	There's no product on the planet that works for everything, unless you get into some serious customization which costs a lot of money... About four and a half years ago we had been talking about, like, one central database for the entire museum and it was pretty clear that it was not going to work.
Q2b	US2		within weeks	
Q2b	US3	don't believe we have any immediate plans. we've been using this database for long enough now that I think it would be wise for us to at least do a RFP and getting assessment to make sure what we're doing is the best for our museum over all these years, but [not] on the agenda at this point.	n	

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

Q2b	US4		n	
Result			Total	
Question #	Respondent ID	Q3) Is there consultation with the indigenous communities on what databases they would like used, and what does that look like?	Answer	Additional Comment
Q3	CA1	NO. Not for the database itself, we've had it for a long time.	No	
Q3	UK1	No. Most of the conversation is driven by the University Rather than the archives and museums. The museums under this (the Uni) are widely different, quite diverse.	No	
Q3	US1A	NO. we have not had those discussions	No	
Q3	US1B	If we're really decolonizing and... committed to this work and having our collections be truly accessible and including the voice of the Source community, then we need to find out what is important to them and it may not be anything that we have already imagined. We have not done that at all at the [museum] and one of the reasons why. There are so many communities... How do you choose them and who gets to be a part of the conversation? But that's not to say that we shouldn't do it because we found with the Hopi that it was actually beneficial to have these conversations because you know the things that we thought would be important to them we're not. And the things that they thought were really important. We were like, we wouldn't have thought that. Of course, right, because we're coming from a completely different mindset. So I don't know how or what we would go about approaching that and it should happen but like I said I don't know how you get members of every single community that's represented in our collections, which are vast	NO	
Q3	US2	Generally, people who use the database have been happy with it.	NO	
Q3	US3	I do know that our previous, our previous curator of Native American art is in and is very community involved and works with many committees and Native American Groups to get insights on things, but often times our curators are not. I mean, it really varies. Their level of interest in the database and the technology itself. And so I would be surprised if they got into that level of the weeds with our technology I'm not familiar with the database selection process for when this was brought onboard		
Q3	US4		Not come up from their side.	
Result			Total	
Question #	Respondent ID	QS4) Does the collections management database privilege indigenous voice and perspective?	Answer	Additional Comment
QS4	CA1	we have tried to integrate some indigenous names, obviously. I can't remember the number off the top of my head, but there are thousands of original language names in the database and we're always trying to research more. And otherwise, we do things. I mean, as far as the history of the museum goes again like the curator in the 1950s and 60s actually brought in Northwest Coast artists and owners. And to look at the collection back then and make notes on the catalog cards from their visits and those comments all ended up in the database and we do a lot of indigenous visits. To the collection.		
QS4	UK1			
QS4	US1A			
QS4	US1B			
QS4	US2			
QS4	US3			
QS4	US4			
Result			Total	
Question #	Respondent ID	Q4) Does your collections management database support indigenous language/characters?	Answer	Additional Comment
Q4	CA1		y	
Q4	UK1		n	
Q4	US1A		n	

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

Q4	US1B		n	
Q4	US2	No, not sure. Having conversations about it here: in 1930's collection of Cherokee NC OK anthropologist [with affiliated university] who wrote down Cherokee syllabary and English on accession cards, and those could only be available as an image on the multimedia tab. If the image has been [uploaded] pushed out [online] could see the syllabary.	some diacritical marks	
Q4	US3	It will support, I believe any unit... so I'm trying to distinguish between our online collections, of which feeds in and if you're directly in the database, but at this point all Unicode characters can be written into mimsy and I believe those all translate.	y	in our titles typically we have like an anchor field for the primary title. And then there's flexi fields for other versions of the title. And so we do list. If we have them multiple titles and this is maybe this is the original language title. This is the translated title
Q4	US4	However, suspicion is that we would have to upgrade KE- EMu and ask for that as an add on. Colleagues in the [Asian history department] have it, but it has to be put in the notes. Not sure that KE-EMu couldn't; it's not part of the package we bought.	Linguistics? Doesn't translate online	Native terminology to objects – add in notes field, linguistics focused so have a tremendous amount of indigenous knowledge or naming. Not always translate to available online
Result			Total	
Question #	Respondent ID	Q4a) If so, how and where is this used in the database?	Answer	Additional Comment
Q4a	CA1			
Q4a	UK1			
Q4a	US1A			
Q4a	US1B			
Q4a	US2			
Q4a	US3			
Q4a	US4			
Result			Total	
Question #	Respondent ID	Q4b) If not, do you have other methods of including indigenous language into records, and what are those methods?	Answer	Additional Comment
Q4b	CA1	We're, we have tried to integrate some indigenous names, obviously. I can't remember the number off the top of my head, but there are thousands of original language names in the database and we're always trying to research more. And otherwise, we do things. I mean, as far as the history of the museum goes again like the curator in the 1950s and 60s actually brought in Northwest Coast artists and owners. And to look at the collection back then and make notes on the catalog cards from their visits and those comments all ended up in the database and we do a lot of indigenous visits. To the collection		
Q4b	UK1	the cultural group name drop down: a list of group names that was out of date, to the point where some of those cultural group names (being used in the database) were offensive, or just wrong. [We made an effort to] find out what the individual indigenous groups wanted to be called, in the present, and that's what we should be applying.		
Q4b	US1A	add audio files and we haven't done that but that is something that the database does allow. we sort of use the free text field and we put the native word in, but it's been, it's not ideal because it doesn't allow for the proper linguistics alphabet to be used. We just sort of make it work. We Often will have other information about. We might keep other notes in a Word document or something where we could support that font.		
Q4b	US1B			
Q4b	US2	integrate contemporary names for groups. Not in the old one. The new one is supposed to have both. I personally am leaning towards video, there was going to be some videos and interviews and things like that with the Northwest coast Hall when it opens and with their software website. And you'll have access to that, but I'm really hoping we come up with a protocol for when there's a visitor and they're willing, and even if they don't talk about a lot of things, if they have like three or four things that are really important, and we can get 10 to 15 minutes on each of those objects about why it's important, edit that and put it on, I think that is really how we're going to basically get a library of Information.		
Q4b	US3	when we're making authority records for Artists, we try to use self-identified cultures and nationalities and include the ability to include multiple oftentimes especially modern and contemporary artists and going back generations people experience multiple identities and try not to. I mean, it's a hot conversation right now is how do you not place an identity on someone, and let people self identify? Which is an easier conversation with living artists that was with non-living artists. You can attach audio files, it's not been our practice to and I		

