2017

Building An Ethical Digital Humanities Community: Librarian, Faculty, and Student Collaboration

Roopika Risam
Salem State University

Justin Snow
Salem State University

Susan Edwards
Salem State University

Building an Ethical Digital Humanities Community: Librarian, Faculty, and Student Collaboration

Roopika Risam, Justin Snow, Susan Edwards
Berry Library, Salem State University, Salem, Massachusetts, USA

Author's accepted manuscript of an article to be published in *College & Undergraduate Libraries:*
http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10691316.2017.1337530

Abstract

This article examines work building a digital humanities community at Salem State's Berry Library. The initiatives are comprised of a three-pronged approach: laying groundwork to build a DH center, building the DH project Digital Salem as a place-based locus for digital scholarship and launching an undergraduate internship program to explore ethical ways of creating innovative research experiences for undergraduate students. Together, these initiatives constitute an important move toward putting libraries at the center of creating DH opportunities for underserved student populations and a model for building DH at regional comprehensive universities.

Keywords

Digital humanities; internships; library and faculty collaboration; pedagogy; social justice; undergraduate students

Introduction

The lack of attention to undergraduate education in digital humanities is a glaring omission that has left digital humanities practitioners who work primarily with undergraduate students struggling to adapt scholarly practices envisioned for graduate students to the fundamentally different needs of undergraduate populations. While collections like Hirsch's *Digital Humanities Pedagogy* (2012) include essays on undergraduate digital humanities work, and a forthcoming issue of *Digital Humanities Quarterly* will focus specifically on undergraduates, scholarship has tended to focus primarily on the needs of graduate student teaching and training (Hirsch 2012). An additional gap involves conversations around pedagogical instruction; the focus, instead, is on building robust infrastructure for digital humanities training.

Programs such as the Digital Humanities Summer Institute (DHSI) at the University of Victoria or Humanities Intensive Learning and Teaching (HILT) of Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis complement graduate course offerings, while undergraduate programs and initiatives receive comparatively less attention. There are logical reasons for this: (1) the infrastructure-heavy dimensions of digital humanities; (2) the specialized nature of faculty research that offers important professional development skills for graduate students and can require graduate-level training; and (3) the worsening humanities academic job market, which has led to an ethical need for value-added skills in humanities PhD programs (Modern Language Association of America 2014). However, it leaves open the question of how to foster the growth of digital humanities initiatives for undergraduate students.

There have been some initiatives intended to bridge the gap between graduate-centric and undergraduate digital humanities through infrastructure. The Institute for Liberal Arts Digital Scholarship, or ILiADS, which was started at Hamilton College in 2015, offers a project-based approach to liberal arts pedagogy. ILiADS brings teams to an annual summer institute to work with experts and coaches on

digital humanities initiatives for undergraduates. While ILiADS is not exclusive to liberal arts colleges and has occasionally included participants from research universities, the emphasis is on a particular kind of elite undergraduate experience. Another initiative, the Digital Liberal Arts Exchange (DLAx), seeks to foster collaboration between research universities and small liberal arts colleges through the sharing of expertise and services. Notably, however, the framing of the exchange and the list of participants emphasizes flagship public research universities and elite small liberal arts colleges.

Conversely, the bulk of students in the American landscape of higher education are taught at institutions like Salem State University, where the university's Digital Humanities Working Group has been incubating a digital humanities model that emerges from the unique needs of the students and the institution's mission. This work is a direct response to the fact that existing approaches to undergraduate digital humanities pedagogy, which privilege elite universities, do not account for the economic, political, and social challenges that beset public institutions of higher education outside of flagship institutions. In response to these constraints, the university is committed to providing undergraduate students with the opportunity to learn about digital humanities and to ensuring ethical collaboration among librarians, faculty, and students.

Salem State University was established in 1854 as Salem Normal School, founded through the efforts of education reformer Horace Mann, to prepare teachers for work in public schools. Today, the regional comprehensive coeducational university serves approximately 10,000 students in more than fifty undergraduate and graduate degree programs in liberal arts and sciences, education, criminal justice, nursing, social work, and business. The primary population is undergraduate, but the university has several thousand master's students as well. As of fall 2016, over 35 percent of undergraduates are students of color, while many students are first-generation college students, receive Pell grants, and attend the university on the GI Bill.

