

## CHAPTER TWENTY-EIGHT

---

# The Invisible Labor of DH Pedagogy

BRIAN CROXALL (BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY) AND DIANE K. JAKACKI  
(BUCKNELL UNIVERSITY)

There are as many different digital humanities pedagogies as there are people who teach digital humanities (DH). Indeed, we have the data to prove it: during summer 2019, we conducted an international survey of DH pedagogues, asking them about their teaching practices (Croxall and Jakacki 2019, 2020). At the same time, we found that there are broad similarities in how the subject is taught. For the sake of our argument, we'll name three. First, it's not uncommon for someone teaching a DH class to call on a friend or colleague to be a guest in their classroom. Second, given the highly technical nature of work within DH, we have also observed that many classes go beyond the one-off guest and are taught in a long-term, cooperative manner. Third, DH pedagogues frequently publish and share their teaching materials: syllabi, assignments, and even student ratings. Reflecting upon these three patterns of teaching, each of which we engage in ourselves, we find it remarkable that these norms are so uncommon outside DH. What's more, we have observed that digital humanities practitioners—including us—do not always employ these teaching practices when they teach a different subject. While they clearly have the experience and skills to implement them in any course, there's something particular about DH that seems to lead to individuals taking on new, often invisible, labor.

Oftentimes the term *labor* connotes something not-pleasant: one goes into labor, is punished by years at hard labor; other times it is productive and ultimately rewarding but still toilsome: the fruit of one's labors, a labor of love. Perhaps a blend of these two aspects can be seen in the labors of Hercules—unquestionably heroic but still requiring the de-mucking of the Augean stables. In academic contexts, labor is complex, and that is undeniably so when it comes to pedagogy. But one characteristic that is simple to understand is that the work of teaching goes largely unnoticed, that it is, in fact, invisible. One reason for this is that in all but rare circumstances, academics do not publish about their pedagogy. Another reason, surely connected to the first, is that while institutions require teaching, they do not care to count it for too much. The work that instructors perform to make their teaching happen, then, becomes invisible. If this is true of pedagogy in general in the academy, it seems all the more unusual that teaching DH so often takes on additional, invisible, and uncompensated labor, piling another hecatomb or so into the stables, just for fun. Clever classical references aside, how do the above-mentioned patterns within DH teaching add more work to its teaching? What types of invisible pedagogical labor seem especially endemic to DH? And, more importantly, what is it about the field of DH and its culture that has led people to take on these further burdens?

## GUESTS AND HOSTS IN THE CLASSROOM, OR *XENIA* AMONG THE DIGITAL HUMANISTS

Perhaps there is no better model of invisible pedagogical labor within DH than the invited guests who so frequently join our classrooms. The functions that these guests fulfill vary. Sometimes they act as an expert on a particular methodology, filling the role of the non-existent textbook. Sometimes they play visiting author, students having read one of their essays or blog posts. These guests may arrive from our own campuses or they may join us remotely via one or another video platform, a practice that was common well before the onset of Covid-19. Often the guests are friends, but at other times they are people we only know through online and/or scholarly interactions. Regardless of why or from where they are joining a class, tremendous effort goes into these in-class appearances for both guests and hosts. But this effort is, for all intents and purposes, impossible to see.

Before we examine how this labor of hospitality—what the ancient Greeks called *xenia*—is rendered invisible, it's worth asking whether the reciprocal relation between guest and host is specific to DH pedagogy. Our survey revealed that a majority of the 340 participants (54 percent) had been asked to be a guest instructor in a for-credit DH class during the two-year period between July 2017 and July 2019 and had been a guest in, on average, more than five courses (Croxall and Jakacki 2020). What's more, a significant portion of respondents (43 percent) indicated that they had invited guests to their for-credit DH classes during this same time period, welcoming an average of 3.58 guests to their classrooms (Croxall and Jakacki 2020). In short, it's extremely common for those who teach DH to invite others who teach DH to join them in their classrooms.