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

		honestly don't know if we have audio files. I don't think we have audio files in our collection. That might be a question. Well, we may have audio files in our archives collection, which is not in the database and which may not be may or may not be digitize at this point		
Q4b	US4	in terms of naming objects, native names of objects. we know the names of the women creators making baskets for the trade, named individuals are always available and pushed online.		
Result			Total	
Question #	Respondent ID	Q5) How is indigenous voice and perspective represented in the collections management database?	Answer	Additional Comment
Q5	CA1			
Q5	UK1			
Q5	US1A	I would add that definitely in the general description, when any of us acquire information that's firsthand. Individuals who are visiting and talking about their belongings and we would add that information. So that's just free text and actually in something like that probably more appropriate. But I can't think of other areas of Past Perfect, you know where it's specifically designed for community involvement		
Q5	US1B			
Q5	US2			
Q5	US3			
Q5	US4			
Result			Total	
Question #	Respondent ID	Q5a) If it is not, how would you like to see this done?	Answer	Additional Comment
Q5a	CA1			
Q5a	UK1			
Q5a	US1A			
Q5a	US1B			
Q5a	US2			
Q5a	US3			
Q5a	US4			
Result			Total	
Question #	Respondent ID	Q6) How is the information in your database indexed?	Answer	Additional Comment
Q6	CA1			
Q6	UK1			
Q6	US1A	material type		
Q6	US1B	lexicon hierarchy		
Q6	US2			
Q6	US3	Department and region		
Q6	US4			
Result			Total	
Question #	Respondent ID	Q6a) How would you describe the nomenclature used in your database? For instance, do you find it based on anthropological terminology or indigenous knowledge systems?	Answer	Additional Comment

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

Q6a	CA1	It was developed through lexicons. Through a wider Museum community from the Getty from the AAT from the Canadian Heritage Information workers. But we do add to it when needed.		
Q6a	UK1			
Q6a	US1A			
Q6a	US1B	It's own thing, but it's also not. It's also totally colonial. But now so many of our records are... now locked into this lexicon unless you create new terms and so I'm constantly creating new terms. you might have something that looks like a container a bowl, for instance, it might look like a bowl, we would catalog it as a bowl and then it would be under this hierarchy in the lexicon under bowl/container/Tool. it's locked into all of these different levels of this lexicon hierarchy, but someone might say, from a community they might say, Well, sure that looks like a bowl because it's a bowl, but it's a religious object. And so we would not use it for any other purpose, but for this religious practice. So to consider it a bowl and put it into that very colonial classification is wrong		
Q6a	US2	It is mostly looking at indigenous artists and individual representation within the database. The bulk of our collections were collected before 1920. The type of information that was recorded really was minimal and, to be totally honest, what they do, if it's one of those organize collections-not just something that came into Uncle Harry's attic, which is a lot of collections-they would collect their materials that have fieldnotes. When they returned, it was expected that those field notes would be turned into a scholarly publication. So, a lot of the background information actually exists in these publications. So, one of the things we've been trying to do is link to those publications. But it's been an interesting thing, because as the web became more capable of doing searches by text, It means that automatically we have to retain that antiquated terminology, or you can't do an automatic search.		
Q6a	US3	We do categorize objects. According to department... anything that comes in from the Native American Artists is categorized as Native American art, it may have a cross categorization as, for example, photography or modern and contemporary art or all three. But it does get that label in there. Then it goes to region right the next division after a Native American is those different which are more of an anthropological division right. May include like an object, almost like an object type. We Have the other type that is a separate field but Like a broader categorization like drawings or prints or games toys, those kinds of things. So for Native American our practices to include both the region and that sort of more broad categorization.		
Q6a	US4			
Result			Total	
Question #	Respondent ID	Q6b) Do you think that is an issue, and why? Have you consulted with indigenous communities to discuss how they feel about the nomenclature?	Answer	Additional Comment
Q6b	CA1	Because the database is really only used in house. Nobody outside of the staff sees Mimsy.		We've focused more on the public view.. how you want case organized... what do you want on display [or not]. The curators actually did that over the course of the five years of the project with as many groups as they can and ...try to do as much as they possibly could, by community consultation.
Q6b	UK1	the group name changes: we talked with the community that the language affects. And asked them. Covered pretty well in America, been consulting widely with indigenous groups.		
Q6b	US1A	Like say that we've had discussions. They're ad hoc and they come up as a result of consultations with tribal members and they will often ask for certain items. They are categorically sort of defined in an indigenous manner and often explain how they're organized in the database and then we have a conversation that allows us to have a conversation about how the database is designed. And you know, and to sort of contribute to what the future might look like for that database, but it's very ad hoc		
Q6b	US1B	not really in a broader sense. So like when and not even not in a departmental sense. There has to be rethinking of the way these lexicons are set up because they come to. They come, they come through as a very Western colonial, I got to classify everything and it's a nice little box, you know, and it didn't work. So that's one of the things to have like if we start to break down some of these classifications in the database that could also translate into a more practical way and like our storage		
Q6b	US2			
Q6b	US3			
Q6b	US4	consulted about our approach – individuals coming to look at collections, we don't initiate that conversation, if they do, they have a discussion. Do try to, if people are concerned about something, they called, then try to address that.		
Result			Total	

