Scholarly monograph publishing, despite the many crises it currently faces, is not going away anytime soon -- precisely because the book (stable, reputable, and persistent) is not going away anytime soon. In short, "books endure," and the scholarly systems for developing and supporting them have grown over centuries and cannot easily be dismantled or disentangled. Hence, Mellon’s initiative sought to encourage a range of thinking about this complex topic, to test out what possible options might be to address the economic, incentive, and innovation challenges of publishing monographs.

In an attempt to organize this menagerie of thirteen projects, the authors organized them into four categories according to what the projects were attempting to do in order to address challenges in scholarly monograph publishing: study monograph publishing processes & economics; enhance monograph publishing at university presses; develop digital publishing capacity for faculty; and develop digital capacity at university presses. In analyzing these different projects, they also visually diagrammed the components of each project's approach to the topic and points of particular tension (i.e., where tradition and innovation were likely to conflict with each other).

After detailing the projects' goals and challenges, the authors lay bare the unspoken "givens" that contribute to the complexity of the monograph publishing system and subsequent conflicts in these different approaches. First, they note an inherent assumption in the Mellon initiative: that the university press is a central point of agency in monograph publishing and will always be. They then call out the three overlapping roles of the monograph -- to promote scholarly communication, to advance careers and scholarly status, and to support (recoup the costs of) publishing work -- and the ways in which these do not always align. In considering the projects themselves and their potential impact on monograph publishing, the authors underscore these roles of the monograph (as scholarship, as tool for career advancement, as a press' source of revenue) in admonishing that "any innovation in monograph or monograph-like publication must be considered in terms of all three value cycles."

Quotes:
- "monograph production is complex; it is difficult to reduce cost structures to regular patterns or structural constraints. By far the largest component of costs is staff time, and within that category, the cost of acquisitions is easily the largest share. [...] Why is acquisitions such a large component of the costs of monograph production? It is because here especially each of these three value cycles must be addressed, for the success of the work, the success of the author, and for the success of the press itself."
"a significant allocation of press time and energy goes to the evaluation of manuscripts which are ultimately not published. Such is the business of quality control, which is widely held to be one of university presses' most valuable contributions to scholarly communications."

"A university press serves the scholarly communication cycle by ensuring that high quality works are developed and delivered to libraries. It serves the career advancement cycle by providing a mechanism by which scholarly status can be conferred, one which importantly is independent of the departmental or even institutional context in which the scholar works. And, clearly, a university press operates according to the market-oriented publishing logic from which it was born."

"The scholarly communications cycle and the publishing cycle both seek to put books in libraries and ultimately in readers’ hands; the career advancement cycle is indifferent to readership."

[Quoting Doug Armato, University of Minnesota Press director]: "Scholarship is changing... There’s a trend to libraries having had better conversations with scholars/faculty than presses. How do we make those conversations ‘interoperable’ with presses’ ways of thinking and doing?"

SOCIETY EVALUATION GUIDELINES: AHA, MLA, CAA&SAH
[these are tagged "Read first" in the Zotero library]


In these guidelines, AHA situates itself within the digital scholarship that it has already completed within the field. They provide a broad definition of digital scholarship as "scholarship that is either produced using computational tools and methods or presented using digital technologies," including articles and monographs that use traditional methodologies but are only published online as well as non-traditional publication. Building upon this definition, they encourage all department heads to embrace not only this definition, but also any emerging aspects of digital scholarship. AHA encourages digital scholarship as a way of "expanding what history is," and ideally would create new research questions that were not possible without the advent of technology.

As they state that digital scholarship should be evaluated on the same merit as traditional scholarship, they divide the responsibilities of evaluating these scholarships into three sectors: the responsibility of the departments, of the scholars, and of AHA itself. Of these divisions, the responsibilities for the departments are particularly useful; the AHA recommends to hire more academics who specialize in digital scholarship and also to utilize support already established on campus, especially that of librarians. Moreover, departments should re-write their tenure guidelines to be more accepting of digital scholarship of all mediums, including the collaborative approach that often accompanies digital scholarship and bring in scholars who are versed in digital scholarship in order to write these guidelines.
Quotes:

- "Historians whose expressive and methodological practices differ very little from print-era scholars should carry no special burden for explaining why their work appears in digital form save to provide basic information about practices of peer review, editorial control, and circulation that any scholar might be asked to supply about any publication during an evaluation process."

- "Digital history in various forms often represents a commitment to expanding what history is, and can do, as a field, as well as the audiences that it addresses. Historians who take a strong interest in digital media and information technology, or who choose to work exclusively in digital environments, should be evaluated in terms of their overall ability to use sustained, expressive, substantive, and institutional innovation to advance scholarship. This is a commitment that is scholarly in some instances, pedagogical in others, or represents a collegial commitment to the discipline of history."

- [Responsibilities for department:] They should inform themselves about developments in the digital context of our work. Most colleges and universities have staff in place whose job it is to monitor and promote new technologies. Librarians, in particular, have long been involved in professional conversations regarding new technologies of teaching and scholarship. Many of them will be delighted to hold workshops and address faculty in groups or as individuals.


In this document, the AHA aims to create a specific guideline for university administrators as well as history department chairs to reevaluate tenure guidelines specifically for public history scholars. Throughout the guidelines, AHA highlights the way in which public historians engage pedagogically both with students as well with the surrounding community. As public historians are more likely to do community-engaged work, including curating exhibitions or developing educational programs for community museums, this scholarship should be evaluated and valued with the same value as traditional print scholarship. In this process, the idea of peer review should be broadened to not just academic historians, but also scholars and employees of museums, historic sites, and other avenues of public history. Additionally, as most public historians are expected to cultivate and organize public history programs within their department and work with students through internships and other projects, their role as an administrator should be reflected in their title and be considered when applying for tenure and other promotion and forms of teaching in nontraditional ways, such as internships and community-based class projects should be valued as a form of scholarship. Departments who hire public historians should have transparent tenure and promotion standards and value community engaged projects.

- Publicly engaged projects can bring funding and prestige to departments and fulfill institutional missions. Yet, because tenure and promotion decisions are most often made solely on the basis of published scholarship, many academic historians who may be interested in pursuing publicly oriented projects shy away from such work, fearing that it will not “count” towards career advancement. Therefore, creating equitable ways to assess and
credit publicly engaged and collaborative research will not only benefit public historians; such an effort can encourage all interested scholars to pursue such projects with the confidence that their hard work will be rewarded.

- The American Historical Association’s Statement on Standards of Professional Conduct defines scholarship as a process, not a product, an understanding now common in the profession. The scholarly work of public historians involves the advancement, integration, application, and transformation of knowledge. It differs from “traditional” historical research not in method or in rigor but in the venues in which it is presented and in the collaborative nature of its creation.


This report was the first stage in development regarding AHA’s recommendations to alter tenure and promotion policy for contemporary historians. Similar to the other two articles, AHA focuses on the way in which digital scholars, as well as public historians, create and develop collective, community scholarship, which should be regarded as equally important as individually published scholarship (especially monographs). As more and more history departments are hiring public historians in their department and expect them to manage a significant amount of administrative duties, such as run a public history program or minor within the department as well as serve as advisors or collaborators on student internships and projects thus creating relationships with the outside community, the departments should be contractually obligated to shift their tenure and promotion policies to reflect these new responsibilities. As committees look for scholarship, pedagogy, and service, they should be aware that the public (or digital) historian may have different obligations than a traditional historian. Publicly engaged projects, both digital projects as well as public history projects, often embody the university’s mission, yet many junior scholars shy away from these projects because of the uncertainty of the reward system. Additionally, in the peer review process, it is necessary that committee members are well versed in all areas of the scholarship, such as evaluating community engagement as well as best practices of a historian or being versed in the digital medium. The report concludes with the best practice recommendations, which are as seen in the other two AHA documents.

- It is critical to note that these issues affect not only faculty members in public history—that is, the joint endeavor in which historians and their various publics collaborate in making the past useful to the public—but also those involved in other publicly engaged and collaborative types of scholarship, such as interdisciplinary and digital history projects.
- The scholarly work of public historians involves the advancement, integration, application, and transformation of knowledge. It differs from “traditional” historical research not in method or in rigor but in the venues in which it is presented and in the collaborative nature of its creation. Public history scholarship, like all good historical scholarship, is peer reviewed, but that review includes a broader and more diverse group of peers, many from outside
traditional academic departments, working in museums, historic sites, and other sites of mediation between scholars and the public.


In MLA's guidelines, they highlight the fact that the use of technology is not new to digital humanists, but rather the use of digital technologies to create new research questions and to broaden the idea of the humanities requires rethinking the evaluation of this type of work. They emphasize that departments should have a clear, written set of guidelines so that scholars who engage with digital mediums in both their scholarship or their pedagogy, as well as scholars who work collaboratively on projects have a safety net in terms of promotion and evaluation. In addition to the use of digital technologies for scholarship, the MLA guidelines really emphasize the use of digital tools for pedagogy and service.

MLA also provides individual recommendations for both department heads as well as faculty members when looking at digital scholarship. One of the biggest take aways of the recommendations is that of medium specificity: departments must evaluate the work based upon the medium in which it is presented and not through the lens of traditional print scholarship. In doing this, it is sometimes necessary to bring in experts of the digital field even if they are outside the specific department. Regardless, they do emphasize the fact that faculty members who are creating digital projects need to document and show the importance and influence of their work.

Quotes:

- The pace of technological change makes it impossible for any one set of guidelines to account completely for the ways digital media and the digital humanities are influencing literacies, literatures, and the teaching of modern languages. A general principle nonetheless holds: institutions that recruit or review scholars working in digital media or digital humanities must give full regard to their work when evaluating them for reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

- [For faculty members] Documentation of projects might include examples of success at engaging new audiences; securing internal or external funding, awards, or other professional recognition; and fostering adoption, distribution, or publication of digital works, as well as reviews and citations of the work in print or digital journals. In framing their work, faculty members should be careful to clarify the context and venue of publications, exhibitions, or presentations (e.g., conference proceedings are among the most prestigious publications in computer science, whereas they are generally deemed to be a lesser form of publication in the humanities).

"Guidelines for the Evaluation of Digital Scholarship in Art and Architectural History: College Art Association and the Society of Architectural Historians Task Force to Develop Guidelines for Evaluating Digital Art and Architectural History for Promotion and Tenure." *College Art*
In these guidelines, the CAA and SAH try to outline what rigor and quality would look like in the digital realm in relation to scholars pursuing this type of work. Deviating from MLA and AHA’s guidelines, the CAA and SAH explicitly state that they are not going to discuss open access or fair use of copyrighted materials, illustrating the unique issue of the necessity to use an abundance of images in digital scholarship for art and architectural history. After outlining the acceptable definitions of what a digital project would be, distinguishing from actual digital scholarship to the use of digital technologies in their scholarship (i.e. the use of powerpoint does not make it digital scholarship), the article emphasizes that the digital methodology must be tied to the research question so that the evaluators will be able to see the direct connection of the digital medium and the intellectual research. Scholars carry the burden of explanation for the digital scholarship methodology, but the CAA and SAH do recommend that departments at universities have a set guideline or document outlining acceptable digital scholarship. Additionally, the process of scholarship, including the creation of a database or other digital tool that would be helpful for someone else’s scholarship, should be considered as contribution to scholarship and evaluated accordingly, just as the creation of bibliographic volumes were once considered valuable sources of scholarship.

In addition to the different processes that accompany digital scholarship, there are many different forms of publications that should be equally valued to their print counterparts. Moreover, the guidelines highlight that the scholarship should not be considered "less than" if published on an open access journal instead of the traditional university press; evaluators should consider alternatives to traditional peer review, as well, such as grant application processes, collaborators as peer reviewers, as well as selection into a digital repository. Furthermore, the guidelines urge evaluators to review the scholarship in its native environment and if members of the committee are not comfortable evaluating the technical aspects of the project, to make sure that they bring in other specialists. Scholars who work collaboratively on a project should not be penalized for not producing solo scholarship, but rather they should be evaluated on the impact the project made and the quality of the results. Although it is up to the scholar to elucidate the work contributed by each team member, evaluators should not expect there to be percentages of each member’s time and to remember that collaborative work often produces intellectual growth and therefore usually takes longer than solo scholarship. Finally, deviating from the MLA and AHA’s documents, the CAA and SAH recommends that scholars should provide a preservation plan for their scholarship and should outline this plan for the evaluation committee.

