

CAA/SAH Task Force to Develop Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure in Digital Art and Architectural History

CAA Office, 50 Broadway, 21<sup>st</sup> Floor, New York, NY

Friday, October 16, 2015, 11:30 a.m–4:00 p.m.

Members: DeWitt Godfrey (CAA President), Ken Breisch (SAH President), Suzanne Preston Blier, Whitney Davis, Linda Downs (CAA Executive Director, ex officio), Gabrielle Esperdy, Michelle Miller Fisher, Pamela Fletcher, Anne Collins Goodyear, Betty Leigh Hutcheson (CAA staff, ex officio), Paul Jaskot, Bruce Mackh, Tara McPherson, Abby Smith Rumsey, Pauline Saliga (SAH Executive Director, ex officio), Ann Whiteside

Present: Blier, Downs, Esperdy, Fletcher, Hutcheson, Saliga, Whiteside

Teleconference: Breisch, Godfrey, Jaskot, Mackh, McPherson, Rumsey

Absent: Davis, Fisher, Goodyear

Minutes

1. Greeting and Introductions (Linda Downs)
2. Sections of Draft
  - I. Preface and Goal of Guidelines
    - Like the phrase “democratic” for dissemination
    - Shouldn’t use synonyms for “guidelines”
    - Standardize the name of the task force and the title. Say “art history and architectural history,” so it’s clear that it’s not referring to digital art
    - Remove last paragraph of preface. Make is shorter and punchier. Save it and move it elsewhere?
  - a. Goal of Guidelines
    - Include footnote for CAA’s Fair Use Guidelines. Make it clear that these issues are evolving.
    - Number 4 different sections (put as bullet points)
      - o (1) Definitions and Criteria
        - (a) Technology
        - (b) Process as Scholarship
        - (c) Defining Content
      - o (2) Forms of Publication and Evaluation
        - (a) What Does Publication Mean
        - (b) Evaluation
          - (i) Peer Review
          - (ii) Institutional Evaluation

- (3) Collaboration
  - (4) Preservation and Stewardship
- Add section at end of guidelines to summarize best practices (one for scholar and one for institution)
  
- II. Digital Scholarship for Art Historians and Architectural Historians
  - Add subtitle for now: Definitions and Criteria
  - Cross reference the guidelines being developed for digital artists (at first mention of art and architectural history)
  - Don't bold or capitalize any terms until final draft, when it's clear what needs emphasis
  - Departments should "tailor" these guidelines
    - a. Technology
      - "Research and practice **that** applies **existing** digital tools or methods."
      - Examples in this section seem important to include. Could potentially drop examples in later sections to footnotes
      - "historical problems **in art and architecture**"
      - Refer to scholars in plural and avoid gender categories of his or her (their, etc.)
      - Capitalize name of tools (e.g. GIS) because copyrighted or pluralize systems
    - b. Process as Scholarship
      - Footnote sentence about "This is standard in the sciences..."
      - Use term "evaluative committees" (and then on first mention footnote to explain all the committees this includes)
      - Instead of "younger scholars" say "scholars considering digital projects"
      - "In general, the importance of the process in digital work can be identified **two ways.**"
      - Remove examples from bullet points on project narrative and stand-alone work of scholarship. Put in footnotes
      - Change "candidate" to "scholar"
    - c. Defining Content
      - Remove last sentence on personnel documents
  
- III. Collaboration
  - Expansion of Teams and Roles section with Pamela's points (to introduce section)
  - Move Difficulties in Collaboration section to appendix. Change title to Complexities of Collaboration
  - Move Possible Solutions section to appendix
  - Indicate that scholarship is **iterative** and collaborative
  - Indicate that digital scholarship introduces new forms of collaboration that need to be recognized and made explicit

- Add sentence about difficulty of identifying/finding right collaborators within “Difficulties” section
  - Move bibliography to end
- IV. Evaluation, Peer Review, and Impact
- Change title to Forms of Publication and Evaluation
    - a. What Does Publication Mean?
      - Not short enough to be bulleted points. Switch to paragraphs.
    - b. Evaluation
      - Cut first two long paragraphs (perhaps move elsewhere)
      - Create two new subsections: internal and external peer review
        - o peer review
        - o institutional evaluation
      - Bullet point to indicate possible places where peer review can take place. Indicate not an exhaustive list
- V. Stewardship, Preservation, and Access
- Soften the tone of first two paragraphs and move the first under Collaboration and the second under Publication sections
  - Flesh out issue of access to data (data one piece of content, which may or may not be accessible)
- VI. Methods and Results
- Expand paragraph and move to beginning
- VII.
- Authors should include what makes them qualified in this area
- VIII. Appendices, Bibliography, Checklist (Scholar and Institution)