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

Question #	Respondent ID	Q7) What type of access do the indigenous communities have to the collections management database and the information stored there?	Answer	Additional Comment
Q7	CA1	we've published pretty much the entire set of information. I mean, there are fields here and there that didn't have enough data in them to bother with but all of our ownership fields, all the text fields about history of use and narrative and everything we put out there. And we have images that can't go out because of copyright sometimes, but the record still goes out even for culturally sensitive objects. The image will be hidden. But the record will still be there. So if people are looking, they can find it		
Q7	UK1	The database is online. It privileges people who have good internet access. Some info is held back due to data protection laws (ex. Personal details of donors if still alive).		
Q7	US1A	So the main database with all of the information is not accessible, except onsite. it's a database that requires some hand holding when someone wants to look at the data. So typically, that a usually somebody who works at the [museum] is usually involved in helping provide that access.		We also have an online version of our database, but that is really it's quite inaccessible actually to most people, other than people who have an archaeological background because they, as you already sort of mentioned, that the lexicon is archaeological focused... And also because of the legal protections for locations of archaeological sites the cultural information which is based on location is very broad.
Q7	US1B			
Q7	US2	Because of the old database structure, they did not have much. they could see information and with the visiting or with the Advanced Research access they could see pretty much anything they wanted to do, including physical anthropology.		
Q7	US3	right now I only have staff members like login or database. And only, not even all staff have access to the database. It's Been pretty selective and to those who need to use it. Our public version is our online collections and so there's both internal there's both and you can set that up to having a truly public requires no login. And then there's a level of access that if you create a login for the database and let me know that you have. I can grant you access to what's considered published internally and that is larger than just who has access to the database itself, but it's a subset of information in the system. And I actually find that to be much easier for me to search when I know what I'm looking for, like, or if I'm looking for an artist's name or that. I've found the online collections to be super accessible and tons of information.	And I actually find that to be much easier for me to search when I know what I'm looking for, like, or if I'm looking for an artist's name or that. I've found the online collections to be super accessible and tons of information.	[percentage of the Collections Database or the objects are online] I think that it's a rolling market 50% because as we bring stuff in as our collections are ever expanding we tend to be somewhere between the 40 and 55 percentage Over the last few years.
Q7	US4			
Result			Total	
Question #	Respondent ID	Q7a) Who makes the decisions about what is accessible to the community? Do decisions about accessibility differ between access for direct descendent community vs the wider indigenous community?	Answer	Additional Comment
Q7a	CA1	Collections manager and predecessor. Copyright issues - [affiliated university] legal department		
Q7a	UK1			
Q7a	US1A	any State Museum anybody has access to anything has the right to look at anything other than if it's protected by law. So NAGPRA objects would be those that are not widely accessible.		
Q7a	US1B			
Q7a	US2	Unless we have been told directly that something is not accessible, we provide access. We generally do not limit access and what we will do is if, in a lot of times I mean online is different, people come and visit, they will ask questions about, which is helpful, because we have all sorts of researchers. I mean, and that's the same thing. It's not just the descendant communities. Well, unless we're told that they can't, and technically we don't tend to say "no you can't." What we will do is, we'll cover a collection and say there will be a sign on it. You should ask permission or this community asks for you to ask permission before you access the material. And generally, that we haven't had any issues beyond that. It is. It's practice, it will change too		
Q7a	US3	I don't know that there's really been a conversation about that in terms of sensitive objects. I mean, one of the advantages of well, I think it's an advantage of being an art museum is that the types of objects that were collected for this collection or not as tend not to be as sensitive as for, say, an anthropology museum, so you know when it comes to issues related to objects that would fall under NAGPRA. And as far as ceremonial and sacred objects. It's a pretty low percentage and it's based on those objects that are not, you know, available to research online or anything like that I think that it's going to be a case by case basis, as I get to know the collection to figure out if some of those steps are needed. But I would say that the majority of the collection. Isn't that level of sensitivity.		
Q7a	US4	its online (access), and a Section decision. If there is a visit related to repatriation, for instance, they can make decisions to make requests or not. We have sat (visitors) in front of the database. During collections visits, usually an elder who can speak to the		