When we have been guests in a colleague's DH class, we have found that it requires significant labor, but it is labor that we are willing to take on as members of a famously collaborative field. The most obvious of the guest's work is the preparation and delivery of whatever content they plan to share with the class. But there are additional forms of labor that guests undertake when agreeing to join a class. Making time in their schedule for the presentation and its preparation is often non-trivial. Depending on their employment status, they might have to get clearance from a supervisor to participate or to cancel other obligations. And they may have to find time outside of their day-to-day work schedule to prepare and/or participate. If a guest is local and will join the class in-person, they may spend time reconnoitering the teaching space and testing any technology they plan to use. If the guest is remote, they will have to prepare the space from which they will broadcast and ensure that they both have and understand the software that the host will use to bring their telepresence into the classroom.

But it's not just the guest speakers who perform additional labor; the host must also exert themselves. First, they must determine where a guest might enhance their class's learning outcome, becoming attuned to their own inadequacies and coming up with a plan (the guest) to compensate or augment. Second, they have to extend an invitation to a guest. And whether the guest is a total stranger or a close friend, time and effort are needed to craft an invite that is rhetorically sound and specific. Third, there will need to be a discussion or two about the structure of the interaction, all of which, again, takes time. The most critical part of these discussions involves the host helping their guest understand the context of the class. What are its aims and trajectory? What will the students have learned before the guest arrives and what are they to learn later? And how can the guest help forward those aims? The work to provide this context to guests ensures that the students learn as much as possible from the visit and that it fits the broader scope of the course.

Fourth, a wise instructor will need to prepare their class for the guest's arrival. While it will be customary to introduce the guest when they appear in the classroom, it's equally important to let the students know ahead of time that a guest will be coming and what the general shape of that guest's visit will be.

Perhaps the most difficult labor that the host must perform happens during the visit itself. Despite all the planning that they have engaged in with their students and their guest, the host must remain carefully attuned to both parties. If, for example, the guest is teaching a skill or methodology, the host needs to be ready to spot students who need assistance. If the guest is discussing their work, the host needs to be ready to ask questions if the students are shy. The host must simultaneously be ready to intervene and steer the conversation so that it best meets the class's needs. Effectively managing the guest, who is, after all, doing the host a favor, is an important task.

At this point, a reader might justifiably observe that little of the above references DH pedagogy. This is absolutely true: bringing in a guest speaker to class always requires this sort of labor from both the guest and the host. But since the DH classroom is a site in which guest speakers appear with potentially high frequency, *xenia*, or the invisible, mutual care of hosts and guests tends to betide DH pedagogues.

## MULTIPLE INSTRUCTORS IN THE DH CLASSROOM

If DH pedagogy often relies on guests from inside the community, we have also observed that it depends even more heavily on support from outside the community but within our own institutions. One complication in this labor is the way in which these individuals occupy different roles, have different prestige, and are rewarded differently. In these contexts, invisible labor takes on another context: evaluating that combined labor is a difficult nut to crack.

This kind of multi-functionary teaching should be distinguished from a straightforward workshop or tutorial session, in which a specialist attends a class session to help set up a WordPress instance or introduce Voyant. In these situations, the instructor of record is not necessarily a participant in such sessions, ceding the floor to the specialist and regaining their position at the end of the class period. What we're describing here is the kind of teaching that occurs along a longer trajectory, one that involves significant collaboration on both assignment and course design. In these cases, the specialist with a graduate degree in text, geospatial, or data analysis is seconded to an instructor's course because that instructor has expressed interest in augmenting traditional methodological analysis with a digital approach. Most of the time these professionals are academic staff housed in the library or IT department. These specialists provide a bridge between the faculty member's content knowledge and the specialized methods of DH. At its most straightforward, the specialist collaborates with the instructor on assignment design, prepares datasets, tutorials, and participates in the instruction over several classes or weeks. At the other end of the continuum, the specialist is embedded in the course for the entire term, serving as a *de facto* co-instructor, involved in every phase of planning and implementation of the course. It is unusual for the specialist to participate in grading or student evaluation in a formal sense, although the instructor may ask for their input on certain aspects of a submitted assignment. Because the word "instruction" appears in the specialist's job description (although usually in reference to teaching workshops), this kind of labor is assumed to be a commitment on the part of the university to the instructor, and the (staff) specialist is not compensated for this adjunct work,

which often requires incremental work hours beyond the established work week (in evenings and on weekends).

