Historians love to joke that the middle class is always rising. Over the past few years, I have come to feel that NCPH, like the middle class, is always rising. This past spring, we had a record-breaking attendance at our conference. In fact, we have had record-breaking attendance at nearly every conference of the past few years. Similarly, membership has exploded during this same period.

All of this is, in many ways, good news. However, NCPH’s explosive growth also raises questions for us. Some of these questions are simple logistical ones. As many long-time members know, NCPH has always prided itself on its “friendly and welcoming” conferences; maintaining this friendly feeling, while the organization and conference grows in size, will be a challenge.

But the growth of NCPH and the growth of public history as a discipline have also sparked innumerable questions about the practice of public history overall. Paramount among these is the question of how we define public history and its practitioners.

For me, the opportunity to rethink how we understand and practice public history carries a tremendous potential. Some of this is linked to my own experiences with public history. As a graduate student in a very traditional PhD program, I never heard the term “public historian.” And even if I had heard this term, I would have assumed that only Americanists could become public historians.

It was only when I traveled to Britain to conduct dissertation research that I began to think about public history. In Britain, historians in and outside the academy are often actively engaged in public conversations about the past. The medical historian whom I admired the most, Roy Porter, was a well-known figure on British television and in British culture overall. But Porter was not unique. British academics engaged in museum work, worked on preservation projects, and wrote for the general public in mass-marketed magazines such as History Today.

This was the kind of historian I wanted to be.

But upon my return to the United States, I was unclear as to how, as a non-Americanist, I could become involved in similar types of projects. At the same time, I also began to discover what I came to feel were huge gaps in my education.

Like many medical historians, I had learned a great deal of historiography in grad school but not much about material culture. In retrospect, this doesn’t make sense. Instruments are often integral to the practice of medicine—and yet I was able to get a doctorate in history without really developing an expertise in this area.

But this gap in my knowledge was far from my greatest frustration. I was eager to participate in broader national discussions about history or, even more simply, projects that incorporated an understanding of history, but I had no idea how I could do so.

After four years as an unhappy professor, I applied to become a public historian for the U.S. Public Health Service, a position that built on my background as a medical historian and one that, I thought, would enable me to practice the kind of history I had seen modeled in Britain.

I was amused, and impressed, when I had my first heart-to-heart conversation about history with my new boss, John Parascandola. When I tentatively reminded him that my dissertation had been on British, not American, medical history, he told me that he thought unconventional backgrounds often served public historians well. Public historians, he said, often need to be extremely nimble, as they are tasked with working on a variety of different projects. He also said that he had been intrigued by my application, which had argued for the connections between American and British medicine.

If I had not already been sold on the idea of doing public history, John’s comments would have convinced me. I was thrilled by the challenge of being on a constant learning curve, and I loved the idea of working in a place that did not follow the rigid national divisions of academic history.

Over the last sixteen years, I have been able to explore a range of public history projects and topics. Working first as a historian for the Public Health Service, then as a preservationist for the National Park Service, and most recently, as a curator for the National Museum of American History has enabled me to engage with others in an ongoing dialogue about history. I’ve even been able to sneak some non-American history in by pushing Americans to think more broadly about cultures outside of North America.

As a public historian (a term that puzzles my non-historian friends who see no such distinctions among historians), I have benefited tremendously from colleagues who have embraced my unconventional background.

My own experiences have led me to believe that the divisions we make between public and academic history are both arbitrary and limiting. More historians, even those who intend to spend their entire career in the academy and those who study non-American cultures, should acquire the skills we associate with public history. And all historians should be encouraged to engage in a broader dialogue with the general public.

In short, NCPH should continue to cast a broad net. Finding room for everyone and a range of conversations at the next conference can, I feel, only benefit us and the historical profession overall.
The past year has been a time of significant growth and transition for the NCPH. Membership in the organization topped 1,600 for the first time (10 percent growth over the last year), and the annual meeting this year broke 1,000 registrants (a 95 percent increase since the 2013 meeting just three years ago). Early this year, we also completed the migration and redesign of the NCPH website and History@Work blog, and The Public Historian also debuted a new look.

The organization accomplished all of this while down a key staff position and while conducting an ongoing national search for the next NCPH executive director. These successes are a direct result of the strength of our board, staff, and committees. Thanks especially go to the Executive Director Search Committee, headed by chair Bill Bryans, along with Marianne Babal, Raymond Haberski, Lisa Junkin Lopez, Alexandra Lord, and Kisha Tandy, as well as immediate past president Patrick Moore. Work in the office is keeping pace without losing a beat thanks to membership coordinator Christine Crosby, our recent graduate intern Nick Johnson, and program assistant Meghan Hillman.

