Digital *Humanities*
Miami University

Discussion Papers and Reports of the
Digital Humanities Working Group

Table of Contents

September 16, 2013

Dear Colleagues,

In the Fall of 2012, the Miami University Humanities Center created a Digital Humanities Working Group (DHWG) charged with studying the possibilities for new digital projects at Miami. Members included:

> Ann-Elizabeth Armstrong, Western College Program and Department of
>   Theatre (armstra2@miamioh.edu) [1]
> cris cheek, Department of English (cheekc@miamioh.edu)
> Nishani Frazier, Department of History frazien@miamioh.edu)
> Arianne Hartsell-Gundy, University Libraries (hartsea@miamioh.edu)
> Stephen Nimis, Department of Classics (nimissa@miamioh.edu)
> Braxton Soderman, Department of Media, Journalism, and Film and
>   Interactive Media Studies (sodermab@miamioh.edu)
> Robert Wicks, Miami University Art Museum (wicksrs@miamioh.edu)

Over the course of the year, this group conducted a comprehensive review of the Digital Humanities at Miami in relation to national and international trends. This review included a study of new scholarly work on the nature, value, and challenges of the digital humanities; a review of existing and potential digital projects, resources, and opportunities at Miami University; a survey of Miami University humanities faculty, designed to assess current knowledge of, and interest in, digital humanities; and recruitment of a distinguished consultant to help the community think through some of these issues together. The group also successfully developed a grant proposal that could attract federal funding for new digital work.

As part of its effort to lead a thoughtful conversation about the future of the digital humanities at Miami University, the DHWG wrote a series of discussion papers on issues that deserve careful consideration by our community. These papers were circulated to faculty in May 2013 and are reprinted in the pages to follow. They address matters ranging from promotion and tenure standards to the future of research and intellectual community. I strongly encourage you to read them.

---

[1] Ann-Elizabeth Armstrong was appointed to the DHWG in September, 2013, after her term on the Humanities Center Steering Committee term expired

I also encourage you to be present at a <u>Faculty Forum</u> on these matters <u>Tuesday, October 8 at 4 p.m. in the Miami University Art Museum</u>. Helping us think collectively about the digital humanities will be Kathleen Fitzpatrick, Director of Scholarly Communication for the Modern Language Association and Professor of English at Pomona College.   Some of discussion will undoubtedly revolve around the thoughtful papers in this volume. I hope you will join me in thanking the Digital Humanities Working Group for its hard work, and I look forward to discussing these matters with you during the campus visit of Kathleen Fitzpatrick.

Sincerely,

Tim Melley
Director of the Miami University Humanities Center

Digital Humanities at Miami University: Survey results

In early 2013, the Digital Humanities Working Group of Miami's Humanities Center conducted a survey among Humanities faculty about the Digital Humanities at Miami University. Faculty members were asked about their definition, interest in and use of the digital humanities, current and future projects, and resources needed for such projects.

About half of the 47 respondents said that they did not have a clear idea about the digital humanities and what this emerging field of research entailed. Those who cited examples typically identified traditional humanist resources that are presented or distributed digitally: J-STOR, EBSCO online books, various archives and web-based projects, particularly ones that make traditionally inaccessible material more widely accessible. A smaller number mentioned interactive digital projects, particularly ones that have a pedagogical purpose, such as language acquisition; others mentioned data-mining in historical sources or in literary corpora.

When asked about projects in the digital humanities, the majority of respondents had not pursued or completed any projects in the digital humanities. Still, there were a handful of responses that do reveal more direct engagement with the digital humanities beyond merely accessing digitized texts or resources online. For example, respondents mentioned creating a digital project in oral history, blogging and podcasts, a possible online translation project, a possible textbook with a digital component, a recent published dissertation on the topic, and producing electronic literature. When asked about projects conceived for the future, there were other interesting works mentioned such as a medical humanities project that will include patient records from Ghana, mapping tools, and access to current and historical data concerning sickle cell anemia and a project digitizing scientific vegetation and botanical maps with historical interest. Yet, overall the survey revealed that completed work in the digital humanities at Miami University is sparse(at least among the survey's respondents), with only about 25% of the respondents indicating that they have pursued digital work in general, while a smaller percentage has actually participated in larger scale digital humanities projects.

When asked if they were thinking about pursuing digital humanities projects in the future and what available resources they would need to consider pursuing digital work, most respondents identified technical assistance and training as crucial; faculty needed support and time for knowledge acquisition, learning how to use digital tools, software, databases, learning how to construct websites, etc.. General access to software and digital tools for pedagogical purposes was also mentioned, as were more server space or access to various media collections. Faculty aired worries about whether this kind of work would be valued and also whether it would be a better use of their time than more traditional humanistic work. Finally, many

faculty members expressed the need for partnerships, collaboration, hiring faculty in the area of digital humanities, or having access to research assistants or students with technical skills that could facilitate their work and build collaborative digital projects.

The Digital Humanities Working Group would like to present a series of short papers that will address some of the questions and issues raised by the survey and by our own discussions. We will begin with a brief stab at defining the digital humanities below, and later papers will address other issues. We hope these presentations will stimulate discussion, both formal and informal, and help faculty imagine and execute digital humanities projects here at Miami University. Being able to define the digital humanities, build relationships among faculty interested in pursuing digital projects, and creating an atmosphere where one has the time and resources to acquire digital skills or collaborate with others who have those skills will be paramount for supporting work in a field which promises to transform the humanities in the 21st century.

What Are the Digital Humanities?

While the digital humanities can be difficult to define we believe that the majority of ideas concerning the digital humanities can be classified into the following four areas: the traditional humanistic study of new media objects, the use of digital tools for scholarly inquiry, the production of digital tools and digitally born objects, and the creation of new forms of collaboration between scholars, students, artists, professionals, and intellectuals and cultural practitioners beyond the academy. The term digital humanities can be applied to the humanistic study of the digital, which focuses on the transformations of culture and society due to the vast expansion of digital media and the rise of a networked society. This cultural study of new technologies is largely undertaken using traditional humanistic methods of scholarship which focus these methods on new media objects--video games, computer networks, new media art forms, electronic literature, digital archives and preservation, social networks, mobile media, etc.. Scholars who analyze such digital forms that follow the tradition of media studies or cultural studies would be prime examples. Here, one would define the "digital humanities" less by scholars use or production of digital tools and more in terms of the kinds of objects that scholars analyze and interpret through traditional humanist methods.

The term "digital humanities" can also be applied to the use of various digital tools that augment or simplify traditional humanistic goals and projects. This includes the use of digital archives of various kinds, such as J-STOR, the Perseus Project, the NINES Project, Google Books or Google Scholar, etc. The use of such tools does not necessarily modify the goals of the humanities, but makes humanistic projects more effective and accessible, saves researchers precious amounts of time, and potentially improves pedagogy in an era where many students are *digital natives* (i.e., they have grown up in a digital environment and have acquired many skills needed to navigate the digital terrain). Since everyone at Miami has access to computers, to the internet, to the cloud, we are all using digital tools of various kinds, and in some senses we are all digital humanists. This broad sense of the digital humanities is perhaps the weakest method of conceptualizing the term, but one that reveals the widest influence of computerization in the humanist disciplines. Yet, the use of digital tools for humanistic study can also be understood more robustly, moving beyond the idea of simply using tools which provide easier access to the materials that humanities scholars need. Humanities scholars can also use digital tools which are actually produced in order to facilitate new methods of interpreting cultural data. Thus, for example, if a scholar uses concordance software to analyze word frequency of an author's text, or studies the works of Mozart through analyzing digital recordings of his music, or employs visualization software that can analyze thousands of digitized paintings in order to measure different stylistic features predominant in an artistic era, then the digital tools and algorithms are being used

to potentially create new interpretations of traditional humanistic material. We are not saying that such a use of tools is a "better" method of scholarship, just "different."