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

		appropriateness of the group (descendent vs wider indigenous communities)		
Result			Total	
Question #	Respondent ID	Q7b) Are there different levels of access depending on one's position in the indigenous descendent community?	Answer	Additional Comment
Q7b	CA1			
Q7b	UK1	where we've been told that it's inappropriate to share info about objects, we've restricted that access to things that have those sensitivities.		
Q7b	US1A	We have not been asked to protect any of the information on our database location other than locational information yet. However, we are, we do protect funerary objects, human remains, sacred objects tied into cultural patrimony. Anything that's legally defined in NAGPRA. They Are protected and they're not available to the general public. And they would, if they are requested, access is limited to usually in the Cultural Resources Department or who have gotten permission from the tribal council.		
Q7b	US1B	we don't make that decision. That is a decision that is made by the community because there are, as you know, Even within a community, not everyone is eligible to have all of the knowledge of a specific thing and that it is oftentimes a privilege and right that is earned by specific individuals in a community. So say somebody is the Hopi, as an example, where there are specific Kiva Societies where until you are invited as a man to enter that Kiva society, You don't know what goes on in that society, you don't get to have the knowledge and often times many people from that community will never have that knowledge. If we had something that was from a particular society, and it was a sensitive piece. We would not be able to give access to that thing.	we're thinking about having if you're not a community member having some form of permissions through the community because we want to protect intellectual property rights.	And so we're thinking about having if you're not a community member having some form of permissions through the community because we want to protect intellectual property rights. Right. And we want to even make aware of what are people coming into our institution [what are they seeing and doing with this information] that belongs to your community. It would have to go through the community and there would have to be permissions and we do ask for NAGPRA related items and we're actually thinking about doing this kind of across the board, not for community members, but for the public and at large, we're thinking about asking like having them [Ask the community].
Q7b	US2	We can certainly put it in place. It would have to be a curatorial call. It, whenever it gets to the point you limit access it becomes, again, because we're a private institution that lives in a building that is maintained by the City. So, there are actually legal things, and that it actually and it probably would be the curator and the legal department that would be the ones to. For all I know, they may have a policy in place, but I doubt.		
Q7b	US3	as we work our way through those things are going to come Up and we're going to have to make decisions; right now I'm going to have two objects taken off exhibit that are part of an active repatriation claim that's going to be published. I would love for us to be an institution that could use a system like that [Murkutu], but it would be. It wouldn't be our dedicated system because our management system of record needs to serve our entire collection, which includes lots of objects that are not Native American. And so it would be specific for them. So it would be a layer on top of ours There needs to be some kind of like some sort of integration between the systems and it would need to be in addition to the one we have "		
Q7b	US4	Not communicated in database		
Result			Total	
Question #	Respondent ID	Q8) What type of authority do the indigenous communities have over the information in the collections management database?	Answer	Additional Comment
Q8	CA1			
Q8	UK1			
Q8	US1A			
Q8	US1B			
Q8	US2	One of the nice things in the new database, we have what they call a... switch so that if someone calls and says, this should not be on the website, we actually will be able to like click a button and then like automatically it will not appear anymore until the status of the object is working		
Q8	US3	if I see something that's wrong myself. I'll ask for a change, or someone else's something's wrong. I Know that the sort of mentality has always been to do what we want to balance the standards with ethics, basically. And so if there are ways that we can do something that is more ethical, then that will take precedent over standard.		
Q8	US4			
Result			Total	