At institutions like Salem State, major numbers in the humanities are in sharp decline as students opt for degree programs where the career paths in front of them are more clearly defined. However, research on hiring trends has suggested that English majors, for example, have significant value in the workplace (Berman 2016). Teaching students how to leverage those skills or convincing faculty to more strongly emphasize the instrumental value of a humanities major can be challenging. Therefore, digital humanities initiatives at Salem State are a direct response to this gap.

Like other regional comprehensive universities, Salem State is an institution at a crossroads. Since 2010, receiving the designation of "university" and changing the nomenclature from Salem State College to Salem State University has produced an existential crisis about what it means to be a university. Faculty and librarians alike are expected to demonstrate that they are meritorious in teaching, research, and service for tenure and promotion—a vague standard, made even less clear by a union contract that does not outline criteria for meritorious performance. So far, it seems, this has meant greater research expectations for faculty still teaching 4/4 teaching loads and for librarians whose instructional and administrative workload has not been commensurately reduced. While this could be mitigated by increasing research support, lowering the teaching load, or hiring more librarians, such endeavors have been constrained by persistent underfunding of state appropriations by the Massachusetts legislature, which has imposed a significant financial burden on the university. As a result, the university bills itself as a "teaching university," without any clarity about what that actually means or how teaching and research are relatively valued.

These circumstances of institutional life at Salem State are endemic of trends in higher education for public teaching institutions: Public universities, particularly those that are not flagship campuses, are being systematically defunded; research expectations are increasing; and there is growing pressure to provide significant learning experiences, experiential learning, and undergraduate research opportunities to students without the support or funds to do so effectively (Mitchell, Leachman, and

Masterson 2016). Committed to building a digital humanities program at the university in response to institutional constraints and working conditions, the Digital Humanities Working Group embraced a three-pronged approach: positioning the library as the hub of digital humanities activity at the university, creating a university-wide umbrella project suitable for integrating students into faculty research, and developing an undergraduate research program for digital scholarship.

In doing so, the working group has embraced an ethos of social justice that guides ethical collaborations among faculty, librarians, and students and that shapes the digital scholarship undertaken. Spiro (2012) has sought to define the values of digital humanities in response to the often-tense debates that have arisen among scholars. She likens the need for such values to an ethical code in other professional settings, which shape priorities, expectations, and socialization. Presuming the common goal "to advance knowledge, foster innovation, and serve the public," Spiro identifies the following values: openness, collaboration, collegiality and connectedness, diversity, and experimentation (Spiro 2012). These values have been central to building a digital humanities community at Salem State University and are essential to the commitment to social justice that has motivated this work.

Positioning the library as digital humanities hub

Digital humanities scholarship has recognized the significant role that libraries play in the field. Ramsay contextualizes digital humanities in the grand tradition of libraries:

> Of all scholarly pursuits, Digital Humanities most clearly represents the spirit that animated the ancient foundations at Alexandria, Pergamum, and Memphis, the great monastic libraries of the Middle Ages, and even the first research libraries of the German Enlightenment. It is obsessed with varieties of representation, the organization of knowledge, the technology of communication and dissemination, and the production of useful tools for scholarly inquiry. (Ramsay 2010)

As Sula (2013) notes, many of the qualities accorded to digital humanities centers replicate functions of libraries, such as building digital collections, creating tools for analyzing collections or managing research, and using digital collections to create new intellectual products. The scholarship on digital humanities in libraries, however, continues the trend in which research focuses on research libraries, and, less frequently, liberal arts colleges, while ignoring the role of libraries in digital humanities initiatives at regional comprehensive universities.

In this way, digital humanities and library scholarship reflect a broader omission in research on librarianship—namely, the nature of libraries at regional comprehensive universities. Libraries and the role of digital humanities within them are distinct at these universities. The library has a different focus in teaching-intensive universities. Librarians from two institutions—Eastern Washington University and Western Carolina University—have written about this issue, emphasizing the role of libraries in hands-on approaches to digital literacy. At Eastern Washington University, the experience of reimagining the library emphasizes the mission of regional comprehensive universities, articulating their endeavors to:

> foster interactive relationships among faculty, students, and the community in the context of the mission and vision of the EWU as a regional comprehensive university; serve as the focal point of the university intellectual life by supporting students, faculty, administrators and the community in academic endeavors such as curriculum development, student research, instructional delivery, and development of critical inquiry; provide special services to support faculty research; and stimulate vital campus culture and life. (Miller 2009)

Based on this vision, they further identify five key goal areas:

> engage students in critical inquiry; provide a virtual and physical environment that encourages intellectual inquiry and stimulates connections between students and faculty; contribute to program excellence through integration of information literacy at all levels of the curriculum; provide special services to support faculty research; and stimulate vital campus culture and life. (Miller 2009)

Western Carolina took a different approach, developing a digital scholarship lab to strengthen digital literacy skills for undergraduate students. Their stated goal was to "adequately support for scholarship and creative activities in support of Western

Carolina University's mission as a regional comprehensive university," which they undertook through an initiative to "ensure appropriate institutional infrastructure to support scholarship and research" (Stoffan 2016).While the establishment of a lab is rare for regional comprehensives, together these examples speak to both the integral nature of instruction in digital and informational literacy for regional comprehensive university libraries, as well as the need for alignment with university strategic plans.

These are strategies that have been used by the Digital Humanities Working Group at Salem State, placing the library at the heart of digital humanities initiatives. Without the library, there would be no digital humanities program at the university. When a new member joined the English faculty in 2013, she was the first faculty member to work in the digital humanities and digital pedagogy. During her first year, at the recommendation of other faculty, the professor applied for one of the university's Strategic Innovation Grants with the goal of piloting a digital humanities center. The proposal narrowly failed to get funded, primarily because it was not effectively presented for its audience—the university's budget committee—which favored more self-contained proposals.

The professor subsequently applied to run a faculty learning community in digital humanities during academic year 2014–2015, intending to bring together faculty and librarians interested in sharing their ideas and resources and to begin fostering an institutional trace for digital humanities. Participants included faculty from English and history, instructional librarians, and the University Archivist and Special Collections Librarian. What became clear was that the professor and the University Archivist had shared interests in digital humanities initiatives, complementary expertise, and interest in pooling their knowledge. Together, they revised the professor's proposal for a digital humanities center, drawing on the archivist's vast knowledge of and experience with the institution.

The professor and archivist decided that a more effective tactic for building a program

was to start interwoven initiatives—Digital Salem, a university-wide umbrella digital humanities project to house digital scholarship by faculty and students on the history, culture, and literature of Salem, Massachusetts, and the Digital Scholars Program, an undergraduate research program that introduced students to digital humanities using the university's archival holdings. Obtaining another Strategic Innovation Grant to pilot the Digital Scholars Program, they prepared for the launch of projects for Digital Salem and the Digital Scholars Program. They were joined by the university's Digital Initiatives Librarian, whose expertise in digital archives was an ideal pairing with the other backgrounds. Together, the three established the university's Digital Humanities Working Group, with the goal of laying the groundwork for a digital humanities program that positioned the library as its hub. The working group has supported two major initiatives: a university-wide digital humanities project called Digital Salem, led by the professor, archivist, and digital initiatives librarian, and the Digital Scholars Program, a research-based undergraduate internship program led by the professor and the archivist. This work has been guided by a strong commitment to social justice through attention to the ethics of library and faculty collaboration, student labor, and public scholarship that seeks to tell stories that are underrepresented in local history.

Central to this work is the ongoing negotiation of the ethics of librarian and faculty collaboration, an issue that has been addressed at length in digital humanities scholarship. In particular, the Digital Humanities Working Group actively resists the dynamic of librarians in service of faculty in their model of collaboration. At the forefront of their work is the belief that each member of the team has unique, valuable expertise that is essential to building a digital humanities program. Muñoz (2012) notes that successful digital humanities initiatives are ones in which the work of librarians is respected as intellectual labor. In this vein, the working group has designed its collaboration practices around equal intellectual contribution that leverages members' individual training and professional aspirations with the goal of modeling this form of collaboration for other colleagues, particularly faculty. As Posner argues, "Digital humanities projects in general do not need supporters—

they need collaborators," resisting the paradigm of librarian service (2013, 45). Drawing on this ethical imperative, the working group has actively discouraged partnerships that are soliciting support and service while seeking ones that recognize team members as intellectual collaborators. In doing so, the team heeds Posner's warning that, "it is important to find ways to impress upon scholars that DH expertise is a specialized, crucial—and frankly, rare—skill, not a service to be offered in silent support of a scholar's master plan" (46).While this expertise has not always been appreciated by colleagues, the working group has been insistent on its value.