- "Scholars should establish a sustainability plan for their digital scholarship. Development of a plan involves discussions with librarians and preservationists to ensure that there is a clear understanding of what can and should be preserved and to understand file formats that are best for particular pieces of the project, the likelihood of preserving a project in its native format, and alternative formats for differing levels of accessibility." p. 10
Introductory summary of various evaluation articles with subsequent links. Here are a few selected articles from the larger issue:

  - Written in 2012, this article acts as a call to action for the American Historical Association to "appoint a task force to survey the profession as to the place of digital historical scholarship in promotion and tenure and graduate student training and to recommend standards and guidelines for the profession to follow." The result of this collaborative project resulted in AHA's decision to create a Task Force on Digital Scholarship (whose guidelines are summarized in this document above.) Reflecting on AHA's 126th annual conference, it is clear that many historians are engaging in digital projects that promote "interdisciplinary, open, and collaborative scholarship" that are "excellent models of research, pedagogy, and public engagement." Despite these great advances, junior scholars and graduate students face risk to their careers by pursuing digital projects and are deterred by the promotion and tenure process; there is an obvious disconnect between traditional evaluation and new digital methodologies and training. Referencing the American Council of Learned Societies, the authors emphasize that is the duty of senior scholars to ensure that junior scholars risky projects receive adequate evaluation and attention in addition to creating digital projects themselves and reshaping departments in order for graduate students to be trained in these methodologies.
  - As this is a call to action, the authors conclude the article in stating that they hope the AHA will reassess the types of scholarship that is deemed valuable in the field in light of new digital methodologies so that not only are these projects accurately evaluated and valued, but also so that training in digital methods becomes an essential part of a graduate student's education.
  - "Opportunities to publish digital work, or to even have it reviewed are limited."
  - "Therein lies the conundrum: the “digital turn” in the humanities is opening up exciting opportunities for complex digital scholarship, graduate programs are beginning to instruct students in the theories and methods of digital history, and institutions are hiring tenure-line faculty to pursue this new genre of scholarly communication but a concomitant evolution of the customs and standards of valuing and assessing this new model of scholarship has not developed apace."
Fitzpatrick approaches the topic of peer review and evaluation of digital projects from two perspectives: that of a professor who received tenure "on the basis of an all-digital dossier" (196) and that of the current director of scholarly communication at MLA. In this article, Fitzpatrick highlights the problems underlying the practice of peer review that can lead to the misunderstanding of evaluating digital scholarship, especially seen in the tension between "the need to read and evaluate material on its merits and the need for objective, independent material's value" (197). Far too often, Fitzpatrick notes, the desire for objectivity gets in the way of reading colleague's work and a reliance upon "the imprimatur of a prestigious university press, or that of a highly selective peer-reviewed journal" (197) is detrimental to evaluating digital projects as they obviously do not have one. She also emphasizes the openness with which digital scholarship are "advised, reviewed, and commented on by experts in the field," (199) which should be incorporated in the evaluation of the project, especially in terms of tenure and promotion, as the impact of scholarship is an aspect that is always prioritized. In her conclusion, Fitzpatrick suggests that scholars need to stop putting all focus on impartial evaluation, to read their colleagues digital work along with the online discussion and forums that are embedded within the project in addition to the texts.

Nowviskie unpacks the problems of searching for equivalency in digital scholarly publishing projects; in attempting to describe a digital project in terms of monographs or journal publication much of the depth of the project is lost, especially in terms of collaborative authorship when different aspects are being provided such as content versus system infrastructure. In addition to the traditional issues of evaluation and assessment for digital scholarship, Nowviskie outlines the issues regarding not properly giving credit to all who participated on the project beyond just faculty and graduate students. Similar to the AHA's guidelines regarding Public History, there should be a holistic approach to evaluation and assessment, looking beyond just the scholarship that is produced but also the contribution to the field as well as the impact of the digital scholarly project that would lead to a "collective and collaborative knowledge production" (172). Nowviskie advocates for professional organizations to rethink their guidelines to highlight that scholarship does not need to be “zero-sum;” creating collaborative relationships between both scholars as well as information professionals is essential to strengthen research and development relationships. Additionally, Nowviskie looks at INKE, which she describes as a large, institutional, and international effort to create research standards that both provide credit to all members of a project but also remain adaptable to different types of projects.

- "Fair evaluation of collaborative digital scholarship can only function within a complex network of responsibilities. Tenure committees are responsible for educating themselves about collaborative scholarly practices and the nature of digital humanities production, so that they may adequately counsel and fairly evaluate early-career scholars. Scholars who offer their work for evaluation are, in turn, responsible for making an honest assessment of that work and its relation to the intellectual labor of others. Digital humanities practitioners outside the ranks of the tenured and tenure-track faculty have a role to play as well. Their assertion (as professionals subject to different but equally consequential mechanisms of assessment) that credit be given where it is due can hasten the regularization of fair and productive evaluative practices among their academic faculty colleagues." 171

- "Formal and regular acknowledgment of collaboration as part of the ritual of assessment and faculty self-governance is strategically productive for our disciplines, both in its educative function and because it will be deeply consequential for policy and praxis in allied information and knowledge professions. It is reasonable to expect that, over time, the cultural shift signified by increasing standardization of collaborative credit will strengthen research-and-development partnerships." 178


Realizing that university departments are willing to accept digital work as scholarly but are unsure how to begin to evaluate this work, Rockwell outlines the basics of evaluating digital scholarship.
First, Rockwell states that it is absolutely necessary for evaluators to "review the work in the medium in which it was produced," (154) a component of the MLA guidelines. Although scholars who provide a narrative description of their digital project for the evaluating committee is helpful, it is imperative that the evaluators experience the scholarship on the original medium as much of the digital scholarship emphasizes interactivity that cannot be translated into a narrative description. Moreover, concerned with research future--- investment by giving tenure

- Let me start with some definitions. Research, for the purposes of this essay, is the activity that leads to scholarship, which is the outcome that can be shared. 152
- Definition of digital: "What matters is that the work is shared with the community in electronic form and, more important, that it is meant to be experienced in electronic form, usually off a computer screen, though some interactive works are presented as installations without a screen" (153)
- " Evaluators need to consider research activity for digital scholars much as they do for traditional scholars, and that is hard when you don’t have the experience to assess what digital humanists are doing" 153
- "The originality of digital work is difficult to assess when all you have is a description. Digital work is often about processes, interactivity, and interface, and no description (even with screen shots) can do the work justice. Many new media works are experiments in form, and that experimentation is lost in translation. Digital work to be evaluated as an original scholarly contribution needs to assessed in such a way that the originality (or lack thereof) is evident" 155
- "In addition to the problem of assessing new media work, there is the perception that at best digital scholarship is essentially community work, editorial work, or a form of translation and therefore theoretically light. It needs to be said over and over that there is nothing a priori untheoretical about digital work; it is rather a form of potential theory." 160
- "It should be noted that one relevant feature of the digital is that access to information can be logged and measured in ways that were unthinkable before. Viewing statistics are easy to gather for blogs, Web sites, tools, and hypermedia. The statistics we can gather have far more detail than the crude metric of peer-reviewed page counts. While neither page counts nor Web statistics really tell you whether information is having an effect, one can infer a lot more about readers from Google Analytics than one can from sales of a peer-reviewed book." 161
- "I would argue it is the difference in the contributions of computing humanists that, on the one hand, make the contributions so valuable taken one by one and that, on the other, make them so hard to classify as scholarship comparable to what other colleagues do. Digital research works resist classification and comparison in so many ways, and that is often their value. This is a period of experimentation with scholarly form, and some of the most useful work will not look like anything else that we recognize as scholarly. " 165
- "In sum, few digital research contributions can be assessed the way print contributions can, but we can develop a culture of assessment that includes conversations that are in the tradition of the humanities." 166


In this article, Bartanen argues that liberal arts campuses are in a unique position to be leaders for the evaluation of digital scholarship as they are already adept at evaluating faculty for their multi-purpose scholarship as their evaluation processes extend beyond scholarly output. For example, liberal arts schools evaluate faculty on their pedagogy and service to the discipline, which could include mentoring undergraduate research which produces multi-authored scholarship, as well as the way in which "community based teaching and civic scholarship" already blend the lines of traditional evaluation. These considerations are similar to the way in which digital scholarship can be evaluated in terms of multi-authorship, especially, publishing without the same page-limits and university press label, and finally the way that digital scholarship can be described as community engagement. Through this process, it is necessary to rethink peer review and scholarly authority beyond traditional notions and to understand these terms in a wider reaching scope so that digital projects can better fit into these evaluation schemes.

In addition to these observations, Bartanen compiled research tables regarding "Digital Scholarship Activity among Annapolis Group and NITLE member Institutions," "Digital Scholarship Activity among selected consortia," and finally "Chart of key components to support guideline development." She also includes the section of "How to Evaluate Digital Scholarship" from Lunenfeld, Peter et. al's book *Digital_Humanities* [summarized later in this document] and a sample addendum for evaluating digital scholarship which could be useful as a concrete example.

- They are blurring traditional boundaries of teaching, scholarship, and service, and they are engaged in interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, and transdisciplinary work. In order to support and reward appropriately such scholarship, evaluators need guidance on how to assess such boundary-crossing work and on what standards account for the scholarly work involved in learning or building new technological tools and archival resources, in analyzing and curating “big data,” as well as in using new tools and resources to extend scholarly arguments and create new knowledge.

- **[Information regarding Bartanen’s data]** To gain some indication of the degree to which, particularly at liberal arts colleges, faculty members are engaged in digital scholarship, this project included review of two selected membership groups: NITLE members and Annapolis Group institutions. A web survey used institutional home page search boxes to identify “digital scholarship”(DS) or “digital humanities” (DH) endeavors, with activity “counted” if the institution (1) had a dedicated DS/DH website, (2) participated in a consortia-level DS/DH program, (3) listed at least one faculty member with DH as a research interest or area of expertise, (4) offered at least one course with “digital humanities” in the title, (5) hosted a THATCamp[12], or (6) had been awarded a grant to fund DS/DH activities. Results are contained in Table 1 and Table 2 and suggest that faculty involvement in digital scholarship is and will be growing in the years ahead. Yet a web search of the 27 institutions listed in
Table 1 did not result in finding any evaluation, promotion, or tenure policies specific to digital humanities or digital scholarship.


The authors clearly articulate that their intended audience of this section is for academic review committees, chairs, deans, and provosts who are struggling with their evaluation of digital scholarship. There are many overlaps with society guidelines, including evaluating the scholarship in the medium in which it was published as well as the idea that authors should indicate their contribution to collaborative projects but it is not necessary for them to create an in-depth, itemized list of each individual contribution. Moreover, although digital projects can look different than traditional print scholarship, it does not diminish the scholarly rigor of the project; all aspects of the digital project should be evaluated equally, meaning that scholarly knowledge goes beyond content production and must include the design of the interface, the database, and the code that goes into the project. Moreover, review committees should be cognizant of the broad reaching approach of digital projects beyond research and including pedagogy as well as service to the field; digital projects are more than just “tools” for pedagogy and/or service, but also contributions to the field and development of knowledge. Peer review must be rethought to include "online forums, citations, and discussions in scholarly venues, by grants received through foundations and other sources of funding, and through public presentations of the project at conferences and symposia" (129). Moreover, the authors advocate that it is somewhat useless to search for equivalence in traditional scholarship to that of digital projects and instead should assess the quality and impact of the work through "the quality and quantity of the research that contributed to the project; the length of time spend and the kind of intellectual investment of the creators and the contributors; the range, depth, and forms of the content types and the ways in which this content is presented; and the nature of the authorship and publication process" (128). Moreover, as academic review cycles are usually a few years apart whereas digital projects undergo more routine review processes, reviewers should be cognizant of the current state of the project as well as the considerations of the scholars's future developments. The authors conclude their section in stating that “experimentation and risk-taking in scholarship represent the best of what the university, in all its many disciplines, has to offer society” (128) and that it is absolutely necessary to adapt to the changing landscape of scholarship and reward scholars, not punish them, for doing this type of work.

- "It is important for review committees to recognize that new knowledge is not just new content but also new ways of organizing, classifying, and interacting with content” 128
- "Digital projects almost always have multiple applications and uses that enhance research, teaching, and service. Digital research projects can make transformative contributions in the classroom and sometimes even have an impact on the public-at-large. This ripple effect should not be diminished. Review committees need to be attentive to colleagues who dismiss the research contributions of digital work by cavalierly characterizing it as a mere 'tool' for teaching or service. Tools shape knowledge, and knowledge shapes tools." 128
• "Digital projects can have an impact on numerous fields in the academy as well as across institutions and even the general public. They often cross the divide that arises among research, teaching, and service in innovative ways. Impact can be measured in many ways, including the following: support by granting agencies or foundations, number of viewers or contributors to a site and what they contribute, citations in both traditional literature and online (blogs, social media, links, and trackbacks), use or adoption of the project by other scholars and institutions, conferences and symposia featuring the project, and resonance in public and community outreach (such as museum exhibitions, public policy impact, adoption in curricula, and so forth)" 129

• "Digital projects may raise critical ethical issues about the nature and value of cultural preservation, public history, participatory culture and accessibility, digital diversity, and collection curation which should be thoughtfully considered by project leaders and review committees." 129

• "To treat scholarship that takes of risk and the challenge of experimentations as an activity of secondary (or no) value for promotion and advancement can only serve to reduce innovation, reward mediocrity, and retard the development of research” 129


Reflecting on a meeting at UNC to discuss tenure and promotional policies, Shaw advocates that digital scholarship should not be expected to "speak for itself." In comparing digital scholarship to code, which Shaw states is often freely published and usually accompanied by a technical report, some people at the meeting believed that this is too much work (creating both a product as well as an article) and follows of past digital humanities work of having to justify the project itself. Shaw criticizes this idea, though, stating that "the suggestion that digital scholarship should have reached a level where it can “stand on its own” implies that such a level exists, and the traditional book or article are already on it" which is "naive." Instead of thinking of these projects as scholarship or expressive media, Shaw finds it better to frame these projects as technologies, which distinguishes between invention and innovation, and argues that scholarly communication can use traditional forms and adapt it in a new way.

