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Project Summary

African Community Heritage Hub (ACHH) is a registered charity committed to breaking barriers, improving lives, promoting participation and community cohesion. Information, advice and support is provided on a range of issues including employment, skills development, homelessness, social isolation and mental health issues. Beneficiaries of the service are people of African descent, other Black and Minority Ethnic communities and the general public; currently most people accessing the service are from Congo. ACHH also aims to facilitate a better understanding of African culture and heritage within their local community by organising African cultural and social events to promote and raise the profile of the African community.

Birmingham City University traces its beginnings to 1843 and five individual colleges that were brought together as the City of Birmingham Polytechnic in 1971. University status was granted in 1992 and the new name University of Central England in Birmingham. The university has expanded significantly since its early beginnings and adopted the name Birmingham City University in 2007. At the time of writing the university is said to have around 24,000 students from 80 countries.

The Minding Black Histories project was undertaken over a six-month period between June and December 2016. It set out to tell the stories of Congolese servicemen of the First World War, about whom very little is known in the UK. To avoid duplication of efforts and undermining the impact of all World War I centenary commemoration activities, a mapping exercise was undertaken at the start of the fieldwork phase to map existing academic, community and artistic projects looking at unacknowledged Black community contributions to wars of European origins. Representatives from these groups were invited to attend a community development day and had the option of participating either in person or online. The purpose of this event was to establish relevant existing research and other work, build on each other’s experiences and share key learning outcomes.
Building on ACHH’s networks within Black, African and Caribbean communities in Birmingham and in the West Midlands, the research then localised and connected with the descendants and living relatives of Black soldiers who fought alongside the British armed forces in the 1914-18 war.

Young volunteers of Congolese origin were recruited by ACHH and provided with training in photography, visual and digital storytelling and interviewing techniques. The young people then went about documenting the stories of these Black servicemen through a series of face to face and online interviews with their relatives, friends and connections in the UK and the Congo.

The photographs and digital narratives were made into a short film documenting the activities of the project. An exhibition had also been planned to take place during Black History Month in October 2016; however, the relatively short timescale of the project did not facilitate this.
How the collaboration came about

Academic and community partners were introduced to each other by a mutual acquaintance from a local not-for-profit Community Interest Company (CIC), which aims to give voice to individuals and communities by creating high quality, inclusive, participatory opportunities in photography.

The introduction is described by the community partner as coming about due to “being in the right place at the right time.” At a chance meeting with the co-founder of the CIC, the community partner mentioned his idea about undertaking a project to identify Congolese soldiers in Britain during the First World War. The mutual acquaintance was aware the academic partner was looking to undertake work with grassroots communities and mentioned this conversation.

The academic partner works with the Voices of War and Peace (VOWP) programme and was aware about its research fund aimed at supporting grassroots community groups to identify and commemorate legacies of the First World War. Following the initial introduction, academic and community partners met to discuss the project, possibilities for collaborating and developing a funding bid. The bid was written and submitted by the academic partner in a relatively short space of time. The academic interest in working with Black and Minority Ethnic communities is described as part of the wider VOWP programme to work with grassroots communities.

Prior to this introduction the community partner had thought about working with a university but did not know how to go about establishing contact. Undertaking the Minding Black Histories project was the first opportunity for ACHH to work with a university.
First it was an opportunity that was massive – oh well working with a university that’s a good thing. We’re gonna learn a lot working with the university. However, the way the collaboration worked out was not what I was expecting. Yeah because writing of the project, the conception of the project was done by the academic partner.

(Community partner)

In terms of achieving common understanding and vision for the project, the academic partner thought this was facilitated by sharing a common language and prior experience in working with community groups.

I’m used to talking the language of community partners and not actually making it very complicated in terms of what the AHRC wants to hear and in a way that made the whole collaboration much easier. I have been working with community partners before I came to BCU (Birmingham City University). All my life really and so we didn’t have a problem setting up the ground for what we wanted to do together.