This kind of cooperative instruction can be highly effective, and we suspect that many students have had a more robust DH learning experience because of these multiple professionals providing different contexts for the work the students are doing. But the labor that is required by both the instructor of record and the specialist can be much more complex and intensive than for another type of course. For the instructor of record, class preparation and lesson plans take on extra levels of complexity because of the need to add time for hands-on work, for installing and troubleshooting software, and adjusting the syllabus for the inevitable need to plan for technical complications and student accommodations. For the specialist, a similar amount of preparation is required, and because the datasets and corpora must draw upon the subject matter of the class, there is rarely a “cookie cutter” solution to develop an assignment or ensure that the students’ experiences are rigorous and satisfactory. There is no plug-and-play version of this kind of rich pedagogical intervention. The necessary collaboration between the instructor of record and the specialist constitutes a non-trivial amount of preparation on both their parts—incremental labor that they have to fit into already overloaded schedules. This is where the invisible labor inherent in co-instructed courses becomes evident. A faculty member may teach anywhere from one to five courses in a semester, all of which require intense and consistent planning over the entire semester. As we learned from our aforementioned survey, 24 percent of respondents indicated that they have worked as an embedded specialist in one or more classes. It is not uncommon for such a specialist to be committed to multiple courses, all of which require intense bursts of planning in courses across departments or disciplines. The instructor and the specialist need to trust one another so their work in the classroom is complementary and to be transparent about how their different forms of expertise complement one another. It takes an incredible amount of work to develop this kind of relationship, trust, shared vocabulary, and vision and to reach a consensus about how this collaboration will best serve students. But there is also a power dynamic at play in these relationships: if the university “provides” such human resources to faculty members, then it is understandable that faculty members assume that specialists are there to support them when and as needed. Faculty members express gratitude for the contributions of the specialists but do not necessarily understand the toll that commitment may take on the staff member. Likewise, the specialist may feel a heightened sense of value to the university’s educational mission through this kind of engagement, and thus work harder to please the instructor through their level of commitment. More surreptitiously, the staff member may feel that they do not have the institutional capital to push back against high expectations of their time or expertise. For this relationship to work, both the instructor and the specialist need to recognize what each contributes, to make, in other words, the other’s efforts visible.

## PUBLISHING AND SHARING MATERIALS

It is a hallmark of DH that—wherever possible—we share our materials: we endeavor to make our projects and publications open access, our code open source, and our datasets open for others to test our hypotheses, run their own analyses, and take the work further and in different directions. So it should not come as a surprise that it has also been the practice of many who teach DH to share their materials—syllabi, lesson plans, rubrics—online, as well. In our survey, 61 percent of respondents

indicated that they published assignments or syllabi for the for-credit courses they taught between July 2017 and July 2019. These numbers suggest that it is more common to share such work than it is to not do so within DH pedagogy. And, again, while we do not have data to say how frequently instructors outside of DH publish their teaching materials, our anecdotal experience makes clear that such sharing is far, far more prevalent in DH than it is in other fields.

Creating the stuff of teaching requires significant labor, a reality that is familiar to all teachers. Sharing that labor is, in turn, an additional and invisible burden since it is not accomplished as soon as the assignment or course schedule is drafted nor is it recognized by our institutions as, to use the language of the neoliberal university, a “value-add.” Whether people share materials via Google Docs, an institutional or disciplinary repository, or host them on their own web server, there are costs—even if only the time of decision-making—that must be paid by the members of the DH teaching community.

Such sharing of materials often spurs additional invisible labor. Colleagues read our syllabi and assignments, either before or after the course has run, and they offer us feedback. The original designer then can review the feedback and make changes to their plans. These changes will likely improve the experience for the students, but they still cost the teacher—and their commenting colleagues—extra, unseen effort.

The reason for this sharing was originally, in large part, because the curriculum for teaching DH did not exist. During the authors’ experiences as graduate students in literature programs, we were treated as apprentices—teaching assistants for faculty members in survey courses or as instructors in first-year writing courses. This apprenticeship, supervised by a faculty mentor, helped us to make sense of classroom mechanisms and course rhythms. Assignments we developed were modeled on those of our mentors and workshopped with others who were apprenticing alongside us. No such equivalent exists in DH.<sup>1</sup> Those of us who developed DH courses or assignments did so without that mentoring model. With no departmental store of ready-made syllabi or rubrics to draw from, we cobbled together new materials and road-tested them in our classrooms and then published them online to start building up that disciplinary cache. By sharing these materials, we collectively built a de facto primer not only on *what* to teach (tools, data) but also *how* to teach it (tutorials, assignment design). By uploading the materials we had developed for our own proto-DH courses to our personal websites; tweeting about rubrics; crowdsourcing syllabi at THATCamps; and curating our own pedagogical process, we became an open educational resource.