While the library has certainly been the appropriate place to serve as a locus for the university's digital humanities program, the Digital Humanities Working Group faces similar challenges as others who are looking to libraries as the home for digital humanities. Although Salem State's library is not focused on research, its digital humanities initiatives are not served by stable infrastructure and depend, instead, on the work of individuals (Bryson, Posner, St. Pierre, and Varner 2011). The working group has undertaken initiatives on a shoestring budget ($7,500), relying on borrowed time from team members with already-full job descriptions, as well as their enthusiasm and commitment to offering digital humanities opportunities to an underserved student population.

In the context of digital humanities, Posner argues, "We do not acknowledge often enough that if a library is to engage in digital humanities activity, its leaders need to give serious thought to the administrative and technical infrastructure that supports this work" (2013, 44). This is certainly true of Salem State, where persistent instability in the library's administrative structure has significantly slowed down the process of developing a centralized infrastructure for digital humanities work. However, the university's administration has expressed commitment to fostering infrastructure, and new library leadership will support this work as well.

Building a university-wide digital humanities project

To ground the university's digital humanities initiatives in a concrete project, the professor, archivist, and digital initiatives librarian developed Digital Salem, a multifaceted digital humanities project established to be a portal for projects produced by members of the Salem State community that shed light on the culture and history of Salem, Massachusetts. The project collocates and disseminates existing place-based digital scholarship produced at Salem State and encourages the creation of more scholarship in the same vein. The concept for Digital Salem draws on the American Association of State Colleges and Universities' mission and ethical commitment of regional comprehensive universities as stewards of place that serve their local communities (American Association of State Colleges and Universities 2002).

Expanding upon Salem State's history of civic engagement and further cementing the university's commitment to its region, Digital Salem seeks to broaden the scope of what it means to involve the surrounding community in scholarship. Its commitment to social justice is exemplified through its intention to move beyond the traditional narratives associated with Salem, such as the Salem Witch Trials of 1692–1693 or the city's thriving late-eighteenth- to early-nineteenth-century maritime trade, to illuminate the untold stories of the city that get lost amid the more popular narratives of Salem's history and culture. As students and faculty engage in research that showcases Salem's rich culture, the underrepresented stories of Salem—from the deep heritage of the Franco-American community to oral histories of student veterans—become actualized and legitimized. Consequently, Digital Salem, as a social justice project, is engaged in recreating Salem's past and bringing attention to the lesser known narratives that have been elided by dominant ones. These accounts, absent from the contemporary conception of Salem, are just as archetypal of the city's legacy as its better-known stories, and they deserve space in its public cultural record.

Digital Salem became an essential bridge between the library and academic

departments, challenging the ethics subtending librarian–faculty interaction at the university. At Salem State, the library and academic departments have typically maintained a traditional relationship of service, where the library supports the faculty. However, with Digital Salem, librarian–faculty relationships have become more collaborative, with the library working alongside the faculty to advance digital scholarship as a shared intellectual endeavor. From the very beginning, Digital Salem has been an interdepartmental collaboration as it is directed by the professor, archivist, and digital initiatives librarian. These project directors are involved at every level, working directly with student scholars as well as with faculty, many of whom have begun to include their students in digital humanities projects.

This collaborative aspect of Digital Salem is not only a matter of ethics but is also one of the contributing factors to its success; individual projects that would otherwise be created in isolation are developed with input from and discussions with a core group of people. These projects are facilitated through the Digital Scholars Program, an undergraduate internship program on Salem-based research led by the professor and archivist. They also coordinate a faculty learning community to assist faculty in developing Salem-based digital humanities projects.

The involvement of these leaders at both the student and faculty levels ensures that those who undertake projects under Digital Salem are cognizant of numerous social justice implications they may unintentionally overlook. Questions about power and privilege are posed to all creators, drawing on the principles and precepts articulated in Social Justice and the Digital Humanities (2017): How accessible is the project for people with disabilities? Whose voices are represented, and are they being disenfranchised? Whose labor enabled the project and how were they compensated for it? Those who choose to collaborate on projects for Digital Salem are encouraged to work through these questions to ensure that their own practices are inclusive and aligned with the project's social justice mission. By looking at the potential hegemonic practices and values implicit in the projects at every point during their development, Digital Salem project directors encourage the development of inclusive

projects that make the politics surrounding their production and consumption comprehensible to users.