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

Question #	Respondent ID	Q8a) Are they consulted about what types of information can and cannot be entered in the database?	Answer	Additional Comment
Q8a	CA1			
Q8a	UK1	Photographs [in the collections] were taken to Australia and asked if they can be restricted or not.		
Q8a	US1A	If somebody comes in and we're talking about, they're visitors to the collections, and they say something that I think would be helpful to add to the database, I would ask them, can I add that to the database or not. I wouldn't add it if they didn't want me to add it		
Q8a	US1B			
Q8a	US2			
Q8a	US3	that would be again something for the future. it sort of goes in line with what I said previously about when we have experts who are working with us in the collection who make us aware of certain sensitivities or terminology corrections or you know date verification		
Q8a	US4	They are consulted if they contact or are here and take it under advisement. Try to be as conscious as possible. Aren't proactive in contacting every group what to do.		
Result			Total	
Question #	Respondent ID	Q8b) Have the indigenous communities been consulted about authority over the metadata in the collections management database?	Answer	Additional Comment
Q8b	CA1			
Q8b	UK1	{will need} the kind of funding that will support the ever increasing data, and hopefully the communities will keep adding to the info, and have more of an exchange about what they want us to do with it, what is its place here in the [museum].		
Q8b	US1A	we have strict guidelines about that, and no one is allowed to delete anything and that can be a problem, because some words can be problematic or offensive. Even. You know. I think we are hearing a lot about high school names, but lots of creeks have very offensive names and this comes in [the] State. But Because that information is often crucial to helping to interpret that material. We don't delete that information we just add to it. And we annotate we might say, this is no longer acceptable. We wouldn't delete it		
Q8b	US1B			
Q8b	US2			
Q8b	US3			
Q8b	US4	It has not come up. Keep all the info - history of record, in house, see what it came in as and subsequent shifts in attribution in tribal group and who that made that call, either native or non-native and embedded in the record. - In house some stuff is blocked from view		
Result			Total	
Question #	Respondent ID	Q9) If there are specialized needs for culturally sensitive or sacred objects (i.e. gendered handling protocols, specialized storage needs, or physical access restrictions), how is that information communicated in the collections management database?	Answer	Additional Comment
Q9	CA1	Restriction field in MIMSY. There's a checkbox for culturally sensitive items that will tell the RRN, and the online catalog that it's culturally sensitive, but there's a table that opens and in there. You can put notes about why.	Restrictions Flags or Specified Fields in database= 2	
Q9	UK1		Input into the notes section of the database= 3	
Q9	US1A	that [has] changed over time. Once NAGPRA passed there were physical signs or usually something at the object level, so that people wouldn't accidentally touch the object or so that they would be cautious and I did not put that in the database, because I Hadn't gotten permission to put that in the database. And subsequently I decided that that does need to be in the database because sometimes things get misplaced or people don't read what's in front of them. So it's just another place to put that information. It's a challenge because right now that data is not available to the public. There isn't a special place necessarily to put that, the database is not really equipped to protect that information: Once it's in there, It's available. That's why I'm so cautious because we're a state institution. So anybody could say we're going to [put in] a FOIA request [and] you have to let us see everything. So that's why I had initially not put it in, but it's important to actually have permission.	Input into the notes section of the database= 3	no dedicated space in the database
Q9	US1B	we don't always know what their special means are ...which is why community review of collections is so important.	Restrictions Flags or Specified Fields in database= 2	With our current database. You can't just pick fields, right, and say these are the fields that I wanted my report, and then boom. You have to rely on these reports that were made by Crystal Reports and they're the only reports that are in your