• My point was that we needn’t view the problem of how to evaluate non-traditional forms of scholarly work as one that “consumers” (such as tenure and promotion committees) must solve alone. We can also help “producers” find ways to make their products more easily consumable.

• If we view new forms of scholarly work as technologies, it becomes clear that having them “stand alone” is precisely what we do not want to do. Inventions that stand alone wither and die. What we need is more focus on innovation and less on invention.

• In the specific case of scholarly communication, that infrastructure includes libraries, funding agencies, and even the villainous publishers. Taking advantage of it requires recognizing how finely adapted many of our traditional tools are to the networks in which they function, and finding ways to emulate that, even if we are accused of pouring new wine into old bottles.
Reflecting on her time as Vice Provost for Interdisciplinary Studies at Duke, Cathy Davidson argues for a rethinking of tenure review. Davidson states that she is a stark defender of the idea of tenure but that the strict requirement of publishing one monograph to demonstrate commitment to the field is restricting and needs to be rethought so that younger scholars are able to pursue other projects, especially when thinking about interdisciplinary scholarship. During her time as vice provost, she states that scholars who claimed that their work was interdisciplinary would receive high marks from their home department but their interdepartmental colleagues would claim that their work is not innovative enough. In light of this, Davidson suggested a small change to the Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure process: deans and chairs have the responsibility of ensuring that any scholar that claims for interdisciplinary work has a separate mechanism by which it is judged and it is up to the dean and chairs to decide which works best. After making this dictate, Davidson found that this more rigorous method helped because many times members of the discipline were unaware of what is impactful or innovative in the interdisciplinary field. She applies this example to the greater idea of tenure and promotion: structural mechanisms need to change in order to fully evaluate non-traditional scholarship. In order to protect tenure, it is necessary to make structural changes that do not stifle the intellectual growth of young scholars.

- In the end, I suspect that changing tenure rules really will mean finding structural mechanisms by which, at any university and in any field, one can evaluate "contribution to the field," structural mechanisms by which we can determine collectively whether a scholar measures up reputationally, in quantity and quality, to the standards of those peers within the scholars' main area of expertise.

- Awarding tenure is making a best professional bet on which people are most likely to contribute to our vitality for a lifetime. Is a one-size-fits all requirement the best way to do that?

In this document, the AHA aims to create a specific guideline for university administrators as well as history department chairs to reevaluate tenure guidelines specifically for public history scholars. Throughout the guidelines, AHA highlights the way in which public historians engage pedagogically both with students as well with the surrounding community. As public historians are more likely to do community-engaged work, including curating exhibitions or developing educational programs for community museums, this scholarship should be evaluated and valued with the same value as traditional print scholarship. In this process, the idea of peer review should be broadened to not just academic historians, but also scholars and employees of museums, historic sites, and other
avenues of public history. Additionally, as most public historians are expected to cultivate and organize public history programs within their department and work with students through internships and other projects, their role as an administrator should be reflected in their title and be considered when applying for tenure and other promotion and forms of teaching in nontraditional ways, such as internships and community-based class projects should be valued as a form of scholarship. Departments who hire public historians should have transparent tenure and promotion standards and value community engaged projects.

- Publicly engaged projects can bring funding and prestige to departments and fulfill institutional missions. Yet, because tenure and promotion decisions are most often made solely on the basis of published scholarship, many academic historians who may be interested in pursuing publicly oriented projects shy away from such work, fearing that it will not “count” towards career advancement. Therefore, creating equitable ways to assess and credit publicly engaged and collaborative research will not only benefit public historians; such an effort can encourage all interested scholars to pursue such projects with the confidence that their hard work will be rewarded.
- The American Historical Association’s Statement on Standards of Professional Conduct defines scholarship as a process, not a product, an understanding now common in the profession. The scholarly work of public historians involves the advancement, integration, application, and transformation of knowledge. It differs from “traditional” historical research not in method or in rigor but in the venues in which it is presented and in the collaborative nature of its creation.


In this article, Ball discusses her role as both the editor of Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy as well as a teacher of multimedia scholarship. Kairos, an online scholarly publication, focuses on multi-media based scholarship, requiring scholars to utilize other mediums than print to support their argument, including "interactivity, digital media, and different argumentation strategies, such as visual juxtaposition and associational logic" and they cannot be printed because they contain ephemeral elements such as animations, videos, web links, audio clips, and other elements that cannot be conveyed in print (62). Bell emphasizes that form and content are inseparable and highlights the fact that arguments can be made stronger by different mediums. She also provided different evaluation tools for students to evaluate other multimedia scholarship. While this article proposes relevant evaluation tools, it is focused on teaching students multimedia scholarship and not extremely useful in terms of larger issues of evaluation for digital projects.

- As Kress (2010) has said, “Design is the servant of rhetoric—or, to put it differently: the political and social interests of the rhetor are the generative origin and shaping influence for the semiotic arrangements of the designer” (p. 50), which, in Delagrange’s case, means she has purposefully arranged the webtext’s multimodal, semiotic elements to serve the political
and social interests of her argument. Further, she accomplished this task with the aid of peer reviewers and editors, and the piece has been published in a venue respected for scholarly multimedia, so we as readers should assume that each design element belongs, is purposeful, and works to make an argument 62


In these guidelines, UVA takes the five core elements of evaluating traditional scholarship and then 'translates' them when one would be evaluating digital scholarship. They cite the MLA’s guidelines (summarized at the top of the document) as one of the main sources of reference.

1. Reading and judging the work,
   1. Digital alternative: read the work in the medium in which it was published
2. Looking to outside experts in the same area for their assessment of the work,
   1. Digital alternative: Take into account "unsolicited comments," such as observations by colleagues made in the "comment forms" of digital works
3. Taking note of the work’s formal peer review, from book and journal editors,
   1. Digital alternative: One of the most difficult, including citation, to evaluate; although some projects create their own editorial board, "it is not clear that an invited editorial board provides an equivalent to independent peer review"
4. Considering citation of the research in the field at large, and
   1. Digital alternative: Citations can be interpreted as adopted by another website, endorsed, or linked to any "library-based subject-collections of webs resources, scholarly association, and/or colleges and universities."
5. Sometimes, considering the impact that this work has had on the general public.
   1. Digital alternative: How many people visit the site


In this inaugural blog post series regarding digital scholarship, Mills notes the difficulties in creating a set standardization for evaluating digital scholarship, especially because evaluation for teaching, service, and research varies greatly from department to department in addition to university and university. She advocates for rethinking our idea of the correlation of tenure review with prestigious journals and presses to tenure review to be more encompassing of digital scholarship.

More blog posts in this series... Read more?
Writing this just before MLA's annual conference in which it released its guidelines regarding digital scholarship and promotion and tenure, Kolowich provides a 'state of the union' in regards to the discussion of digital scholarship in the field. He offers short quotes from the series of essays that the MLA's journal *Profession* published prior to the conference (summarized elsewhere in these notes).

- "And so the classic criticism of academic humanities — that they spend more time navel-gazing than solving tangible problems — turns out to be applicable to how academic departments have approached the problem of how to account for the merits of those who do the majority of their writing in the post-postmodern language of computer programmers and network architects."

---


- **Intro:**
  - academic publishing- insupportable economic model 3
  - consortial arrangements for libraries have ben an extreme negative affect for publishers
  - scholarly monograph "undead" 4
  - if the monograph was truly dead would be forced to find a different venue to publish 5
  - "It's thus important for us to consider the work that the book is and isn't doing for us; the ways that it remains vibrant and vital; and the ways that it has become undead, haunting the living from beyond the grave" 5
  - "The obsolescence faced by the first academic book is not primarily material, any more than is the putative obsolescence of the novel; a radical shift to all-digital delivery would by itself do nothing to revive the form."  5
  - "Without such active work to preserve electronic texts, and without the ongoing interest of an commitment by publishers, many digital texts face an obsolescence that is not at all theoretical, but very material" 6
  - obsolescence of scholarly monograph comes from the institution not the mechanics
  - general argument- decenter the monograph as the "gold standard" 7

---

This chapter is the introduction to a volume devoted to the theme of evaluation of digital project. It provides some historical background and helps to situate the discussion. In particular, it gives some insights on the debate about the strength and limitations of the digital publication compared to the traditional forms of publications. The authors point out that: "the increasing interest in digital media in the academic world has coincided with the growing “crisis in scholarly publishing,” in which the infrastructure has been stressed by economic forces to the point of breaking," (124). This article seems to suggest that (at the time the article was written) there were different approaches to the problem of the relationships between digital publishing and traditional publishing. For example, according to a report created by the Association of University Press (AAUP) in (?), digital publishing is an unreliable tool to disseminate ideas compared with the traditional form of peer-reviewed literature. The reason of this phenomena is mostly economic: the high expanses involved in the traditional publishing encourage the maintaining of high quality standards of the published products. However, as this conclusion is contradicted by the fundings of a paper sponsored by the Mellon Foundation in the March of 2011. According to this study: “over-reliance on publisher imprimatur has led to the ‘outsourcing’ of peer review by linking the quality, relevance, and likely impact of a piece of work to the symbolic brand of its publisher . . .” Schreibman, Mandel and Olsen, in this article keep the distance from the position taken by the AAUP’s report and they say to be in favor of a more optimistic approach to digital publishing. An approach that (according to them) characterizes documents such as:

- The Wiki created by the MLA Committee on Information Technology (CIT) in 2008 to provide guidelines framework for departments to evaluate digital scholarship ( a framework inspired by the work of Geoffrey Rockwell) .

In spite of its optimistic approach to digital scholarship, this article doesn't deny that we are still far from developing clear guidelines for digital publications. In order to fill this gap, the authors organized in 2009 a workshop at the 2009 MLA convention in Philadelphia. Given that most of the time the members of a tenure committee are not experts of digital humanities, the goal of the this workshop was to mainly "to obtain feedback on the difficulties nonspecialists encountered in the evaluation process of digital projects" (127).

According to the results of this workshop, the factors that prevent the departments from embracing digital publishing as a legit form of publication are:
1. The evolving definitions of scholarship in language and literature over the past fifty years, in particular the rise of criticism as the dominant mode of scholarship
2. The discounting of scholarly activities like textual editing, bibliography, and translation and the mislabeling of much digital scholarship as service (Sehat and Farr; McGann, “Note” and Online Humanities Scholarship; Gabler)
3. The ongoing crisis in scholarly book publishing
4. The low status of collaborative scholarship

Expanding on their experience in this workshop, the authors notice that it was quite difficult for not experts to grasp the values of digital for two reasons: first of all, the technical language was perceived as jargon. Also not-experts can’t see "how technical decisions are theoretically informed and constitute research-supported argumentation" (p.127)


According to this article is that Peer Review process is overestimated in the academic environment. The role of peer review is important but it is not the only tool used for setting quality standards. By analyzing the world of the digital publishing the article shows that an important role is played by the figure of the editor.

The editor is in charge of being aware of the most recent developments in a discipline and to select valuable works. Their role in shaping a field is often underestimated. The article pointed out that unlike peer-reviewers, editors have high incentive in keeping very high standards because their are directly responsible of the success or failure of a publishing company.


This post is a "open Letter to the Promotion and Tenure Committee at Texas A&M University, Department of English" written by Laura Mandel, who is professor at this department. [Laura Mandel](http://idhmcmain.tamu.edu/commentpress/promotion-and-tenure/) is an expert in digital humanities and author of a book entitled: Breaking the Book: Print Humanities in the Digital Age ( 2015) "is a manifesto on the cognitive consequences and emotional effects of human interactions with physical books that reveals why the traditional humanities disciplines are resistant to ‘digital’ humanities").

The goal of this post is to provide some guidelines for evaluating digital scholarship. The post is divided in two parts.

