

Teiger Foundation 2026 Hosting grants

Hosting 102: Establishing Positive Relationships

June 23 2026 2:00 pm EST

This edited transcript was posted on July 6, 2026.

Lauren Leving: Hi everyone. Thank you so much for being with us here today for [Teiger Foundation's](#) program Hosting 102: Establishing Positive Relationships. I am Lauren Leving, one of the producers for Teiger's series of Hosting programming. I am a white woman with olive skin, dark brown hair that is just above my shoulders, and I'm wearing a black and white checkered shirt, which is new so I'm very excited about it. Today's program will focus on how to establish and steward healthy working relationships with a specific focus on collaboration in the exhibition touring process. We'll begin with a presentation by Daviree Velázquez Phillip of Together+Through about how to shape these collaborative relationships, followed by a presentation and conversation between curators Natalie Bell and Sara Cluggish, who worked together on the tour of Basel Abbas and Ruanne Abou-Rahme's exhibition *Only sounds that tremble through us*. We'll conclude with a question and answer (Q&A) session, so you'll all have the opportunity to ask questions of the participants. Just to note, we're not using the Q&A feature, so please put the questions in the chat at any time during the program and we'll get to them at the end.

The Q&A will be led by my co-producer and new collaborator, Laura Copelin, who I'm really excited to introduce. Laura is an independent curator, writer, and arts consultant. Over the past fifteen years, she has held curatorial and leadership roles at MOCA Tucson, Ballroom Marfa, and the Santa Monica Museum of Art, which is now ICA LA. She works at the intersections of contemporary art, poetry, and ecology, and has organized exhibitions, new commissions, publications, and programs with artists and poets including Fernando Palma Rodriguez, Cecilia Vicuña, Grace Rosario Perkins, Lynn Xu, rafa esparza, CA Conrad, and many other incredible people.

Finally, the program is going to be recorded. It's going to be uploaded to Teiger's website. We will also upload a toolkit with resources including the

presentations that are shared today. Also, if you would like an accessible PDF with the alt text of these presentations now to follow along, please put your email in the chat and we will send that right over to you. The toolkit that is following the presentation will also include an example of an access rider, which I personally find to be an essential tool that supports open lines of communication in relationships. Access riders are personalized documents that artists, or really any individual, can share with an organization that outline their accessibility needs. They're best supporting the human that sends the access rider, but also the team that is working with, in collaboration or to support them.

[The toolkit uploaded to Teiger Foundation's site includes Daviree Velázquez Phillip's presentation and a reflection guide to support self-awareness before entering new relationships. The access rider was not included.]

I will share more about Natalie and Sara later in the program, but now I'm really excited to introduce Daviree Velázquez Phillip. Daviree is a Community Cultivator, Capacity Builder, and Change Facilitator at Together + Through, PLLC, based in Evanston, Illinois. She provides one-on-one coaching and supports organizations as a mediator and consultant for holistic institutional health, among other roles. Daviree spent fifteen years in higher education, where she served as an executive leader and led programs for communities that have historically experienced marginalization, representing both students and people impacted by universities. She is a queer woman of color, a Boricua, a mother.

Thank you all again for being here, and thank you, Dav. I'm going to pass it over to Daviree. Thanks all.

Daviree Velázquez Phillip: Hi, hello everyone. As shared, my name is Daviree Velázquez Phillip, but you're more than welcome to also call me Dav as most folks do. My pronouns are she and her. I am a light-skinned brown woman. I have short dark hair that's nearly black. I have a tight fade. Right now, my hair is, for my curly folks out there, probably about a 2A/2C curl texture, and then my skin, as I said, is light brown given that I'm experiencing my summer melanation - excited about that. I have blue headphones on, round blue glasses, and I have a soft pink shirt on that's buttoned up to my neck.

Today I'm going to be talking about relationship building, which I find incredibly important for all of our relations, but certainly as you're establishing relationships with new partners, or new institutions or new collaborations, and taking a moment on how to start relationships in a good way. So, let's go ahead and bring up my slides please.

[Slideshow opens with Slide 1: Introduction] Thank you. [Slide 2: Our Journey] What we're going to be covering in the time that I have with you all today is: we're going to explore institutional elements that shape collaborative relationships. I'm going to share a little bit about Together + Through and the work that we do, and our perspective. I'm going to give you some considerations for how you may want to establish new working relationships or come to preexisting relationships with new energy. We're going to talk about determining intention and agreements for new working relationships. I'm going to provide some examples of key questions or practices to engage in that allow relationships to start off in a good way. Then, we're going to do a little bit of self-awareness or some practice around self-awareness: who are you as you're engaging in new relationships?

[Slide 3: Together + Through] Together + Through, we are an organization as mentioned based in Evanston, or the land of the Council of Three Fires. We provide psychotherapy, coaching, consulting services, and conflict facilitation. Our therapy is individual or relationship. So, in many ways we talk about what it means for us to be in relationship with ourselves, to be in relationship with each other, and finding the harmony and balance in those relationships so that we can also be good relatives to all of our relations on earth in a sustainable and interdependent way.

[Slide 4: Together + Through Framework] In our work, we see relationships, as I mentioned, from an individual perspective, but also what it takes to work with others. Here is our emerging framework. We won't spend a whole lot of time here, but I at least want to provide what our perspective is when it comes to establishing relationships both with ourselves and with each other. We begin our framework where it says humility and accountability, and from our perspective that really means: do I have a sense of who I am, what I bring to the table; am I able to communicate that to others in a way that says: this is who I am, this is how I'm going to show up so that people know how to engage with me and also how I practice accountability; what are my strengths; what

are my areas for improvement; how might I signal to you how to give me feedback about my strengths and my areas for improvement. So, that's a bit of how we practice some humility and accountability, and we believe that we need to start there when establishing relationships with others because that begins with understanding self.

Then we come into pace and presence. When I'm working with an organization or when I'm working with a collaborative set, we spend some time talking about what kind of pace allows us to be present with each other. Another way of saying that is: what kind of pace allows us to pay attention, allows us to remain intentional, and allows us to remain in alignment with each other. Oftentimes, we move at a pace that's controlled by external forces, so we might have a sense of urgency. We may need to move quickly, and what we have found is the quicker that we move, oftentimes our relationships suffer from having that level of intentionality or the ability to be present. Again, asking ourselves, what kind of pace can this project move at that still allows me to maintain the relationships?

We're heading into the next phase of our framework which is relationships and reciprocity, and that's where most of our workshop will spend today, talking about: what does it mean to be in relationship with others? That's not the same as friendship or romantic relationship, but truly what it means to relate to one another. In this context, what it means to relate to one another when we're working on a collaborative project or an endeavor, or we're bringing two institutions together or to creatives together; what does it mean for us to be in relationship with each other, and then how do we practice both giving and receiving in this dynamic?