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

				database and then you have to whatever fields were Included in that report is what you get. So with a new database, we would be able to include some of that stuff so that you could see right away, like, oh, we don't pull this one out, because this one is a male handling only
Q9	US2	if you're a member of the tribe, you need to ask us what's in there and we can tell you what's in that cabinet/storage. ...it's difficult, and also because we have compact storage. There are tribes that have long standing disagreements and they were asking me if we could move this one collection to someplace else over there. It was impossible because the collections were too large. they let us clean this up afterwards, when they were researching, they sprinkle cornmeal to separate them from us sort of thing. So, there actually are cultural mitigations and we do have objects that need to be fed periodically. But we also do say that if we have to clean up afterwards. I mean, we do get pests in our storage if we're not careful, and... people have been very reasonable. [There is] a space that's set aside for indigenous groups to come and to be with artifacts, to be with objects, it's a room where you can actually do smudging, which in [city] is next to impossible with fire laws, but it has an HVAC system... We would keep a record of it being fed, just because it's just a question if we see cornmeal, where did this come from? But people are aware of it	Input into the notes section of the database= 3	Gendered Access, we do not deal with. there are certain points at which I feel if they feel strongly about the object, they need to repatriate them because we really, we are, we're a museum of all these cultures and it is, that to me is one of the roles of NAGPRA, it is to get the objects that need, that have special needs, to have them back to where they belong. It can be problematic. We have some notes on things, but I, we get into privacy issues and gender and privacy issues nowadays are as big a minefield, as I can think, and having to, how do we determine the researcher and what if the researcher is not part of that tribe. It's, it becomes very, it becomes very messy. To some degree, it's self-policing.
Q9	US3	would probably have a conversation about how to take something off of access if it had been previously exposed or something of that level of sensitivity being acquired at this point. But if that was then and it had not previously been exposed then, we would have a conversation about what to do.	Restrictions Flags or Specified Fields in database= 2	Usually that lean towards culturally sensitive and then we'll put notes in there about why. We do have a handful of objects that are listed as culturally sensitive. But I haven't seen the level of specificity about gendered handling, I'm not confident enough to know if that's because... the objects don't meet that or if it's because that information hasn't been obtained yet, but if there's specific protocols, we would include that in the notes. But it to me if it has to if it needs that level of [care it should be repatriated.]
Q9	US4	It isn't communicated (in db). We do try to be as accommodating as possible for issues, set aside so as not to be seen. Gender and repatriation came up - a dozen Cherokee crania repatriated. Three gentlemen came from NC. Participant is only male [that works] in the section, and it was asked that in packing of material, that it had to be done by a male.	Not communicated in database	care and we can't show the work, why do we have it? We're an art museum. So I think that would, it's in a sense that's an advantage to me in terms of handling the sensitive material because of that.
Result		By default we know what cabinets are [sensitive materials], we don't want to draw attention to them (with signage?) That's an in house call	Total	
Question #	Respondent ID	Q9a) What type of authority does the indigenous community have over this information?	Answer	Additional Comment
Q9a	CA1			
Q9a	UK1			
Q9a	US1A			
Q9a	US1B	most of the instructions that we have for these items were given to us by a community member. So from a variety of ways in which that information was delivered to us. It might have been through like actual consultation, where they came in and we asked them, like, oh, what are these. What are these things? How do we handle them? And then they told us where it might have come through an email or a discussion in some other way. But we haven't made up any of those things ourselves. we're starting this where we have a read only user login where when research researchers come in, they can actually log in with this read only password and username and then access records if they so choose.		people from like New Zealand will contact me and say what's in your collection, and then Just Send them a PDF of everything that we have. So access that way. However, I can't export or import anything from ARGUS. So I have to send them the information through these very giant PDFs and it's so it's accessible but it's almost not accessible because if you have 500 things and you have to search through a PDF. It's time consuming and cumbersome and it would be easier to do it in an online format. However, the information that's online is not the same as the information that's in the internal database. And so those are two totally different things. You get a very, very basic Description of what the item is online format.
Q9a	US2			
Q9a	US3	whoever my consultant was I would defer to their recommendations. I think that certain information isn't meant to be shared outside the Community, and if that's what's the case, I wouldn't put it in there, but that would also tick a box on the side of this shouldn't be in this collection.		
Q9a	US4			
Result			Total	
Question #	Respondent ID	Q9b) If this information is not retained in the database, who makes the decision to omit it from the database record?	Answer	Additional Comment
Q9b	CA1	I can make those decisions, but usually I'm talking to a curator and we work it out together, but not always.	curator and collections manager	
Q9b	UK1		answer not recorded	
Q9b	US1A	I actually had conversations with in one case that community. And they said that how do you want these to be separated and they specifically said, you know, put them in separate boxes and keep them separate. But in the same general location. And during our move that just became complicated and had we had that information	collections manager	

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

		in the database, it would have been able to more quickly, ensure that those materials were separate, kept and maintained their separate status. And the only reason they were able to maintain that separate status was because I knew what the situation was. And because I'm not going to be here forever. What prompted me to realize that it needed to be in the database.		
Q9b	US1B		indigenous community consultant	
Q9b	US2	they have the best understanding of, at least an outsider's understanding, of the groups and the history, and they, and again, a lot of times they networked into communities already, they are very good again at sort of navigating the sensitivity issues and how to do things. We haven't had, we don't have much information of a sensitive nature.	curator	the new database will be a springboard for a lot of fields, it's other blocks of data-That can be added that will address those issues more clearly, and kind of filter down over everything of this nature. And I think it will be again, and it's the joy of having your own database rather than something off the shelf, where you can adapt and At this point we live in the notes field.
Q9b	US3		indigenous community consultant	
Q9b	US4		indigenous community consultant	
Result			Total	
Question #	Respondent ID	Q10a) On a scale of 1-5, 5 being most important, how much would a decolonizing practice such as privileging indigenous voice factor into your choice of collections management database?	Answer	Additional Comment
Q10a	CA1		did not record answer	
Q10a	UK1		Very important/high priority (5) = 1	
Q10a	US1A		Somewhat important (3-4)= 2	
Q10a	US1B	we need to be transparent in all forms, and that includes the database and so it's not just collections management it's not just the physical collections.	Very important/high priority (5) = 1	
Q10a	US2		did not record answer	
Q10a	US3	It's different because Native American art is just part of a bigger collection. So I don't think that would be a high priority. If we were going to redo the whole system Because the system is for such a broad category of objects	Not as important/lower priority (1-2) = 3	
Q10a	US4	"Perfect world? 5. Real world - we're not there yet. Voice is generally there."	Very important/high priority (5) = 1	
Result			Total	
Question #	Respondent ID	Q10b) On a scale of 1-5, 5 being most important, how much would a decolonizing practice such as sharing authority over information and objects with the indigenous communities factor into your choice of collections management database?	Answer	Additional Comment
Q10b	CA1		did not record answer	
Q10b	UK1		very important/high priority	
Q10b	US1A		somewhat important	
Q10b	US1B	we need to collaborate in a real way with people and not just through consultation because [it is] still the form of extracting information... We don't want to burden [them] with the responsibility of now you have to vet all of this database for accuracy. If people want to work with us we absolutely need them to but we don't want to say this is your responsibility. ...We need to collaborate with people... to create these records in a collaborative way. I don't know what everything there is to say about something to share and I certainly can't make the decision of what's appropriate to share - I'm not from that community.	very important/high priority	
Q10b	US2		did not record answer	
Q10b	US3		not as important/lower priority	
Q10b	US4	"Ideally 5 Not there yet based on physical visits. Odd email rarely happened, then issue you don't know if that person has the authority. We wait until physical visits to make [that call?]."		
Result			Total	
Question #	Respondent ID	Q10c) On a scale of 1-5, 5 being most important, how much would a decolonizing practice such as the indigenous communities' electronic accessibility to information and objects factor into your choice of a collections management database?	Answer	Additional Comment
Q10c	CA1		did not record answer	

