



Library Partnerships in the Digital Humanities Project Lifecycle The Digital Humanities Summer Residency

Matariki Network of Universities Library Benchmarking Project 3

Dartmouth College Library

Contents

Survey Questions.....	2
Project overview	3
Scope.....	3
Key Drivers.....	3
Objectives	4
Policy Framework.....	4
Aim to Support Research.....	5
Data gathering.....	5
Performance measures	5
Plans for ongoing evaluation	6
Key lessons learnt.....	6
Appendix A Dartmouth Digital Humanities Summer Residency.....	8
Appendix B Arts and Humanities Resource Center Summer Residency Program	9

Survey Questions

In terms of a specific project around 'planning for change to support research, not in isolation but in partnership with others'.

1. Describe the project you have chosen to report on.
 - a. Outline the scope of the project; include the features and the resources involved (including details of the partnerships.)
 - b. Identify the key drivers and objectives for the project.
 - c. Outline the policy framework that supports the project.
 - d. Explain how the project aims support research.
2. Detail the processes that were used to gather data that were used to inform the development of this project.
 - a. Briefly outline this formative assessment data and explain how it was used to inform the development of the project.
 - b. Include details of the process to gather the formative assessment data; i.e. how the data was gathered, who was involved, and how the data was verified.
3. Detail the performance measures used to evaluate the success of this project.
 - a. List the performance measures.
 - b. Include details of the process to gather the post implementation evaluation data; i.e. how the data was gathered, who was involved, and how the data was verified.
 - c. Indicate how, where, and to whom the success of the project was reported.
4. Outline the plans you have for the ongoing evaluation of the effectiveness of the projects outcomes.
5. Outline the key lessons learnt from undertaking this project.
 - a. Include details of any constraints that could not be mitigated or resolved throughout the project.
 - b. Indicate where the lessons learnt from undertaking the project have or may be applied.

Project overview

Scope

Dartmouth's Arts & Humanities Resource Center (AHRC) Summer Residency (now called the Dartmouth Digital Humanities Summer Residency) is in its second year of providing collaborative support from the Library and from Information Technology Services' Educational Technologies for a faculty digital humanities project. See the [Call for Proposals for the 2016 Residency](#)¹ ([Appendix A](#)).

The goal of the residency is to provide support and development for a scholarly DH project, as well as a prototyping infrastructure, "deep collaboration," and a staffing model for the digital humanities project lifecycle. The Residency is intended to initiate or significantly develop a project. Receiving the support of the Residency does not necessarily imply that a scholar's project will be completed over the course of the summer term. The success of the Residency does not, therefore, hinge on the success of the project.

The pilot project for the 2015 Summer Residency was Scott Sanders' (Assistant Professor of French and Italian) [Multimedia in the Long Eighteenth Century](#) (MMLEC)². MMLEC is a text-mining project that seeks to automate the discovery of musical paratext (notation and lyrics) in a corpus of 100,000+ French and English novels from approximately 1688 to 1815. An overview of the project is available in this [video report](#)³ as well as this [article](#)⁴. The Residency Pilot Report is available as Appendix B.

Key Drivers

- Faculty member or scholar as principal investigator;
- Digital Humanities librarian;
- Subject librarians;
- Technologists and programmers within the Library and in Educational Technologies and Research Computing;
- Student assistants who are interested in digital scholarship and digital learning;
- Directors and leaders of other partner organizations on campus, such as the [Neukom Institute for Computational Science](#)⁵ and the [Leslie Humanities Center](#)⁶

¹ <http://digitalhumanities.dartmouth.edu/dartmouth-digital-humanities-summer-residency/>

² <https://sites.dartmouth.edu/mmlec/>

³ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BC4wFWv1ee0&feature=youtu.be>

⁴ John Wallace, Scott M. Sanders, and Mark Boettcher. 2015. Multimedia in the Long Eighteenth Century. In *Proceedings of the 2nd International Workshop on Digital Libraries for Musicology* (DLfM '15). ACM, New York, NY, USA, 29-32. DOI=<http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2785527.2785533>

⁵ <http://neukom.dartmouth.edu/>

⁶ <http://www.dartmouth.edu/~lhc/>

Other drivers in the DH community at Dartmouth and elsewhere may be implicated as we report on the Residency:

- Wider initiatives such as [Dartmouth's Digital Humanities community of practice](#)⁷;
- Dartmouth Scholars' Collaboratory (in development);
- Inter-institutional collaborations such as the recently established [Digital Liberal Arts Exchange](#)⁸.

Note that this focus on the DH project lifecycle and infrastructure has been made possible by having two positions focused on developing DH infrastructure and community: a position for a DH librarian and a position in Educational Technologies.