It leverages the use of digital tools to potentially forge questions which might spurn new discoveries within the humanities. This use of digital tools has traditionally been labeled *humanities computing*, and the rise of digital humanities is indebted to this historical form of scholarship. Thus, digital humanities can be understood broadly as using digital tools to gain easier access to traditional materials, *or* it can be used more narrowly to describe the use of digital tools that have been created specifically to analyze various aspects of cultural data. The former is too broad of a definition that simply encompasses our lives in a computerized world, while the later might be a bit too narrow, although it allows one to pinpoint the work of the digital humanities more clearly.

Yet, we can also understand the digital humanities as stemming not only from the *use* of digital tools but from their conception, design and *production*. Some online archival and cultural resources—for example, resources facilitated by Miami University such as The Mississippi Freedom Summer Project 1964 Digital Collection, The Myaamai Project, and Wyandot History: A Guide to Original Sources and Current Scholarship—are designed specifically to make humanistic inquiry more robust by providing access to important collections and diverse cultural data; humanities scholars and humanistic technicians are inevitably involved in creating and conceiving these digital resources. Thus, it is not about using these tools, but actually creating them which is important. The same could be said about the creation of tools that are produced for humanistic study discussed above. While one might use data visualization software for research (or for pedagogical purposes) often digital humanists are actually engaged in the coding and programming of these tools. Thus, humanities scholars might collaborate with programmers to create software in order to do their research. For example, the Software Studies Lab at UCSD is not only developing a vocabulary of "cultural analytics" (e.g. instead of "google analytics," etc.) to discuss cultural artifacts, but they are also producing "Software For Digital Humanities" that allows for analyzing digital images and even visualizing media objects such as paintings in novel ways. While digital humanists might study new media objects in a traditional way, or use digital resources and tools to facilitate their research, they often create new tools which will be beneficial to humanities research in the future—new database structures of digital archives, new visualization technologies, new analytic tools based on computational linguistics, etc..

We would also like to mention that beyond the creation and design of digital archives and preservation projects, beyond creating computational tools for humanities research, some digital humanists also create and produce *born digital* works that are also important for understanding the digital humanities. Born digital works are scholarly or artistic works that can only exist in digital format. For example, the academic journal Vectors from USC has commissioned scholarly articles which could only exist in an online format; a writer was often paired with a

programmer to create engaging scholarship within the new media realm of the internet. Or, for example, many video games created by Miami students in The Armstrong Institute for Interactive Media Studies can only exist as digital objects and are thus "born digital." This has less to do with the preservation of analog resources (e.g. printed books and articles, paintings, etc.) which are given new life in digital form, and more to do with the production of new media objects that exist only in digital format—video games, interactive websites, multimedia electronic books, etc.. The production of such works might also extend to faculty and student involvement in creating and maintaining websites, blogs, social media presences, YouTube videos and channels, Google Maps, etc.. Here, scholars and students are not necessarily creating tools for the study of cultural data, but they are creating objects that can only exist in the world of the digital. They are scholars and students working in traditional fields associated with the humanities—creative writing, critical scholarship, art production, etc.—and producing new media works which could never have existed in an analog world.

Implicit in the above examples is the fact that technology has changed the way that humanists work. For example, many projects conceived with a digital dimension require greater collaboration among scholars and forging connections with people with vastly diverse forms of expertise and even different institutional homes. Scholarship in the humanities is traditionally carried out by individuals, and publications tend to be single-authored. Scholarship in the digital age is thus being transformed by the demands and opportunities of our times. In this context one encounters a fourth, broadly conceived world of the digital humanities, "not simply the digital/computational study of the humanities or the humanistic study of the digital," but rather the way in which "the humanities as a whole shifts from a print paradigm to a digital one." (A. Reid, "Graduate Education and the Ethics of the Digital Humanities" in M. Gold, ed. *Debates in the Public Humanities*, 357.) In this digital paradigm scholars will be called to enter into new forms of collaboration that will leverage the possibilities of digital scholarship. This could mean entering into collaborations across great distances with like-minded (or other-minded) individuals to pursue the production of more traditional modes of humanistic inquiry (writing books, articles, creating art, etc.). For example, a recent book from MIT Press entitled *10 PRINT CHR$(205.5+RND(1)); : GOTO 10* is a humanistic work co-authored by ten different scholars across institutions who came together to interpret the cultural significance of one line of computer code. These scholars relinquished the traditionally singular voice of scholarship to share in a polyvocal experiment of collaborative authorship. Indeed, new forms of community building and scholarship are created by the emergence of computer networks and social media. Such forms of collaboration have many scholars noticing that the humanities might be becoming more like the sciences in the sense that knowledge production is not necessarily individually directed, but created through team effort. Thus, while digital networks make available new paradigms for distributed scholarship, some have called for the creation of Humanities Labs(based on ideas stemming from traditional scientific labs) where scholars in various disciplines might come together physically to work on large humanities based problems.

Such an atmosphere would also be conducive to gathering interested parties throughout the university to work together on digital humanities projects—for example, bringing together computer scientists with humanities scholars to produce new digital tools, or bringing together web designers with critical scholars to explore the digital environment of the internet for new modes of scholarly production. In fact, at Miami University's King Library, the inauguration of The Center for Digital Scholarship offers an opportunity to cultivate a lab-like, interdisciplinary atmosphere where digital work across divisional boundaries could prosper. In any event, one model of the work of the new, digital scholar abandons the traditional, isolated thinker toiling away at individual scholarship for a new approach based on team based knowledge production. Again, we are not saying that this new approach is "better" but only a "different" mode of scholarship which the digital facilitates.

In the end, there are certainly other ways to refine and re-define these brief definitions that we have offered concerning the digital humanities. The nascent, interdisciplinary field is broad in scope and will be clarified as we isolate different activities within its bounds. While we can probably all define ourselves as "digital humanists" simply because computerization is revolutionizing society, we believe that doing work in the digital humanities means more than simply existing in our digitized world, which is not really a choice we have in today's world, but choosing to use digital tools to produce new knowledge, to create new possibilities for interpreting traditional humanities materials, to create born digital works that are both critical and creative, and to leverage the vast networks of communication to augment new forms of collaborative scholarship. It is our goal, as members of the Digital Humanities Working Group, to catalyze possibilities for augmenting digital humanities work at Miami University. We hope that these brief remarks concerning the definitions of the digital humanities will spur discussion and debate around this emerging paradigm of humanities based research.

Promotion and Tenure in the Digital Age

The gold standard for promotion and tenure in the humanities has traditionally been the single-authored book or article, published in a prestigious venue, and vetted by the highest quality reviewers to insure that it meets with the standards of the profession. However, journals and presses with the best reputations are not always the portals for the most innovative work; indeed they tend to be more conservative than the field as a whole, functioning as a kind of gatekeeper of scholarly prudence. Technology has begun to change this model and will no doubt continue to do so, and the digital humanities are at the heart of the debate surrounding this change. The following key considerations in evaluating scholarship will be explored below: the use of impact factors (rather than prior vetting), digital publication (vs. print publication), and digital collaboration (vs. single-authored work).

Impact Factor: Impact Factor (IF) is a numerical-based assessment used by libraries and other academic institutions to judge a journal's citation rate. Impact Factors over a period of time are documented in journal citation reports, which identify which journals receive greater references or mention. The larger the citation numbers the greater the journal's validation as a highly regarded source. The reliability of these numerical indices has sometimes been challenged; and they have also been criticized for creating an elitist framework that marginalizes smaller or subject-specific journals. For example, *the Journal of American History* (JAH) is notorious among African-American History scholars for its inaccessibility to scholars writing on subjects related to people of color. *The Journal of African American History* (JAAH), in operation since 1916, has filled that void, and is a revered and highly selective journal in that subject area. Yet, *the Journal of African American History* does not register very high in impact factor calculations. Using the current IF framework, any article published in the *JAAH* ranks lower than if it were in *JAH*, despite the fact that publication in *the Journal of African American History* has greater standing and import in the field of African American history.