At the level of implementation, Digital Salem needed an appropriate platform for two distinct purposes: to act as the foundation for individual digital humanities projects and to function as a home for the projects, providing context for them. The project directors began by articulating the circumstances that shape this work to determine the ideal solution. First, there were very few financial resources available, and funding was limited, which meant relying on a low-cost platform. Project directors also needed to ensure that the platform could be supported by the limited time and expertise of the Digital Salem directors themselves. Thus, it needed to be straightforward enough to be used by students and faculty so that they could minimize time spent learning the platform and maximize time spent on scholarship.

Similarly, it was necessary that the platform not require a dedicated web developer to install and maintain, as that level of proficiency or collaboration with IT was not available. As most of the source materials used for research were unique documents from the University Archives, Digital Salem required a platform that would be able to easily ingest digitized primary sources. Finally, the platform needed to be robust enough to accommodate multiple discrete projects. In this way, the design of the project reflects the constraints of regional comprehensive universities, where those developing digital humanities initiatives must serve as their own project directors, technical support, and researchers.

The project directors determined that the best solution was to implement two separate platforms: one for media management itself (Omeka) and one to collocate the individual projects (WordPress). Both platforms fit most of the criteria articulated during the planning phase—they are free, easy to learn, and easy to install. However, the use of archival material in the projects led to the decision to use two platforms. Omeka is ideal for projects involving archival material; WordPress is capable in this regard but would need additional customization to be comparable

to Omeka. Omeka is more suited for discrete projects, whereas WordPress can easily function as a portal to direct users to any number of individual projects. Other platforms (e.g., Scalar, Mukurtu) are certainly available for digital scholarship, and the Digital Salem directors support them to the extent they are able. However, having a primary set of platforms, especially for the Digital Scholars Program, was the most efficient and effective way to provide the necessary support without overwhelming either the student participants or the Digital Salem directors.

Coordinating with Salem State's IT department, the project directors gained access to a web server to host the Digital Salem platforms. Having a server that the library primarily controls allows project directors to quickly deploy as many instances of Omeka and WordPress—or any other platform—as needed. This also means that they do not need to rely on Omeka.net or WordPress.com hosting services. The project directors also have more freedom to customize the platforms without being limited to the number of plug-ins installed. Additionally, this provided the opportunity to design and implement best practices for preserving the projects in the long term. In the case of any problems or emergencies, project directors are able to troubleshoot directly with university colleagues as opposed to depending on third-party technical support.

Developing an undergraduate digital humanities research program

An essential part of growing Digital Salem is the Digital Scholars Program, which grew out of the faculty learning community on digital humanities where the professor and archivist began collaborating. Among other topics, the group discussed how to best introduce digital humanities research to the university's undergraduate student population, with an internship program as an especially attractive option. The demographics of Salem State are much like those of other regional public comprehensive institutions. Many of the students are the first in their family to go to college, and most of them work, sometimes full-time, to afford the cost of attending school; it is also a predominantly commuter population, and many students have

time-consuming family commitments. Therefore, the digital humanities internship program had to take these factors into account. Salem State students, especially at the undergraduate level, benefit most from an experience that combined learning about how to use digital humanities practices in their scholarship while providing them with skills that they can use in future employment or graduate studies.

The professor and archivist submitted a proposal for a pilot program to the Salem State University Strategic Innovation Grant Program, a competitive internal funding program designed to support new initiatives that addressed the goals of the university strategic plan. The Digital Scholars Program grant application emphasized the project's effect on student success, including building "soft" skills such as critical thinking, collaboration, and project design, as well as technical skills working with platforms for exhibit, map, and timeline building. The students would also participate in a workshop with Career Services on career building and how to translate the skills they learned in the internship for employment or graduate school applications. At the end of the semester they would attend a lecture by a scholar currently working in the field of digital humanities.

The pilot semester included students from the Art History, American Studies, English, and History departments. One group of students worked with the Digital Scholars Program leaders, while the other students worked with other faculty members on their own projects. While all the students received internship credit from their respective departments, there was no funding to pay them. This raised an ethical problem that the Digital Scholars Program leaders have had to negotiate. As outlined in *A Student Collaborators' Bill of Rights*, "As a general principle, a student must be paid for his or her time if he or she is not empowered to make critical decisions about the intellectual design of a project or a portion of a project (and credited accordingly)" (Di Pressi, Gorman, Posner, Sasayama, and Schmitt 2017). Since this principle is key to creating an ethical experience for students engaged in digital humanities projects, the Digital Scholars Program leaders had to design a program that would foreground benefits to the students while avoiding exploitation

of student labor.