Objectives

- To foster DH scholarship under a collaborative model;
- To develop a framework for DH project lifecycles that can be modified to fit a range of projects with Library and ITS involvement – this Residency is one model, but not the only model, for collaborative DH support;
- To identify specific types of projects for which this model is best suited;
- To identify where the model may break down;
- To identify the needs, limitations, and factors not accounted for in the model.

Policy Framework

Partnership with the DH project lifecycle is directly connected to the Library's mission and goals:

The Dartmouth College Library fosters intellectual growth and advance the teaching and research missions of the College by supporting excellence and innovation in education and research, managing and delivery scholarly content, and partnering in the development and dissemination of new scholarship.

The nature of this partnership has changed as DH has grown in scope and ambition at Dartmouth; faculty and other scholars are increasingly turning to the Library as a partner in digital scholarship, and a faculty “cluster hire” in the field of [Digital Humanities and Social Engagement](#)⁹ is underway this spring.

⁷ <http://digitalhumanities.dartmouth.edu/>

⁸ <https://dlaexchange.wordpress.com/>

⁹ http://www.dartmouth.edu/~provost/clusters.html#digital_humanities

Aim to Support Research

The project aims and objectives not only support research, they *are* a form of research or scholarly inquiry. DH is a transformative community of practice at Dartmouth and elsewhere that is highly self-reflexive in considering its own models of epistemology and production. Most DH projects include, in their scholarly output, some deliberate reflection on the ways in which the project itself was generated, sustained, and preserved.

Data gathering

Residency pilot report on MMLEC; interviews with project leaders and Library and ITS staff involved on the project; publications issuing from the project.

Performance measures

Ongoing process reports were made informally to Library, ITS, Neukom, Leslie Center, and faculty leadership and a formal report ([Appendix B](#)) was submitted in November 2015. Also in November 2015, MMLEC and the Residency were the topic of the monthly [Digital Seminar](#)¹⁰, open to the campus DH community.

Prof Sanders, with John Wallace and Mark Boettcher from Research Computing, presented on an early stage of the project at the [Digital Libraries for Musicology Workshop](#)¹¹ in June 2015. All Residency collaborators submitted proposals to the [international Digital Humanities conference](#)¹², to be held in Krakow, Poland, in August 2016; proposals by Mark Boettcher, Scott Millsbaugh, and Laura Braunstein were accepted.

Reporting on and assessing the Residency led to a number of questions:

- How do we measure the “success” or “performance” of a digital project?
- Or are we measuring the success of Library involvement?
- Or are we measuring the success of our model of partnership vs former models of partnership?

Early on, we decided that the success and/or completion of the Residency was not necessarily linked to the success and/or completion of the project; few DH research/scholarship projects can be completed in ten weeks. As a prototype/pilot, the Residency met its goals. The ongoing question is how to assess what benefits the project brought back to the Library and ITS. That is, what new skills, infrastructure, and team development are generated by involvement with the faculty, ITS and Library

¹⁰ <http://digitalhumanities.dartmouth.edu/event/digital-seminar-multimedia-in-the-long-18th-century/>

¹¹ <http://www.transforming-musicology.org/dlfm2015/>

¹² <http://dh2016.adho.org/>

colleagues, and student assistants on this particular project? How does this benefit future projects and ongoing work?

Plans for ongoing evaluation

The primary focus of the ongoing evaluation will be the matter of sustainability:

- Is this a model that we can continue to support, with the resources, skills, and technology currently available?
- What would need to change – in the design of the Residency and/or in terms of staff and technology resources – in order to continue to offer the Residency?
- What are the minimum/maximum levels of support that we can offer?
- What is the “afterlife” of the Residency? That is, once the intensive summer support has ended, how do we manage ongoing commitment to the project?
- How will non-traditional projects such as this and other models of DH scholarly production impact the Library’s preservation initiatives (through the Digital Library Repository and the Dartmouth Academic Commons), as scholars increasingly come to expect the Library to be their partner in ongoing maintenance and long-term preservation of digital scholarship?

Key lessons learnt

Early on in developing MMLEC, the project team realized that additional expertise was needed from Library staff in order to develop a bibliographic database of the “master list” of the corpus of texts. Project time from additional Library staff member (in the Digital Library Technologies Group) was requested and granted after the project was underway. In the second year, a technical review was part of the proposal evaluation to identify up front if technical support might be required and at what level.