In the digital age, the very process of registering citations has been transformed. A recent study of IF's current usefulness in the digital age has pointed to a number of major concerns P&T committees will have to address in the future. Since, 1990, with the growing prominence of the internet and search engines, article citation has become less dependent on a journal's physical presence, impact factor and reputation. Highly cited papers are not necessarily found in highly cited journals.[2] The use of Journal IF standing recently received its greatest challenge from sites like *altmetrics* (alternate metrics) and *PLoS One* (a peer reviewed open access online publication). Altmetrics measures impact factor based upon the article, and not the

---

[2] Lazano, Gringras, Lartzaire, "The Weakening Relationship between the IF and Paper Citations in the Digital Age," Journal of American Society of Information Science and Technology 63:11 (2012):2140-2145.

journal in which it appears. Altmetrics statistics incorporate citation usage, download numbers, user survey/star level allocation, bookmarks, reader comments, and references in blogs, articles, or other social network spaces. Total Impact, a site that also attempts to use open source information to determine Impact Factor made some forays into creating a more inclusive impact factor. [3]

Like any new technology, the altmetrics system still has problems. For example, downloading an article says nothing about its actual relevance or impact on the field itself; and any person can falsify numbers by increasing downloads or adding well-placed references or comments. Second, much of this instrumentation depends on open-sources, and as a result has limited statistical sources. Third, it cannot quantify and gather information from social network sites like Twitter, which are temporary in nature. Finally, altmetrics has a better chance of offering an accurate assessment system if articles are published on-line and not in print. This, of course, leads us to the second issue in digital humanities: online publication.

Digital Publication: If hell is a tenure packet without publications and heaven is publication in the highest-ranking journals, then digital publications occupy a space that looks more like purgatory. Promotion and tenure committees tend to situate digital publications in an inferior category compared to their print-based sibling. One factor for this is the fairly new status of many online journals. Their very newness raises questions about rigor in acceptance rates. Additionally, some scholars have raised alarms regarding the degree to which online journals have slipped in monitoring citation accuracy.[4]

Realistically speaking, however, digital publications are not going away. Ultimately, the costs of traditional print publishing will eventually force a move into the online world. Already, UNC Press has begun experimentation of e-book and supplemental e-books with its older works, while training other publishers to consider e-books as the future step toward paper freedom. If the digital world is the great democratizer, then its future expansion raises questions about who will be read and how to judge a book's impact on the field.

Digital Collaboration: The most obvious question in Digital Collaboration is who is the author? The second question is how does one define, quantify, or evaluate the intensity of scholarly production or the impact of the final product. Determining answers to these questions can help P&T committees in evaluating a digitally collaborative project. Before, moving forward, it might be helpful to provide some examples of digitally produced projects. The three projects below illustrate the

---

[3] Jennifer Howard, "Scholars Seek Better Ways to Track Impact Online", Chronicle of Higher Education January 29, 2012; Jennifer Howard, "Tracking Scholarly Influence Beyond the Impact Factor," Chronicle of Higher Education, February 28, 2012, 2:49 pm

[4] Paul Fyfe, "Electronic Errata: Digital Publishing, Open Review, and the Futures of Correction" in Matthew Gold, ed. *Debates in the Digital Humanities* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012), p. 259-280.

range of digitally born scholarship, which should count in some way as scholarly production in a tenure or promotion packet.

Hypercities: Hypercities is an open source google mapping project of Berlin, which was originally created to provide a historical map overlay of current and past spaces, memorials, etc. It was intended to "record mapable histories." Hypercities later expanded to include "Hypercities Egypt," where the map was connected to a twitter feed and served to record demonstration sites as they occurred or were tweeted. What initially began as a historical map study of Berlin eventually became a site which facilitated organization of data from twitter, photo, and YouTube streams, and which reflected current historical events.

Voyant: Reveal Your Texts: Voyant-tools.org provides a window into which readers can insert portions of texts and see them analyzed. This is a software program that allows readers to understand the text without having to refer to outside readings. More importantly, it acts as a second layer of meaning for the text immediately in a way that print text will not allow.

Harambee City On-line: Harambee City On-line is a supplemental creation for the print copy of a book on the history of a civil rights organization, Congress of Racial Equality (CORE). Ultimately, this site will serve more as an archival or curatorial space for materials which did not find its way into the text, including personal documents, photographs, and oral history interviews. It is not interactive but serves as a supplemental archive to the print book.

With such different types of digitally born research productions, there are several questions about how to determine the weight of research and narrative creation. Is it like an article? A translation? Is it more like an edited volume or the kind of new research found in monographs? If many persons are contributing, who is the author? In collaborative cases, should one or more such projects count as a monograph?

IF's, Digi-Pubs, and Digi-Borns, Oh My!:[5]
Although the various issues outlined above point to potential problems of evaluation, the basic point of this paper is to suggest guidelines for how Miami University committees can begin to judge any of these areas.

IF's:
Significant changes are on the horizon for IF's. Undoubtedly, the university has a number of years before alternate forms of identifying scholarly influence firmly

---

[5] Center for Digital Research in the Humanities - CDRH guidelines on evaluating digital scholarship http://cdrh.unl.edu/articles/eval_digital_scholar.php ; MLA Guidelines: http://www.mla.org/guidelines_evaluation_digital ; TAPoR: http://portal.tapor.ca; Todd Presner, "How to Evaluate Digital Scholarship," UCLA's Digital Humanities program (September 2011); IDHMC: the *Initiative for Digital Humanities, Media, and Culture* at Texas A&M University

emerge to take the place of IF. However, Miami University might want to consider some additional solutions to the IF problem. These can include:

- Inclusion and acceptance of Altmetrics and other similar sites like Eigenfactor.org, R-Factor which rate the overall journal effectiveness over its lifespan versus recent performance.
- Be open to incorporating non-traditional citation measures, i.e. sites which incorporate their own impact numbers, i.e. YouTube "hits"
- Consider works which appear in blogs, on-line news/newsletters, YouTube, and other online forms of intellectual space.

Digital Publications:
Of course, number three lends itself to obvious questions of which intellectual spaces count and how to judge those spaces. Much of this will depend on each department. The likeliest mode of digital scholarship is still the digital publication. Because this is a developing field, there are more questions than answers regarding ranking and relevance within a promotion and tenure packet. Most evaluative methods simply use the same rubric as that of paper scholarship. In effect, digital publication can be judged and given equal measure by the following criteria:

- Peer Review of digital publications
- Originality and contribution to the field
- Identifiable audience and pedagogical effectiveness
- Outside opinion on work's impact on the field

Digi-Born Collaborations:
The most difficult to assess for many universities are those endeavors which are digitally born. However, there are many expressions of scholarly endeavors in the virtual world that various departments can quantify as intellectual engagement. Fine arts might accept a visual/audio piece that happens to use a medium like YouTube; and the history department might consider a twenty minute visual essay or website on a particular historical subject. In either case, there remains the difficult task of measuring these virtual products against traditional requirements for promotion and tenure. In other words, when does a website reach the standard of a book review? A translation? An article? A book? The following categories and questions are relevant in assessing the quality of digi-born collaborations.

