<u>Worksheet</u> for CAA/SAH Task Force to Develop Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure in Digital Art and Architectural History
Friday, July 10, 2015

<u>Response to Raym Crow's report</u>

<u>Response to Seth Denbo's report</u>

<u>Response to Alice Lynn McMichael's report</u>

What elements from Alice Lynn's recommendations (p. 17) should be addressed in the guidelines of every institution?

- Maintain broad definitions of (digital) art and architectural history, and keep them separate from specific tools or methods.

- Define "scholarship," and make a firm statement that a variety of projects can embody that definition, e.g., by making arguments and advancing the fields/disciplines.

- Emphasize rigor and quality of work.

- Use "scholar" or "researcher" instead of "faculty member" when describing the person who does digital work. Don't limit the scope of the guidelines to tenure and promotion cases. Make a confident statement that scholarship is performed by graduate students, alt-ac researchers, and non-tenure track scholars, among others.

- Acknowledge that various kinds of contributions can be scholarly, and not limited to "service" or supporting roles.

- Address and promote collaboration unapologetically. Scholars should be able to elucidate their own contributions to the project as a whole.

- Endorse the UCLA Student Collaborators' Bill of Rights and apply it to all junior scholars.

- Digital scholars should address stewardship/best practice for data and preservation.

- Firmly state that peer-reviewed, online journals are as relevant as peer-reviewed print journals. Article publication should not privilege paper.

- Acknowledge alternative forms of peer review (e.g., grants, trade publications).

- Recognize presses and venues that publish peer-reviewed digital work as on par with traditional monographic projects/presses.

- The definition of "publication" should be broad and flexible enough so scholars can make financial and ethical decisions on an individual and project-by-project basis.

- Reviewers should review the work via the project's intended medium.

- Digital projects should include a document with technical requirements for reviewers/users.

- Separate building/non-linear projects from the category of "service."

- Recognize scholarly arguments and scholarly contributions in various kinds of non-monographic projects, for various audiences. (The burden is still on the scholar to make that argument, but the opportunity must be granted.)

    o In the same vein, reconsider "public scholarship" and non-traditional contributions in light of digital dissemination/platforms that have changed the nature and scale of this kind of communication (as opposed to conflating them with "teaching" or an op-ed piece).

Other considerations
Should responsibilities of authors, departments, and evaluators be listed and assigned?

Should the guidelines include qualifications for peer reviewers?

Should the guidelines include language from other guidelines or fields (such as design, McMichael report, p. 8)

Who is responsible for determining proficiencies in methodology and practice?

Should the guidelines include recommendations for establishing standards for digital projects (such as digital building reconstructions?

What should the preface to the guidelines include?

Should the guidelines endorse or cite other association's work?

Should the guidelines address hiring in anyway?