Additionally, there is no French counterpart to the British Library’s [English Short-Title Catalog](#)¹³, and the Bibliothèque nationale de France (BnF) does not have an API (application programming interface) that would allow the team to ingest the corresponding bibliographic data for the French-language corpus. The Library’s subject specialist for French, Jill Baron, is continuing conversations with staff from the BnF for an ongoing international collaboration, inspired by MMLEC’s immediate scholarly need, to develop this resource.

A number of questions that have arisen over the course of the Residency. Our reflections include:

- How do DH projects illuminate differences among organizational cultures (i.e. Library, Educational Technologies, Research Computing, Humanities Center, student assistants)?

¹³ http://estc.bl.uk/F/?func=file&file_name=login-bl-estc

- How can we most effectively educate ourselves and our colleagues about these cultures?
- How can we enhance Library culture in order to make those lessons productive instead of a source of conflict or anxiety about human and technological resources?
- How can we anticipate stresses/needs of future Residency projects and other DH scholarship?
- What differs Residency support/partnership from other ongoing DH work?
- How can we best help scholars to focus and present their research questions in order to benefit from Library and ITS collaboration?

Appendix A Dartmouth Digital Humanities Summer Residency

Call for Proposals

Digital Humanities Summer Residency 2016

Dartmouth ITS (Information Technology Services) and the Dartmouth College Library are seeking faculty applications for the 2016 Digital Humanities Summer Residency. Piloted in 2015 at the Arts and Humanities Resource Center, the Summer Residency program is an opportunity for a selected faculty member to spend the summer term planning, building, and publishing a digital humanities project in collaboration with technical and subject area experts from across Dartmouth. All proposals are welcome. We will work to expand and promote the Resident's project, whether still in the planning phase or already in development.

The Digital Humanities Summer Residency provides up to \$10,000 for hardware, software, student assistants, outreach, and professional travel, plus targeted staff support for:

1. Project planning and management
2. Resource acquisition
3. Digital infrastructure
4. Outreach and publicity
5. Curricular integration
6. Project preservation

Project leaders chosen for the Summer Residency should expect to commit to a schedule of weekly meetings and to participate fully in the development and execution of their project. A memo of understanding detailing outcomes and deliverables will be agreed upon before the start of summer term. For an example of a previous project, please watch the short video that was produced for Multimedia in the Long Eighteenth Century. MMLEC was led by Scott Sanders, Assistant Professor of French, and was selected as the focus of the AHRC Residency Program in summer 2015.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BC4wFWv1ee0>

To apply, please send a description of your proposed project (no more than 300 words) to digital.humanities.support@dartmouth.edu by April 18, 2016. Proposers will be notified by May 9, 2016.

Appendix B Arts and Humanities Resource Center Summer Residency Program

2015 Pilot Report

During the summer term of 2015, Academic and Campus Technology Services (ACTS), in conjunction with the Dartmouth College Library, piloted an Arts and Humanities Resource Center (AHRC) Residency Program. The pilot was conceived as part of an initiative to transform the AHRC into a locus of collaboration between faculty in Arts and Humanities departments and key staff from Educational Technologies, Research Computing, and the Library.

Project

Scott Sanders (Assistant Professor of French), the faculty PI of *Multi-Media in the Long Eighteenth Century* (<http://sites.dartmouth.edu/mmlec/>), was selected as the AHRC Summer 2015 Resident for the pilot. A team representing Research Computing, Educational Technologies, and the Library offered support to the project over the summer. John Wallace (Research Computing) had already worked extensively with Professor Sanders to conceptualize and begin prototyping the project, which consists of a macro-analysis of how eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century French and British novels represent music and song as paratext. Sanders and Wallace also co-authored a paper on the project (<http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=2785533>), which was presented at the Digital Libraries for Musicology (DLfM) Workshop in June 2015.

Team

- Jill Baron, Romance Languages and Literatures Librarian, Dartmouth College Library
- Eric Bivona, Senior Programmer, Digital Library Technologies Group, Dartmouth College Library
- Mark Boettcher, Senior Programmer/Analyst, Research Computing
- Laura Braunstein, Digital Humanities and English Librarian, Dartmouth College Library
- Liya Liu, MALS '15
- Scott Millsbaugh, Instructional Designer, Educational Technologies ACTS
- Scott Sanders, Assistant Professor of French
- Jessica Tin, Visiting student from Smith College
- John Wallace, Research Systems Engineer, Research Computing

Budget

The Library and ACTS both contributed \$2,500 to the pilot, which was spent in the following way:

- Student Labor - \$666 (55.5 hours combined x \$12.00 an hour)
- Hardware - \$225 (4TB hard drive)
- Media Production – estimated \$3000 (MPG-produced trailer for the project and AHRC Summer Residency Program)
- Event Costs – \$704

Total expenditure: \$4595

In addition, staff members Wallace, Boettcher, Millspough, Baron, and Braunstein all contributed significant work hours.