Review:
1. Evaluate project in medium presented
2. Consult specialists in relevant disciplines
3. Who are the participants and what are their backgrounds,
4. Determine hierarchy of collaboration or the main PIs
5. What kind of knowledge does this collaboration create
6. What is the content and what is included/excluded
7. What was the editorial process
8. Does it follow best practices for digitizing materials, is it effective

9. Does its production create original an innovative knowledge
10. Are there any weaknesses in the content or does it answer all the appropriate questions

Technology Component:
1. Does it follow standard TEI encoding
2. Is there technical innovation or sophistication to the project
3. Does it follow solid design principles
4. Is it open source and if so, how does it maintain scholarly integrity.
5. Who provides the host server
6. What are the long term implications and can the site be built upon in the future
7. Who is responsible for long term maintenance

Evaluation and Self Reflection:
1. What formal or informal studies and assessments were conducted or built into project
2. Was there any feedback or consultation
3. Were design experiments conducted
4. Will the project be peer reviewed, and if so, in what vignettes and how often.
5. What papers/essays were produced that reflect self assessment and documents steps within the projects
6. Were there any supplemental materials written to facilitate use of the site by others (i.e. operational book, instructions, etc.)
7. Rationale of choice regarding use of commercial vs. university host servers
8. Collaborative projects are measured not as hierarchy or but as simply the evaluation of each person's work

Dissemination of Knowledge:
1. What is the site's intended use
2. Are there valuable unintended audiences
3. What disciplines or fields does it impact
4. What is the project's affiliation with others
5. Is it acknowledged by other projects
6. How often is the site in use

Peer Review Acknowledgements:
1. Was grant funding received
2. Was it in connection with other related digital research projects
3. What are the pedagogical applications
4. Has there been conference presentations to vet the digital product
5. What Print publications resulted from the digital research

These items have been pulled from a number of sources related to digital evaluation. This is not an exhaustive list. So far, how to quantify digital scholarship compared

with the traditional scholarly forms (books, essays, etc.) still remains elusive. However, these categories can help begin a discussion.

The digital world is shaping scholarship in innumerable ways. Recently, Miami University established the Center for Digital Scholarship. However, what relationship will faculty members have to the center without an established policy of its value and worth to the university or to the academic field? Miami University must begin to shape a policy soon or be left to catch up as the digital world zooms by.

Bibliography

altmetrics: a manifesto
http://altmetrics.org/manifesto/

Center for Digital Research in the Humanities at University of Nebraska–Lincoln
http://cdrh.unl.edu/

Gold, Matthew. *Debates in the Digital Humanities*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012.

Hacker, Prof. "The Challenges of Digital Scholarship," Chronicle of Higher Education (January 25, 2012) accessed April 17, 2013
http://chronicle.com/blogs/profhacker/the-challenges-of-digital-scholarship/38103

Howard, Jennifer "Scholars Seek Better Ways to Track Impact Online" Chronicle of Higher Education (January 29, 2012) accessed April 17, 2013.
http://chronicle.com/article/As-Scholarship-Goes-Digital/130482/

Initiative for the Digital Humanities, Media, and Culture's Commentpress
http://idhmc.tamu.edu/commentpress/

The MLA Committee on Information Technology provides guidelines for evaluation
http://www.mla.org/resources/documents/rep_it/guidelines_evaluation_digital

The NINES / NEH Summer Institutes: Evaluating Digital Scholarship
http://institutes.nines.org/

The Digital Humanities and Undergraduate Research

As noted last time, the gold standard for humanistic scholarship has always been the single-authored book or journal article published in a prestigious venue, and vetted by the highest quality reviewers to insure that it meets with the standards of the profession. Unlike the sciences, where collaborative work in a laboratory setting provides a research apprenticeship that includes a whole range of tasks and activities, the model for work in the humanities is the solitary scholar in his or her library carrel: reading, thinking and writing. One consequence of this practice is that we do not regularly model the process of scholarly work for our students. They do not see the many drafts and false starts that are an inevitable part of the process of producing polished scholarship. We do teach various stages of writing and comment on drafts that they produce, but collaborating with students in humanities research is not something that is structured into out ideas about teaching and scholarship, and is not institutionally encouraged or rewarded. Thus the vision proposed as the guiding principle of the office of research for undergraduates recently announced by Miami University seems puzzling to many of us:

Students will be given increasingly sophisticated opportunities to develop as scholars, artists, and professionals. This vision requires purposefully sequenced opportunities to advance undergraduate research, beginning with students assisting faculty and graduate students on their research in routine ways, moving to more sophisticated tasks, and then engaging in original research as coauthors or authors.

Where do we fit into this vision?
One of the promises of digital humanities is to reinvigorate teaching and research in the humanities by promoting greater collaboration between students and faculty.[6] Digital projects promote greater collaboration for many reasons, not least of which is that they typically involve a broader range of skills than traditional scholarly work. Undergraduates often have technology skills far superior to their professors, and they are often more comfortable with the latest technology, such as social networks and blogging. It is tempting, of course, to find menial tasks, such as scanning texts or correcting OCRs, for which students can provide cheap labor; but good collaborative projects require understanding of the big picture by all participants.

Digital projects in the humanities that involve students directly in the process of research have begun to emerge, and it will be useful to sample a few about which we are familiar. Others may know of other examples, either successful or not.

---

[6] Luke Waltzer, " Digital Humanities and the 'Ugly Stepchildren' of American Higher Education," in M. Gold ed. *Debates in the Digital Humanities* (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota, 2012), 335-49. Chris Blackwell and Thomas Martin, "Technology, Collaboration, and Undergraduate Research" http://www.digitalhumanities.org/dhq/vol/003/1/000024/000024.html

1. The Homer Multitext Project is funded by the Center for Hellenic Studies[7] and provides grants for undergraduates to go to the center in the summer, receive training in paleography and then work on still unedited manuscripts of Homer. The result is a vast online textual resource that is able to give a more complex and nuanced view of Homer's textual tradition, a view that is itself unthinkable without digital representation, and without the work of hundreds of individuals carefully preparing the material under the supervision of the project managers. The work of the project is designed both to clarify the text of Homer, but equally to engage undergraduates in basic research methods in paleography. Work on the project also requires significant use of digital tools.

2. The NINES Project (**N**etworked **I**nfrastructure of **N**ineteenth Century **E**lectronic **S**cholarship) is "devoted to forging links between the material archive of the nineteenth century and the digital research environment of the twenty-first."[8] The project aims to develop tools for making use of digital archives and for supporting the creation of digital archives. While at Miami University, Laura Mandell, the director of the project, engaged many undergraduates in encoding literary texts in XML, which entailed researching authors and producing the content for appropriate tags. The work involved both traditional research skills and an understanding of how information can be accessed and put to use. The undergraduate contributions were sometimes paid labor and sometimes made in the context of a course for credit.

3. The Penn Sound Center for Contemporary Writing, which is committed to producing new audio recordings and preserving existing audio archives, is another project that uses undergraduates extensively.[9] The project is a great example of online archiving: bridging the oral and the literary, providing materials for present and future scholars, and hosting a history of poetry through recording technology. In 2011 there were more than forty thousands files on line. and more than ten million downloads in its first eight years, suitable for pedagogical purposes in a formal or informal setting. The work is collective and undertaken in a voluntary capacity by undergraduate and doctoral students, who do digitizing, gather permissions, design web pages, etc. Some of the undergraduates are work-study students; others work as interns.

4. There are a number of examples of "crowd-sourcing" projects, where many people of varying degrees of expertise can contribute to creating a resource or curating a text. *Transcribe Bentham* is a well-documented example of this process, not entirely successful, but with a complete account of what worked and what did not.[10] The organizers concluded that "there is an audience of potential volunteers who are willing and able to engage in more demanding crowdsourced tasks ... even those as challenging as Bentham's," and that with the right organization, such a

---

[7] http://chs.harvard.edu/chs/homer_multitext
[8] http://www.nines.org/
[9] http://writing.upenn.edu/pennsound/about.php
[10] http://blogs.ucl.ac.uk/transcribe-bentham/

project "can be a successful and rewarding venture for volunteers and researchers alike."[11]

5. Faculty in Miami's Classics Department have begun working with students to prepare and publish, via Print-on-Demand services provided by Createspace.com, a series of intermediate language texts. This enterprise was originally supported by one of Miami's USS grants and subsequently the Goldman Prize, awarded to Classics and Philosophy major Evan Hayes. After developing some language processing programs, he has co-authored four intermediate Greek and Latin texts and is currently working with other students and faculty on six others. The published texts have been reviewed in journals and adopted as textbooks in classes in the US and Europe. Such an enterprise is appropriate for various projects that do not aspire to achieve a scholarly *imprimatur*, but can still have value for other reasons. Developing pedagogical tools, in particular, is a good way for students to engage with material in a way that transforms their relationship to it and also has a concrete outcome that others can use and appreciate.