When contemplating this particular mode of invisible labor, we believe there is another turn of the screw to consider: *who* performs it. While there are always exceptions to a rule, we observed that much of the evolutionary and experimental DH curriculum development over the last decade was undertaken by colleagues who are either early in their careers (pre-tenure) or are in transient or insecure positions with regard to teaching (postdocs, adjuncts, alt-ac professionals), or completely off the tenure track. Put differently, those doing the invisible labor of making pedagogical labor public were those whose employment made them largely invisible to the academy. Some of these colleagues have since been promoted, but just as many have switched institutions and/or careers, a fact we each discovered while completing permissions work for our contributions to *Digital Pedagogy in the Humanities*.<sup>2</sup> In other words, and unlike other humanities disciplines, the people taking the biggest pedagogical risks are those with the most to lose. The invisibility of many of these colleagues and their labor became, in the end, total, and, taking the advice of Radiohead, they disappeared completely from the academy.

## (IN)VISIBLE VALUES

Having articulated three broad categories of invisible labor that are, we believe, endemic to DH pedagogy, we want to turn our attention to the more foundational question: *why*? Why does DH teaching involve so much extra effort? What is it about either those who teach or the subject itself that leads people to go above and beyond in the classroom?

We believe that these labor practices owe a lot to the values of the DH community and the attempts of its members to live out those values. Perhaps the most succinct articulation of such can be found in Lisa Spiro's "This is Why We Fight': Defining the Values of the Digital Humanities." In this influential essay, Spiro argues that we should define the field not with "particular methods or theoretical approaches" but via "a community that comes together around [shared] values" (2012, 16).<sup>3</sup> She encourages the community to develop such a statement through an "open, participatory, iterative, networked process" and explains that she is trying to "kick off the discussion" rather than prescribe a charter (18). In the years since Spiro's essay appeared, there has not, to our knowledge, been a concerted effort to draft such a statement. But Spiro's work continues to be cited as a clear and strong articulation of the values that DH practitioners tend to embrace. She may have wanted to start the conversation, but we believe she said her piece so well that it was simply greeted by a chorus of *Amen!*, and in truth she provides the framework that folks inclined toward DH pedagogy embrace.

Spiro presents five different ethical categories that she believes the "digital humanities community aspires to achieve" (2012, 24). These are openness, collaboration, collegiality and connectedness, diversity, and experimentation. She sees these values as intrinsic and essential to the work we do and the ways in which we do it, and yet they are not always recognized or made explicit enough to resonate with people in the broader academy. Openness is "a commitment to the open exchange of ideas, the development of open content and software, and transparency" (24). Collaboration is "essential to its [DH's] work and mission" which, among others, is "transforming how the humanities work," changing from a largely solo endeavor to drawing on diverse skills and perspectives (25). What's more, the DH community "acknowledges contributions by all involved, whether they are tenured faculty, graduate students, technologists, or librarians" (26). Collegiality and connectedness is closely connected to collaboration, whereby the community encourages contributory problem-solving. Diversity within our community of practitioners leads to a sense of vibrancy, in which "discussions are richer, and projects are stronger if multiple perspectives are represented" (28). The final value she suggests is experimentation, whereby we support "risk taking, entrepreneurship, and innovation" in our research and its pedagogy (28).

While the two of us know that Spiro did not intend to have her five suggested values become canonical, we think she cogently articulated what the two of us felt when we first began exploring the digital humanities. We were drawn to the field because it was open, collaborative, and so on, and we have continued to work—and, in particular, teach—in this space because we believe in these values. Still, we have noticed a disconnect over the years between the commitment so many of us have made to enacting these tenets and recognition of what this commitment requires of us. It is most evident in the ways our work is or is not acknowledged at an institutional or broader academic level, but surprisingly we have also noticed a kind of neglect within DH of the particular kinds of labor that are required to teach DH. As we began work on this essay, our instinct was to write something of an indictment, using Spiro's work as a foil. We would chronicle the DH community's fall from grace through reference to this ten-year-old declaration of its intentions!