Outcomes

The AHRC Residency Program Pilot was conceived strategically as part of the larger plan to re-invigorate the space of the AHRC, in tandem with Dartmouth's wider Digital Humanities initiative. Therefore, the success of the summer pilot was understood to be independent from the overall success of the project. While the project team has worked to realize Professor Sanders's vision for *MultiMedia in the Long Eighteenth Century*, achieving particular technical milestones was not the primary focus of the pilot. Rather, the AHRC Residency Program Pilot was designed to allow ACTS and the Library to:

1. Prototype a team-based approach to supporting Digital Humanities projects that can be standardized for future implementation.

Successes: The team met weekly to share information, assign tasks, and plan next steps. This worked exceptionally well, as each team member was accountable for task completion on a regular basis.

Challenges: Some tension emerged as to project management, particularly in regard to managing the overall project versus managing the summer residency pilot. While the goals of each were compatible, the group did not always agree on priorities for the summer in relation to priorities for the ongoing project.

2. Test the capacity of ACTS and the Library to fully support DH projects at Dartmouth without recourse to external contractors (like programmers and project managers).

Successes: Much of the programming needed for the project fell to MarkBoettcher, who developed tools and processes that could potentially support future computational projects in the humanities. For example, the page tagger developed as a result of the project has some application to Michelle Warren's *Remix the Manuscript* (<http://sites.dartmouth.edu/RemixBrut/>), as well as several other proposed projects

Challenges: Some technical knowledge necessary to build the project's bibliographic database fell out of the portfolio of Baron and Braunstein. A project request was sent to the Digital Library Technologies Group, which resulted in Eric Bivona joining the team. Additionally, the bibliographic data for the French novels in the project corpus needed to come from the Bibliotheque nationale de France, which does not offer an accessible search interface (or an API) for gathering the data that we needed. Discussions with staff at the BnF are ongoing, and may result in the BnF's partnership on the project.

3. Deepen the services offered by and at the AHRC

Successes: The pilot modelled an intake process for future DH projects. Our experience suggests that intense cooperation at the beginning of a project, such as the AHRC Residency, can move projects forward with greater organization

and resource commitment than when scholars work to make these connections to resources on their own. The AHRC (and associated staff from ITS and the Library working on digital humanities) could also support coordinated outreach and communication for DH projects (such as project websites), and there may be projects where the only support needed is communication and outreach, as part of the larger communication and outreach efforts of DH at Dartmouth.

Challenges: Some questions emerged regarding the staff affected by project requirements, and how reporting structures might impact the commitment of staff to a project, if the intake process does not involve managers of these staff. For example, the MMLEC project requires the design and programming of a bibliographic database, expertise that could be provided by the Digital Library Technologies Group. Requesting Bivona's expertise required another project proposal to this department. The Library, in particular, has staff with deep and broad technical expertise, but much of their time is committed to internal processes and projects. Freeing up library technical staff to work on DH projects, in collaboration with faculty and other scholars, would benefit both scholarship and the library.

4. Focus ACTS and Library efforts on developing services and staff competencies for a future digital scholarship center.

Successes: Initial intake, project management and development, and communication (including outreach and publicity) are likely services that a digital scholarship center could provide for new and ongoing projects. The AHRC Summer Residency could potentially become part of a digital scholarship center's programs and services.

Challenges: Currently, there is no official, central point of service for the intake, management, and outreach efforts pertaining to new DH projects. Millspaugh and Braunstein are filling this role, and have been learning on the job in collaboration with colleagues. This informal process has been flexible and nimble, and has allowed ITS and the Library to coordinate and adapt services in relation to researchers' needs -- an adaptability in services that we hope a digital scholarship center would also provide.

Library Assessment Capability Maturity Model

		Stages of the Assessment Cycle			
		Objectives	Methods and data collection	Analysis and interpretation	Use of results
Level of capability	Continuous ¹ (Optimized)				
	Managed ² (Measured)				
	Defined ³ (Confirmed)	See page 4.	Call and review of proposals; team approach.		
	Repeatable ⁴ (Documented)		Conference presentations; articles; videos.	Testing capacity of staff; informal process reports.	
	Initial ⁵ (Ad hoc)				

¹ Process management includes deliberate process to incorporate continuous process improvement and organizational optimization

² Quantitatively managed in accordance with agreed-upon metrics and required outcomes

³ Defined as standard business process

⁴ Documented such that repeating can become standard procedures

⁵ Chaotic, ad hoc, individual heroics