(Academic partner)

The key focus was on developing and delivering the project within a relatively short timescale, discussions regarding mutual understanding and relevance of key terminology such as race, ethnicity, collaboration and so on were not a focus for specific discussion.
Developing collaborative research

The idea for the research topic came from the community partner:

There is something recorded about Congolese soldiers but on the French side of Europe, I wanted to work on this because when we did some research we found one Congolese soldier who was brought over here when he was wounded and he died here in the UK. The idea was to dig a bit more to find out what really happened because according to the data there were 52 Congolese soldiers in Belgium at the time when the war broke out, but there were a lot of Belgian soldiers who came here when they were wounded. How many of the Congolese soldiers were among them we don't know. That was what we wanted to dig, research and publish.

(Community partner)

The academic partner describes the broad agenda for research as being set by funders such as the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) and Research Councils UK (RCUK) and is therefore pre-determined, with some freedom to operate within the broad pre-set framework. The VOWP programme is described as going from acknowledging a lack of focus on the contribution of Black soldiers to supporting several projects that commemorate Black servicemen's contributions. Through the AHRC and Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) focus on Black and Minority ethnic people's contributions in World War one, several community groups are said to have been able to progress their work on this topic.
Minding Black Histories was funded through Voices of War and Peace which is one of five AHRC First World War Engagement Centres that provides UK-wide support for community groups funded through a range of Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) programmes.

The community partner had previously considered applying for HLF funding to undertake this project. However, ACHH already had HLF funding for another project at the time so it was not possible to submit another application while existing funding was still live.

Initial discussions between the academic and community partner informed budgeting for activities. The funding application was then devised and submitted by the academic partner. A number of challenges are highlighted by both academic and community partners regarding the funding:

- The university payment system is not compatible for community organisations that rely on funding from collaborative projects to cover costs including volunteer expenses. Delays in payment can create significant financial concerns for community partners.

  When you say okay each one (young people volunteering) is gonna get a travel pass for the day and refreshments, that’s added up to £10 for each youngster but you don’t have that £10. Yeah you dig from your own pocket, not to let other people down and claiming the money at the university was not easy.

  (Community partner)
The difference in resources available to community groups and universities is an important consideration that needs to be taken into account. Resources available to universities are likely to be relatively greater than those available to community organisations, particularly organisations that do not have access to resources which can tide them over until due and delayed payments are received.

- Due recompense for project participants must be considered during project planning. In this project there was a reliance on young people volunteering their time and this issue is said to be problematic for motivating participants and respecting their contributions.

But actually if young people were going to come to the workshop they were missing other things. If they were gonna come to the workshop and they had a last minute job that they could do because most of them, they're not necessarily asylum seekers or refugees but they're all mostly in precarious situations and they need to earn a living. So on the day of the workshop when we were expecting 10 people, five might not show up because they got a job last minute that they had to take specifically because they needed money. The fact that we were committed to just engaging young people on a volunteer basis made it really difficult to keep them and this was one of the main challenges the community partner was facing.

(Academic partner)

Reliance on volunteers and the idea that people will want to participate without receiving anything in return, is not the case in all circumstances and this needs to be recognised.

- The set-up of accounting and payment processes in community organisations are different to university systems. University payment systems for community partners would benefit from review, such as setting up independent systems
that allow universities to pay community partners faster and not expect them to be able to run on the same processes that universities operate on.

The finance and payment systems can become extremely challenging for community partners and this can impact on relationships as well, because you end up just sending emails back and forth about reimbursements and money when you could be spending that time talking about aims, activities and impact. Black and Minority Ethnic communities should be trusted to find a target audience and beneficiaries they want to work with and be supported to work within their own structures. Often what we do is we come and impose our own mechanisms onto community partners. We say we’re listening, but we’re not really.

(Academic partner)

It is apparent that finances and payment processes impact collaborative work on several levels.

- Greater involvement of community partners in developing the funding bid and costing of activities would help establish, from the outset, the range of likely costs from the community perspective.

The good way to fund a project is to cost it as fully as possible and develop a budget at the design stage. Then it’s up to the funder to decide if they have enough money to support the project or to say ‘no we don’t have enough money to support this sort of project’.