The projects undertaken by the students varied because the program leaders created an internship experience that placed the students in the forefront, enabling them to choose their project, perform archival research, and determine the platform that they would use to present their work. The intellectual leadership of students in their research projects was integral to ensuring an ethical approach to student labor. As time was limited to a semester, and none of the students had experience working with primary source materials, the program leaders identified two archival collections from which they could choose topics and develop their projects. Each of the collections contained a variety of different types of materials (including images, text, and ephemera) and offered a number of potential topics that the students could explore. The Salem Normal School Archives (1854–1932) documents the history of one of Horace Mann's teacher training institutions from its founding until its development into Salem Teachers College. The Walter George Whitman collection (1894–1959) documents the life of a member of the science faculty at Salem Normal School, with an emphasis on his time teaching in Nanjing, China during the 1925–1926 academic year.

The students chose the collection in which they were most interested, with half of the students picking Whitman and half the Salem Normal School. They worked closely with the directors to explore the nuances of each collection, choose materials to work with, and determine their research questions. The students were mentored throughout the process, meeting individually or in groups on a weekly basis. An initial issue arose when program leaders noticed the difficulties some of the students were having with the process: They approached the project with the thesis that they wanted to prove instead of creating a question and working with the primary source material and digital humanities practices to reach a conclusion. Extensive mentoring was needed to teach the students the optimal way to approach a digital studies project.

Once the students identified their project topics, they worked with the Digital Scholars Program leaders to learn the best way to approach working with archives, identify secondary source materials that were relevant to their project, choose a platform that would best present their research, and learn different technologies. The program leaders encouraged students to approach this process iteratively, being flexible and open to discovery. One group worked collaboratively, meeting with each other outside the assigned times, even though their projects used different approaches. One of the students chose to work with Whitman's collection of colonial-era postcards to explore Western views of the East; the other student worked on encoding a section of Whitman's memoir using TEI. The students who chose to work with the records of the Salem Normal School produced a video on Horace Mann's role in creating the normal schools and a timeline of curricular changes. Students also worked closely with the Digital Salem project directors, benefitting from the close attention of three professionals. One student was intrigued by a folder of Whitman's receipts from his journey through India. With the program leaders' guidance, he chose to map Whitman's India trip in the context of colonial-era travel. Several of the students worked on timelines and exhibits related to race and LGBT activism on campus. Another student created a 3-D model of the first Salem Normal School building on its South Salem campus. While the projects all were created under the umbrella of the Digital Scholars Program and Digital Salem, each student had full autonomy in making decisions about all facets of their individual projects. Several of the students presented their work at the university's Undergraduate Research Day, and all received credit as collaborators along with credit for their coursework.

When assessing the program, which has been running for three semesters with fifteen student participants, the Digital Scholars Program leaders take into account both the students' experiences in the program and the outputs they produced. Students who worked directly with the program leaders undertook highly mentored independent research. They identified research questions, data, and appropriate platforms for that data, creating a deliverable in the form of a small-scale piece of

digital scholarship of their own design and execution. However, the project leaders identified a significant gap in research skills and information literacy among these students. Through assessment, the program leaders also discovered that the students who worked with other faculty members had a different experience. They were tasked with collecting data for research projects started by the faculty members. The faculty determined the research question, the data that would be used, and the platform. The students did not have a collaborative relationship with the faculty members, and they were not involved in making substantive decisions about the project or engaging with the research beyond the "mechanical labor" mentioned in the Student Collaborators' Bill of Rights. The program leaders had not anticipated that this would be the students' experience because it was fundamentally different from the way they had envisioned and pitched the Digital Scholars Program.

Because of issues identified through assessment, the program leaders have made changes to the program. The students now work exclusively with the professor and archivist, although a faculty member occasionally asks "for a student" (they are denied). The program leaders created a syllabus of readings and hold "boot camps" for all of the students on how to work with primary source materials, develop a research question, and how to best present their work to the public. Additionally, the program leaders added "Student Activism at SSU" to the list of topics; this proved to be attractive to several of the students. Participants in the Digital Scholars program now meet as a class as well as individually with project leaders. The students choose separate topics to work on but learn from each other and help each other during class time.