We take time to clarify the scope of our relationship. So, what are we agreeing to do? What are we not going to do? How will we know that we are still in alignment with our original intention and our frame of reference? Or, how will we know when we've sort of stepped out of bounds with that? And, maybe that's an invitation to then recalibrate the scope, or to remind ourselves who we wanted to be and what we wanted to produce together so then we can come back into alignment.

All of this is an ongoing process. For as long as I'm breathing, I hope that I am forever evolving, and I hope we all are as a species. So, really taking the time to reflect. Reflect on what I've learned, reflect on what I've

experienced, and taking the time then to integrate that so that it becomes wisdom and eventually that it informs my behavior so I have this ongoing commitment to practice new ways of being in relationships.

[Slide 5: Start Here: Engage in dialogue] Whenever we're starting a relationship - again, whether that be a romantic relationship, platonic, or workplace relationship - we highly recommend starting in dialogue. Let's take the time to communicate with each other. Ideally maybe screen to screen or over the phone, or if our preference is text message we take the time to figure out what is the best way for us to dialogue with each other. And in that dialogue, here are some key questions that we want to offer you to take with you to initiate this conversation. What are our intentions? What are we intending to do in this relationship? Why are we relating to each other in this way? Why are we doing this now? What is it about this moment that maybe we want to initiate working with each other, or we want to bring this project forward, or we have this vision and now is the time to implement it? Why are we doing this right now as opposed to the past or the future; what is it about this moment?

Who else is involved in this relationship? It might be just you and me that's having the conversation, but in the background maybe my supervisor's also a part of this, or maybe there are other stakeholders who are a part of this. Maybe there are other people who contributed to the creative process that although they're not on this call right now or in this conversation, we know that their perspective, their expertise, and their opinions matter.

Then, what is happening externally that might influence our relationship? So, knowing that we might be here in this pod together, what's happening in the world around us? Or, what's happening within the context of your organization or your institution that we need to be mindful of that might influence us? Maybe that's something happening politically. Maybe there's a shift in funding. Maybe there was a major event that just took place at that location. Maybe there was something that happened within the climate that's influencing our ability to relate to each other. But, just recognizing that all of our relationships exist within a greater context.

[Slide 6: Intentions + Actions] Again, this moment of 'in dialogue.' Really clearly stating: what are our intentions, and then what are the actions we are going to engage in to bring those intentions forward? So, let's be clear with

each other. Let's set our clear intentions and our goals and our agreements at the beginning of our relationship. There are a couple of reasons why in working relationships we don't start this way, and I just want to make note of them for a moment. Many times we skip this critical stage of sitting down and initiating the conversation, initiating the relationship, because many of us do not have positive experiences establishing workplace relationships. Sometimes we're just thrown in together or expected to figure it out one way or another, so we don't necessarily know that starting off with an informative dialogue is actually critical for the health of our relationship.

Sometimes we also exist in environments where it's just about producing, so the relationship is not important but what's important is what we produce; So, let's skip all that communication, the relational aspects of the project, and let's just get into what it is that we're creating; and, maybe it will happen organically along the way, but we don't see that necessarily as crucial to the relationship development process.

Sometimes we are in an environment that has a sense of urgency. "I would really love to sit down and talk with you." "I'd love to have a conversation over coffee." "I wish that we had more time to get to know each other better, but we need to do this and we need to do this now." "I have this pressure that's coming to me externally or we need to execute this funding immediately." It's the sense of urgency, whether it's grounded in reality or not, oftentimes our relationship is clunked in it because of the greater environment that we exist in.

Sometimes there's a lack of trust. "I really don't want to get to know this person." "I don't want to take the time for us to figure out what are our intentions, or what are we bringing to the conversation." "I don't want to establish that kind of relationship, I just want to move forward with what's happening." There might be a lack of trust or maybe we're a bit more reserved. And, other times it's just a lack of investment. "I'm not interested." "I'm not interested in getting to know the person that I'm working with or that I'm collaborating with." "I just want to work on the project itself." So, there are other reasons why we skip these stages or this stage of initial dialogue and relationship building. These are just some.

But more importantly, what I would ask for you to take away from this slide is that, in my opinion and in my experience, the dialogue is really important

because if not, a lot of my work is grounded in conflict resolution. And, what I have often seen when we arrive at a point of generative conflict or working through differences, is that we skip this vital piece of engaging in dialogue at the beginning of our working relationship.

[Slide 7: Establishing working agreements: 5 behaviors to practice] Here are five behaviors that we're encouraging you to practice when establishing workplace or working agreements. Maybe you're working on a new project or a new initiative, and here are five practices that we're going to go through rather quickly.

[Slide 8: Action 1: Humility + Accountability] Number one. We talked about this already, but humility and accountability. This is where we're coming to the relationship having an understanding of who we are and how we're going to practice being accountable to what it is that we're working towards. And, we're creating the spaciousness for someone to meet us in that vulnerability and self-awareness. Within action one, we are going to discuss: what is the purpose of this project? Let's slow down for a moment to make sure that we both have a shared understanding of what we're getting into here.

Maybe, what are some of the values embedded, or the ethics embedded, in this project? So, maybe we're working on something that is very political or very timely; or we're bringing voice into a conversation that we really need this perspective to be highlighted, or we understand that maybe in some ways it's being minimized or under attack. What kind of values are we embedding in this project?

And, just because we're working on something doesn't necessarily mean that we have shared values, so we want to take the time to really say: what's bringing you to this project? How will I demonstrate my commitment to maintaining the purpose and vision? In practice, this might sound like, "This is what I'm really good at." "This is what I bring." "This is how I'm going to make sure that we move towards our goals." "What are you also able to bring forward?" Again, I'm coming to the table, and I'm offering what my perspectives are, my expertise, and my skills so that someone gets to know who they're working with, and I'm creating the conditions where I can receive that as well.

Then, I ultimately recommend that we agree on what our goals are. Now that we've talked about what standards we're working towards, we've talked about our values and ethics, and we've talked about what kind of behaviors we're going to demonstrate to work towards those goals, let's write it down so that we can come back to that or figure out a way to document that so that we can reference that time and time again even as the project itself evolves.

[Slide 9: Action 2: Scope] Then we move into scope. Maybe we talked about goals and we talked about what we're bringing to the project, but now we want to be very clear around what are our specific roles, and how are we going to function in those roles. So, we're not waiting to say, "What part are you taking on?" Or, "are you responsible for that?" Or, maybe we're just assuming that people will automatically know where they need to move into an active role. Instead, we're taking the time to map that out so that there's a level of clarity of, "you're responsible for this and I'm responsible for this, and both of us have a shared understanding of what we're all responsible for."