There are limits and difficulties with deploying undergraduates in these kinds of projects. Students often take on responsibilities that they are unable to follow through on, simply underestimating the effort that is required. It is difficult for even the best Miami students to sustain a pattern of regular independent work for the long haul, so good supervising is very important and time-consuming (Scientists who operate labs can attest to this as well). Developing good working relations with students can take a lot of time, and frequently they become interested in humanities research later in their academic career than students in the sciences. However, digital work is not as limited by physical proximity as other kinds of collaboration.

Creating good digital projects must also be followed up with good long-term support to ensure sustainability, a key issue that has been addressed in previous discussion papers. Digital projects often end up unfinished or so poorly supported that they cease to be useful after a short time. Another issue that arises with the use of students is who owns the digital materials once they are produced. The NINES Project was housed at Miami for years and many Miami students contributed to it; but unsurprisingly Laura Mandell took it with her when she left for Texas and the Miami connection is no longer a part of its profile. Once again, institutional policy will have to be articulated clearly in order to make the efforts of faculty and students effective and valuable.

Although it is perhaps changing, anecdotal evidence suggests that involving undergraduates in humanities research projects has not always been viewed positively by granting institutions such as NEH, who are interested in seeing a high quality product. As long as humanists view collaborative work with our students as

---

[11] "Building A Volunteer Community: Results and Findings from *Transcribe Bentham*" *Digital Humanities Quarterly* 6.2 (2102):
http://www.digitalhumanities.org/dhq/vol/6/2/000125/000125.html

being less valuable, it is unlikely that it will be rewarded or recognized institutionally. Yet undergraduate research experience is something that Miami has sought to promote as a special quality of our profile. It will require some genuine rethinking of the kind of work we do in order for us humanists to contribute to this effort. Projects in the digital humanities are one place where prospects for collaboration with undergraduates are bright.

Finally, we have been speaking mostly of collaborative projects that are usually funded by grants, but there have also been efforts at the curricular level to prepare students for humanities research in a digital context. UCLA, for example, has created a Digital Humanities Minor[12] and a Graduate Certificate Program in Digital Humanities.[13] In a recent article in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, it is noted that good liberal arts institutions have already moved toward a "model of teachers and students as co-researchers, collaborating across disciplines and cohorts" so that the digital humanities is an "enhancement of the core methods of an ideal liberal-arts education."[14] For Miami, with its emphasis and reputation in undergraduate teaching, a stronger curricular presence for the digital humanities can help revitalize what we already do well.

---

[12] http://www.cdh.ucla.edu/instruction/dhminor.html
[13] http://www.cdh.ucla.edu/instruction/dhgradcertprog.html
[14] http://chronicle.com/article/Stop-Calling-It-Digital/137325/

The Sustainability of Digital Humanities Projects

Creating digital humanities projects can provide benefits not found in more traditional kinds of humanities scholarship, such as reaching a larger audience and having digital tools to make research more efficient. On the other hand creating digital humanities projects can create unique challenges. When a scholar publishes a book, there is a tangible finished product. When a scholar creates a digital project, there is often a website or digital tool that will require some sort of maintenance. Just picture a website you used to visit regularly that either disappeared one day or eventually became unusable when it was no longer actively maintained (broken links, code that no longer works, etc.), and you can see the importance of good maintenance.

Survey of the Main Issues

The preservation of digital humanities projects come with unique challenges, particularly because the technology is still relatively new. There are three main issues involved.

Technology changes. We are living in a time when technology is changing rapidly, so the decisions about where and how to present one's project will have an effect on its long term viability. File formats, software, hardware, and web standards change. Storage mediums (hard drives and servers) can fail (Smith 378). New tools become prominent, and user expectations can quickly change. For instance, today most people expect to be able to view a website on a mobile device, an expectation that didn't exist just a couple of years ago.

Costs. There is a real financial cost to maintaining these projects. Costs can include staff, equipment, and server space. If there is to be ongoing maintenance, it may be necessary to set aside money to continue to pay someone to keep the website updated and to have money to purchase more server space, if the project becomes larger with time.

Ownership. Who owns a digital humanities project, the scholar or the university where it is created? Obviously faculty will want to maintain control of their intellectual work. What happens though when a faculty member goes to a new institution? Will they make sure that the new institution is willing to provide the resources needed to relocate their project? If they don't, do they expect that the institution they left will continue to provide server space and resources? If no considerations are made, many projects will stagnate or disappear when the faculty member leaves.

Key Discussions

Discussions of how to maintain digital humanities projects center around the responsibility of the individual scholars creating the projects, the need for

collaboration among different experts, and the need for libraries and other institutions to help in the preservation and curation of these projects.

Most scholars and practitioners who write about successful digital humanities projects agree on the need for careful planning from the beginning of the project (Cantara 38). Strong project management can often address future contingencies. For instance good metadata (information used for searching) and the use of standard file formats can help avoid some of the technology changes described above. Carefully thinking about workflows, methods, and tools can save time and work later in the process. Some thought to financial concerns and potential revenue streams will also help. Recent reports from the Blue Ribbon Task Force and the Ithaka S+R point to the importance of financial support for long term sustainability of projects.

Another important element for making sure a digital humanities project survives is to have multiple stakeholders, so that the project can continue even if one member of the project leaves. Collaborations are also important because they can make the projects stronger: "Collaboration between humanists and technologists may lead to more profound understandings and more incisive tools than either would develop by working alone" (Pitti 485). It can benefit a project to have experts in such areas as coding, usability, metadata, etc. Collaboration can be difficult though since humanists are often used to doing their scholarship alone. It can also be difficult to find experts who can devote the necessary time to a project. Finally there needs to be discussions early in the process about expectations, responsibilities, and documentation of individuals' contributions, so that every member of the team knows what to expect.

Most of the literature being written on how to preserve digital humanities projects mentions libraries and institutional repositories as key players. Libraries are seen as an obvious fit because of one of the main missions of most libraries, which is to preserve information. Many libraries may have the tools and staff necessary to preserve the data, and they can function as a space on campus where people from different departments, different ranks, and different skill sets can come together. Still a scholar should not just assume that a library can support his or her project, especially without initial groundwork laid by the creators of the project. As Linda Cantara explains, it can be unwise to expect that a library will create the preservation metadata needed when a resource is submitted to the library (39), mostly because it may be too late at that point to try to impose metadata on a project that already contains large amounts of information. Also, many libraries may be able to archive content, but may not be able to maintain the tools and the interfaces of the projects. It thus becomes important to clarify just what role the library will play. As Kretzschmar describes the relationship between the libraries and his Linguistic Atlas Project, "We have raised the distinction between content and tools, because the implications are quite different for the resources to sustain them. Information should last forever under the care of Library staff, but particular

tools, for now, can only be temporarily maintained given the inconsistent access to resources in the digital humanities" (444).

All three aspects of this discussion require careful planning and communication but will ultimately result in stronger projects that are more likely to be sustainable.