NCPH also owes a debt of thanks to the Indiana University School of Liberal Arts History Department, led by interim chair Daniella Kostroun, for their ongoing support of the NCPH during this lengthy search process. Working with the department and the Dean’s office at our host institution, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis, throughout the search has strengthened our relationships and is allowing us to discover new, creative ways to work together to benefit the department, NCPH, and the fields of history and public history as we move into the future.

It has also been a year of big changes for me personally. I am writing this column as I prepare to be out on maternity leave for eight weeks as my husband and I welcome our first child. Many thanks to Susan Ferentinos who has stepped in to serve as acting director during my leave—Sue’s history with the organization, experience as an accomplished public historian, and creative ideas will no doubt ensure that the NCPH is in good hands.

I encourage you to explore the updates from our committee chairs in this issue to hear more about what they are working on, to review the 2015 organizational financial report, to read the reports from the working groups at the conference in Baltimore, and to check out the great photos from our largest conference ever.

This is an exciting time to be a public historian!
EVENT SPONSORS:
Canada’s History – Printed Awards Program
Historic Hampton, Inc. – Hampton National Historic Site Bus Tour
John Nicholas Brown Center for Public Humanities and Cultural Heritage – Coffee Break
Maryland Historical Society – Program Images
Maryland Humanities Council – Public Plenary
Roy Rosenzweig Center for History and New Media – Coffee Break
Steveson Banjos – in the MuseumSession
University of California Press – Coffee Break
University of Central Florida – THATCamp Bootcamp
University of Louisiana Lafayette – Awards Breakfast and Keynote Address
University of Maryland, Baltimore County – Opening Reception
University of Massachusetts Amherst – Name Badges

EVENT COSPONSORS:
American Association for State and Local History – Speed Networking
The American West Center, University of Utah – Public History Educators’ Breakfast
Central Connecticut State University – The Commons
The Park National Service – NFS 100th Anniversary Symposium
Smithsonian Institution – NFS 100th Anniversary Symposium
University of Massachusetts Boston History Department/Public History Track – The Commons
Alder, LLC – Consultants Reception
American Association for State and Local History – Consultants Reception
Historical Research Associates – Consultants Reception
Historical Research Work – Consultants Reception
Littlefield Historical Research – Consultants Reception
Patrick Cox Consultants – Consultants Reception
Northwest History Network – Consultants Reception
Stevens Historical Research Associates – Consultants Reception
William Willingham – Consultants Reception

MANY THANKS TO OUR 2016 CONFERENCE SPONSORS!
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NCPH inspires public engagement with the past and serves the needs of practitioners in putting history to work in the world by building community among historians, expanding professional skills and tools, fostering critical reflection on historical practice, and publicly advocating for history and historians. Public History News is published in March, June, September, and December. NCPH reserves the right to reject material that is not consistent with the goals and purposes of the organization. Individual membership orders, changes of address, and business and editorial correspondence should be addressed to NCPH, 127 Cavanaugh Hall – IPUP, 425 University Blvd., Indianapolis, IN 46202-5140. E-mail: ncp@ipup.edu. Tel: 317-274-2716. Join online or renew at www.ncph.org. Headquartered on the campus of Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis, NCPH is grateful for the generous support of the IU School of Liberal Arts and the Department of History.
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NCPH would like to extend a special thanks to our new Patron and Partner members:

Know History (Patron)
Ottawa, Canada
Frontier Culture Museum of Virginia (Patron)
Staunton, VA
St. Cloud State University (Patron)
St. Cloud, MN
University of Massachusetts Boston (Patron)
Boston, MA
After the September 18-19, 2015 meeting of the NCPH Board of Directors in Louisville, Kentucky, and prior to the spring meeting in Baltimore, Maryland, the board convened electronically and by telephone and took the following actions:

- Decided that NCPH should sign on to the Oral History Association’s comments on the proposed revisions to the regulations for protection of human subjects in research (announced by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and fifteen other federal departments and agencies), and decided to support the National Coalition for History’s policy board (on which NCPH holds a seat) signing on as well.
- Voted unanimously to close the executive director search that had been opened in March 2015.
- Decided that NCPH should sign on to the American Political Science Association’s Statement on Campus Carry.
- Voted unanimously to work with Indiana University to conduct a targeted recruitment of Stephanie Rowe for the position of NCPH executive director.
- Voted unanimously to adopt the Curriculum and Training Committee’s best practices document on “Establishing and Developing a Public History Program.”
- Supported the National Coalition for History signing onto a letter from the Save Princeton Coalition opposing construction on land near Princeton University where the Battle of Princeton was fought during the Revolutionary War.
- Voted unanimously to approve the hiring of Stephanie Rowe as NCPH executive director, contingent upon final approval from Indiana University.