Then we're going to talk about the timeline for working towards our responsibilities. So, we're agreeing to what kind of pace will allow us to still be productive in what it is that we're creating, what we're bringing into the world, but also allow us to check in with each other. It's not just about a timeline of our deliverables, but also a timeline that includes us checking in with each other. Maybe we've been working on this project now for three weeks. Maybe we've been working on this project for a year. Along that time, let's see how we're doing in our communication. Let's make sure that we're staying in alignment with our understanding of the intentions and the visions of our partnership and of our project.

[Slide 10: Action 3: Pace and Presence] Then we move into, again, pace and presence. So, us asking ourselves as we're establishing this agreement, "What kind of capacity do I actually have to contribute to this relationship or contribute to this project?" I might have this great idea and I might feel very passionately about it, but if I'm practicing the self-awareness, the humility and accountability that we talked about, I also need to be mindful of: what kind of time do I have to allocate to this? How many people need to be involved for us to actually bring this about in a good way? Do I have the financial resources to do this? So, does my capacity or my resources match my intentions and for us to have that conversation upfront?

What else is on my plate that might interfere with my ability to participate? Maybe I have many things happening right now. Maybe our organization is experiencing job layoffs so there's less people in order to help make this happen. Maybe I'm going through my own personal transitions and to the extent that I'm comfortable sharing that, to let you know I might not be available in the next six months.

While being able to share as openly as we can with respect to understanding where our relationship is at that point, what else might interfere with my ability to participate? How might you communicate when you notice your reaching capacity? So, "I know I said that I had the time, and resources, and the ability to engage in this way, and I want to be upfront that my capacity is actually shifting." And, rather than waiting for my collaborator to say, "Hey, Dav, you're not responding to my emails" or, "I'm noticing that our communication is dwindling." I don't want to put the responsibility on them to have to call me into the conversation. I want to say upfront, "Hey, I'm noticing my capacity is shifting, and I want to name that so that we remain in relationship with each other."

Maybe we're at a point where we need to renegotiate roles and responsibilities. Maybe the pace and my ability to be present has shifted, so can we come into a conversation about the need to change roles and responsibilities?

Then also, what else is involved in being able to ask, "Are we at a point maybe where we've reached a no in our collaboration?" Are there moments where we have to say, "Actually, we've hit the end of the road with this one, and as much as we want to move forward, we've reached this no." How do we recognize when we've reached a no, and, can we be on the same page with reaching the no instead of one person knowing that we've arrived at that place and the other one maybe in denial or not having the awareness of it? Or, maybe someone else has set that no for us, and can we talk about that openly for the sake of our relationship? Maybe even asking what the institution is not okay with and not waiting until we arrive at that point of then being told that we shouldn't have done that; so, starting the conversation with, "I already know that who I'm working with or what I represent would not be okay with this. Let me put that transparently on the table for us to hold together."

[Slide 11: Action 4: Establish the relationship agreement] Now we're moving into establishing the relationship agreement. A lot of what I went through already was a lot of conversation and taking the time to make sure that we are in alignment - that we have shared goals, shared intentions, a shared understanding of our roles and responsibilities, and an understanding of what sort of pace we're going to operate at - so that we can move forward with whatever it is that we're working towards. And, now these agreements. We've identified this portion, but now let's move to officially what we are agreeing to and how we're going to relate to one another.

How are we going to adapt to change? Maybe we'll say we agree to emailing each other. Maybe we agree to having a meeting before there is a significant change. Or, maybe within Dav's role she has the authority to make these kinds of changes, and within the other person's role they have this authority to make these kinds of changes. But we're documenting this so that we have this shared agreement that we can reference so that, maybe when we're stressed or overwhelmed or maybe we're forgetful, we have evidence of a time where we worked through this proactively to set our relationship up for success.

How are we going to have difficult or maybe courageous conversations? So, kind of normalizing that anytime we're working with people, anytime that there's movement, there's going to be some elements of friction. It's not necessarily avoiding conflict but knowing how we are going to engage in it in a way that honors your humanity and mine, and allows us to still move forward with our project - normalizing that for each other. So I might say, "Dav, when I'm experiencing maybe some conflict here, here's how I'm going to invite you into this conflict." Or maybe, "Here's the way that I'm going to cue you into something not feeling right for me."

How are we going to describe taking responsibility or accountability? I have found in most of the relationships, whether it's in a therapeutic sense or working with an organization, we might say: What does accountability look like to you? How do you practice taking accountability? What kind of relationships have you demonstrated taking accountability with? I have found that with many of the people that I work with we use that language, but we don't necessarily know the behaviors or actions that we engage in that demonstrate it. So, this is being able to share that with one another. And, what are we agreeing to? Here's how we're going to practice this in this working relationship.

How will we know when it's time for the relationship to end in a values-aligned way? There might be a point where we say, "We were working on this, and it was working in a good way." Or, "We were working towards this end goal, and we recognize along the way that it's not going to happen" or "the need, for the product or whatever we are working towards, no longer exists." How do we honor that and still honor the work that we've done with each other? Then, be aware if there are any legal agreements or institutional agreements that you also may need to incorporate as you're documenting your relational agreements.

[Slide 12: Action 5: Honor your process] And then the last piece for me - and this one is an important one, this is grounded in my values and in my practice - is that we honor our processes. That, after taking the time to ask each other these important questions and documenting our responses and establishing this agreement, let's figure out a way to honor the work that we've done. Maybe you're sharing a meal with each other. Maybe you're engaging in some sort of ceremony or ritual. But, some way to say, "We took the time to establish this working relationship, and we did so because we believe that establishing the relationship will only enhance the work that is to come."

I do believe that it's important to honor this process because from my perspective we exist in a world where relationships aren't prioritized, often productivity is. To say that we are going to prioritize the relationship really can be countercultural. So, taking the time to acknowledge that and celebrate that with each other, I believe, is incredibly important.

[Slide 13: Conclusion] And, here's my contact information. If you want to continue the conversation around being in relationship or working through agreements, or maybe you have worked through agreements and we're finding ourselves in a point of conflict and we need some support, you're always more than welcome to reach out to me. Thank you.

Lauren Leving: Thank you so much, Dav. Wow, that was so wonderfully informative. Again, we are going to have Dav's presentation as a PDF on Teiger Foundation's website, but if you would like it right now, please put your email in the chat and we'll send it over to you. And of course, if anyone has

questions for Dav, we'd love to answer them at the end of the program, so pop them into the chat

Now we are going to transition into a case study where Natalie Bell and Sara Cluggish share their experiences working together on Basel Abbas and Ruanne Abou-Rahme's solo show *Only sounds that tremble through us*. So, if you two want to come on camera.