(Community partner)

Community partner participation in the development of funding bids can highlight activities and approaches to community collaboration which the university may not be fully aware of. Thereby facilitating more thorough costing and if necessary adapting activities to available funding.

The fact that we were committed to just engaging young people on a volunteer basis made it really difficult to keep them and this was one of the main challenges the community partner was facing.
Limited and insufficient funding can result in planned activities not being undertaken and unforeseen costs arising from additional activities, or changes to the project, not being met.

When you are in the field there’s things that happen that you didn’t see. We didn’t have any contingency fund (to accommodate unforeseen costs).

(Community partner)

An example of additional unforeseen costs in this project relate to travel to undertake interviews. It would have been more practical and convenient to undertake some journeys by car, especially when equipment needed to be transported and trains could be missed if young people were delayed reaching the station. However, the budget was costed for train travel and could not be reallocated to cover travel by car.
Minding Black Histories

Undertaking the research

The original idea proposed by the community partner was further discussed by academic and community partners and then developed into a research project by the academic partner. There were several phases to delivering this project:

1. The academic partner was aware about the possibility of duplication and keen to avoid replicating work undertaken by other organisations. To address this concern a community development day was set up, inviting projects known to be undertaking work on Black servicemen’s contributions in the First World War. This enabled mapping of existing work on this topic, provided networking opportunities for all participants and an online account was set up to support conversations to continue beyond the community development day.

2. Young people were recruited and trained in story telling techniques using the mediums of photography and video. The training was provided by the CIC who introduced academic and community partners.

3. The community partner travelled to the Congo to identify descendants of the soldiers and undertake interviews with them.

4. People in Kinshasa with whom contact was established were asked to take photographs of streets that were named after Generals who fought during the First World War and send them to project participants. The young people then took photos of each other holding these images in Birmingham city centre.

Because the idea was that they themselves are legacies of the First World War today. That was really interesting because of that sort of layering of belonging and memory.

(Academic partner)

5. A video was produced, documenting the activities of the project and bringing together the photographs and filmed interviews.
A more detailed description about the delivery of this project can be found [here](#). Ethnicity of the Principal Investigator, Middle Eastern, is also described as significant to undertaking a project of this nature and addressing sensitive issues.

The kind of discussions we had with young people at the workshops were about history and whether they identified with this White history. One thing we had in common you know, is that we’re not White westerners, but we are being represented by Western hegemony in the presentation of images and having this in common made things much easier.

(Academic partner)

Race and ethnicity of other staff working on the project is described by the academic partner as potentially having a significant impact on this kind of collaborative work.

I know from White people on the project and the researchers, they were extremely conscious of that Black and white sort of...obviously we are very careful about how we approach these questions but often times I found myself joking with the young people about how uncomfortable that could be or (researcher) could be while working on the project. It’s hard when you are conscious of the fact that you are a White person who is again creating the story and the history of Black and Ethnic Minorities and it’s good to be conscious of that.

(Academic partner)

A key learning regarding facilitation of young people to participate in the project was that initial expectations were unrealistic in terms of expecting them to: participate in a voluntary capacity; have an immediate and ready interest in the research topic; be available to work on the project in addition to their other commitments including education, family/social responsibilities and employment which could come through at the last minute for some young people.
So we were somehow expecting that young people would be actually interested in exploring that part of their history, when they’ve got a completely different set of challenges today. They weren’t able to really immediately create the links between these but interestingly, and this has to do with the things that were I think achieved through this project, as discussions were moving forward they realised they had so much in common.

(Academic partner)

Research collaboration is said to have occurred mostly at the fieldwork stage with the university supporting delivery of training to young people; data collection was undertaken by ACHH staff and young people. The community partner would have liked greater collaboration in all aspects of project design and delivery including data analysis and writing up.
Roles and responsibilities are said to have been discussed at the start of the project, though the academic and community partner perspectives differ on this. The academic partner thought the roles and responsibilities were set out in the bid and made clear who was responsible for what. The community partner, however, felt the decisions about who would do what were largely taken by the university and communicated to ACHH.