On Thursday, March 17, 2016, the NCPH Board of Directors convened during the NCPH Annual Meeting in Baltimore, Maryland, and took the following actions:

- Approved the minutes of the fall 2015 board meeting in Louisville, Kentucky, and the November 16, 2015 board meeting held by conference telephone call.
- Approved the minutes of the fall 2015 board meeting held by conference telephone call.
- Formed a sub-committee of the board to focus on long-range planning, to include Kristin Ahlberg, Anthea Hartig, Alexandra Lord, Marla Miller, and Jean-Pierre Morin, with Cathy Stanton serving as a liaison to the Digital Media Group.
- Elected board member Kathleen Franz to the Executive Committee to replace board member Jill Ogline Titus, whose term on the board was ending.
- Voted to adopt the recommendation of the Environmental Sustainability Committee and the Finance Committee to move some endowment funds from Vanguard into the Pax World Balanced Fund (PAXWX), in order to bring the allocation of funds in the endowment back into the percentages outlined in the NCPH investment guidelines.
- Voted to pursue a proposal from Central Connecticut State University to host the 2019 NCPH annual meeting in Hartford, Connecticut.
- Heard a presentation by National Coalition for History (NCH) executive director Lee White on the state of history advocacy and the NCH.
- Discussed the creation of a memorandum of agreement between the NCPH and the International Federation for Public History (IFPH) to formalize the relationship between the two organizations.
- Formed a sub-committee of the board to focus on long-range planning, to include Kristin Ahlberg, Anthea Hartig, Alexandra Lord, Marla Miller, and Jean-Pierre Morin, with Cathy Stanton serving as a liaison to the Digital Media Group.

2015 END OF YEAR FINANCIAL REPORT

The 2015 fiscal year turned out well, and we are pleased to report an unusually strong budget surplus. Memberships was up in all categories, particularly individual memberships, which crested 1,500 for the first time in September 2015. Another boost in income came from the large number of registrations for the 2015 Annual Meeting in Nashville, breaking all previous records. Costs for the 2015 Annual Meeting were lower than budgeted due to a rebate from the Sheraton Nashville Downtown in recognition of a number of service issues. Administrative expenses were also under budget as a result of a new executive director not being hired before the end of the FY. Many of the organization’s costs, such as portions of staff salaries and benefits, and office space and computers, are covered by our generous host institution, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis, and do not appear in the figures below. A final key piece of the income picture was the Board of Directors’ success in encouraging you, the members, to contribute more than $11,000 for the Annual Fund. Thank you!

NCPH 2015 Operating Budget
January-December, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>2014 Budget</th>
<th>2014 Actual</th>
<th>2015 Budget</th>
<th>2015 Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memberships &amp; Partners/Patrons</td>
<td>$94,400</td>
<td>$109,546</td>
<td>$96,400</td>
<td>$122,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Subscriptions</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>$32,709</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$3,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Meetings &amp; Mini Cons</td>
<td>$107,000</td>
<td>$134,185</td>
<td>$126,000</td>
<td>$158,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUPUI Projects &amp; O’Brien Lecture</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$7,860</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Transfer from DIF &amp; Endowment Earnings</td>
<td>$40,145</td>
<td>$27,479</td>
<td>$41,358</td>
<td>$37,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions to Annual Fund</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$9,629</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$11,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Budget Income</td>
<td>$279,145</td>
<td>$322,496</td>
<td>$351,733</td>
<td>$389,652</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>2014 Budget</th>
<th>2014 Actual</th>
<th>2015 Budget</th>
<th>2015 Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>$17,950</td>
<td>$18,048</td>
<td>$17,750</td>
<td>$20,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Meeting</td>
<td>$88,635</td>
<td>$79,647</td>
<td>$89,200</td>
<td>$85,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>$23,750</td>
<td>$16,805</td>
<td>$45,705</td>
<td>$41,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards</td>
<td>$8,495</td>
<td>$7,156</td>
<td>$7,358</td>
<td>$6,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$129,030</td>
<td>$126,000</td>
<td>$158,099</td>
<td>$158,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board &amp; Committees</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$3,010</td>
<td>$2,850</td>
<td>$4,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biannual Audit/Review</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy &amp; Participation in Other Associations</td>
<td>$6,615</td>
<td>$6,615</td>
<td>$6,615</td>
<td>$6,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Budget Expenses</td>
<td>$275,675</td>
<td>$260,363</td>
<td>$349,044</td>
<td>$327,033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net Operating (Deficit)/Surplus | $3,470 | $62,133* | $2,689 | $62,619 |