Natalie Bell is Chief Curator at the MIT List Visual Arts Center in Cambridge, Massachusetts. She's organized numerous solo exhibitions of artists including American Artist, Every Ocean Hughes, and Matthew Angelo Harrison, and recently co-curated the group exhibition *Performing Conditions: Artistic Labor and Dependency as Form*. Before joining List, Natalie served as an Associate Curator at the New Museum, and as an assistant curator for the 55th Venice Biennale, *The Encyclopedic Palace*.

Sara Cluggish is the Mary Hulings Rice Director and Curator of the Perlman Teaching Museum at Carleton College in Northfield, Minnesota. She leads the strategic, artistic, and fiscal direction of the Perlman and its collection. Sara was previously the Director of FD13 Residency for the Arts in Minneapolis; Curator at Site Gallery in Sheffield, UK; and Assistant Curator at Nottingham Contemporary in the UK. In 2025, she was a Fellow with the American Association of Museum Curators' Propel Program, which is an initiative for the professional advancement of mid-career curators.

Now, I'm going to invite Sara and Natalie to speak about this project and talk about their working relationships. Later on, I will pop back on the screen, and we'll have a discussion stemming from what they're sharing. Thanks so much, Sara and Natalie. Take it away.

Natalie Bell: Thank you so much, Lauren. Hi, everyone. I'm Natalie. I am a white woman with palish, peachy pink skin and short, kind of curly, reddish hair, and gold earrings, and a black V-neck shirt. I'm sitting in an office with some books and diagonal fluorescent lighting in the back.

Sara Cluggish: Hi everyone. I'm Sara. I am a white woman with fair skin in my

early 40s. I'm also in my office with books in the background, some plants. I am wearing a white denim shirt with a very starchy collar, front pockets, and a gold necklace that I wear every day which my grandmother gave to me.

Natalie Bell: [Slideshow opens with Slide 1: Introduction]. [Slide 2: Curatorial Premise] We're going to be speaking about this exhibition, *Only sounds that tremble through us*, which originated at the List Visual Arts Center, which is the contemporary art museum at MIT. We're in Cambridge, Massachusetts, and the exhibition traveled to the Perlman Teaching Museum where Sara leads at Carleton College. I'll just give a quick overview of some of the themes driving the exhibition. Basel and Ruanne work on primarily long-term research projects that center around themes of resilience, memory, and collectivity. They work in moving image a lot, and their moving image works often layer found video footage alongside their own footage. They're very poetic. The soundscapes are strong and a guiding principle within a lot of their editing is that the work can be complicated by gaps or glitches. There's a lot of emphasis on fragmentation within sound and image and a sense of porosity and fugitivity within the work. There are a lot of questions of visibility and opacity in their work. They use references to masks or digital avatars at times. And, as you might see in some of these pictures, they're also often using a kind of ultraviolet palette as a way of referencing what the eye can actually see.

I want to say a little bit too about the nature of the work, which is relevant to hosting in our case. This is an exhibition that's core is really video and sound. It's a very highly choreographed exhibition design that the artists lead. And, not just the physical space, but the color, the lighting, and image and sound quality are really of the most importance. It is unlike a lot of touring exhibitions, maybe more stereotypical ones. This was not a show that involved a lot of difficult museum loans or a bunch of different lenders. It was not even very heavy on physical objects that were being loaned, but it came with its own challenges and things that we needed to be aware of.

[Slide 2: From the List to the Perlman] In terms of the presentation at the List Center and its genesis, this was an exhibition that I'd been wanting to do for a very long time. I'd known Basel and Ruanne for almost a decade and had sort of been waiting my turn to work with them, and we decided to realize this project at MIT. It was a kind of echo of their work that had debuted at MoMA in 2022, and the primary work within it is a three-channel video installation.

[Slide 3: *Only sounds that tremble through us* exhibition view at the List Center] Again, you see this glowing pink violet light in the gallery, which is a combination of wall paint color and a low lighting in the space. The primary work *Only sounds that tremble through us*, which also shares the exhibition's title is this three-channel installation that borrows from their very extensive digital video archive that was collecting everyday communal song and dance footage from diverse communities throughout specific parts of the Arab world, Syria, Palestine, Yemen, and Iraq; they were mostly collected from social media and then were combined with footage that the artists took themselves, and in particular with song and dance enacted by various dancers and musicians as a way of interpreting and using the body to sample different modes of song and dance.

[Slide 4: *Only sounds that tremble through us* exhibition view at the List Center] Complementing the three-channel video work in the show was a series of freestanding steel panels with concrete bricks around them. These became panels that hosted prints of the artists' images and drawings, screen grabs of their poetry that were arranged like overlapping windows on a computer screen. And, the plant they use as a type of thistle that's significant because it grows in areas of disturbed ground and often inadvertently marks the ruins of former Palestinian villages; it signals both a kind of reference to resilience and growth, and a living archive within the plant form - a way of witnessing histories. The work that you see more toward the ceiling was a series of swaying chiffon banners that were printed with related plant imagery, kind of echoing the palette that you see throughout.

[Slide 5: *Only sounds that tremble through us* exhibition view at the Perlman Teaching Museum]

What you see here are views from the Perlman. Sara, I don't know if you want to speak to these.

Sara Cluggish: Yeah, sure. I've been smiling as you've been talking, Natalie, because so much of what you said was present in the very first conversation that we had about the possibility of us hosting this exhibition of Basel and Ruanne's work, that you had really been kind of waiting in line to work with

them and it was very apparent to me that you had such a close relationship with them and respect for the work. So really, I reached out to Natalie about touring the exhibition to the Perlman Teaching Museum at Carleton College, which I should know is a much smaller institution. Carleton is a smaller college than MIT in terms of our staff structure. We are a team of four, so a small scale organization under this umbrella of a larger parent organization. We'll get into more of the logistics, but really I wanted to bring the exhibition to Carleton College to present it to an audience of young people.

As Natalie and I were establishing our working relationship and getting to know each other - we had kind of known each other from afar and had a lot of respect for each other's curatorial work, but we were establishing our own working relationship at the same time that we were merging our teams through the tour. And, I was newly establishing a relationship with Basel and Ruanne, with the artists, which Natalie absolutely helped facilitate.

Really, it was important for me to bring the work to Carleton. We have a very active Students for Justice in Palestine chapter. We had a lot of conversations around what it meant to present this work on a college campus in the wake of October 7th. And, also the differences in our campus communities and audiences, and the really rich potential for hosting an exhibition to open up new conversations in a new space with new audiences.