Conclusions
Ultimately institutions of learning need to take responsibility for preserving new digital forms of scholarship and creative works because these institutions will hopefully outlive the individual scholars. Still individual scholars will need to take the lead to ensure the durability of their projects and to make sure that digital preservation is a priority of their universities, their libraries, and their museums. Before beginning digital projects scholars should be proactive in making sure they have the support and the resources they need to preserve their projects. They should consider including the costs of preservation in their grant proposals, partnering with their libraries and museums, reaching out to technology experts at their institutions, and committing to learning new technologies as necessary. These steps are necessary if digital scholars want their works to be sustainable. As Susan Brown, et al. writes:

> While a comparison to the loss of the library at Alexandria in the
> pre-print era might be a tad hyperbolic, it is sobering to contemplate
> the waste of knowledge and intellectual effort that would result
> from the failure of the academic community to resolve the thorny
> problem of how to sustain access, over the long term, to the results
> of the first generation of experimental endeavours in the digital
> humanities if we can't figure out what is to be done (section 27).

Resources
DH Curation Guide. http://guide.dhcuration.org/
Digital Humanities Initiative. Preservation.
http://isites.harvard.edu/icb/icb.do?keyword=k15573&pageid=icb.page75013
Miami University Scholarly Commons. http://sc.lib.muohio.edu/
Planning a Digital Project. http://digitalwa.statelib.wa.gov/newsite/best.htm

Reports
Blue Ribbon Task Force. "Sustainable Economics for a Digital Planet: Ensuring Long-Term Access to Digital Information." *Final Report of the Blue Ribbon Task Force on Sustainable Digital Preservation and Access.* Web. 18 March 2013.
Maron, Nancy L., and Matthew Loy. "Funding for Sustainability: How Funders' Practices Influence the Future of Digital Resources." New York: Ithaka S+R, 2011. Web. 18 March 2013.

Bibliography
Brown, Susan, et al. "Published Yet Never Done: The Tension Between Projection and Completion in Digital Humanities Research." Digital Humanities Quarterly 3.2 (2009): n. pag. Web. 18 March 2013.

Cantara, Linda. "Long-Term Preservation of Digital Humanities Scholarship." *OCLC Systems & Services* 22.1 (2006): 38-42. *Library, Information Science & Technology Abstracts with Full Text.* Web. 8 March 2013.

Kretzschmar, William A., and William Gray Potter. "Library Collaboration with Large Digital Humanities Projects." *Literary & Linguistic Computing* 25.4 (2010): 439-445. *Humanities International Complete*. Web. 8 March 2013.

McGann, Jerome. "Sustainability: The Elephant in the Room." *Online Humanities Scholarship: The Shape of Things to Come.* Ed. Jerome McGann. Houston, TX: Rice UP, 2010. Print.

Pitti, Daniel V. "Designing Sustainable Projects and Publications." A Companion to Digital Humanities. Ed. Susan Schreibman. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2004. 471-487. Print.

Shevlin, Eleanor. "Digital Humanities and the Archives I: Economics and Sustainability." *Early Modern Online Bibliography Blog*. 22 Feb. 2012. Web. 18 March 2013.

Smith, Abby. "Preservation." *A Companion to Digital Humanities*. Ed. Susan Schreibman. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2004. 576-591. Print.

Sharing as a Public Good:

Approaching the Future of Digital Humanities

"The digital humanities is not about building, it's about sharing."--Mark Sample

Introduction: Lowering the Barriers to Access Creative Commons Open Access in the Humanities Fair Use Born Digital Image Matters The Public Domain

NOTE: The Miami University Libraries has begun to prepare resource guides related to some of the topics dealt with here.
> [1] Digital Humanities Resource Guide
> http://libguides.lib.muohio.edu/digital-humanities
> [2] Copyright and Open Access Resource Guide
> http://libguides.lib.muohio.edu/oa
> [3] Citation Resources and Guidelines
> http://libguides.lib.muohio.edu/citation

We privilege the original, the sculpture we can touch, the painting that reveals the brushstrokes of the artist, the book manuscript with corrections in the author's hand. Traditional humanities scholars are attracted to the physicality of the texts or objects they study, the papers they write and the books they publish. The occupational weightiness of the discipline, in all its senses, has undergone a major transformation over the course of just a few decades. The challenges experienced by humanities scholars attempting to fully comprehend the incredible potential of the digital world in which we now operate has been compared to the paradigmatic shift experienced by Medieval monks struggling to understand the format of the modern book when all they had known previously was the scroll. (YouTube video, "Medieval Help Desk," http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pQHX-SjgQvQ).

Certainly the way humanities scholars conduct their work today has been fundamentally changed by the advent of the digital environment, including ...how we gain access to primary documentation. ...how we gather and preserve that information for later retrieval. ...how we interpret what we have gathered. ...how we disseminate the results of our efforts. ...how we are credited for our labor.
Less than a half century ago, humanities researchers invariably began their work at the card catalog, painstakingly recording the call numbers and location information on notecards. Today both of these elements of the traditional research process are largely absent, replaced by email notification, QR codes scanned by smartphones, tablet computers or other portable electronic recording devices.

Access to prized documents was once limited by one's ability to be physically present. Even after examining a rare manuscript, the process of requesting an image of the target object was time consuming and expensive, requiring sometimes lengthy correspondence with the repository and the payment of hefty fees. Copies

were clearly marked "For Research Purposes Only," often with the added stipulation that the copy was not to be circulated beyond the individual for whom it was produced and could not be placed in an archive or repository.

Today, the proliferation of digital image making technologies at a low cost has greatly reduced the barriers to access and dissemination. More often than not, researchers are now permitted to use their personal camera or smartphone to take images of the very same correspondence that was formerly greatly restricted. For material that has already been digitized, many large research libraries have automated the process of content delivery, requiring little more than credit card information and an email account.

Through the 1970s the *National Union Catalog* was the first stop for locating obscure published sources. Even though a fair percentage of the pre-1956 publications in the NUC remain unlisted in WorldCat, the latter has now become the default first search option, with the hefty NUC volumes consulted only when absolutely necessary. The HathiTrust Books Collection and other digitization projects have enabled researchers to determine at a glance the utility of a given resource.

Even unique items have become far more accessible. Many archives and museums have placed high quality digital scans of their more notable items on their website or posted them to shared sites like Tumblr or Flickr. Officially sanctioned reproductions have been greatly supplemented by images taken by those who frequent museums and, unbeknownst to the staff, use their cell phones to take a high quality image of their favorite painting or work of sculpture to share on Facebook. Once an image is on the internet it is nearly impossible to police its use. The level of control over image making and image distribution formerly exercised by cultural institutions and its continued relevance given the demands of current users has become a matter of intense debate in DH circles.

The traditional model of the researcher doggedly collecting materials from obscure repositories and not sharing the results until all of the loose ends were accounted for has been replaced by scholarship by a dispersed community of scholars and interested individuals outside of the academy, to not only to assemble materials for virtual online repositories, but also to contribute to scholarship by correcting transcriptions, suggesting novel interpretations, and constructing multiple narratives from the same body of primary sources.

Research results are no longer restricted to being distributed by the scholarly press, with its long and drawn-out editorial process, with object of providing a definitive, authoritative end product, the book or monograph. In its place is a new model of scholarship, not as a final product, but as an ongoing collective process of constant correction, of perpetual refinement, never quite reaching completion, let alone perfection.

As more and more information is becoming freely available to those with access to a computer and an Internet connection the expectations of free or low cost access are becoming greater as well. At the same time, the proliferation of writers and self-professed authorities distributing their writings on the web has meant that readers must become even more critical consumers of intellectual content.

It is equally important to recognize that due to limits on funding and time, not every source on every topic will ever become digitized. Even when a favorite rarity is available as a digital facsimile, at some point it will become necessary, for the serious researcher at least, to examine, say, a vintage printing *The Oath of a Freeman* in order to determine its authenticity. Perhaps the main point to be made here is that each form of a document (original, facsimile, photographic reproduction, microfilm/microfiche, digital scan, electronic transcription) provides us with the opportunity to consider different interpretive frameworks for understanding the target work or collection. The terrain is even trickier in the realm of texts and images that are born digital.