A) In the first part, the authors makes a list of different tools available to a committee for assessing the values of a digital project. She lists:

- Journals (Ex. Praxis): the author points out that considering print journals more reliable is an out-to-date approach to the problem. More useful it is to consider the ranking of the journal.
- Databases and Institutions such as NINES
- Evidences of prices and awards ( not necessary specific to digital publishing)
B) In the second part of the post, Mandel provides a taxonomy of different kinds of digital projects. This taxonomy includes:

a) digital editions: This category often includes works that are not necessarily cutting edge but still useful to the community. Mandel points out that the value of digital project is to convey content in a way that it is supposed to be different from a print object. However, she also recognizes that sometimes the digital medium allows to publish works can't be printed because of economic constraints. The guidelines here could be similar (but not identical) to the guidelines used for evaluating print editions.

b) databases/digital archives: this category includes different form of "curation", that means the practice of selecting and organizing sources. Mandel points out that these curated archives/database while different from a monographs still need to be considered as forms of research: "Whereas in the case of the monograph, this "filtering" [of sources] is done for the sake of making one particular argument, in the case of curating textual data in online research environments involves making possible a number of arguments, all of them nonetheless theoretically inflected by what has been brought into the limelight and relegated to obscurity." Therefore, when judging these project we should consider them as platform that allows multiple users to collaborate and to develops multiple approach to a problem. As an example, Mandel uses http://www.hypercities.com/

c) Softwares: According to Mandel, softwares should count for tenure and promotions because they are tools design to interrogate specific issues that caracterize a discipline. "We have here digital humanities research buttressed by careful theorizing, software that counts as research precisely insofar as enacts humanities principles." The example used by Mandel is Voyant.


This document is divided in two sections. In the first part, it summarizes the conclusions of others professional guidelines while in the second part it offers some criteria that should help faculties in producing the documentation for the tenure promotion.

As I said, this document doesn't offer original material but it summarizes the conclusions of other resources, in particular: "Guidelines for the Evaluation of Digital Scholarship in Art and Architectural History", “Guidelines for Evaluating Work in Digital Humanities and Digital Media”, “Guidelines for the Professional Evaluation of Digital Scholarship in History” and “Tenure, Promotion, and the Publicly Engaged Academic Historian: A Report". According to the authors of this documents, these are some recurrent themes in this literature:

- "All of the professional association guidelines indicate that faculty engaged in digital humanities scholarship need to be evaluated both rigorously and fairly". In this case, "fair" means that the reviewers need to be competent.
- the evaluation need to take into account the multimodal dimension of the artifacts ( the article use the term "form" qualified as "spatial, interactive, and networked".

- the collaboration is a crucial dimension of this project: "Consequently, tenure and promotion candidates must communicate the collaborative nature of the work to the tenure and promotion committees must make clear their individual contributions to the team enterprise."
- digital scholarship is an important topic especially at a time of uncertainty for the monograph.

In terms of criteria, the candidate should be able to articulate the role played by the digital project in their research agenda. (The importance of digital projects for pedagogy is mentioned but not develop). These are the types of evidences that the candidates should include in their folder:
- "Peer review of competitive national grant applications"
- evidences of impact: "citations in other scholars' works; unique users coming to the site; links from other reputable sites, etc."
- application of international standards (ex: Text Encoding Initiative guidelines, Encoded Archival Description [EAD], Linked Open Data [LOD, Resource Description Framework [RDF]])
- evidences of collaboration with other projects at other institutions
- evidences of "best practices in design and implementation"
- evidences of best practices for sustainability
- "Compatibility between design, content, and medium."


An interesting reflection on the definition of scholarship that can be still relevant today. This article laments that a too narrow interpretation of scholarship dominates History as a field: "Almost all colleges pay lip service to the trilogy of teaching, research, and service, but when it comes to making judgments about professional performance, the three rarely are assigned equal merit." The tendency of considering the monograph as the most important component in the CV is consistent with this very traditional vision of scholarship. The goal of this article is to propose a more capacious and cohering interpretation. The proposed framework is based on an essay by Eugene Rice entitled: "The New American Scholar: Scholarship and the Purposes of the University". According to Rice, we should substitute the trilogy of research, service, and teaching with a new one characterized by four related components (I quote from the article):

- The advancement of knowledge--essentially original research
- The integration of knowledge--synthesizing and reintegrating knowledge, revealing new patterns of meaning and new relationships between the parts and the whole
- The application of knowledge--professional practice directly related to an individual's scholarly specialization
- The transformation of knowledge through teaching--including pedagogical content knowledge and discipline-specific educational theory

The second part of the articles illustrates how this framework can be used for categorize different forms of scholarship that are devaluated or simply invisible (ex: translation, creation of bibliographies and databases etc.)
“New Criteria for New Media.”
Promotion and Tenure Guidelines Addendum: Rationale for Redefined Criteria

This is a document written by members of the new Media Department of the University of Maine. The goal of the document is to "summarize some of the key areas in which new media research departs from traditional academic scholarship, with the aim of providing a rationale for specific criteria for promotion and tenure detailed elsewhere". According to the authors, traditional peer-reviewed journals are insufficient tools to assess the performance of scholars active in a particularly dynamic area as new media. Therefore, they provide a list of measures of recognition that "should be prioritized in the evaluation of new media research candidates":

1. "Invited / edited publications": invitations to collaboration in edited work should count as valuable as publication in peer-reviewed journals
2. Participation in "live conferences" (both face-to-face and virtual)
3. Citations on printed material or websites (this include also citation on syllabi and other pedagogical document. On this regard, they make an interesting point: "In the sciences, readings or projects cited on a syllabus are likely to be popular textbooks, but in an emerging field like new media, such recognition is a more valid marker of relevance."
4. "Download/visitor counts"
5. "Impact in online discussion"
6. "Impact in the real world": measured by looking at journalistic genre (magazine columns and newspaper editorial but also by "counting Google search return".
7. "Net-native recognition metrics": these are the form of evaluations created in the context of an online community
8. "Reference Letters"


This is a blog post written by Shannon Christine Mattern, who is professor of School of Media Studies at The New School in New York. The Blog is meant to provide guidelines for students' digital works. However, the criteria presented can be also used more in general to assess digital projects produced by scholars. In her contribution Mattern creatively summarizes the conclusions presented in her bibliography. In particular, she quotes:
These are the criteria:
- **Concept:** "Is there a strong thesis or argument at the core of this project?"
- **Concept/Content driven Design:** Does the project’s form suit its concept and content? “Do structural and formal elements of the project reinforce the conceptual core in a productive way?”
- **Documentation and transparent, collaborative development:** Do project creators practice self-reflexivity? Do they “account for the authorial understanding of the production choices made in constructing the project?”
- **Academic Integrity & Openness:** "Does the project evidence sound scholarship, which upholds all the traditional codes of academic integrity? Does it credit sources where appropriate, and, if possible, link out to those sources? Does it acknowledge precedents and sources of conceptual or technical inspiration?"
- **Review & Critique:** “Have there been any expert consultations? Has this been shown to others for expert opinion?”


Very short blog in which Davidson circulates some links that deals with the process of getting tenure for digital humanists:
http://think.usc.edu/2012/04/02/reseach-on-the-digital-frontier/
http://institutes.nines.org/docs/
http://www.mla.org/docs/toc/prof/2011/1
http://www.mla.org/guidelines_evaluation_digital
http://hastac.org/documents/evaluating-digital-scholarship
http://cdrh.unl.edu/articles/eval_digital_scholar.php
http://jasonheppler.org/2012/06/06/aha-forming-a-task-force-on-digital-s...


This article is an exploratory research about the new role of the library as publisher. In this article, the concept of "publishing" is very broad and it includes different genera of publications (from books to gray literature and documents in a repository) ["The boundary between activities that merit the name publishing and less formal and coherent enterprises is fluid and contestable" p. 9]. The sources of the article are both a review of the literature on this topic and survey sent to 150 libraries in 2015. The main point of the article, is that in spite of budget cuts and economic bottlenecks, many libraries are more and more playing an important role as publishers. This happens for two main reasons:

A) Library are at the center of multiple other services that facilitate this new role:

"One important reason for the localization of some new publishing-type initiatives in libraries is synergy and contiguousness" [p.7] and then quoting a 2008 study of Carla Hahn: "Library publishing services are part of a range of new kinds of services libraries have developed or are developing. There appears to be no dominant sequence of service evolution, but publishing services are co-managed and often integrated with a range of new services such as digitization initiatives, digital..."
humanities initiatives, digital repository deployment, development of learning objects, digital preservation activities" [p. 7]

B) by definition, Libraries have a strong connections with academics who are the primary audience of academic publications.

The article explores different examples of publishing Library [p.10] and initiatives. However, it warns that: "The most striking discovery in our study is that we have not detected any pattern showing which organizational structures are more effective than others" [p.18].

The article could be used in the introduction of our studies to provide some background around the role of the library of the publisher and as organization that provides services for digital publication.


This is series of blogs written by Amanda Visconti who is managing director of the Scholar's Lab digital humanities center at the University of Virginia Library. This series builds upon her Master dissertation and her PhD dissertation: both focus on DH user testing. The first blog introduces the distinction between "Use" and "Usability" and "Usefulness". Usability is the use of the website as intended by the author ( "Can your site be used as you intend?"). "Use" defines how reader use your site for their own interest ( "How are people using your site--as intended, or for other ends?"). "Usefulness" asks the question :"If your site can be used as intended (usability), is it actually helping the people you’re looking to serve?". In the Blog, the author gives suggestion on how to measure these three facets. The second blog, she speaks more about the audiences pointing out that scholars can't be considered the only audience. She refers to her dissertation in which she mostly focuses on the amateur reader defined as : " amateurs" in the old sense of people whose pursuits aren't undertaken in a professional role, but are followed with passion, competence, and curiosity--the humanist geek latent in all of us". She gives some examples of strategies used by DH projects to engage this kind of readers ("tours and introductions", " tools for" making meaningful serendipitous discovery within a set of objects", "focused teaching tools and exercises that help the reader learn to think like a scholar in your field"). The third blog provides some bibliography. In the fourth blog, she summarizes what she already said providing some further insights. She encourages the development of user studies in the three areas that she already identify ("usability", "usefulness", "use").

1. "digital humanists can test the structure of a digital text, examining the system that delivers resources to the user; this involves a usability approach that follows users in their functional interactions with a site's interface."
2. "digital humanists can identify the value of a digital text's content by looking at the usefulness of the content to the scholar".
3. Third, digital humanists can identify the value of a digital text's content by looking at an audience's use of a digital text; such a study would look at user behavior, assessing what users are trying to do with a site and how they go about doing it.

In this last question she also repeats how important is to focus on not academic audiences: "digital humanists must assess not the quality of the digital text as an idealized resource, but its value when accessed by real scholars on a daily basis. Being so closely tied to a digital texts'
development, scholar users of a digital text can quickly voice any issues with the project they are using; amateur users cannot similarly voice their needs.


The report stems from a collaboration between Laura Brown, "the former president of Oxford University Press USA, and Ithaka’s Strategic Services group". The goal of the study is to investigate how Universities engage in different forms of publishing practices and to propose recommendations to improve the role of Universities in this field. This is a qualitative study on a survey and on interviews with three groups of people: administrators, librarians and directors of University Presses. The main finding is that the administration, libraries and University are most of the time incapable of coordinating their efforts. Administrators consider University Press as peripheral entities while University Presses "have become disconnected from their own university’s mission" [17]. Particularly interesting is the passage about the relationship between Libraries and University Presses. Libraries have been really active in promoting different forms of new services meant to foster intellectual productions and disseminations of idea. However, their role has a limited impact beyond the campus: "Libraries provide tools and infrastructure to support new forms of informal publishing, but these tend to be inward focused (toward the home institution) rather than externally focused (towards the best scholarship in a given discipline), limiting their appeal to users." [16]. Repositories are an example of these limitations: "Institutional repositories so far tend to look like “attics” (and often fairly empty ones), with random assortments of content of questionable importance. Attempts by librarians to create new online resources by digitizing special collections often fail to take into consideration the potential market for those materials or what is really needed." [16]. While librarians would benefit from taking advantage of the skills in marketing that members of the university press have, University presses could use the repository as platforms for lunching their products: "Looking ahead, presses and libraries should work together to build publishing environments and develop skill sets that enable the creation and dissemination of innovative types of scholarly products and tools now beginning to breed in the electronic environment. These new virtual laboratories – created on campus and built together by libraries, presses, and faculty – can assemble and interlink a variety of content types, from traditional peer-reviewed formats such as monographs, journals, and reference works, to conference proceedings, newsletters, wikis, subject matter repositories, preprints, interdisciplinary centers, large primary source collections, gray literature, datafiles, multimedia products, and other new and hybrid formats" [30]

Quotation that summarizes the main idea/recommendation of the report:
"In our discussions we found strong interest in the notion of creating a third party entity to catalyze and lead these changes. This entity could provide some combination of the following elements: first and foremost, a technology platform and a competitive business model for putting current and legacy content online; market research to identify what new products are needed, how to build them, and how to reach new markets; marketing capabilities for reaching these new markets; business development capabilities; and strategic consulting to translate these opportunities into practical options for individual institutions. This entity could act as a partner for library and press directors
in helping them put forward a compelling vision to their university leadership, helping them develop plans of action, and could provide the shared electronic space in which to implement these plans."


ms we've selected to read in the Zotero library (called “Mellon Project Team - Expansive DH Publishing”), provide the following:

- citation (Chicago style, Author-Date)
- brief (1-2 paragraph) abstract that summarizes why the item is relevant for including in this study (e.g., specific connection to topic, key takeaways)
- 2-3 quotes (if there are relevant quotes), cited in Chicago Style

RESOURCE ALLOCATION


Scholarly monograph publishing, despite the many crises it currently faces, is not going away anytime soon -- precisely because the book (stable, reputable, and persistent) is not going away anytime soon. In short, "books endure," and the scholarly systems for developing and supporting
them have grown over centuries and cannot easily be dismantled or disentangled. Hence, Mellon’s initiative sought to encourage a range of thinking about this complex topic, to test out what possible options might be to address the economic, incentive, and innovation challenges of publishing monographs.