[Slide 6: *Only sounds that tremble through us* exhibition view at the Perlman Teaching Museum] You can see that the installation shot in some ways has a lot of similarity to MIT List's installation. We really shared gallery plans upfront. Natalie helped me think through, as I was writing the grant application, how the exhibition might be reconfigured and also highlighted that the artists work with an exhibition designer, and kind of gave me some clues as to how to approach them and also how to structure the budget to make it possible. Because again, this is something we can talk more about in terms of institutional asymmetries: differences in budget and capacity. So, for me, the Teiger Foundation Hosting grant was just such a wonderful opportunity to bring a really rich, layered, high caliber work to Carleton, to a city, - it premiered at MoMA - to a town of 20,000 people in Northfield, Minnesota about 45 minutes south of Minneapolis.

[Slide 7: Artist Talk with Basel Abbas at the Weitz Center for Creative Cinema, Carleton College] We also put together a really rich and robust public

program, and putting in the grant allowed me the space and the opportunity to kind of dream about that and think what we might want to do. What you're seeing here is a picture of opening night conversation that Basel and I had around his and Ruanne's practice, - the kind of genesis of the work, their life experiences - allowing our students time to get to know the artists and ask questions in-person. We also invited in a local Palestinian American dancer, Leila Awadallah, who got to know the artists in this moment and developed a kind of embodied tour. Our students also, - our student workers, we employ thirty of them - a team of four event student workers developed an audio tour of the show because as Natalie mentioned sound is a really rich material in the work, and Carleton has a radio station. So, they were also able to kind of open up and unlock different layers of the work in that way.

[Slide 8: Class visit to *Only sounds that tremble through us* exhibition view at the Perlman Teaching Museum] Natalie, anything I missed that you would really want to touch on? This is just a slide of students in the exhibition. I'll say it was very well received. We had classes from Amna Khalid's Freedom of Expression class. Here you see Melissa Scott's ethnomusicology class. We also had the Muslim Student Association and Jewish On Our Own Terms, different cultural groups who came to see the show which was kind of unusual and new for us, and even requests from staff. There was a group of administrators who asked to come and get a tour of the show, so it was incredibly well-received. In addition to the conversations Natalie and I had, our teams had, and we had with the artists, there was also a lot of internal conversation that I had with our administration and community building that I had to do with departments across campus which is the nature of directing an academic institution museum.

Shall we open that up for questions, or is there anything else that you would like to add, Natalie?

[Slide 9: Establishing a Positive Working Relationship]

Natalie Bell: Yeah, I'm happy to open to questions or say a little bit more about our working arrangements in the process.

Sara Cluggish: Sure.

Lauren Leving: I think that we can use these bullet points and think about your working arrangements in the process in this conversation. I already obviously had questions prepared, but I'm taking ferment notes because it just seems - congratulations. It seems amazing.

I am wondering if you could share a little bit about the ways that you navigated the asymmetries. I think that that happens a lot in the hosting process. MIT, The List, is larger than the Perlman and also Carleton, and Sara you mentioned that you're a team of four. I think you also said that it was the largest project that the museum organized during your tenure. So, I'm wondering if you could talk about the conversations of navigating the asymmetries? Then, were there specific pain points that make sense to address in these relationships, and where did your greatest supports come from for both of you both in and outside of The List? I think you specifically talked about that (Sara) with faculty and staff, but I'm curious about that.

Sara Cluggish: Well, I'll say Natalie was just a really great partner on the grant. Right away when I expressed interest, she was very transparent with me. She shared their budgetary structure, their plans. She did everything possible to help make the grant successful and to be a partner to me from that point onward, really, and also help me understand how to communicate with the artists what their capacity was. That was very important.

I think something that was kind of strange to you, Natalie, is that my team goes on leave for the summer. So, we found out about the grant in late June/ July and then immediately started going into registration and shipping arrangements, but I'm the only one who's on a full-time contract. They're all ten months, so they're off in July and August. Her team was kind of like, "The director is managing the initial shipping conversation," so there was a little bit of calibration in that moment.

Natalie Bell: Yeah, that's a nice way to put it. I think it brought some humility to our team, to go from feeling the sense of frustration like, "Oh, it's July, and we don't have a plan for shipping things that need to ship in August yet." It's so stressful, but to then be like, "Oh, we can really help their team because they're shorter staffed in these months." And, we really

wanted to make it happen. I would just say, for me, the first step was making sure it was something that the artists were up for, knowing that they're very busy, often overcommitted. And, at the same time, wanting to make it something that they could easily say yes to, so also facilitating it in a way that would make it as little of an additional lift for them as possible and something that can really be curatorially led and they just have the opportunity to show their work somewhere else. I mean, that was my mentality around, just treating it as an opportunity for them to say yes to something that hopefully we mostly take care of.

Lauren Leving: Can I ask, with that Natalie, did you approach them together or did you frame the conversation of: we have an opportunity to bring this show? How was that?

Natalie Bell: I mean, I think it started when Sara reached out about preparing the application, and her interest and understanding that the project would be grant-contingent. So, while we wanted everything to happen, we wouldn't know until midsummer, and at that point we were to be deinstalling in late July/early August. It led to a tight timing question and needing to plan some contingencies which was doable. But, it required us to be strategic as to: what's the best way to keep things flexible but also the least labor intensive for everybody, and all while understanding that your (Sara's) team is working with fewer folks on hand during the summer months. When you (Sara) reached out with the interest in the grant, that's when I brought the question to the artists right away. This was just to make sure that if, for some reason it was too much of a conflict with their scheduling, then I would just say, "You know what, they're not interested." There's different types of touring shows, but I wouldn't consider one where the artists play such a large role in it to be the type that could tour without their blessing.

Sara Cluggish: Yeah, and Natalie introduced me to them before we knew the outcome of the grant, so I was really building a relationship with them and a dialogue with them while we were waiting to hear. And if we hadn't got it, then maybe that dialogue would've gone somewhere else in the future. Natalie was very generous to extend that out to me.

To the points around scope, it did at some points feel like her team was an extension of our team. My technical director got to know the person who leads the MIT List team very well and had an open dialogue with him where, if she

had tiny questions about a screw or something, she could easily contact him. So, that was really something that, when we did our evaluation meeting, my team reflected on very positively.

We want to be ambitious. We want to punch above our weight. We want to bring great art, artists, new ideas to Carleton, to Northfield. But yeah, it was the largest scale exhibition I would say budgetarily for us. We knew going in that the timescale was going to be something that we were going to have to work with and have a little bit of hustle and roll up our sleeves. And, we all did that.