No I was not happy because I wanted to have more input in deciding what to do and to know exactly what they were doing in addition to publicity. You (interviewer) are here because we were involved in that project. That’s publicity and people know this organisation a bit more now.

The academic partner recognises the limitations imposed on developing collaborative, co-produced work due to insufficient time and resources.
Accountability

The academic partner explained financial accountability to the community partner, otherwise accountabilities are described as being informal and emerged organically. The researchers reported to the academic Principal Investigator; the community partner and trainers delivering workshops to young people already knew each other and developed their own ways of working together.

Finance, because the most important was the funding processes so that was formally explained at the beginning and we did explain to (community partner) that often times it was 'gonna come with delays etc. and for everything else it sort of organically emerged. So by the time the bid was written, when (community partner) read it before I submitted it was clear to everybody what you know….who was doing what.

(Academic partner)

The community partner’s perspective is that accountabilities were decided by academic partners. The community partner was accountable to the university, especially in terms of financial accountability, interestingly neither partner highlighted whether or how the university was accountable to the community partner.
Outputs and legacy

The tangible outputs from this project include photographs and a video which are owned by ACHH. The academic partner will be writing a paper incorporating the Minding Black Histories project, alongside other projects, ownership of this will be within academia. The video is published under open licence and is accessible on the VOWP website and on YouTube. The paper to be written by the academic partner is will focus on the opportunities and challenges presented by co-designed and collaborative research projects, Minding Black Histories will be one of several projects that inform this paper.

As already highlighted, an exhibition was planned as an output at the start of the project but could not be realised due to the relatively short timescale for the project, combined with delays in producing the video and relatively fewer photographs produced than had been initially intended.

Yeah even the exhibition was not in our remit. I met with them to hand over the material so they could work on the exhibition. When I met the (photographer) to discuss the exhibition we realised there were not enough photographs. Yeah that’s why the decision came about to produce a film.

(Community partner)

Both the academic and community partners describe the need to be flexible and adapt as necessary regarding production of outputs envisaged at the start of a project. In this project the initial idea to have a photographic exhibition was revised to take into account changing circumstances once the project was under way and the decision was taken to produce a video. The academic partner highlighted that working with funders who are open to changes such as this and understand the need to adapt in order to accommodate changing circumstances, was important and helpful to the collaboration.
So we did adapt to the kind of content that was created and ultimately it was better in a sense that you know we can share it online, it’s something that is now on VOWP website.

(Academic partner)

The academic partner also highlighted the less tangible output of learning about how to manage these kinds of projects and expectations.

The more you do these kinds of projects the better you get at managing finance and expectations. So I do see myself as a sort of bridge between the community partner and the institution (university) and I have learnt a lot by doing that work and connecting between the two, absolutely yeah.

(Academic partner)

Legacy of the project is described by the academic partner as also being influenced by available funding, in particular the assessment of legacy in the longer term.

Now in terms of the legacies of the project it really depends on levels to which the VOWP centre and the AHRC will continue their interest in Black and Ethnic Minorities beyond you know sort of the lifespan of projects of two or three years. So in a few years we’ll be able to tell more.

(Academic partner)

The perspective of the community partner is that the photographs and video are the tangible outputs they have and it would have been preferable to have had greater overall involvement in producing the outputs. Nevertheless, there were gains for community participants in terms of non-tangible outputs and legacy. The young people and ACHH staff gained knowledge and skills through participation and potentially the organisation will gain in other ways from the collaboration, such as greater publicity.
Yeah because when we started with the young people on this particular project they didn’t know anything about the involvement of Congolese soldiers in the First World War. They did learn quite a lot. They got more interested, they changed in attitude. Yeah, myself I’m still learning yeah, it’s because of this project. The youngsters did learn a lot, for example we have names of roads in Congo but we didn’t know where these names came from and because of this project we now know that those names came from the East part of Africa in Tanzania. Yeah because there was a Congolese army victory when they were fighting, in Tanzania the Congolese army were fighting the Germans.