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

Q10c	UK1	So many stakeholders, academic stakeholders	3 or 4	
Q10c	US1A		5	
Q10c	US1B	I think it can only help us. These types of things can free us to then do other things that are much more important than like creating a report to send to someone. Yes. So, it's very important to me to be able to have people be able to access that information on their own	5	
Q10c	US2	it was hugely significant and being able to share it with indigenous communities.	high priority	
Q10c	US3	t I think you're asking about access directly into our systems. Since that's not something that we're doing now and I don't think ... it would fall into that decision-making process. ...trying to get it to a point that would be accessible directly to an indigenous community would be a huge haul you know.	low priority	
Q10c	US4	"5 – may not always be out there or online database, if request is coming from collections manager then will provide"	5	
Result			Total	

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

Appendix D: Document Analysis Coding

Example		Themes				
Respondent ID		Perspective	Accountability	Language	Access	Authority
CA1	This [university redacted] initiative provides resources and community grants that support the preservation of Indigenous cultural heritage. [Museum redacted]'s Oral History and Language Lab and Library and Archives participate by providing training in the preservation of digital assets and the conversion of audio materials on cassette to digital preservation formats. Indigitization also seeks to promote enhanced and appropriate access to those recordings for communities and, where possible, the broader public. indigenous Access			y	y	
				1	1	
Example		Themes				
Respondent ID		Perspective	Accountability	Language	Access	Authority
CA1	"The RRN is an online research portal that provides access to museum and other public collections around the world, with a focus on First Nations items from the Northwest Coast and British Columbia. It facilitates access for First Nations community-based researchers who might otherwise be unable to travel to see these works in person. It was co-developed by the Musqueam Indian Band, the Stó:lō Nation/Tribal Council, the U'mista Cultural Society, MOA and LOA." Indigenous Access	y	y	y	y	y
		1	1	1	1	1
Example		Themes				
Respondent ID		Perspective	Accountability	Language	Access	Authority
CA1	"This online system contains images and any available information on the objects in [redacted]'s collections." "Indigenous Access"	y			y	
		1			1	
Example		Themes				
Respondent ID		Perspective	Accountability	Language	Access	Authority
CA1	2. "Willingly enters into discussion with originating communities as to the proper care, display, and storage of sensitive materials;" p 1 of 1	y	y		y	
		1	1		1	
Example		Themes				
Respondent ID		Perspective	Accountability	Language	Access	Authority
CA1	2. "Using a special form, staff will record all concerns about Museum practices expressed to them by First Nations or others. The same form also will be available at Admissions or Reception for members of the public to fill out. 3. Reports concerning specific objects in the Museum should identify object catalogue number(s), the respondent's name, address, and telephone number, relationship to the originating community, the date, and the nature of the concern. 4. All reports will be directed to [redacted]'s Collections Manager, who will convene a meeting of relevant staff to discuss the matter. Respondents will then receive a response from [redacted] either inviting further discussion or informing them of the steps the Museum has or is taking regarding the issue. 5. All recorded inquiries will be kept on file at [redacted] for future reference." COCSO	y	y		y	
		1	1		1	
Example		Themes				
Respondent ID		Perspective	Accountability	Language	Access	Authority
CA1	3. "Will, within the constraints of Museum resources, inform itself about and take appropriate measures (as outlined below) to ensure that any or all agreed-upon restrictions are observed "Guidelines for Management of Culturally Sensitive Materials" p1 COCSO	y	y			y
		1	1			1
Example		Themes				
Respondent ID		Perspective	Accountability	Language	Access	Authority
UK1	"Increase access to all collections online (including artefact, photo, sound, and manuscript collections) through targeted projects." "Catalog, photograph, and create online catalogue records for 110,000 objects." "Increase access and mobility of collections currently in off-site storage." Strat plan 17-18		y	y	y	
			1	1	1	
Example		Themes				
Respondent ID		Perspective	Accountability	Language	Access	Authority
UK1	"Continue to invest in our IT infrastructure to ensure it is capable, expansive, scalable and robust, to maximize the capacity of the [museum] to collaborate." Digital strategy: "transform the collections metadata into digital form (the		y		y	