After the exhibition opens, you kind of have this moment of like, "Oh (exhalation)." It's the kind of work that also required that myself and anyone who works on education at our museum really do a lot of speaking, teaching, and guiding people through the exhibition. So, it did feel like a big lift. But, in terms of the opportunity costs it really resonated with the college, and we are so glad that we were able to bring the work here.

Lauren Leving: Yeah, absolutely. I mean, with everything that both of y'all are saying it feels that it returns to the transparency of: we're not going to wait to see if we get this grant. We know this timeline. Let's be very open about the timeline. Let's be very open about starting something, starting a relationship, even if this doesn't pan out because the relationship is still valued. You still value the relationship as opposed to the final exhibition as the outcome; that's not the only outcome. Thinking about how your technical directors or exhibition directors can work together, and what does it mean when relationship building and transparency is the thing that the project can grow out of, which doesn't always happen that way. I think it's really refreshing to hear about.

Sara Cluggish: I think the difference in scale, it's not necessarily a problem. You can easily view it as a problem, but it's something that (can be navigated) if you are transparent as you say, and you work together to set up a plan and boundaries. There were things that you (Natalie) were able to do at MIT. For instance, you have the beautiful magenta window, and I looked at the budget. We have a skylight, which would've looked amazing if we could have put magenta gels on it, but we would've had to take out our grid and do all of these things. Again, it's very clear management of expectations for everyone, i.e. we can do *this*, but we can't do *this*.

Lauren Leving: It also feels like you are asking: what does it mean to be realistic with your capacities? And, you are acknowledging that even though institutional capacities are not always the same, it doesn't mean that you both can't create a phenomenal show or project and realize that in two separate spaces, which is really exciting.

I'm so curious - I didn't realize, Natalie, that you knew Basel and Ruanne for almost a decade before working with them. How did this inform your working relationship when you entered this project with them?

Natalie Bell: Yeah, I mean, we just had a lot of background trust, so I think that goes a long way and it's nice when that's there.

Lauren Leving: Do they have an exhibition designer that they always consistently work with?

Natalie Bell: I don't know that it's always, but it was the same person for both of us. I think it's another relationship that exists through trust, where they know this person. They met him through working with him on a prior exhibition at an institution and then have carried on with him independently because they liked the way he visualized and understood the work.

Sara Cluggish: I think it goes back to Natalie's point that this isn't necessarily a traditional, prepackaged touring exhibition. There were three works in the show, and the way that Basel and Ruanne work is that they really are thinking spatially. They kind of use the language of sampling, so past works bleed into new works; it's all about reconfiguring this web of ideas and material. So, Natalie told me right away, "This is the way they work. They're very architecturally responsive, responsive to the site."

I think, sometimes, curators working with an exhibition designer can feel like, "Hey, that's my job," and you could easily feel a little territorial. But, really, this person just became another partner in this larger family of

individuals who made it possible for the work to be seen by new audiences. And really I said to them, "This is an exhibition for young people. This is a show for eighteen to twenty-two year-olds, and it's important for them to see this work and question things and process it at this moment in their lives." And, that's the exciting premise.

Lauren Leving: I think that that brings us into programming or the adaptation part. There's definitely overlaps in your audiences, but the age groups are maybe slightly different, and I assume the class offerings and the goals are different. So, can you share about the programming that you both did? Sara, you touched on it a little bit. But maybe for both of you, going more into depth on those relationships with external or internal program partners; how involved the artists were or not; and how you're able to spread trust around everyone because there's multiple stakeholders.

Sara Cluggish: Do you want to kick it off, Natalie?

Natalie Bell: I mean, I think in a way you're best to answer this question. And reflecting on this, I feel like the second venue had the more robust programming because you had a little more of a lead time on being able to do the outreach for that. Maybe, also, it was having the show come with the brochure texts, and all the interpretive materials made it easier to take it to the next layer after that of bringing that out into your publics.

Sara Cluggish: Yeah, my understanding is that MIT has this very rich relationship with the graduate students and that they were able to give talks and lead individuals through the work. I went to the opening at MIT before we knew the outcome of the grant, and I was able to meet the artists in-person then and get a feel for Natalie's audience at the opening. At the same time, even before I put the grant in, I had a conversation with our Provost Office, with colleagues internally, to talk about what it meant to bring the exhibition here at this moment in time, which is something I would do for any show but especially one that requires so much kind of community outreach. One surprising relationship that was established through that initial moment was that I had a great dialogue and rapport with our Chaplain's Office, which is an interfaith office with teams across Jewish, Muslim, and Christian religious traditions.

This is kind of going in depth, but there had been a couple of instances at Hamline University and Macalester College locally where student groups didn't understand our work on view or information that a professor was putting forward fully. And, how do I say this? It became kind of reactive. So, our campus was very aware of those moments, which happened a year or two prior. They encouraged me to meet with the Chaplain's Office, and they have the direct line to those groups like the Muslim Student Association and Jewish On Our Own Terms. So, I did a special training for them and then they brought their student groups. We called it a soft launch.

We didn't open with an artists' conversation like we normally would. We brought the artists out three weeks later so the campus had time to live with the work, to get to know it, to ingest it and percolate on it, and then we introduced them to the artists in person. That relationship has really been rich and gone on. We did a program with Pedro Reyes around gun violence, and they were also really instrumental in helping me think through what that meant to present to young people.

So, that was great, and then my normal courting of different academic disciplines. The fun thing about presenting artwork on a campus museum is that you think in a very interdisciplinary way, and it's like, "How can I adapt the language of this artwork to make it interesting to a political science professor?" We had an art and democracy class that came in. We had a dance class that came in because I think also I was attracted to Basel and Ruanne's work because it's like music, sampling, electronic music, thinking about geopolitical conversations, thinking about Arabic poetry. I really wanted to do an Arabic poetry workshop. So Lauren, to sum it up, my problem was I had too many ideas and I tried to action two. There's actually one or two programs that didn't happen, so it was a good lesson for me. You can have fifty ideas, but really what is the cream? Where do you put your energy?

Lauren Leving: I don't think that's ever a bad thing. I mean, that's part of curatorial practice when you're like, "What is the scope, and how am I narrowing these? What is the audience, and what are the goals? And, what is most successful, or what possibly will be the most successful programming and support of the audiences?" Being able to do so much experimentation, the fact that Teiger's funding is able to make this possible is also very exciting.

Yeah, I think that's great.

I think one final question, and then we'll turn it over to a broader Q&A that Laura will lead. I'm wondering if, especially after we are learning from Dav's presentation and from working with Daviree in our pre-meetings as a person and facilitator, I'm wondering if there's anything you would do differently as you look back and, two parts, if there's something that you've learned or taken away that you're excited to bring into future collaborations?