* This surplus was actually $46,278 once UC Santa Barbara was paid its share, or $15,855, of the institutional revenue from The Public Historian for 2014, in 2015.
When I reflect back on my experience at the NCPH/SHFG joint meeting in Baltimore, I find myself truly appreciative for the community of historians who decide to call NCPH and the public history movement their home. As an emerging public historian who serves as the sole professional employee of a small institution in rural central Nebraska, it can be difficult to remain on the cutting edge of public history theory and practice. Yet few conferences are quite as welcoming (and invigorating!) as the NCPH annual meeting, and so here I am, almost two months later, still brimming with ideas for how to push my institution to better “challenge the exclusive past.”

Nearly two years ago, I was hired as the director of the Frank House, a historic home and house museum on the campus of the University of Nebraska at Kearney. As a recent graduate of the public history program at Arizona State University, I was thrilled to have found an academic job in museum administration. But a house museum in rural Nebraska faces its share of challenges, not the least of which is a somewhat narrow story that has become increasingly irrelevant to the larger, evolving community. How can we engage new audiences, share more diverse and relevant histories, and ultimately save an important piece of the community’s past?

The most recent NCPH annual meetings in Nashville and Baltimore have helped me to wrestle with this issue. I found two of the Baltimore sessions—“Re-interpreting Relevance: Preservation, Herstory, and the Challenge to the Traditional Narrative” and “Searching for an Inclusive Past through Cultural Landscapes”—to be especially useful, along with the many informal conversations I had with colleagues over coffee in the exhibit hall. Today, I am happy to say that we have begun moving forward with measurable success, although some of these changes were already in motion before the Baltimore conference. Recently rebranded as the G. W. Frank Museum of History and Culture, we are currently designing programs, tours, and future exhibits that will use the home and the dozens of individuals who have lived there as a lens for exploring issues of race, class, gender, and labor in central Nebraska. Ultimately, I hope that this will engage the community in an important (if a little uncomfortable) conversation about the history of both the home and the larger region.

As part of this reinvention, we have also begun to reach out to the student body and the broader community in new and creative ways. Programs like “Live Action Clue” and “History in Motion” (a rendition of history through interpretive dance) attract new, often younger, and previously untapped audiences. Meanwhile, several innovative class projects—from developing marketing materials and digital interactives, to getting hands-on with actual restoration work—have helped to create a fresh and engaging relationship between the museum and the university’s student body.

Much work remains to be done, including figuring out how to engage the university’s sizable population of international students, but I like to think that we are headed in the right direction. And I would like to once again thank NCPH and the New Professional Awards Committee for helping to encourage me in that direction by selecting me as the recipient of this award.
Seven of the working groups that met during the NCPH conference in Baltimore have provided summaries of their discussions. NCPH working groups are seminar-like conversations that take place before and during the conference. The groups, comprised of eight to ten people, explore in-depth a subject of shared concern and work toward a common purpose and outcome. If you are interested in creating a working group for the 2017 NCPH Annual Meeting, proposals are due July 15, 2016. (See the call for proposals at http://bit.ly/ncph2017cfp.)

**BUILDING CAPACITY TO CHALLENGE THE EXCLUSIVE PAST**

Public history and public humanities organizations often want to work with grassroots populations and tell narratives from the perspective of workers, the poor, racial and ethnic minorities, and other marginalized peoples, but are often stymied by their own lack of outreach or fears of repercussions from funders. For their part, even when grant makers and capacity-building organizations are excited by such work, they are uncertain how to succeed. Our “Building Capacity to Challenge the Exclusive Past” working group consisted of individuals from organizations that fund public history work, such as state humanities councils and the National Endowment for the Humanities, as well as educators and practitioners with a stake in building the capacity of smaller grassroots organizations to be able to explore more diverse histories. Prior to meeting in Baltimore, participants posted and commented on case statements via the NCPH blog History@Work (http://bit.ly/buildingcapacity2016). These statements and online discussions centered around one overarching question: How can organizations that support public history projects, in addition to how much risk the groups we work with are willing to take in examining and sharing their stories (particularly when some groups may not feel empowered to do so or have a distrust of organizations seeking to support them). Further details of our discussion can be found in our notes and working document stored at https://goo.gl/2PJsdA.