In an attempt to organize this menagerie of thirteen projects, the authors organized them into four categories according to what the projects were attempting to do in order to address challenges in scholarly monograph publishing: study monograph publishing processes & economics; enhance monograph publishing at university presses; develop digital publishing capacity for faculty; and develop digital capacity at university presses. In analyzing these different projects, they also visually diagrammed the components of each project's approach to the topic and points of particular tension (i.e., where tradition and innovation were likely to conflict with each other).

After detailing the projects' goals and challenges, the authors lay bare the unspoken "givens" that contribute to the complexity of the monograph publishing system and subsequent conflicts in these different approaches. First, they note an inherent assumption in the Mellon initiative: that the university press is a central point of agency in monograph publishing and will always be. They then call out the three overlapping roles of the monograph -- to promote scholarly communication, to advance careers and scholarly status, and to support (recoup the costs of) publishing work -- and the ways in which these do not always align. In considering the projects themselves and their potential impact on monograph publishing, the authors underscore these roles of the monograph (as scholarship, as tool for career advancement, as a press' source of revenue) in admonishing that "any innovation in monograph or monograph-like publication must be considered in terms of all three value cycles."

Quotes:

- "monograph production is complex; it is difficult to reduce cost structures to regular patterns or structural constraints. By far the largest component of costs is staff time, and within that category, the cost of acquisitions is easily the largest share. [...] Why is acquisitions such a large component of the costs of monograph production? It is because here especially each of these three value cycles must be addressed, for the success of the work, the success of the author, and for the success of the press itself."

- "a significant allocation of press time and energy goes to the evaluation of manuscripts which are ultimately not published. Such is the business of quality control, which is widely held to be one of university presses' most valuable contributions to scholarly communications."

- "A university press serves the scholarly communication cycle by ensuring that high quality works are developed and delivered to libraries. It serves the career advancement cycle by providing a mechanism by which scholarly status can be conferred, one which importantly is independent of the departmental or even institutional context in which the scholar works. And, clearly, a university press operates according to the market-oriented publishing logic from which it was born."

- "The scholarly communications cycle and the publishing cycle both seek to put books in libraries and ultimately in readers' hands; the career advancement cycle is indifferent to readership."
[Quoting Doug Armato, University of Minnesota Press director]: "Scholarship is changing... There's a trend to libraries having had better conversations with scholars/faculty than presses. How do we make those conversations 'interoperable' with presses' ways of thinking and doing?"

SOCIETY EVALUATION GUIDELINES: AHA, MLA, CAA&SAH
[these are tagged "Read first" in the Zotero library]


In these guidelines, AHA situates itself within the digital scholarship that it has already completed within the field. They provide a broad definition of digital scholarship as "scholarship that is either produced using computational tools and methods or presented using digital technologies," including articles and monographs that use traditional methodologies but are only published online as well as non-traditional publication. Building upon this definition, they encourage all department heads to embrace not only this definition, but also any emerging aspects of digital scholarship. AHA encourages digital scholarship as a way of "expanding what history is," and ideally would create new research questions that were not possible without the advent of technology.

As they state that digital scholarship should be evaluated on the same merit as traditional scholarship, they divide the responsibilities of evaluating these scholarships into three sectors: the responsibility of the departments, of the scholars, and of AHA itself. Of these divisions, the responsibilities for the departments are particularly useful; the AHA recommends to hire more academics who specialize in digital scholarship and also to utilize support already established on campus, especially that of librarians. Moreover, departments should re-write their tenure guidelines to be more accepting of digital scholarship of all mediums, including the collaborative approach that often accompanies digital scholarship and bring in scholars who are versed in digital scholarship in order to write these guidelines.

Quotes:

● "Historians whose expressive and methodological practices differ very little from print-era scholars should carry no special burden for explaining why their work appears in digital form save to provide basic information about practices of peer review, editorial control, and circulation that any scholar might be asked to supply about any publication during an evaluation process."

● "Digital history in various forms often represents a commitment to expanding what history is, and can do, as a field, as well as the audiences that it addresses. Historians who take a strong interest in digital media and information technology, or who choose to work exclusively in digital environments, should be evaluated in terms of their overall ability to use sustained, expressive, substantive, and institutional innovation to advance scholarship. This
is a commitment that is scholarly in some instances, pedagogical in others, or represents a collegial commitment to the discipline of history."

- [Responsibilities for department:] They should inform themselves about developments in the digital context of our work. Most colleges and universities have staff in place whose job it is to monitor and promote new technologies. Librarians, in particular, have long been involved in professional conversations regarding new technologies of teaching and scholarship. Many of them will be delighted to hold workshops and address faculty in groups or as individuals.


In this document, the AHA aims to create a specific guideline for university administrators as well as history department chairs to reevaluate tenure guidelines specifically for public history scholars. Throughout the guidelines, AHA highlights the way in which public historians engage pedagogically both with students as well with the surrounding community. As public historians are more likely to do community-engaged work, including curating exhibitions or developing educational programs for community museums, this scholarship should be evaluated and valued with the same value as traditional print scholarship. In this process, the idea of peer review should be broadened to not just academic historians, but also scholars and employees of museums, historic sites, and other avenues of public history. Additionally, as most public historians are expected to cultivate and organize public history programs within their department and work with students through internships and other projects, their role as an administrator should be reflected in their title and be considered when applying for tenure and other promotion and forms of teaching in nontraditional ways, such as internships and community-based class projects should be valued as a form of scholarship. Departments who hire public historians should have transparent tenure and promotion standards and value community engaged projects.

- Publicly engaged projects can bring funding and prestige to departments and fulfill institutional missions. Yet, because tenure and promotion decisions are most often made solely on the basis of published scholarship, many academic historians who may be interested in pursuing publicly oriented projects shy away from such work, fearing that it will not “count” towards career advancement. Therefore, creating equitable ways to assess and credit publicly engaged and collaborative research will not only benefit public historians; such an effort can encourage all interested scholars to pursue such projects with the confidence that their hard work will be rewarded.

- The American Historical Association’s Statement on Standards of Professional Conduct defines scholarship as a process, not a product, an understanding now common in the profession. The scholarly work of public historians involves the advancement, integration, application, and transformation of knowledge. It differs from “traditional” historical research not in method or in rigor but in the venues in which it is presented and in the collaborative nature of its creation.

This report was the first stage in development regarding AHA's recommendations to alter tenure and promotion policy for contemporary historians. Similar to the other two articles, AHA focuses on the way in which digital scholars, as well as public historians, create and develop collective, community scholarship, which should be regarded as equally important as individually published scholarship (especially monographs). As more and more history departments are hiring public historians in their department and expect them to manage a significant amount of administrative duties, such as run a public history program or minor within the department as well as serve as advisors or collaborators on student internships and projects thus creating relationships with the outside community, the departments should be contractually obligated to shift their tenure and promotion policies to reflect these new responsibilities. As committees look for scholarship, pedagogy, and service, they should be aware that the public (or digital) historian may have different obligations than a traditional historian. Publicly engaged projects, both digital projects as well as public history projects, often embody the university's mission, yet many junior scholars shy away from these projects because of the uncertainty of the reward system. Additionally, in the peer review process, it is necessary that committee members are well versed in all areas of the scholarship, such as evaluating community engagement as well as best practices of a historian or being versed in the digital medium. The report concludes with the best practice recommendations, which are as seen in the other two AHA documents.

- It is critical to note that these issues affect not only faculty members in public history—that is, the joint endeavor in which historians and their various publics collaborate in making the past useful to the public—but also those involved in other publicly engaged and collaborative types of scholarship, such as interdisciplinary and digital history projects.
- The scholarly work of public historians involves the advancement, integration, application, and transformation of knowledge. It differs from “traditional” historical research not in method or in rigor but in the venues in which it is presented and in the collaborative nature of its creation. Public history scholarship, like all good historical scholarship, is peer reviewed, but that review includes a broader and more diverse group of peers, many from outside traditional academic departments, working in museums, historic sites, and other sites of mediation between scholars and the public.

In MLA's guidelines, they highlight the fact that the use of technology is not new to digital humanists, but rather the use of digital technologies to create new research questions and to broaden the idea of the humanities requires rethinking the evaluation of this type of work. They emphasize that departments should have a clear, written set of guidelines so that scholars who engage with digital mediums in both their scholarship or their pedagogy, as well as scholars who work collaboratively on projects have a safety net in terms of promotion and evaluation. In addition to the use of digital technologies for scholarship, the MLA guidelines really emphasize the use of digital tools for pedagogy and service.

MLA also provides individual recommendations for both department heads as well as faculty members when looking at digital scholarship. One of the biggest take aways of the recommendations is that of medium specificity: departments must evaluate the work based upon the medium in which it is presented and not through the lens of traditional print scholarship. In doing this, it is sometimes necessary to bring in experts of the digital field even if they are outside the specific department. Regardless, they do emphasize the fact that faculty members who are creating digital projects need to document and show the importance and influence of their work.

Quotes:

- The pace of technological change makes it impossible for any one set of guidelines to account completely for the ways digital media and the digital humanities are influencing literacies, literatures, and the teaching of modern languages. A general principle nonetheless holds: institutions that recruit or review scholars working in digital media or digital humanities must give full regard to their work when evaluating them for reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

- [For faculty members] Documentation of projects might include examples of success at engaging new audiences; securing internal or external funding, awards, or other professional recognition; and fostering adoption, distribution, or publication of digital works, as well as reviews and citations of the work in print or digital journals. In framing their work, faculty members should be careful to clarify the context and venue of publications, exhibitions, or presentations (e.g., conference proceedings are among the most prestigious publications in computer science, whereas they are generally deemed to be a lesser form of publication in the humanities).


In these guidelines, the CAA and SAH try to outline what rigor and quality would look like in the digital realm in relation to scholars pursuing this type of work. Deviating from MLA and AHA's guidelines, the CAA and SAH explicitly state that they are not going to discuss open access or fair use of copyrighted materials, illustrating the unique issue of the necessity to use an abundance of images in digital scholarship for art and architectural history. After outlining the acceptable definitions of what a digital project would be, distinguishing from actual digital scholarship to the use
of digital technologies in their scholarship (i.e. the use of powerpoint does not make it digital scholarship), the article emphasizes that the digital methodology must be tied to the research question so that the evaluators will be able to see the direct connection of the digital medium and the intellectual research. Scholars carry the burden of explanation for the digital scholarship methodology, but the CAA and SAH do recommend that departments at universities have a set guideline or document outlining acceptable digital scholarship. Additionally, the process of scholarship, including the creation of a database or other digital tool that would be helpful for someone else's scholarship, should be considered as contribution to scholarship and evaluated accordingly, just as the creation of bibliographic volumes were once considered valuable sources of scholarship.

In addition to the different processes that accompany digital scholarship, there are many different forms of publications that should be equally valued to their print counterparts. Moreover, the guidelines highlight that the scholarship should not be considered "less than" if published on an open access journal instead of the traditional university press; evaluators should consider alternatives to traditional peer review, as well, such as grant application processes, collaborators as peer reviewers, as well as selection into a digital repository. Furthermore, the guidelines urge evaluators to review the scholarship in its native environment and if members of the committee are not comfortable evaluating the technical aspects of the project, to make sure that they bring in other specialists. Scholars who work collaboratively on a project should not be penalized for not producing solo scholarship, but rather they should be evaluated on the impact the project made and the quality of the results. Although it is up to the scholar to elucidate the work contributed by each team members, evaluators should not expect there to be percentages of each member's time and to remember that collaborative work often produces intellectual growth and therefore usually takes longer than solo scholarship. Finally, deviating from the MLA and AHA's documents, the CAA and SAH recommends that scholars should provide a preservation plan for their scholarship and should outline this plan for the evaluation committee.