(Community partner)

Clearly the community partner does not feel they were sufficiently involved in producing all outputs but despite this, recognises the benefits gained by community participants.
Structural inequalities

The Community partner highlighted the lack of knowledge about how to approach a university/academic partner as a structural inequality, especially as some funders will only fund projects if a university partner is on board. The Minding Black Histories collaboration may not have happened at all had it not been for a chance meeting.

Yeah if it was not for this chance to meet (person from the CIC), myself I didn’t know how to approach the university for any kind of collaborative work. I’ve got an idea about a piece of research to do with Arts and Humanities but you don’t know how to approach them because they say, when I read this a long time ago, that you have to have university partners, like a researcher but you don’t know how to approach them.

(Community Partner)

The community partner also commented that it was difficult to answer questions about structural inequalities, possibly because the concept is unfamiliar or understood differently by people depending on the context of their work.

I don’t know how to put it the equalities and stuff yeah?

(Community partner)

The academic partner cited funding as a structural inequality, particularly short term funding because it impacts on how engagement and collaborative work continues beyond the funding period. Another issue highlighted relates to knowledge about structural inequalities and how this can inform development of collaborative projects such as Minding Black Histories.
The extent to which we are ‘gonna be able to keep engaging with those people beyond this grant……I’d be able to answer that question in two years I think. I haven’t done this long. I’m a, you know, early mid-career young woman who’s trying to do academia in a mostly white male middle class plus managed environment so absolutely those inequalities basically were the backbone of this project, the reason why this project happened is us recognising these inequalities and they absolutely affect the way the project was run.

(Academic partner)

Competition for funding is highlighted as a wider impact that determines who and which projects are funded.

Inequalities basically were the backbone of this project, the reason why this project happened is us recognising inequalities and they absolutely affect the way the project was run.
Representing communities

Community representation is said to have been achieved through a variety of approaches. In the Minding Black Histories project, the communities being represented include the Congolese servicemen who are the focus of the research topic and communities represented by ACHH, in particular the young people participating in this project.

The community partner explained that representation of communities at ACHH is achieved through a range of approaches including meetings and outreach work organised and undertaken by ACHH.

We do outreach work for example to get the input of people, we have to go to them or we call them for a forecast group meeting or community event, like now we are preparing for an event in August. That’s when the staff speak to the community for their point of view to seek their input, what sort of stuff they want to see happening in the community. How can we develop ourselves, which way do we want to go. Yeah that’s the way we represent communities.

(Community partner)

Young people working on Minding Black Histories were recruited by ACHH through the African Churches network and through families accessing ACHH services such as supplementary classes.

Yeah then you speak to the church leader that I need to do this, to do this can I access your youngsters and speak to them. They have choir meetings and biblical studies. Then you go to those meetings, you speak to the youngsters. Yeah this is one of the only ways you can get that for our people because they meet in churches and they have got their own set ups.

(Community partner)
The community partner was unclear at the time of interview how accurately the young participants in the project would be represented in outputs that he had not seen such as the publication that is to be written by the academic partner. It would also have been preferable to have the young participants produce the video but the short timescale did not facilitate this and the job was given to an external producer.

We were filming interviews, there was video and audio, that short film that show a lot about the world. I would have preferred that if we did produce that short film, it could have been the work of the youngsters. That they produced this short film they can be proud of. They can show their friends.

(Community partner)

The academic partner’s view is that community representation was achieved both by the work undertaken by the community partner as described above and also through the planning and delivery of the community development day held at the start of the project.

Before community development day we sort of had on our radar the different events that were happening that other groups were organising and we funded (community partner) to attend two of those gatherings and we got (researcher) to attend one of them. So by the time community development day happened here we already knew some of those groups and they already knew each other.