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

	digital framework that has been successfully set up needs consolidation and continued digitization work to ensure any backlog is attended to." Strat plan 27						
			1			1	
	Example	Themes					
Respondent ID		Perspective	Accountability	Language	Access	Authority	
UK1	"...address document the backlog in documentation of collections according to the Museum's Documentation Backlog Plan. ... transfer historical conservation treatment records to collections databases and upgrade online access to collections images and data..." 4		y		y		
			1			1	
	Question	Themes					
Respondent ID		Perspective	Accountability	Language	Access	Authority	
UK1	"All remedial treatments will be fully documented with a written and photographic record on the applicable collections management databases..." Collections 7		y				
			1				
	Question	Themes					
Respondent ID		Perspective	Accountability	Language	Access	Authority	
UK1	"Addressing colonial, racist and otherwise derogatory language on labels and/or in database description, doing provenance research into the manner in which objects were taken (e.g. by the use of military violence or coercion) and, where requested, taking objects off display or enabling the return of objects to originating communities are all integral to that process." CTC Policy	y	y	y		y	
		1	1	1		1	1
	Example	Themes					
Respondent ID		Perspective	Accountability	Language	Access	Authority	
UK1	"The urgency of decoloniality is at the core of our work, with curatorial authority to be shared and/or handed to Indigenous curators, knowledge keepers and/or artists, who respond critically to the Museum" CTC Policy		y			y	
			1				1
	Example	Themes					
Respondent ID		Perspective	Accountability	Language	Access	Authority	
UK1	"This transformational project is amalgamating our different collection databases and will make it much more intuitive to browse through the collections and do research on them, providing access and transparency for communities across the globe. As part of the transfer and data cleaning, we are updating cultural group names to work towards using autonyms and stop using racist and derogatory categories and terminology. The current list of names is woefully out of date and based either on donor or collector's information or on Ethnologue language group attributions. As a result, it often contains dated, incorrect, derogatory and/or racist terms. Not only are we hoping to create a primary list of appropriate terms, including as many autonyms as possible, but we are also hoping to create a number of thesauri, which can be attached to this list. This would enable searching by synonyms and alternate spellings. We would also like to be able to link smaller cultural groups to larger confederations. The Museum is working with First Nation and other experts to update the list." CTC policy	y	y	y	y	y	
		1	1	1	1	1	1
	Example	Themes					
Respondent ID		Perspective	Accountability	Language	Access	Authority	
US1A	"Held-In-Trust collections are available for research by qualified researchers and may be photographed, sketched, reproduced or exhibited, unless the Museum is notified in writing to the contrary by the depositor." CP 25				y	y	
					1	1	
	Example	Themes					
Respondent ID		Perspective	Accountability	Language	Access	Authority	
US1A	"Collection objects not on exhibition may not be photographed without express permission and advance approval of the Department Curator of Collections Manager. Photography of these objects shall be closely supervised by the Department Curator of Collections Manager, who will ensure accordance with professional photographic and collection handling methods." CP 26	y	y		y		
		1	1		1		
	Example	Themes					
Respondent ID		Perspective	Accountability	Language	Access	Authority	
US1A	"The Museum also recognizes that it has a continuing and special responsibility with regard to the collection of objects that might be regarded as culturally sensitive. We will review the proposed collection of such materials on a case by case basis with the Native American Advisory Committee, and, where appropriate, with the appropriate representatives of individual tribes." NACP 2 "The Museum recognizes that tribal community perspectives about	y	y		y	y	

DECOLONIZATION & DATABASES

	the status of many objects may differ substantially and that this difference may apply specifically to the manner in which some Native American objects are handled, accessed, conserved and stored. In the event that the Museum acquires or retains possession of any culturally sensitive Native American materials, whether held-in-trust, by joint ownership agreement, or otherwise, the Museum will endeavor to provide storage, handling, and care conditions in accord with the wishes of the concerned Tribe as indicated by their authorized representative, insofar as legally permissible or operationally possible with available Museum resources." NACP 2					
		1	1		1	1
	Example	Themes				
Respondent ID		Perspective	Accountability	Language	Access	Authority
US1A	"The Museum recognizes that additional concerns arise due to the passage of Public Law 101-601, the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act. Native American human remains and NAGPRA defined objects, as well as other culturally sensitive objects are all subject to continuing tribal review and ultimate requests for repatriation. Pending the disposition of these reviews, the Museum regards NAGPRA-relevant Native American human remains and cultural objects as having a special relationship to culturally affiliated tribes. The Museum will treat such human remains and cultural objects with the confidentiality and security that their status requires, and will not permit access to them until tribal reviews are completed and a final determination of status has been made or unless an appropriate tribal representative authorizes access for research or other purposes." NACP 2		y		y	y
			1		1	1
	Question	Themes				
Respondent ID		Perspective	Accountability	Language	Access	Authority
US1A	"The Museum will maintain its original records relating to any repatriated materials. The Museum will also agree to hold any associated sensitive information in confidence at the request of the tribe, and will not provide access to such materials except as required by law or with the written permission of an authorized representative of the tribe." 4-5		y		1	y
			1		y	1
	Example	Themes				
Respondent ID		Perspective	Accountability	Language	Access	Authority
US1A	"The Museum will distribute periodic summaries or inventories to potentially affiliated tribes. Tribal representatives are always welcome to review collections and any data associated with them." 4		y		y	y
			1		1	1