Our time in Baltimore was productive and engaging. From here, this group hopes to create a working paper to help build a community of practice around issues of democratizing access to public history and humanities support.

—JOSEPH CIADELLA AND JESSE JOHNSTON

**CAMPUS HISTORY AS PUBLIC HISTORY**

As some of the most exclusive sites in our communities, educational institutions are increasingly called upon to confront and interpret their own histories. Yet when treasured campus stories, landscapes, buildings, monuments, or traditions carry the legacies of exclusion, conflict often emerges. Within this process, public historians can help navigate competing demands and facilitate new research and dialogues.

The eighteen members of the “Campus History as Public History” working group represented a wide range of public and private institutions: colleges, universities, and K-12 schools. We spent the months prior to the conference participating in focused discussion around four key areas of interest:

- campus history products, from exhibitions and programming to websites and other publications;
- teaching and learning;
- project structures, staffing, and sustainability; and
- methods for creating an ongoing dialogue between projects and stakeholders.

At the meeting in Baltimore, our in-person discussion highlighted the need to further refine what “capacity building” involves in theory and practice. In particular, members emphasized the need to “be present” when assisting local communities using history to examine contemporary social issues important to their civic and cultural life. This presence can come through listening to needs on the ground, workshops, hands-on technical assistance with applications, gatherings to bring various people together, and ongoing projects. Removing administrative barriers to applying for funding and collaborating was also a common theme. This is especially important around issues of evaluation and measuring success, where funding organizations and larger institutions can help lessen the burden for smaller organizations without this background and experience.

A portion of the discussion also focused on risk taking, both on the part of funders and applicants. We discussed a need to be open about how much risk we are willing to take as supporters of public history projects, in addition to how much risk the groups we work with are willing to take in examining and sharing their stories (particularly when some groups may not feel empowered to do so or have a distrust of organizations seeking to support them). Further details of our discussion can be found in our notes and working document stored at https://goo.gl/2PJsdA.

Our time in Baltimore was productive and engaging. From here, this group hopes to create a working paper to help build a community of practice around issues of democratizing access to public history and humanities support.

—JOSEPH CIADELLA AND JESSE JOHNSTON

**INTERPRETING THE HISTORY OF RACE RIOTS AND RACIALIZED MASS VIOLENCE IN THE AGE OF “BLACK LIVES MATTER”**

This working group’s pre-conference work included the creation of a website (http://raceriothistorytoday.weebly.com/) where participants provided case studies of public history projects examining historical race riots and racialized mass violence. From the beginning, we defined “race riot” and “racialized mass violence” capaciously, as evident in the inclusion of cases focused on Native American commemoration and mass incarceration.

The group structured the conference session in a way that would maximize audience dialogue.
We offered the audience six themes that cut across each case study: dialogue, reconciliation, and healing (or the limits thereof); language and naming; space and site specificity; parallels and connections; anniversaries and commemorations; and erasure and absence. For over an hour, audience members rotated between subgroups of discussions facilitated by group members.

We are in the earliest phase of planning for two products to come out of this working group. The first is a revised and enhanced digital platform, including a website for case studies and resources that connect community members, activists, and public historians. Our proposed digital initiative also involves a social media presence that might include a Tumblr feed for assembling relevant news items and regular guided Twitter conversations. The second product is an e-book that collects our case studies while incorporating the critical approach to commemoration and interpretation that emerged in Baltimore as an important theme. We intend this to be a resource for community members, activists, public historians, and students.

The majority of the group will reconvene in mid- to late summer to decide a more definite timeline and procedure for our future work. We are interested in expanding our base of case studies and reaching beyond public historians toward present-day activists and organizers. Anyone interested in contributing to either the website or e-book should contact Devin Hunter at dhunte2@uis.edu.

—DEVIN HUNTER

Before the conference, participants responded to a set of questions with case studies detailing their experiences, challenges, and successes in creating accessible exhibitions and programs. These case studies identified four major themes to serve as the foundation of our work:

- Planning
- Stakeholder Engagement
- Training
- Narrative

In order to maximize productivity at our session, we used these four themes to organize the discussion. After brief introductions, participants and audience members gathered together by theme. Groups discussed the issues related to their topics and worked to develop recommendations to share with the public history community. After the group discussion, we reconvened the full audience to talk about the recommendations that had emerged from the smaller conversations.