Given this new environment in which we study, research, gather, write, discuss, and disseminate our collective knowledge, the questions quickly proliferate: "When is citation not enough?" "When do I need to request permission to quote, copy or post something that has been previously published, either in print or online?" "What do I do with materials that exist only in a digital form?" "How do I maintain control over my creation once it has entered the digital domain?" "How are traditional rights being challenged in the digital environment?"

The purpose of this brief guide is to provide some entry points for getting answers to those and related questions. In general, the compilers have selected a half dozen or so resources that get to the heart of a particular issue; most are available on the Internet at no charge. All of the topics considered here can be found on Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia, one of the most successful examples of a collaborative digital initiative. To find articles of interest simply type your topic enclosed in double quotations followed by wiki, e.g. *"creative commons" wiki*, into the search box of your favorite web browser. The Wikipedia entry should appear at the head of your search results.

I. Creative Commons
Founded in 2001, Creative Commons is a non-profit organization formed to promote the "some rights reserved" or the "copyleft" movement. Creative Commons licenses allow creators of copyrighted works to easily control how they wish to share their works with others. While built upon existing copyright law, which presupposes unique authorship, Creative Commons licenses are presented in a form that is easy for the non-lawyer to understand.

Currently four modules or conditions combine to form six license types. Attribution is common to all of the licenses, meaning that the author of the work must be cited. Each of the conditions is accompanied by its own graphic icon.

*Attribution (CC BY)
*Attribution Share Alike (CC BY-SA)
*Attribution No Derivatives (CC BY-ND)
*Attribution Non-Commercial (CC BY-NC)
*Attribution Non-Commercial Share Alike (CC BY-NC-SA)
*Attribution Non-Commercial No Derivatives (CC BY-NC-ND)

[1] Creative Commons
http://www.creativecommons.org

[2] Flickr
http://www.flickr.com/creativecommons/

[3] YouTube
http://www.youtube.com/yt/copyright/creative-commons.html

[4] Support Creative Commons
https://creativecommons.net/

[5] Kickstarter
http://www.kickstarter.com/pages/creativecommons

II. Open Access in the Humanities

Open access (OA) allows unrestricted access to peer-reviewed scholarly journals, books and monographs that are available electronically through the Internet. Authors can self-archive in an institutional or disciplinary repository or publish on an OA journal website. Open content licenses allows users to modify the work, first practiced in shared versions of computer software, today applied more broadly.

Two models of OA are currently practiced:
*Green OA Self-archiving
*Gold OA Publishing

[1] Berlin Declaration on Open Access to Knowledge in the Sciences and Humanities (2003)
http://oa.mpg.de/berlin-prozess/berliner-erklarung/

[2] Open Humanities Press
http://openhumanitiespress.org/

[3] Peter Suber, "Promoting Open Access in the Humanities" (2005)
http://legacy.earlham.edu/~peters/writing/apa.htm

[4] Gary Hall, "Radical Open Access in the Humanities" (2011)
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4WfXeeWPcIo

[5] Gary F. Draught, "Peter Suber's 'Promoting Open Access in the Humanities--Eight Years Later'" (2012)
http://oaopenaccess.wordpress.com/2012/03/30/peter-subers-promoting-open-access-inthe-humanities-eight-years-later/

[6] WikiProject Open Access
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:WikiProject_Open_Access

III. Fair Use

Fair Use is an exception to the exclusivity granted under copyright law permitting scholars, researchers and educators to cite or incorporate copyrighted materials, both published and unpublished, into their own work without notifying the copyright holder or obtaining a formal license to do so. Determining the applicability of Fair Use to an individual case is based upon a four-factor balancing test. Section 107 of the 1876 Copyright Act delineates these factors:
the purpose and character of the use, including whether such use is of commercial nature or is for nonprofit educational purposes; the nature of the copyrighted work the amount and substantiality of the portion used in relation to the copyrighted work as a whole; the effect of the use upon the potential market for, or value of, the copyrighted work.

[1] U.S. Copyright Office
http://www.copyright.gov/fls/fl102.html

[2] Copyright Advisory Office, Columbia University
http://copyright.columbia.edu/copyright/fair-use/

[3] Fair Use Checklist Guidelines
http://copyright.columbia.edu/copyright/fair-use/fair-use-checklist/

[4] Fair Use Checklist
http://copyright.columbia.edu/copyright/files/2009/10/fairusechecklist.pdf

IV. Born Digital

Materials which originate in a digital form--such as websites, blogs, listservs, email, digital photographs, electronic databases, ebooks, digital music or other sound recordings--are often referred to as born-digital. Intellectual property rights and digital preservation issues are matters of great concern in this constantly evolving and highly unstable environment. This is especially true given the increasing quantity of user-generated content on the Internet, produced with little or no production or archiving standards. The rise of on-demand publishing of born-digital works (through such services as Lulu.com or Shutterfly.com) further complicates bibliographic control over single-and multiple-authored works.

[1] Defining Born Digital

https://www.oclc.org/resources/research/activities/hiddencollections/borndigital.pdf

[2] AIMS Born-Digital Collections: An Inter-Institutional Model for Stewardship (2012)
http://www2.lib.virginia.edu/aims/whitepaper/AIMS_final.pdf

[3] Digital Preservation Coalition
http://www.dpconline.org/advice/preservationhandbook/introduction/definitions-andconcepts

[4] Managing Born-Digital Special Collections (2012)
http://publications.arl.org/Managing-Born-Digital-Special-Collections-and-ArchivalMaterials-SPEC-Kit-329/

[5] Oral History in the Digital Age (2012)
http://ohda.matrix.msu.edu/2012/06/borndigital/

[6] Born Digital: Guidance for Donors, Dealers, and Archival Repositories (2013)
http://mediacommons.futureofthebook.org/mcpress/borndigital/

V. Image Matters

The landscape of image rights is rapidly evolving. An examination of even a handful of museum websites reveals a vast range of policies regarding what can be photographed, for what purposes, and whether or not permissions are required. For example, what rights, if any, does individual have to distribute digital images of a sculpture taken with their smartphone during a visit to the Metropolitan Museum of Art? At what point do the rights of the owner of a painting supercede those of the artist or her estate?

[1] Harvard Law School, Art Law: Image Rights
http://www.law.harvard.edu/faculty/martin/art_law/image_rights.htm

[2] Cynthia Esworthy, A Guide to the Visual Artists Rights Act (1997)
http://www.law.harvard.edu/faculty/martin/art_law/esworthy.htm

[3] Art Basel Miami, Art Law in the Digital Age (2011)
http://vimeo.com/33116360

[4] Wikipedia: Image Use Policy
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Image_use_policy

[5] Kenneth D. Crews, Copyright, Museums and the Licensing of Art Images (2012)
http://www.kressfoundation.org/research/Default.aspx?id=35409

[6] Artist Rights Society
http://www.arsny.com

VI. The Public Domain

The public domain refers to creative works whose intellectual property rights are not longer in force or have expired. No permission or license is required to perform, reproduce or publish such works. One of the advantages of public domain works is that they can be used to develop derivative works without permission from the creator. At the same time, identifying which paintings, books, and other creative works are in the public domain can be a daunting task.