(Academic partner)

Representing communities occurs at several levels and their participation in all stages can maximise opportunities for them to have a voice in how they are represented and portrayed.
University–Black and Minority Ethnic community collaborations

The academic partner cites networks set up to bring together people undertaking this kind of collaborative work as being potentially useful, with sufficient time and money set aside to enable meaningful participation. Using such a network as the basis to develop new networks that focus on other minority groups, beyond race and ethnicity, could also be useful to future collaborative work.

The community partner highlighted preparation as key to undertaking collaborative research, both in relation to project design and delivery but also funding.

Preparation you know, preparation. The design of the project should be done by both partners and the costing as well. Taking account of the needs of community partners as well because being part of this project we used more of our own resources that we could have used somewhere else.

(Community partner)

Setting up, resourcing and facilitating networks to communicate on specific collaborative areas of work and greater involvement of community partners in project design and costing are the key messages conveyed here.

In relation to developing equal partnerships in collaborative research, the academic partner highlighted trust and trusting community organisations, addressing funding barriers and power dynamics as key.

Nobody can do their (community organisations) job other than them and so when we talk about collaborative research or co-design or co-production, it is
like going beyond these titles and actually really co-designing projects as in going to somebody with an idea that’s one sentence or one question mark and then devising a sort of strategy and log frame together. It is difficult because we often don’t speak the same language (terminology) we don’t call things by the same name but once you’ve established a mutual sort of ground of understanding then it becomes really interesting because then those projects are not only doing this because they want the money, they’re actually doing it because they believe it would contribute to growing their communities and expanding their networks and their own organisations. So when that becomes the case you can do a lot with just six months of funding. If you just go with a log frame that’s imposed on you by your funder and you tick your research boxes then that doesn’t really go anywhere. So trust the community partners, they know better.

(Academic partner)

Facilitating academics to learn how to speak with people outside of academia is also considered important by the academic partner, including skills development and capacity building to work with communities.

The community partner highlighted the need for external bodies such as universities to better understand and appreciate how certain concepts, such as volunteering, are perceived in particular communities. Also, more generally recognise the challenge of explaining why voluntary participation in a project such as this is relevant to participants.

Yeah the challenge in working with young people is very, very challenging. One of the questions I was asked by one youngster was ‘Why do you want me to do that? And then another at the college ‘Why do you want me to be involved in your sort of stuff?

(Community partner)
Another important issue for the community partner in achieving equality is the recognition that university systems, such as finance and payments, are not always suited to the situation of community organisations and the procedures they have in place to run their organisation.

The academic partner highlighted that Community partners should not be treated in a way that conveys they should consider themselves lucky and be grateful. Academics need to address any arrogance on their part in this respect.

Actually they (community groups/partners) don’t need us they’ve got their own channels to get their own funding so if you’re really serious about working with community partners we need to really start from scratch. We need to completely change the way academics approach people. There’s this arrogance that we bring with us that is extremely damaging to the kind of relationship we do with community partners....and if we’re interested in actual real impact beyond just like wrapping up projects and submitting the photos and saying ‘right we’ve done it’ then shelving it.

(Academic partner)
The future

Both academic and community partners would like to undertake collaborative work in future including with each other and also as a continuation of this project. A key element that will contribute to realising this is described as the availability of funding and sufficient time.

The next thing I want to be thinking about as a continuation of this project is thinking about people today in the city as themselves, legacies of the wars and conflicts that happened 100 years ago......contemporary sort of representations of that in today’s young (people) and you know African or Arab or other ethnic minority community contributions.

(Academic partner)

The community partner is keen to collaborate to do further work on the current project as well as consider other collaborations in future.

I would like to (collaborate), even the same project here. Yeah because my idea of the project has not been realised. I still have the motivation to do this same project because what I wanted to do has not been realised.

(Community partner)

The community partner is of the opinion that the objectives of the university have been realised to a greater extent than those of the community partner and acknowledges this view may not be shared by the academic partner.

Maybe they feel that it has not met some objectives because we planned to produce five interviews but we produce less yeah.

(Community partner)
Despite the challenges presented by this collaboration, both academic and community partners recognise the benefits gained and the lessons learned can be applied to future collaborative work, which both partners are keen to engage in if resources become available.