We hope to share our group’s recommendations with the public history community in the coming months. In the meantime, we would love to hear from public historians who were not able to participate in the working group but share an interest in this topic. What types of resources or support do you need to help make your sites and programs accessible to people with disabilities? We encourage you to view the case studies and discussion featured at http://bit.ly/accessibileph2016 to learn more about our working group. Please email your ideas to nicole.orphanides@gmail.com and hlheckler@gmail.com.

—HEATHER HECKLER AND NICOLE ORPHANIDES

MUSEUMS AND CIVIC DISCOURSE: PAST, PRESENT, AND EMERGING FUTURES

U.S. museums’ support of civic discourse and social action is largely a twentieth-century development. However, there is no critical accounting of this history that can contextualize and inform current deliberations over the paths that museum work in these areas might take. Also lacking are perspectives from groups historically underrepresented within museums, funding agencies, and other decision-making circuits.

This lack is underscored by renewed calls to address institutional inequities in hiring, governance, and other operational functions. Our working group’s long-term goal is to produce a digital-first volume to begin to address these voids.

Our pre-conference case statements identified areas where—based on our own practice, research, and encounters—historical and interdisciplinary perspectives are needed. We then read “across” the statements to identify intersecting and recurrent concerns. Drawing from these online conversations, twelve of us gathered in Baltimore and organized the concerns into four thematic categories for small group discussion:

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

NCPh T-SHIRTS FOR SALE ONLINE

If you attended the 2016 NCPh Annual Meeting but forgot to pick up a souvenir of your time in Baltimore—or if you just want to show off your NCPh pride—look no further: we’re selling NCPh t-shirts online! To purchase, log in to our database at http://bit.ly/ncphlogin using your email and password, click on “Shopping” on the left sidebar to find our online store, and add the t-shirt to your shopping cart. T-shirts are dark grey with a blue and orange design featuring the 2016 conference theme, “Challenging the Exclusive Past.”

The shirt is $15, the shipping is free, and you’ll be supporting your professional organization—a good deal all around! We also have a limited number of t-shirts from the 2015 conference in Nashville available, so if you attended that meeting and would like to buy a souvenir t-shirt, email the NCPh office at ncph@iupui.edu.
HIGHLIGHTS FROM BALTIMORE WORKING GROUPS // CONT. FROM PAGE 7

- Historicity and the Deep Present
- Self-Critique in Museums
- Defining Publics, Civics, Communities
- Access and Inclusion

Colleagues attending the open session also joined in, forming breakout groups on themes of their own choosing.

Each group identified omissions in our historical knowledge and proposed ideas for advancing understanding in these gap areas. Proposals included: the development of local critical institutional histories attentive to communities’ lived and inherited memories around exclusion and museum going; adoption of a conscious, intersectional politics of citation to push museum scholarship beyond the white, often male, canon; and a provocation to sidestep museums’ fraught baggage altogether in favor of new (anti) institutional forms. (Session notes are available for review and comment online: http://bit.ly/1NS3HDU.)

The “Museums and Civic Discourse” group is gathering at the American Alliance of Museums conference at the end of May to bring additional voices into the process. We also invite colleagues to collaborate with us online: follow #MuseumsCivicDiscourse and visit http://museumscivicdiscourse.tumblr.com/. Next steps include developing the volume’s framework, issuing a call for papers, setting up a project website, and making the project’s evolving literature survey available online. Our work is supported by the University of Connecticut’s Public Discourse Project (http://publicdiscourseproject.uconn.edu/), and our publication will be developed in collaboration with a new Mellon-funded scholarly communications design studio at UConn.

—CLARISSA CEGLIO, ELENA GONZALES, ROBIN GRENIER, NICOLE IVY, AND JENNIFER SCOTT

PUBLIC HISTORY AND THE POTENTIAL OF SPORTS HISTORY MUSEUMS

Originally, the intent of the working group’s activities on-site was to move quickly from one big issue facing sport museums to the next. However, the discussion was so energetic and fruitful—especially from the attendees—that we instead allowed the conversation to flow organically. Working group participants discussed many topics, including the role of fandom in sport museums, similarities to other subfields (namely military and religious history), the “hall of fame” model of interpretation, the importance of sports media, and finding a balance between sport history and “the history of sport.” We also explored the role of reflective practice and historical empathy in interpreting sport.

We hope that this group of scholars interested in sport and public history will continue to work together going into the future. As for what’s next specifically, Josh Howard and Kathy Shinnick will be working with participants to develop a theory and practice of sport and public history. We have set up a Facebook group (aptly named “Sport and Public History”) to encourage a more informal exchange of ideas, and we are exploring the possibility of working group participants contributing blog posts to a few sites. An ultimate goal is for this working group to evolve into a book in the Rowman & Littlefield Interpreting History series.