The Digital Scholars Program is committed to creating a rich learning experience for its student participants. Students receive extensive mentoring, are exposed to new ways of thinking about research, gain experience with project creation and management, and learn new technologies. In addition, they are treated as collaborators in the creation of Digital Salem projects and are fully credited as such. As a result, the program is a model for an ethical digital humanities internship for

undergraduate students at regional public comprehensive universities.

Conclusion

Together, the initiatives outlined here comprise Salem State University's digital humanities initiatives. The Digital Humanities Working Group is presently in the process of developing a proposal for a digital humanities center—to be housed in the library—that will bring together the initiatives they have started. For Salem State's institutional context, particularly its funding constraints and focus on teaching over research, the decision to begin by building a digital humanities project and undergraduate research program was a successful move because these initiatives serve as proofs of concept that make the case for institutional investment in them and in a digital humanities center. While the Digital Humanities Working Group is not especially tied to the "center" model for digital humanities initiatives, the "center" is the only institutional precedent that Salem State has for an entity that facilitates interdisciplinary and cross-unit collaboration. However, as digital humanities at the university transitions from individual initiatives to a centralized model, the working group is designing it to ensure that the same commitment to building an ethical digital humanities community that has shaped the work so far serves as its guide.

References

American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU). 2002. "Stepping Forward as Stewards of Place." http://www.aascu.org/publications/stewardsofplace/

Berman, Jillian. 2016. "English Majors Earning More Money Now That so Few Students Want to Be English Majors*." Market Watch.* http://www.marketwatch.com/story/why-college-students-shouldn't-be-afraid-of-english-degrees-2016-12-09

Bryson, Tim, Miriam Posner, Alain St. Pierre, and Stewart Varner. 2011. "Spec Kit 326: Digital Humanities." *Association of Research Libraries*. http://www.arl.org/storage/documents/publications/spec-326-web.pdf.

Di Pressi, Haley, Stephanie Gorman, Miriam Posner, Raphael Sasayama, and Tori Schmitt. 2017. "A Student Collaborators' Bill of Rights." *UCLA Digital Humanities.* http://www.cdh.ucla.edu/news-events/a-student-collaborators-bill-of-rights/.

Hirsch, Brett D. 2012. *Digital Humanities Pedagogy: Practices, Principles and Politics*. Cambridge: OpenBook.

Miller, Julie L. 2009. "'Reinventing the Library' at Eastern Washington University: An Intensive Strategic Planning Experience with Faculty." *Technical Services Quarterly* 26(2): 96–106. https://doi.org/10.1080/07317130802260792.

Mitchell, Michael, Michael Leachman, and Kathleen Masterson. 2016. "Funding Down, Tuition Up." *Center on Budget and Policy Priorities.* http://www.cbpp.org/research/state-budget-and-tax/funding-down-tuition-up.

Modern Language Association (MLA). 2014."Report of the Task Force on Doctoral Study in Modern Language and Literature." https://www.mla.org/Resources/Research/Surveys-Reports-and-Other-Documents/Staffing-Salaries-and-Other-Professional-Issues/Report-of-the-Task-Force-on-Doctoral-Study-in-Modern-Language-and-Literature-2014.

Muñoz, Trevor. 2012. "Digital Humanities in the Library Isn't a Service." *Gist—GitHub*. https://gist.github.com/3415438.

Posner, Miriam. 2013. "No Half Measures: Overcoming Common Challenges to Doing Digital Humanities in the Library." *Journal of Library Administration* 53(1): 43–52. https://doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2013.756694.

Ramsay, Stephen. 2010. *Care of the Soul* (blog), October 8, 2010. http://stephenramsay.us/text/2010/10/08/care-of-the-soul.html.

Social Justice and the Digital Humanities. 2017. "Creative and Critical Precepts for Digital Humanities Projects." http://criticaldh.roopikarisam.com/criticaldh/.

Spiro, Lisa. 2012. "'This Is Why We Fight': Defining the Values of the Digital Humanities." In *Debates in the Digital Humanities* (pp. 16–35), edited by Matthew K. Gold. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Stoffan, Mark. 2016. "Digital Literacy Development at a Public Regional University: The Western Carolina University Experience." In *Teaching Technology in Libraries: Creative Ideas for Training Staff, Patrons and Students* (pp. 27–33), edited by Carol Smallwood and Lura Sanborn. Jefferson, NC: McFarland.

Sula, Chris Alen. 2013. "Digital Humanities and Libraries: A Conceptual Model." *Journal of Library Administration* 53(1): 10-26. https:/doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2013.756680