- "Scholars should establish a sustainability plan for their digital scholarship. Development of a plan involves discussions with librarians and preservationists to ensure that there is a clear understanding of what can and should be preserved and to understand file formats that are best for particular pieces of the project, the likelihood of preserving a project in its native format, and alternative formats for differing levels of accessibility." p. 10

**EVALUATING DIGITAL SCHOLARSHIP**

[these are tagged "Evaluation" or "evaluation" in the Zotero library]


Introductory summary of various evaluation articles with subsequent links. Here are a few selected articles from the larger issue:

Written in 2012, this article acts as a call to action for the American Historical Association to "appoint a task force to survey the profession as to the place of digital historical scholarship in promotion and tenure and graduate student training and to recommend standards and guidelines for the profession to follow." The result of this collaborative project resulted in AHA's decision to create a Task Force on Digital Scholarship (whose guidelines are summarized in this document above.) Reflecting on AHA's 126th annual conference, it is clear that many historians are engaging in digital projects that promote "interdisciplinary, open, and collaborative scholarship" that are "excellent models of research, pedagogy, and public engagement." Despite these great advances, junior scholars and graduate students face risk to their careers by pursuing digital projects and are deterred by the promotion and tenure process; there is an obvious disconnect between traditional evaluation and new digital methodologies and training. Referencing the American Council of Learned Societies, the authors emphasize that it is the duty of senior scholars to ensure that junior scholars risky projects receive adequate evaluation and attention in addition to creating digital projects themselves and reshaping departments in order for graduate students to be trained in these methodologies.

As this is a call to action, the authors conclude the article in stating that they hope the AHA will reassess the types of scholarship that is deemed valuable in the field in light of new digital methodologies so that not only are these projects accurately evaluated and valued, but also so that training in digital methods becomes an essential part of a graduate student's education.

"Opportunities to publish digital work, or to even have it reviewed are limited."
"Therein lies the conundrum: the “digital turn” in the humanities is opening up exciting opportunities for complex digital scholarship, graduate programs are beginning to instruct students in the theories and methods of digital history, and institutions are hiring tenure-line faculty to pursue this new genre of scholarly communication but a concomitant evolution of the customs and standards of valuing and assessing this new model of scholarship has not developed apace."

- Mattia summarizes below


Fitzpatrick approaches the topic of peer review and evaluation of digital projects from two perspectives: that of a professor who received tenure "on the basis of an all-digital dossier" (196) and that of the current director of scholarly communication at MLA. In this article, Fitzpatrick highlights the problems underlying the practice of peer review that can lead to the misunderstanding of evaluating digital scholarship, especially seen in the tension between "the need to read and evaluate material on its merits and the need for objective, independent material's value" (197). Far too often, Fitzpatrick notes, the desire for objectivity gets in the way of reading colleague's work and a reliance upon "the imprimatur of a prestigious university press, or that of a highly selective peer-reviewed journal" (197) is detrimental to evaluating digital projects as they obviously do not have one. She also emphasizes the openness with which digital scholarship are "advised, reviewed, and commented on by experts in the field," (199) which should be incorporated in the evaluation of the project, especially in terms of tenure and promotion, as the impact of scholarship is an aspect that is always prioritized. In her conclusion, Fitzpatrick suggests that scholars need to stop putting all focus on impartial evaluation, to read their colleagues digital work along with the online discussion and forums that are embedded within the project in addition to the texts.


Nowviskie unpacks the problems of searching for equivalency in digital scholarly publishing projects; in attempting to describe a digital project in terms of monographs or journal publication much of the depth of the project is lost, especially in terms of collaborative authorship when different aspects are
being provided such as content versus system infrastructure. In addition to the traditional issues of evaluation and assessment for digital scholarship, Nowviskie outlines the issues regarding not properly giving credit to all who participated on the project beyond just faculty and graduate students. Similar to the AHA's guidelines regarding Public History, there should be a holistic approach to evaluation and assessment, looking beyond just the scholarship that is produced but also the contribution to the field as well as the impact of the digital scholarly project that would lead to a "collective and collaborative knowledge production" (172). Nowviskie advocates for professional organizations to rethink their guidelines to highlight that scholarship does not need to be "zero-sum;" creating collaborative relationships between both scholars as well as information professionals is essential to strengthen research and development relationships. Additionally, Nowviskie looks at INKE, which she describes as a large, institutional, and international effort to create research standards that both provide credit to all members of a project but also remain adaptable to different types of projects.

- "Fair evaluation of collaborative digital scholarship can only function within a complex network of responsibilities. Tenure committees are responsible for educating themselves about collaborative scholarly practices and the nature of digital humanities production, so that they may adequately counsel and fairly evaluate early-career scholars. Scholars who offer their work for evaluation are, in turn, responsible for making an honest assessment of that work and its relation to the intellectual labor of others. Digital humanities practitioners outside the ranks of the tenured and tenure-track faculty have a role to play as well. Their assertion (as professionals subject to different but equally consequential mechanisms of assessment) that credit be given where it is due can hasten the regularization of fair and productive evaluative practices among their academic faculty colleagues." 171

- "Formal and regular acknowledgment of collaboration as part of the ritual of assessment and faculty self-governance is strategically productive for our disciplines, both in its educative function and because it will be deeply consequential for policy and praxis in allied information and knowledge professions. It is reasonable to expect that, over time, the cultural shift signified by increasing standardization of collaborative credit will strengthen research-and-development partnerships." 178


Realizing that university departments are willing to accept digital work as scholarly but are unsure how to begin to evaluate this work, Rockwell outlines the basics of evaluating digital scholarship. First, Rockwell states that it is absolutely necessary for evaluators to "review the work in the medium in which it was produced," (154) a component of the MLA guidelines. Although scholars who provide a narrative description of their digital project for the evaluating committee is helpful, it is imperative that the evaluators experience the scholarship on the original medium as much of the digital scholarship emphasizes interactivity that cannot be translated into a narrative description. Moreover, -concerened with research future--- investment by giving tenure
Let me start with some definitions. Research, for the purposes of this essay, is the activity that leads to scholarship, which is the outcome that can be shared. 

Definition of digital: "What matters is that the work is shared with the community in electronic form and, more important, that it is meant to be experienced in electronic form, usually off a computer screen, though some interactive works are presented as installations without a screen" (153)

" Evaluators need to consider research activity for digital scholars much as they do for traditional scholars, and that is hard when you don’t have the experience to assess what digital humanists are doing" (153)

"The originality of digital work is difficult to assess when all you have is a description. Digital work is often about processes, interactivity, and interface, and no description (even with screen shots) can do the work justice. Many new media works are experiments in form, and that experimentation is lost in translation. Digital work to be evaluated as an original scholarly contribution needs to assessed in such a way that the originality (or lack thereof) is evident" (155)

"In addition to the problem of assessing new media work, there is the perception that at best digital scholarship is essentially community work, editorial work, or a form of translation and therefore theoretically light. It needs to be said over and over that there is nothing a priori untheoretical about digital work; it is rather a form of potential theory." (160)

"It should be noted that one relevant feature of the digital is that access to information can be logged and measured in ways that were unthinkable before. Viewing statistics are easy to gather for blogs, Web sites, tools, and hypermedia. The statistics we can gather have far more detail than the crude metric of peer-reviewed page counts. While neither page counts nor Web statistics really tell you whether information is having an effect, one can infer a lot more about readers from Google Analytics than one can from sales of a peer-reviewed book." (161)

"I would argue it is the difference in the contributions of computing humanists that, on the one hand, make the contributions so valuable taken one by one and that, on the other, make them so hard to classify as scholarship comparable to what other colleagues do. Digital research works resist classification and comparison in so many ways, and that is often their value. This is a period of experimentation with scholarly form, and some of the most useful work will not look like anything else that we recognize as scholarly." (165)

"In sum, few digital research contributions can be assessed the way print contributions can, but we can develop a culture of assessment that includes conversations that are in the tradition of the humanities." (166)

In this article, Bartanen argues that liberal arts campuses are in a unique position to be leaders for the evaluation of digital scholarship as they are already adept at evaluating faculty for their multi-purpose scholarship as their evaluation processes extend beyond scholarly output. For example, liberal arts schools evaluate faculty on their pedagogy and service to the discipline, which could include mentoring undergraduate research which produces multi-authored scholarship, as well as the way in which "community based teaching and civic scholarship" already blend the lines of traditional evaluation. These considerations are similar to the way in which digital scholarship can be evaluated in terms of multi-authorship, especially, publishing without the same page-limits and university press label, and finally the way that digital scholarship can be described as community engagement. Through this process, it is necessary to rethink peer review and scholarly authority beyond traditional notions and to understand these terms in a wider reaching scope so that digital projects can better fit into these evaluation schemes.

In addition to these observations, Bartanen compiled research tables regarding "Digital Scholarship Activity among Annapolis Group and NITLE member Institutions," "Digital Scholarship Activity among selected consortia," and finally "Chart of key components to support guideline development." She also includes the section of "How to Evaluate Digital Scholarship" from Lunenfeld, Peter et. al's book Digital_Humanities [summarized later in this document] and a sample addendum for evaluating digital scholarship which could be useful as a concrete example.

- They are blurring traditional boundaries of teaching, scholarship, and service, and they are engaged in interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, and transdisciplinary work. In order to support and reward appropriately such scholarship, evaluators need guidance on how to assess such boundary-crossing work and on what standards account for the scholarly work involved in learning or building new technological tools and archival resources, in analyzing and curating "big data," as well as in using new tools and resources to extend scholarly arguments and create new knowledge.

- [Information regarding Bartanen's data] To gain some indication of the degree to which, particularly at liberal arts colleges, faculty members are engaged in digital scholarship, this project included review of two selected membership groups: NITLE member and Annapolis Group institutions. A web survey used institutional home page search boxes to identify "digital scholarship"(DS) or "digital humanities" (DH) endeavors, with activity “counted” if the institution (1) had a dedicated DS/DH website, (2) participated in a consortia-level DS/DH program, (3) listed at least one faculty member with DH as a research interest or area of expertise, (4) offered at least one course with “digital humanities” in the title, (5) hosted a THATCamp[12], or (6) had been awarded a grant to fund DS/DH activities. Results are contained in Table 1 and Table 2 and suggest that faculty involvement in digital scholarship is and will be growing in the years ahead. Yet a web search of the 27 institutions listed in Table 1 did not result in finding any evaluation, promotion, or tenure policies specific to digital humanities or digital scholarship.

The authors clearly articulate that their intended audience of this section is for academic review committees, chairs, deans, and provosts who are struggling with their evaluation of digital scholarship. There are many overlaps with society guidelines, including evaluating the scholarship in the medium in which it was published as well as the idea that authors should indicate their contribution to collaborative projects but it is not necessary for them to create an in-depth, itemized list of each individual contribution. Moreover, although digital projects can look different than traditional print scholarship, it does not diminish the scholarly rigor of the project; all aspects of the digital project should be evaluated equally, meaning that scholarly knowledge goes beyond content production and must include the design of the interface, the database, and the code that goes into the project. Moreover, review committees should be cognizant of the broad reaching approach of digital projects beyond research and including pedagogy as well as service to the field; digital projects are more than just "tools" for pedagogy and/or service, but also contributions to the field and development of knowledge. Peer review must be rethought to include "online forums, citations, and discussions in scholarly venues, by grants received through foundations and other sources of funding, and through public presentations of the project at conferences and symposia" (129). Moreover, the authors advocate that it is somewhat useless to search for equivalence in traditional scholarship to that of digital projects and instead should assess the quality and impact of the work through "the quality and quantity of the research that contributed to the project; the length of time spend and the kind of intellectual investment of the creators and the contributors; the range, depth, and forms of the content types and the ways in which this content is presented; and the nature of the authorship and publication process" (128). Moreover, as academic review cycles are usually a few years apart whereas digital projects undergo more routine review processes, reviewers should be cognizant of the current state of the project as well as the considerations of the scholars’s future developments. The authors conclude their section in stating that "experimentation and risk-taking in scholarship represent the best of what the university, in all its many disciplines, has to offer society" (128) and that it is absolutely necessary to adapt to the changing landscape of scholarship and reward scholars, not punish them, for doing this type of work.

- "It is important for review committees to recognize that new knowledge is not just new content but also new ways of organizing, classifying, and interacting with content" 128
- "Digital projects almost always have multiple applications and uses that enhance research, teaching, and service. Digital research projects can make transformative contributions in the classroom and sometimes even have an impact on the public-at-large. This ripple effect should not be diminished. Review committees need to be attentive to colleagues who dismiss the research contributions of digital work by cavalierly characterizing it as a mere 'tool' for teaching or service. Tools shape knowledge, and knowledge shapes tools." 128
- "Digital projects can have an impact on numerous fields in the academy as well as across institutions and even the general public. They often cross the divide that arises among research, teaching, and service in innovative ways. Impact can be measured in many ways, including the following: support by granting agencies or foundations, number of viewers or contributors to a site and what they contribute, citations in both traditional literature and online (blogs, social media, links, and trackbacks), use or adoption of the project by other scholars and institutions, conferences and symposia featuring the project, and resonance in public and community outreach (such as museum exhibitions, public policy impact, adoption in curricula, and so forth)" 129
“Digital projects may raise critical ethical issues about the nature and value of cultural preservation, public history, participatory culture and accessibility, digital diversity, and collection curation which should be thoughtfully considered by project leaders and review committees.” 129

“To treat scholarship that takes of risk and the challenge of experimentations as an activity of secondary (or no) value for promotion and advancement can only serve to reduce innovation, reward mediocrity, and retard the development of research” 129


Reflecting on a meeting at UNC to discuss tenure and promotional policies, Shaw advocates that digital scholarship should not be expected to "speak for itself." In comparing digital scholarship to code, which Shaw states is often freely published and usually accompanied by a technical report, some people at the meeting believed that this is too much work (creating both a product as well as an article) and follows of past digital humanities work of having to justify the project itself. Shaw criticizes this idea, though, stating that "the suggestion that digital scholarship should have reached a level where it can “stand on its own” implies that such a level exists, and the traditional book or article are already on it" which is "naive." Instead of thinking of these projects as scholarship or expressive media, Shaw finds it better to frame these projects as technologies, which distinguishes between invention and innovation, and argues that scholarly communication can use traditional forms and adapt it in a new way.