[1] The Public Domain Review
http://publicdomainreview.org/

[2] Mark Helprin, A Great Idea Lives Forever. Shouldn't Its Copyright? (2007)
http://www.nytimes.com/2007/05/20/opinion/20helprin.html?ex=1337313600&en=3571064
d77055f41&ei=5124&partner=permalink&exprod=permalink&_r=0

[3] James Boyle, *The Public Domain: Enclosing the Commons of the Mind* (2008)
https://docs.google.com/a/miamioh.edu/file/d/0B-Z5nizO9NffdlJxY1RMWm5Ec2M/edit

[4] Text Encoding Initiative
http://www.tei-c.org/index.xml

[5] Public Domain Sherpa
http://www.publicdomainsherpa.com/

[6] Citing Sources Elizabeth Shown Mills, Evidence Explained: Citing History Sources from Artifacts to Cyberspace (2009).
http://www.amazon.com/Evidence-Explained-History-Artifacts-Cyberspace/dp/0806318066/ref=sr_1_2?s=books&ie=UTF8&qid=1362342610&sr=12&keywords=elizabeth+shown+mills+evidence

Sustainable Digital Archives: Email and Listservs

"Any collection promises totality."
—Susan Stewart

This brief and more informal discussion paper concerns electronic mail and in particular the efficient archiving and management of electronic listservs within and beyond a university context. The point is to use the e-listserv archives currently held at Miami University as a synecdoche for broader archival practices in emergent digital records. The onset of *the digital* briefly held the promise of archival stability and longevity; even the spectre of freedom was invoked and the paper-free workplace. None is proving to be the case. If work is to be lost, should *we* care? If, for example, nobody is much agitated by the overall drift of the question being asked here then it has been put and answered by silence. Perhaps *we* simply intone "bring it on" to ephemerality. But IF *we* choose to care what can *we* do about it? Might there be a case for lobbying the University to adopt a clear policy for long-term archiving?

E-Lists and Miami University

"An electronic mailing list . . . is similar to a traditional mailing list — a list of names and addresses — as might be kept by an organization for sending publications to its members or customers, but typically refers to four things — a list of email addresses, the people ("subscribers") receiving mail at those addresses, the publications (email messages) sent to those addresses, and a reflector, which is a single email address that, when designated as the recipient of a message, will send a copy of that message to all of the subscribers." Quoted from Wikipedia, March 2013, one emergent contemporary exemplar of global collaborative scholarly work, "the free encyclopedia that anyone can edit."

Electronic lists are in widespread public and private use for diverse and divisive purposes between scholarly communities. Many first experiences of virtual community, of those presently in the academy, can be traced to the years of first between 1994-2004 and many scholars will have been active contributors to multiple listserv communities in the intervening years. Many rarely now correspond in conventional ways that leave a paper trail. Future biographies are going to be increasingly dependent upon email archives. Archives of scholarly works, from early drafts to field notes and so on, will be increasingly digital. We are not far away from two decades into substantial e-list history, e-list sociology, e-list anthropology, e-list psychology, e-list scholarly collaboration, e-list linguistics . . e-list studies. But the sum total of e-lists housed at Miami offers other horizons through acts of what Derrida calls a "gathering together of signs"

to create consignment; for example a portrait of a mid-western state academic institution in the emergent twenty-first century: or a microcosm of the changing states of the English language at a critical moment in global linguistic development. Perhaps something significant about the shifting student demographic can be traced therein and so on.

The Miami server List Archives, still at LISTSERV.MUOHIO.EDU, currently houses approximately one thousand five hundred list archives. It's an ad hoc collection. Nobody set out to collect it, although each of the lists offers a form of collection in its own right. Many lists on the Miami server are simply announcement lists but in amongst them are lists of genuine academic import. It would therefore seem to be an important function of the university to establish and maintain good archival protocols, both to serve its future generations of students and its future scholar and researchers. True, some of these lists have very small numbers of subscribers (1 is the lowest). A substantial number service small clubs and fan base groups, such as MUANIME. Whilst the size of a subscriber base is not a criteria indicating importance of content a significant proportion of these lists also have a relatively large number of subscribers:

GLBTQNEWS – 609

HABITAT (Habitat for Humanity) – 1,827

HPCC (High Performance Computer Cluster – 697

IVWSMEMBERS (international Virginia Woolf Society) – 425

KKYTBS-L (Kappa Kappa Psi / Tau Beta Sigma) – 2,186

LILLYCON (Lilly Conference on College Teaching) – 2,204

MICROCLOUB (Miami University Microbiology Club) – 1,336

MUDROPOUTS (the Miami University Skydiving Club) – 1,323

Now, there needs to be and will be ongoing conversation about discrepant boundaries among public and private spheres in this particular period. Boundaries are being haphazardly redrawn and contested by the proliferation of social media to both productive and unproductive effects. What is said here is in no way an accusation, nor intended to impute Miami in isolation. Rather it is an invitation for Miami to look forwards and become exemplary in this one area of digital scholarship. This is an opportunity for Miami to take a lead and to assure the stability and security of primary research sources, on behalf of its faculty and its students at all levels of past, present and future scholarship.

Case Study

In April, 2001, Keith Tuma established an electronic mail discussion list at Miami University focused on contemporary poetry in the British, Scottish, Welsh and Irish Isles, together with a network of transatlantic and transpacific peers working in, on, or about the premises of poetry and poetries written in English or translated into English. A subscriber base for UKPOETRY developed by invitation only quickly increased over the intervening 12 years and the list has unquestionably been a site of serious and in some cases important discussions by upwards of 275 scholars and critics and practicing poets of note, and a majority of them have academic institutional assignations of high standing, in the United Kingdom, in the United States, Canada, New Zealand, Ireland and Australia. It's a niche community, but it is already understood as an important one. It is significant for its field: as significant as it would be for a similar group of international mathematicians or microbiologists or archaeologists sharing their research.

The archives, hosted at Miami, contain significant materials of import for anyone wishing to study British and Irish poetries in the early twenty first century; for anyone wishing to research transatlantic and transpacific poetic communities; for anyone interested in provisional community formations. The question, in this instance, might well be "why should Miami care?" One response is that the work of several professors at Miami is partially enmeshed with this archive. Another would be, well this is a global community, one of the priorities that Miami espouses. This archive presents a translocal problem worth addressing.

Any member of this list trying to conduct a search on the archives will find that there is currently a gap, between December 2001 and January 2004. Two years archival material is missing, a loss first pointed out by a UKPOETRY subscriber conducting research on a prior thread. This is a substantial gap and it is not only the case for UKPOETRY. It must be emphasized and understood this missing period of time is the case for ALL lists in the Miami University system. Apologizing for the *inconvenience*, in December 2012 a senior systems administrator in IT services wrote the list administrator Dr Tuma that an index of missing archives could be provided but not the archival materials themselves. Had those archives missing have been discovered sooner then full restoration might have been more a possibility.

John Millard, in the newly emergent Digital Learning Center is working on UKPOETRY and making substantial progress in its reconstruction. That's the good news and it remains possible that with a lot of time and effort the archive can be substantially, perhaps completely, reconstructed. The problem of how to insert missing mail from the list's archival timeline might remain. However this is one list out of a far larger workload, one list out of possible hundreds. We might ask at this point on what basis lists will be considered worthy of special archival attention? Are some e-lists more worthy than others or is the entirety

the point?

For UKPOETRY an issue of permissions remains. At least one person has indicated that they are unwilling to be cited, so this archive will operate as a dark archive; containing primary source documents, accumulated over the course of an individuals or organization's lifetime, access to which is currently limited. The intention with this particular list is that it could become fully public in fifty years. The intervening decades indicate an ongoing responsibility for Miami, to maintain the list in an accessible condition throughout intervening decades. Such a responsibility comes with budgetary implications. But if the university cannot substantiate such an obligation then what service is it performing for past, current and future scholarship?

Hard copy correspondence used to be the responsibility of individual scholars and subsequent estates. Any university could say that the responsibility remains with individual researchers, scholars and creative practitioners. However this burgeoning archival thorn requires that a university make it possible for those individuals to maintain their archival records and a timeline cannot so easily be drawn up for that. Miami University wants its faculty and students to exploit digital tools, indeed is encouraging more online teaching to become part of the meshwork of pedagogic delivery. This commons is something relatively new and needs to be addressed.

Is this not a moment for substantive policy?