—JOSH HOWARD

STANDING UP FOR HISTORY IN THE WAR AGAINST THE HUMANITIES

This working group enjoyed a broad and vibrant discussion with audience members. Topics included:

- the numerous ways in which history is undervalued and its practice not fully understood by non-practitioners, as well as the consequences thereof;
- the various reasons behind the public’s (and many students’) perception of history as irrelevant, uninteresting, and unhelpful in today’s society;
- strategies for competing with (or even working with) STEM fields for increased funding and public support;
- effective ways for academic and public history practitioners to better engage the broader community in both the active practice and consumption of history;
- the possibility that promoting greater unity, respect, and cross-training in academic and public history might improve the support for history among the public, policymakers, and institutional leaders;
- creating “history emissaries” to help promote the value of history both within the field and between disciplines, communities, and other public institutions;
- the exact skills that should be taught to create good “history emissaries;”
- which groups/individuals/institutions might serve as allies—or potential targets to “win over”—for the purpose of achieving this working group’s larger goals;
- potential ways of addressing practical considerations, such as funding issues, staffing shortages, quantitative assessments of history’s qualitative value, inadequate skills training, and insufficient methods of outreach;
- the specific content and contexts, and the “civic toolkit,” that history can provide to a society often struggling from a lack thereof; as well as

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE
NCPH COMMITTEE UPDATES

These updates give a sampling of what NCPH volunteers are doing for the organization and the field of public history. The committees encourage your input throughout the year; contact information for committee chairs and members can be found at: http://ncph.org/about/governance-committees/.

CONSULTANTS COMMITTEE
The Consultants Committee is busy at work. Late last year, we unveiled the upgraded Consultants Directory on the NCPH website, http://ncph.org/consultant-directory. The directory can be searched by name, areas of expertise, region, years of experience, and degree. There are now forty consulting historians listed in the directory. Inclusion in the directory is a benefit of NCPH membership. If you have not done so already, we encourage all consultants to add or update their names to the directory by visiting http://ncph.org/consultant-submissions.

In March, we launched a new series on History@Work, “Ask a Consulting Historian,” in which we interviewed committee member Jennifer Stevens. Stay tuned for more interviews with established and emerging consultants. If you would like to participate in an interview or have a colleague you would like to suggest, connect with us on Twitter @NCPHConsultants.

At the 2016 Annual Meeting in Baltimore, we had another successful Consultants Reception. We are already looking ahead to the 2017 Annual Meeting in Indianapolis and, as a committee, plan to submit consulting-related proposals.

This spring, we said good-bye to several committee members whose terms had ended, including co-chair Adina Langer, Michael Adamson, Pete Anderson, and Sandra Reddish. We thank them for their committee service and their advocacy for consulting historians.

CURRICULUM AND TRAINING COMMITTEE
The Curriculum and Training Committee completed several major tasks during the 2015-2016 academic year. A new best practices document, “Establishing and Developing a Public History Program,” received approval from the NCPH Board of Directors in February. It is now posted on the NCPH website at http://bit.ly/phbestpractices. Two other best practices documents—one on integrating technology into public history teaching, the other on the role of public history in college- and university-level historical curricula—are under development. Jon Hunner, Allison Marsh, and Daniel Vivian conducted a workshop on “Teaching Public History” at the 2016 NCPH annual meeting in Baltimore, which had more than thirty people participate.

The committee intends to hold a similar workshop at the 2017 conference in Indianapolis. Ed Salo of Arkansas State University will serve as chair of the committee in 2016-2017.

NCPH NEW PROFESSIONAL AND GRADUATE STUDENT COMMITTEE
The New Professional and Graduate Student Committee has continued working on the resource The Public History Navigator: How to Choose and Thrive in a Graduate Public History Program, with an in-depth review of content scheduled for every two years and minor changes or updates every year. We encourage people to send out the guide, located at http://bit.ly/phnavigator, to any listservs, alumni, or career resources they know of. We continue to organize History@Work posts for the “Ask a Public Historian” column (now merged with “Ask a Practitioner”) and have several in the pipeline. The committee agreed to continue hosting an informal social event at the 2017 NCPH Annual Meeting in Indianapolis.