Sara Cluggish: I mean, I just had a feeling listening to Dav's presentation that I'm going to employ this in the future. I think there were elements of what Dav talked about that we really employed, but Dav's approach and strategy is so considered. I really responded to the point around humility, and I think that that was something that was present.

There were kind of moments I was aware of. Natalie had other projects she was opening and because of the nature of the way Basel and Ruanne work and working so closely with them, there were maybe moments where I let the communication drop a little bit. And, I was like, "Oh, I need to loop Natalie back in on how things are going, on what's happening." Natalie also was able to come and see the show and talk to some of our students which was a lovely moment.

Natalie Bell: Yeah, and we got to have a meal then.

Lauren Leving: Always great to share over food. Love a snack. Natalie, do you have anything to add to that?

Natalie Bell. No. I think maybe we could have structured check-ins more. I've done that more with artists on projects lately, just to have a standing meeting as a way of checking-in. But, we pulled it off, and I don't recall feeling frustrated with you at any point. So yeah, it was really a great collaboration.

Sara Cluggish: And at the end of the day, I think both of our audiences and

the artists were really happy, which is the goal. The work looked great in both spaces.

Lauren Leving: Absolutely. Amazing. I think we're going to transition into the Q&A. So we'll invite Laura, our host/ moderator, and Daviree, one of our Q&A participants, back on screen. Great. And I'm going to go off screen, and I'll let you have a discussion. Thanks so much.

Laura Copelin: Thank you so much, Lauren, and it's been wonderful to build this new collaboration with you and the Teiger team. So, I'm just feeling a lot of appreciation after hearing both of the presentations. But, everyone, I'm Laura Copelin. I am a white woman with peachy skin, green eyes, and brown hair cut above my shoulders with a long strand on one side. I'm wearing an indigo-dyed top, and behind me you can see a wooden paneled wall, a wooden ladder, and a dark monochrome painting. So, I'll be leading our Q&A, but please feel free to chime in with any questions that you may have had during the presentation.

I wanted to start out and just say thank you so much for these wonderful presentations to Sara, Natalie, and also Daviree. I feel like I learned even more even though we've been in conversation for several weeks about this. I just wanted to kick it off to go back to Daviree and all of the wonderful things that you resourced us with, to just return to this question of judging one's capacity. As we've heard from Sara and Natalie, sometimes there's a wealth of opportunities and a wealth of ideas, and I'm curious about your process. You have so much experience in navigating these relationship building exercises. How would you approach judging capacity realistically when there's tons of optimism, or when there's some institutional or external pressure to produce at a very high level?

Daviree Velázquez Phillip: And thank you for that question. I think it truly is a self-journey. So, being able to know yourself. What kind of sleep do I need in order to be able to be present? How do I nourish myself? What are some of the other components to my health and wellbeing that I must engage in that help me stay maybe a bit more regulated, grounded, that help me facilitate presence? So, there's a little bit of self checking-in too. I know for myself, the more excited I am, the more creative I am, and my imagination sort of runs wild. And so, there does need to be this moment of allowing myself to be filled with wonder, to be filled with excitement and creativity, and then

bringing that back into now. What of that can I actually do while still being good to myself and still being good to this relationship?

So, kind of questioning and knowing yourself over time as a practice and being devoted to being present, I think, is a part of that response and then also sharing with whoever you're in partnership with or in collaboration with. "Here are the other things that are on my plate right now that might influence my ability to be present or to demonstrate my full capacity." And depending on that relationship, be willing to receive that person's input like, "Oof, Dav, it sounds like you have a lot going on. Are you sure?" Allowing that to be not a moment to prove yourself, but noticing that that person is extending a bit of vulnerability of, "I care about you and before you overcommit. This is my check-in. Are you going to receive it that way?" Again, that piece of humility of, "Okay, maybe they're noticing something I'm not, and how receptive can I be to somebody else's perspective?"

Laura Copelin: Yeah, I really appreciate that. I find, similarly to what Sara was saying earlier, your process is so intentional, and it seems like you've crafted each kind of step in a really thoughtful and logical order. I guess I was curious about, just to build a little bit off of that, how you would approach saying no or putting up a boundary because that is a struggle? I know I feel very much the same as you both when you were talking about that burst of inspiration or having a wealth of ideas to choose from, and it's always been a struggle for me in my own practice to reel it back in, to contain the ideas. Or, sometimes there's a fear about disappointing a collaborator or disappointing an artist by saying no or setting a boundary. I'm just kind of curious to hear from you, Daviree, how you would approach that with kindness and intention. Then also Natalie and Sara, if there were any moments of no that were really clear that appeared for you both, or conversely moments of a big yes that took priority.

Daviree Velázquez Phillip: I'm a big fan of allowing the relationship or the collaboration to grow instead of starting off with more than what we have capacity for. I feel like that's very rewarding when we see, "Oh, we initially agreed to this and we're doing so well with this component that we agreed to that now we can build out over time." You sort of get to celebrate the growth of your collaboration, the growing up of your collaboration. It facilitates new ideas and expansion. So, I feel like we almost rob ourselves of that opportunity if we just go for the greater goals upfront, like allowing our relationship to evolve over time. That's one piece.

I've had to take into account what happens when I say I do want to do something or I do overcommit and then what the consequences are for other people. While I might be incredibly excited or passionate or creative and I'm operating from that place, I need to think beyond myself and really consider if I'm not able to do this, what happens? And, not in a way that puts pressure on me but to truly then make informed decisions about how much am I taking on and recognizing that it's not just me, that there are other people who are involved. Their time, their energy, and their focus matters just as much as mine does. Those are a couple of other pieces.

Then, when I say no, most of the time when I've arrived at a point and I have to say, "I've overcommitted" or "I really do want to do this, but I'm no longer able to." I'm honest. "I feel a sense of disappointment." "I'm sad that this is happening." "I wish that I had more capacity but at this time I don't, and I understand some of the implications of me shifting my mind or me changing my opinion. I'm open to hearing the impact that that may have on you."

Or other times I'll say, "My capacity has changed, and in order for us to still move forward with our original plan, here's maybe some of the additional support I would need. Do you have capacity then to take that out, or are there other people we can point that to?" So, it doesn't have to be an all or nothing, but it might be, "Maybe I need more support. Do we have other areas that we can tap for that support so that we could still achieve it?" Just the way that we were going to go about it is what changes. So, allowing there to still be creative problem solving even when we're struggling with being human, and life happens, and sometimes we change our minds. Even that moment with vulnerability can be a creative process.

Laura Copelin. That's a lovely reflection. Sara and Natalie, I wondered if you guys had any responses to that.