My point was that we needn’t view the problem of how to evaluate non-traditional forms of scholarly work as one that “consumers” (such as tenure and promotion committees) must solve alone. We can also help “producers” find ways to make their products more easily consumable.

If we view new forms of scholarly work as technologies, it becomes clear that having them “stand alone” is precisely what we do not want to do. Inventions that stand alone wither and die. What we need is more focus on innovation and less on invention.

In the specific case of scholarly communication, that infrastructure includes libraries, funding agencies, and even the villainous publishers. Taking advantage of it requires recognizing how finely adapted many of our traditional tools are to the networks in which they function, and finding ways to emulate that, even if we are accused of pouring new wine into old bottles.


Reflecting on her time as Vice Provost for Interdisciplinary Studies at Duke, Cathy Davidson argues for a rethinking of tenure review. Davidson states that she is a stark defender of the idea of tenure but that the strict requirement of publishing one monograph to demonstrate commitment to the field is restricting and needs to be rethought so that younger scholars are able to pursue other projects,
especially when thinking about interdisciplinary scholarship. During her time as vice provost, she states that scholars who claimed that their work was interdisciplinary would receive high marks from their home department but their interdepartmental colleagues would claim that their work is not innovative enough. In light of this, Davidson suggested a small change to the Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure process: deans and chairs have the responsibility of ensuring that any scholar that claims for interdisciplinary work has a separate mechanism by which it is judged and it is up to the dean and chairs to decide which works best. After making this dictate, Davidson found that this more rigorous method helped because many times members of the discipline were unaware of what is impactful or innovative in the interdisciplinary field. She applies this example to the greater idea of tenure and promotion: structural mechanisms need to change in order to fully evaluate non-traditional scholarship. In order to protect tenure, it is necessary to make structural changes that do not stifle the intellectual growth of young scholars.

● In the end, I suspect that changing tenure rules really will mean finding structural mechanisms by which, at any university and in any field, one can evaluate "contribution to the field," structural mechanisms by which we can determine collectively whether a scholar measures up reputationally, in quantity and quality, to the standards of those peers within the scholars' main area of expertise.

● Awarding tenure is making a best professional bet on which people are most likely to contribute to our vitality for a lifetime. Is a one-size-fits all requirement the best way to do that?


In this document, the AHA aims to create a specific guideline for university administrators as well as history department chairs to reevaluate tenure guidelines specifically for public history scholars. Throughout the guidelines, AHA highlights the way in which public historians engage pedagogically both with students as well with the surrounding community. As public historians are more likely to do community-engaged work, including curating exhibitions or developing educational programs for community museums, this scholarship should be evaluated and valued with the same value as traditional print scholarship. In this process, the idea of peer review should be broadened to not just academic historians, but also scholars and employees of museums, historic sites, and other avenues of public history. Additionally, as most public historians are expected to cultivate and organize public history programs within their department and work with students through internships and other projects, their role as an administrator should be reflected in their title and be considered when applying for tenure and other promotion and forms of teaching in nontraditional ways, such as internships and community-based class projects should be valued as a form of scholarship. Departments who hire public historians should have transparent tenure and promotion standards and value community engaged projects.
Publicly engaged projects can bring funding and prestige to departments and fulfill institutional missions. Yet, because tenure and promotion decisions are most often made solely on the basis of published scholarship, many academic historians who may be interested in pursuing publicly oriented projects shy away from such work, fearing that it will not “count” towards career advancement. Therefore, creating equitable ways to assess and credit publicly engaged and collaborative research will not only benefit public historians; such an effort can encourage all interested scholars to pursue such projects with the confidence that their hard work will be rewarded.

The American Historical Association’s Statement on Standards of Professional Conduct defines scholarship as a process, not a product, an understanding now common in the profession. The scholarly work of public historians involves the advancement, integration, application, and transformation of knowledge. It differs from “traditional” historical research not in method or in rigor but in the venues in which it is presented and in the collaborative nature of its creation.


In this article, Ball discusses her role as both the editor of Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy as well as a teacher of multimedia scholarship. Kairos, an online scholarly publication, focuses on multi-media based scholarship, requiring scholars to utilize other mediums than print to support their argument, including "interactivity, digital media, and different argumentation strategies, such as visual juxtaposition and associational logic" and they cannot be printed because they contain ephemeral elements such as animations, videos, web links, audio clips, and other elements that cannot be conveyed in print (62). Bell emphasizes that form and content are inseparable and highlights the fact that arguments can be made stronger by different mediums. She also provided different evaluation tools for students to evaluate other multimedia scholarship. While this article proposes relevant evaluation tools, it is focused on teaching students multimedia scholarship and not extremely useful in terms of larger issues of evaluation for digital projects.

As Kress (2010) has said, “Design is the servant of rhetoric—or, to put it differently: the political and social interests of the rhetor are the generative origin and shaping influence for the semiotic arrangements of the designer” (p. 50), which, in Delagrange’s case, means she has purposefully arranged the webtext’s multimodal, semiotic elements to serve the political and social interests of her argument. Further, she accomplished this task with the aid of peer reviewers and editors, and the piece has been published in a venue respected for scholarly multimedia, so we as readers should assume that each design element belongs, is purposeful, and works to make an argument 62

"Evaluating Digital Scholarship." University of Virginia.
http://as.virginia.edu/evaluating-digital-scholarship
In these guidelines, UVA takes the five core elements of evaluating traditional scholarship and then 'translates' them when one would be evaluating digital scholarship. They cite the MLA's guidelines (summarized at the top of the document) as one of the main sources of reference.

1. Reading and judging the work,
   1. Digital alternative: read the work in the medium in which it was published
2. Looking to outside experts in the same area for their assessment of the work,
   1. Digital alternative: Take into account "unsolicited comments," such as observations by colleagues made in the "comment forms" of digital works
3. Taking note of the work's formal peer review, from book and journal editors,
   1. Digital alternative: One of the most difficult, including citation, to evaluate; although some projects create their own editorial board, "it is not clear that an invited editorial board provides an equivalent to independent peer review"
4. Considering citation of the research in the field at large, and
   1. Digital alternative: Citations can be interpreted as adopted by another website, endorsed, or linked to any "library-based subject-collections of webs resources, scholarly association, and/or colleges and universities."
5. Sometimes, considering the impact that this work has had on the general public.
   1. Digital alternative: How many people visit the site

http://edwired.org/2008/06/13/making-digital-scholarship-count/

In this inaugural blog post series regarding digital scholarship, Mills notes the difficulties in creating a set standardization for evaluating digital scholarship, especially because evaluation for teaching, service, and research varies greatly from department to department in addition to university and university. She advocates for rethinking our idea of the correlation of tenure review with prestigious journals and presses to tenure review to be more encompassing of digital scholarship.

More blog posts in this series... Read more?


Writing this just before MLA's annual conference in which it released its guidelines regarding digital scholarship and promotion and tenure, Kolowich provides a 'state of the union' in regards to the discussion of digital scholarship in the field. He offers short quotes from the series of essays that the MLA's journal Profession published prior to the conference (summarized elsewhere in these notes).
"And so the classic criticism of academic humanities — that they spend more time navel-gazing than solving tangible problems — turns out to be applicable to how academic departments have approached the problem of how to account for the merits of those who do the majority of their writing in the post-postmodern language of computer programmers and network architects."


Intro:
- academic publishing- insupportable economic model 3
- consortial arrangements for libraries have ben an extreme negative affect for publishers
- scholarly monograph "undead" 4
- if the monograph was truly dead would be forced to find a different venue to publish 5
- "It's thus important for us to consider the work that the book is and isn't doing for us; the ways that it remains vibrant and vital; and the ways that it has become undead, haunting the living from beyond the grave" 5
- "The obsolescence faced by the first academic book is not primarily material, any more than is the putative obsolescence of the novel; a radical shift to all-digital delivery would by itself do nothing to revive the form." 5
- "Without such active work to preserve electronic texts, and without the ongoing interest of an commitment by publishers, many digital texts face an obsolescence that is not at all theoretical, but very material" 6
- obsolescence of scholarly monograph comes from the institution not the mechanics
- general argument- decenter the monograph as the "gold standard" 7


This chapter is the introduction to a volume devoted to the theme of evaluation of digital project. It provides some historical background and helps to situate the discussion. In particular, it gives some insights on the debate about the strength and limitations of the digital publication compared to the traditional forms of publications. The authors point out that: "the increasing interest in digital media in the academic world has coincided with the growing “crisis in scholarly publishing,” in which the infrastructure has been stressed by economic forces to the point of breaking." (124). This article seems to suggest that (at the time the article was written) there were different approaches to the problem of the relationships between digital publishing and traditional publishing.

For example, according to a report created by the Association of University Press (AAUP) in (?), digital publishing is an unreliable tool to disseminate ideas compared with the traditional form of peer-reviewed literature. The reason of this phenomena is mostly economic: the high expanses involved in the traditional publishing encourage the maintaining of high quality standards of the published products. However, as this conclusion is contradicted by the fundings of a paper sponsored by the Mellon Foundation in the March of 2011. According to this study: “over-reliance on publisher imprimatur has led to the ‘outsourcing’ of peer review by linking the quality, relevance, and likely impact of a piece of work to the symbolic brand of its publisher . . .”

Schreibman, Mandel and Olsen, in this article keep the distance from the position taken by the AAUP's report and they say to be in favor of a more optimistic approach to digital publishing. An approach that (according to them) characterizes documents such as:

-The Wiki created by the MLA Committee on Information Technology (CIT) in 2008 to provide guidelines framework for departments to evaluate digital scholarship (a framework inspired by the work of Geoffrey Rockwell).

In spite of its optimistic approach to digital scholarship, this article doesn’t deny that we are still far from developing clear guidelines for digital publications. In order to fill this gap, the authors organized in 2009 a workshop at the 2009 MLA convention in Philadelphia. Given that most of the time the members of a tenure committee are not experts of digital humanities, the goal of the this workshop was to mainly "to obtain feedback on the difficulties nonspecialists encountered in the evaluation process of digital projects" (127).

According to the results of this workshop, the factors that prevent the departments from embracing digital publishing as a legit form of publication are:

1. The evolving definitions of scholarship in language and literature over the past fifty years, in particular the rise of criticism as the dominant mode of scholarship
2. The discounting of scholarly activities like textual editing, bibliography, and translation and the mislabeling of much digital scholarship as service (Sehat and Farr; McGann, “Note” and Online Humanities Scholarship; Gabler)
3. The ongoing crisis in scholarly book publishing
4. The low status of collaborative scholarship
Expanding on their experience in this workshop, the authors notice that it was quite difficult for not experts to grasp the values of digital for two reasons: first of all, the technical language was perceived as jargon. Also not-experts can't see "how technical decisions are theoretically informed and constitute research-supported argumentation" (p.127)


According to this article is that Peer Review process is overestimated in the academic environment. The role of peer review is important but it is not the only tool used for setting quality standards. By analyzing the world of the digital publishing the article shows that an important role is played by the figure of the the editor.

The editor is in charge of being aware of the most recent developments in a discipline and to select valuable works. Their role in shaping a field is often underestimated. The article pointed out that unlike peer-reviewers, editors have high incentive in keeping very high standards because their are directly responsible of the success or failure of a publishing company.


This post is a "open Letter to the Promotion and Tenure Committee at Texas A&M University, Department of English" written by Laura Mandel, who is professor at this department. [Laura Mandel] is an expert in digital humanities and author of a book entitled: Breaking the Book: Print Humanities in the Digital Age ( 2015) “is a manifesto on the cognitive consequences and emotional effects of human interactions with physical books that reveals why the traditional humanities disciplines are resistant to ‘digital’ humanities”).

The goal of this post is to provide some guidelines for evaluating digital scholarship.

The post is divided in two parts.