JOINT TASK FORCE ON PUBLIC HISTORY EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT
The Joint AASLH-AHA-NCPH-OAH Task Force on Public History Education and Employment continues to collect data on trends in education and hiring. A new survey of alumni of master’s programs in public history and closely related fields is now available at https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/phalumni. Eligible respondents are encouraged to take the survey, which will provide a detailed understanding of public historians’ career paths. A report on the survey of public history employers conducted last year is now in preparation. The task force will submit it to the four sponsoring organizations later this year.

HIGHLIGHTS FROM BALTIMORE WORKING GROUPS

• concrete next steps for how this group’s members might join with other history advocacy groups in actively researching, promoting, and demonstrating the value of history to broader society.

The working group built off of the earlier efforts and discussions generated by the History Relevance Campaign (HRC), the History Communicators movement, and the American Historical Association’s Mellon Career Diversity Initiative. Ultimately, the group plans to use this conference discussion and audience feedback to support the various branches of the HRC and the History Communicators. Working group members are currently discussing which specific projects and branches of these two initiatives they would like to assist with, and how they might best help promote the broader goals of these two groups, both within their individual institutions and networks, and by expanding those networks to reach new audiences and potential allies.

—TIM GROVE AND JOHN DICHTL
Baltimore Annual Meeting Wrap Up

From March 16-19, 2016, over a thousand public historians gathered at NCPH’s largest-ever annual meeting in Baltimore, Maryland. This year’s conference, “Challenging the Exclusive Past,” was a joint meeting with the Society for History in the Federal Government (SHFG). It was great to connect with our colleagues from SHFG and take advantage of their engaging sessions.

About 44 percent of attendees gave us feedback via our post-conference survey. Those who took part enjoyed meeting new colleagues from around the public history landscape and learning from each other’s varied backgrounds. Survey respondents frequently lauded the variety of sessions, openness of our community, networking opportunities, conference location, and the conversational nature of the meeting.

The unprecedented size of the 2016 conference added opportunities and challenges. This year’s registration was 30 percent larger than the 2015 conference, and almost double the registration of just three years ago at our Ottawa meeting. Even when accounting for SHFG participants, this year was still our largest conference thus far. As with last year’s meeting, attendees noticed our growth, especially when session or event rooms became overcrowded. We continue to make adjustments to our arrangements for future meetings in order to account for our growth.

Attendees enjoyed opportunities to connect and network with each other at events like Speed Networking and Dine Arous. This year’s increased registrations presented attendees with more networking possibilities than at previous conferences. Out to Lunch, a new program launched this year, was particularly well-received, and we are hoping to expand it at next year’s conference. Funds set aside for fostering diversity at the annual meeting enabled undergraduate students from Hampton University to attend, the Jewish Museum of Maryland to exhibit, and the Diversity Task Force to hold an “unconference.”

Special events like the National Park Service’s 100th Anniversary Symposium and the public plenary on the 2015 Baltimore uprising were also conference highlights. The NPS Symposium celebrated the agency’s past and considered its future, particularly how it might become more diverse and inclusive in the upcoming years. The public plenary featured local voices on the 2015 Baltimore uprising and the history of racial inequality and protest in Baltimore.

A huge thank you to our Program and Local Arrangements Committees, all of our hardworking volunteers, our sponsors, presenters, and attendees for making the 2016 Annual Meeting memorable and successful!
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The Renaissance Baltimore Harborplace, located in Baltimore’s historic Inner Harbor, served as the conference hotel.

The NCPH Poster Session is always a popular venue for meeting new colleagues and learning about innovative public history projects.

At Friday’s Public Plenary, Devon Wilson-Said speaks about her experiences during Baltimore’s 1968 protests.

Members of the Ft. McHenry Color Guard join the Opening Reception.

Brad Kolodner, Greg Adams, and Ken Kolodner perform at the Banjos in the Museum session on Friday, March 18.
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Call for Proposals

The theme of the next NCPH conference is “The Middle: Where did we come from? Where are we going?” In a society fascinated by extremes, the middle is often undervalued, overlooked, and unstudied. Public historians, however, tend to engage in work that addresses the interests and concerns of the wide-ranging public, not just the select. For public historians, the middle can be a delightful but challenging place.

The 2017 NCPH conference in Indianapolis, itself located near the median center of the U.S., is the ideal location for the diverse public history field to wrestle with the concerns of the middle in interpreting the past.

You can read the full Call for Proposals at http://bit.ly/ncph2017cfp.

Deadline for proposals is July 15, 2016.

During the month of June, you can offer feedback on topic proposals or seek out panels to join by visiting http://ncph.org/public-history-commons/.