Natalie Bell: I mean, one thing coming to mind is that touring shows inevitably put pressure on other people in your team. They tend to be driven by curatorial, and the labor is distributed everywhere. I think it's hard to both be sensitive to that but then also pursue them because it is effectively

generating more workload for everyone. And yes, there are touring fees and technically the institution receives some income or compensation to account for the “administrative cost,” but we all know that's not going into anybody's pocket. So, it's a negotiation, and it's something I think about and would love to find ways to account for it better.

Laura Copelin: Yeah, that makes a lot of sense, and I appreciate you naming that piece especially because that labor gets distributed in uneven ways across teams. And, it sounds like you two had to do some communication across your teams to just navigate those differences in scale, to introduce the project in different ways. Was there anything that you wanted to say more about in terms of how you brought your teams into this project at the outset, or what you learned along the way?

Sara Cluggish: I think we really struggled for clarity. I mean, I looked back at some of the emails we exchanged for this project, and it was very technical. It was very technical, and you have that email where someone starts in black, and then there's red, and then there's purple. So, there was kind of a balance. We wanted things in writing. We wanted clarity there, and then oscillating between that and like, “Okay, when do we need to step out of this structure and into another one and have a call?”

Natalie Bell: Yeah. I also was remembering that we broke out of a typical touring mode a bit because we didn't know the timing, and we didn't know if the grant would come through. Typically, if we're touring an exhibition, we prepare an Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), which then is followed by a formal agreement. In our case, that goes through the institute's legal department and has lots of rounds of review but requires a real firm specificity about dates, terms, fees, et cetera. And, when we are doing that, it's often when a show is established and then we are the lender, basically, so we're extending our loans from our show and sub-lending them. I think, in this case, we created an MOU that acknowledged that the show in some version of its form was going to tour, but that the loans would be administered directly between Carleton and the artists. This was a workaround to allow more flexibility in your timing and to allow my team to say, “Okay, we're returning the loans to the artists on the date that we have in our current loan agreements. We're not just reextending them and creating indefinite revisions of paperwork.” And, you can do those things. You just have to figure out the workaround that makes sense because there's no textbook form of how this has to work. You just have to make it work for everybody.

Sara Cluggish: And thinking about why you have that MOU, what purpose does it serve. Having flexibility and also clarity and firmness of intention.

Natalie Bell: Right. Yeah. The MOU is to confirm intent, but it's not binding in any serious way. So, it's sort of a stepping stone but an important one that signals real intention.

Laura Copelin: Totally. I appreciate that kind of technical information and backbone that informs the relationship and all of the layers that it has to go through in both your institutions. Quickly, I just want to get to a couple of the questions that came through the chat, so the first one is directed to Dav. Daviree, we have the question that says: when you first start talking about collaboration, should you have a conversation ahead of time about how you want to address conflict if it comes up?

Daviree Valázquez Phillip: Thank you for the question. Yes, I absolutely agree that how we are going to address conflict and normalizing conflict, as I mentioned, is important. I have seen MOUs that even detail how we're going to engage in conflict, especially in Indigenous communities. We will list out: here are our steps to resolving conflict, recognizing when it emerges amongst each other and with ourselves. So, naming that like, "Hey, it might happen, and if it doesn't, great. This might be a very special circumstance, but if and when it does happen, even if it's not between us, - maybe we're managing conflict with other people who are involved in the process - how do we want to work through that? How do we want to talk about it? How might we signal to each other: we're hitting a moment where there might be a few bumps in the road; you ready to buckle in together?" Figuring out a way to let us know that we're still in partnership as we navigate this, that we're not automatically at ends.

The reason why I would say naming that as a part of your initial dialogue and relationship building is: if you name it too late, and there's already too much tension involved in the communication, and it makes it harder for us to do the kind of relational work that's necessary. Obviously, we still can. We can still work through this, and we can work through it together. But if you want a sense of ease, especially if you're someone who might be conflict

avoidant, - maybe you have a lot of trauma associated with navigating conflict and working collaborations - do yourself a favor and engage with it proactively.

Laura Copelin: That makes a lot of sense, yes. I also have a question here for Sara, a really thoughtful question that says: I appreciate the inclusive trust and sensitivity, especially regarding different faith-based chaplains, to include a universal ecumenical approach to percolate and provide the generative programming and engagement. There's such collaboration in your approach. Does the outreach approach need to focus on a specific age group for audience engagement for a more successful foundational support? Oh, I guess this is a question, maybe, that's also sort of Teiger-related. So, for the hosting site, is there a need to focus on a specific audience for the foundation to support? But maybe you can speak to your target audience, Sara, and how you crafted that in the hosting context.

Sara Cluggish: Yeah, no, it's a lovely question. Thank you for that. I think that in writing any grant or thinking about why now; why this work; why open it up to this community of young people, scholars, thinkers in our case, it's very important to ask yourself those questions, and to know your audience intimately, and to think through what it gives them and what the challenges might be of bringing that particular work here. I mean, part of the reason why we worked with those faith-based chaplains is that they had this relationship of trust with these different groups of young people. And, if you think about the climate on college campuses in the wake of October 7th and some of the rhetoric between young people of different faith traditions, it's important to have someone mediate that. I would say that generally Carleton itself is pretty left-leaning and very respectful, but I was kind of aware of news coverage and how this particular audience of young people is being painted in the public eye. But, inviting them in essentially was a strategy for saying that trust then *maybe* can extend to the museum.

And, it's not my job to tell you what to think or feel about artwork. I say this to our student workers all the time. As a curator, my job is to allow you, with the information, the tools, to meet the artwork on your own terms, to bring your own life experiences, your own subjectivities, and ideas to it to make an informed opinion about what you think. So, that was how we structured the conversations. In a way, it was very explanatory and not persuasive, if that makes sense. But in writing any grant application, it's an excellent opportunity to think through: who are my core audiences; who are new

audiences who I might be able to court and bring into the project?

Laura Copelin: Thank you, Sara. That's a very generous answer. Well, I think we're almost at time here. There's a million more questions I have, and I'm sure our audience has as well. If you have a burning question that you didn't get to ask, please feel free to email us.

I just want to express my deep gratitude to Sara, Natalie, Daviree, and everyone on Team Teiger, and Lauren as well. Thank you for sharing your experiences and your expertise, panelists, and we will be following up with a toolkit from this session. This recorded session will also be posted online in the very near future. As Stephanie said in the chat, the next quarterly Hosting grant deadlines are September 9th and December 9th. We really appreciate everyone attending today and the thoughtful questions that you already asked. We're working on building several other programs to help develop skills and spark connections around exhibition hosting, so please stay tuned through Teiger Foundation channels for those. I hope everyone has a wonderful day, and goodbye everyone.