A) In the first part, the authors makes a list of different tools available to a committee for assessing the values of a digital project. She lists:

- Journals (Ex. Praxis): the author points out that considering print journals more reliable is an out-to-date approach to the problem. More useful it is to consider the ranking of the journal.
- Databases and Intitutions such as NINES
- Evidences of prices and awards ( not necessary specific to digital publishing)

B) In the second part of the post, Mandel provides a taxonomy of different kinds of digital projects. This taxonomy includes:

a) digital editions: This category often includes works that are not necessarily cutting edge but still useful to the community. Mandel points out that the value of digital project is to convey content in a way that it is supposed to be different from a print object. However, she also recognizes that sometimes the digital medium allows to publish works can't be printed because of economic
constraints. The guidelines here could be similar (but not identical) to the guidelines used for evaluating print editions

b) databases/digital archives: this category includes different form of "curation", that means the practice of selecting and organizing sources. Mandel points out that these curated archives/database while different from a monographs still need to be considered as forms of research: "Whereas in the case of the monograph, this "filtering" [of sources] is done for the sake of making one particular argument, in the case of curating textual data in online research environments involves making possible a number of arguments, all of them nonetheless theoretically inflected by what has been brought into the limelight and relegated to obscurity." Therefore, when judging these project we should consider them as platform that allows multiple users to collaborate and to develops multiple approach to a problem. As an example, Mandel uses http://www.hypercities.com/

c) Softwares: According to Mandel, softwares should count for tenure and promotions because they are tools design to interrogate specific issues that carachterize a discipline. "We have here digital humanities research buttressed by careful theorizing, software that counts as research precisely insofar as enacts humanities principles." The example used by Mandel is Voyant.

This document is divided in two sections. In the first part, it summarizes the conclusions of others professional guidelines while in the second part it offers some criteria that should help faculties in producing the documentation for the tenure promotion.
As I said, this document doesn't offer original material but it summarizes the conclusions of other resources, in particular: "Guidelines for the Evaluation of Digital Scholarship in Art and Architectural History", "Guidelines for Evaluating Work in Digital Humanities and Digital Media", "Guidelines for the Professional Evaluation of Digital Scholarship in History" and "Tenure, Promotion, and the Publicly Engaged Academic Historian: A Report". According to the authors of this documents, these are some recurrent themes in this literature:
-"All of the professional association guidelines indicate that faculty engaged in digital humanities scholarship need to be evaluated both rigorously and fairly". In this case, "fair" means that the reviewers need to be competent.
-the evaluation need to take into account the multimodal dimension of the artifacts (the article use the term "form" qualified as "spatial, interactive, and networked").
- the collaboration is a crucial dimension of this project: "Consequently, tenure and promotion candidates must communicate the collaborative nature of the work to the tenure and promotion committees must make clear their individual contributions to the team enterprise."
-digital scholarship is an important topic especially" at a time of uncertainty for the monograph."
In terms of criteria, the candidate should be able to articulate the role played by the digital project in their research agenda. (The importance of digital projects for pedagogy is mentioned but not develop). These are the types of evidences that the candidates should include in their folder:
- "Peer review of competitive national grant applications"
- evidences of impact: "citations in other scholars’ works; unique users coming to the site; links from other reputable sites, etc."
- application of international standards (ex: Text Encoding Initiative guidelines, Encoded Archival Description [EAD], Linked Open Data [LOD, Resource Description Framework [RDF]])
- evidences of collaboration with other projects at other institutions
- evidences of "best practices in design and implementation"
- evidences of best practices for sustainability
- "Compatibility between design, content, and medium."


An interesting reflection on the definition of scholarship that can be still relevant today. This article laments that a too narrow interpretation of scholarship dominates History as a field: "Almost all colleges pay lip service to the trilogy of teaching, research, and service, but when it comes to making judgments about professional performance, the three rarely are assigned equal merit." The tendency of considering the monograph as the most important component in the CV is consistent with this very traditional vision of scholarship. The goal of this article is to propose a more capacious and cohering interpretation. The proposed framework is based on an essay by Eugene Rice entitled: "“The New American Scholar: Scholarship and the Purposes of the University”. According to Rice, we should substitute the trilogy of research, service, and teaching with a new one characterized by four related components (I quote from the article):

- The advancement of knowledge--essentially original research
- The integration of knowledge--synthesizing and reintegrating knowledge, revealing new patterns of meaning and new relationships between the parts and the whole
- The application of knowledge--professional practice directly related to an individual's scholarly specialization
- The transformation of knowledge through teaching--including pedagogical content knowledge and discipline-specific educational theory

The second part of the articles illustrates how this framework can be used for categorize different forms of scholarship that are devaluated or simply invisible (ex: translation, creation of bibliographies and databases etc.

“New Criteria for New Media.”
Promotion and Tenure Guidelines Addendum: Rationale for Redefined Criteria
This is a document written by members of the new Media Department of the University of Maine. The goal of the document is to "summarize some of the key areas in which new media research departs from traditional academic scholarship, with the aim of providing a rationale for specific criteria for promotion and tenure detailed elsewhere". According to the authors, traditional peer-reviewed journals are insufficient tools to assess the performance of scholars active in a particularly dynamic area as new media. Therefore, they provide a list of measures of recognition that "should be prioritized in the evaluation of new media research candidates":

1. "Invited / edited publications": invitations to collaboration in edited work should count as valuable as publication in peer-reviewed journals
2. Participation in "live conferences" (both face-to-face and virtual)
3. Citations on printed material or websites (this include also citation on syllabi and other pedagogical document. On this regard, they make an interesting point: "In the sciences, readings or projects cited on a syllabus are likely to be popular textbooks, but in an emerging field like new media, such recognition is a more valid marker of relevance."
4. "Download/visitor counts"
5. "Impact in online discussion"
6. "Impact in the real world": measured by looking at journalistic genre (magazine columns and newspaper editorial but also by "counting Google search return".
7. "Net-native recognition metrics": these are the form of evaluations created in the context of an online community
8."Reference Letters"


This is a blog post written by Shannon Christine Mattern, who is professor of School of Media Studies at The New School in New York. The blog is meant to provide guidelines for students' digital works. However, the criteria presented can be also used more in general to assess digital projects produced by scholars. In her contribution Mattern creatively summarizes the conclusions presented in her bibliography. In particular, she quotes:


These are the criteria:

- **Concept:** "Is there a strong thesis or argument at the core of this project?"
• **Concept/Content driven Design**: Does the project’s form suit its concept and content? “Do structural and formal elements of the project reinforce the conceptual core in a productive way?”

• **Documentation and transparent, collaborative development**: Do project creators practice self-reflexivity? Do they “account[ ] for the authorial understanding of the production choices made in constructing the project?”

• **Academic Integrity & Openess**: “Does the project evidence sound scholarship, which upholds all the traditional codes of academic integrity? Does it credit sources where appropriate, and, if possible, link out to those sources? Does it acknowledge precedents and sources of conceptual or technical inspiration?”

• **Review & Critique**: “Have there been any expert consultations? Has this been shown to others for expert opinion?”


Very short blog in which Davidson circulates some links that deals with the process of getting tenure for digital humanists:

http://think.usc.edu/2012/04/02/reseach-on-the-digital-frontier/
http://institutes.nines.org/docs/
http://www.mlajournals.org/toc/prof/2011/1
http://www.mla.org/guidelines_evaluation_digital
http://hastac.org/documents/evaluating-digital-scholarship
http://cdrh.unl.edu/articles/eval_digital_scholar.php
http://jasonheppler.org/2012/06/06/aha-forming-a-task-force-on-digital-s...]


This article is an exploratory research about the new role of the library as publisher. In this article, the concept of "publishing" is very broad and it includes different genera of publications (from books to gray literature and documents in a repository) ["The boundary between activities that merit the name publishing and less formal and coherent enterprises is fluid and contestable" p. 9].

The sources of the article are both a review of the literature on this topic and survey sent to 150 libraries in 2015. The main point of the article, is that in spite of budget cuts and economic bottlenecks, many libraries are more and more playing an important role as publishers. This happens for two main reasons

A) library are at the center of multiple other services that facilitate this new role:

"One important reason for the localization of some new publishing-type initiatives in libraries is synergy and contiguousness" [p.7] and then quoting a 2008 study of Carla Hahn: "Library publishing services are part of a range of new kinds of services libraries have developed or are developing. There appears to be no dominant sequence of service evolution, but publishing services are co-managed and often integrated with a range of new services such as digitization initiatives, digital humanities initiatives, digital repository deployment, development of learning objects, digital preservation activities" [p. 7]
B) by definition, Libraries have a strong connections with academics who are the primary audience of academic publications.

The article explores different examples of publishing Library [p.10] and initiatives. However, it warns that: "The most striking discovery in our study is that we have not detected any pattern showing which organizational structures are more effective than others" [p.18].

The article could be used in the introduction of our studies to provide some background around the role of the library of the publisher and as organization that provides services for digital publication.


This is series of blogs written by Amanda Visconti who is managing director of the Scholar's Lab digital humanities center at the University of Virginia Library. This series builds upon her Master dissertation and her PhD dissertation: both focus on DH user testing. The first blog introduces the distinction between "Use" and "Usability" and "Usefulness". Usability is the use of the website as intended by the author ("Can your site be used as you intend?"). "Use" defines how reader use your site for their own interest ("How are people using your site--as intended, or for other ends?"). "Usefulness" asks the question: "If your site can be used as intended (usability), is it actually helping the people you're looking to serve?". In the Blog, the author gives suggestion on how to measure these three facets. The second blog, she speaks more about the audiences pointing out that scholars can't be considered the only audience. She refers to her dissertation in which she mostly focuses on the amateur reader defined as: "amateurs" in the old sense of people whose pursuits aren't undertaken in a professional role, but are followed with passion, competence, and curiosity--the humanist geek latent in all of us". She gives some examples of strategies used by DH projects to engage this kind of readers ("tours and introductions", "tools for" making meaningful serendipitous discovery within a set of objects", "focused teaching tools and exercises that help the reader learn to think like a scholar in your field"). The third blog provides some bibliography. In the fourth blog, she summarizes what she already said providing some further insights. She encourages the development of user studies in the three areas that she already identify ("usability", "usefulness", "use").

1. "digital humanists can test the structure of a digital text, examining the system that delivers resources to the user; this involves a usability approach that follows users in their functional interactions with a site's interface."

2. "digital humanists can identify the value of a digital text's content by looking at the usefulness of the content to the scholar."

3. Third, digital humanists can identify the value of a digital text's content by looking at an audience's use of a digital text; such a study would look at user behavior, assessing what users are trying to do with a site and how they go about doing it.

In this last question she also repeats how important is to focus on not academic audiences: "digital humanists must assess not the quality of the digital text as an idealized resource, but its value when accessed by real scholars on a daily basis. Being so closely tied to a digital texts' development, scholar users of a digital text can quickly voice any issues with the project they are using; amateur users cannot similarly voice their needs."
The report stems from a collaboration between Laura Brown, "the former president of Oxford University Press USA, and Ithaka’s Strategic Services group". The goal of the study is to investigate how Universities engage in different forms of publishing practices and to propose recommendations to improve the role of Universities in this field. This is a qualitative study on a survey and on interviews with three groups of people: administrators, librarians and directors of University Presses. The main finding is that the administration, libraries and University are most of the time incapable of coordinating their efforts. Administrators consider University Press as peripheral entities while University Presses "have become disconnected from their own university’s mission" [17]. Particularly interesting is the passage about the relationship between Libraries and University Presses. Libraries have been really active in promoting different forms of new services meant to foster intellectual productions and disseminations of idea. However, their role has a limited impact beyond the campus: "Libraries provide tools and infrastructure to support new forms of informal publishing, but these tend to be inward focused (toward the home institution) rather than externally focused (towards the best scholarship in a given discipline), limiting their appeal to users." [16]. Repositories are an example of these limitations: "Institutional repositories so far tend to look like "attics" (and often fairly empty ones), with random assortments of content of questionable importance. Attempts by librarians to create new online resources by digitizing special collections often fail to take into consideration the potential market for those materials or what is really needed." [16]. While librarians would benefit from taking advantage of the skills in marketing that members of the university press have, University presses could use the repository as platforms for lunching their products: “Looking ahead, presses and libraries should work together to build publishing environments and develop skill sets that enable the creation and dissemination of innovative types of scholarly products and tools now beginning to breed in the electronic environment. These new virtual laboratories – created on campus and built together by libraries, presses, and faculty – can assemble and interlink a variety of content types, from traditional peer-reviewed formats such as monographs, journals, and reference works, to conference proceedings, newsletters, wikis, subject matter repositories, preprints, interdisciplinary centers, large primary source collections, gray literature, datafiles, multimedia products, and other new and hybrid formats” [30]

Quotation that summarizes the main idea/recommendation of the report: "In our discussions we found strong interest in the notion of creating a third party entity to catalyze and lead these changes. This entity could provide some combination of the following elements: first and foremost, a technology platform and a competitive business model for putting current and legacy content online; market research to identify what new products are needed, how to build them, and how to reach new markets; marketing capabilities for reaching these new markets; business development capabilities; and strategic consulting to translate these opportunities into practical options for individual institutions. This entity could act as a partner for library and press directors in helping them put forward a compelling vision to their university leadership, helping them develop
plans of action, and could provide the shared electronic space in which to implement these plans."

[33]
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