But as we revisited Spiro's piece, we found a different explanation and so chose a different way in. Now, we believe that a key to understanding the invisible labor within DH pedagogy is in the attempts of teachers to live out these different values.

Why do DH teachers invite guest speakers to the classroom? As mentioned above, it's to help teach a skill, to respond to a reading, or to provide a methodological context. But teachers also extend these invitations because DH values diversity, connectedness, collaboration, and experimentation. We know that our class will be "richer" if we bring in other perspectives. We know that we do not have to be masters of all things DH and can draw on the expertise of colleagues. As we host guests, we can also perform connectedness for our students as we push back against academic hierarchies—in what other field does a "luminary" show up in your classroom? And yet we also know that introducing a new person into the classroom is a bit of a risk, but one that is worth the attempt if it leads to transforming how the humanities classroom works. Why do guest speakers accept our invitations? Because DH values collegiality and connectedness. We say "yes" when we are asked to appear in a colleague's classroom because we *are* collaborative. We want to offer help to those who need it, whether that assistance comes in the form of teaching XML or of responding to students in person (or virtually, but still present). We believe that making such an appearance in class—whether in person, traipsing from another corner of campus, or remotely—will enhance the experience of the students in the class.

Why do we co-teach, ask others to teach with us, or collectively support a complex pedagogical construction? Because the kind of radical experimentation inherent in good DH pedagogy requires multifaceted collaboration. As with guest lecturers, these new classroom paradigms heighten the sense of diversity that multiple instructors (and types of instructors) can provide our students. It is not just about teaching different types of tools, where one specialist introduces GIS and another TEI. Oftentimes a specialist will come to the classroom with a particular critical perspective on the method being taught or how it is applied in different contexts that changes how our students understand the material as well as the method. Perhaps it is simply that specialists lighten the load for the instructor of record, who end up believing they have the right to expect this labor of the specialists, the librarians, and other support staff. But we would like to think that the collegiality that DH prizes results in an acknowledgment that the commitment of labor by all involved should be acknowledged ... if not rewarded.

Why do we share our teaching materials online? Surely it is connected to the value the community places on openness. Much of the time our assignments and syllabi are developed in conversation with those of others who have made their work public, so it is only natural that we do the same thing. This open exchange of ideas and reliance on the work of others simultaneously enacts both the collegiality and collaboration that the DH community seeks to foster. Additionally, publishing teaching materials often draws on the ethos of experimentation. Although academia privileges the dissemination of research, it is much more unusual to make public what we do in the classroom (see Sample 2009). For a DH pedagogue, posting a syllabus may be an experiment that involves technology (learning a new platform, for example), but it is also just as likely to be an experiment in defying the norms of the academy, whose members tend to guard their artifacts as precious intellectual property. But this is where that hallmark of openness and generosity came to bear. Not only did we build those early DH courses from the ground up, we took the extra step of making them public. We broke with convention and summoned the extra energy to curate our own pedagogical process, inviting our colleagues to adapt and experiment in their own contexts.<sup>4</sup>

To state it clearly: we believe that the invisible labor that DH pedagogues commit themselves to is clearly connected to the values that the DH community espouses. At this point, however, a canny reader might raise an objection: if these teaching practices are spurred on by the community's values, then wouldn't the community, well, *value* this labor? Wouldn't the ethical commitments of DH practitioners to recognize the "contributions by all involved" lead to pedagogical work being appreciated and counted? To such a reader, we concede that DH does, in many ways, do more to acknowledge pedagogical work than many other fields. Journals like *Kairos* or the *Journal of Interactive Technology and Pedagogy* and collections like *Digital Humanities Pedagogy* (ed. Hirsch), *Teaching with Digital Humanities* (eds. Travis and DeSpain), or *Digital Pedagogy in the Humanities* (eds. Davis, Gold, Harris, and Sayers) regularly provide opportunities to discuss one's praxis in print.<sup>5</sup> If such DH-centric publications help shine a light on teaching, perhaps, such pedagogical labor is invisible when viewed within the context of the broader academic enterprise. While those in the DH community may see our efforts (whether on our public websites or as we appear in one another's classes), the institutions that employ us fail to recognize them. This should not be surprising since pedagogy is, as mentioned, an ill-favored stepsibling to "research" in the US universities' tripartite system of categorizing labor: scholarship, teaching, and service. To be very specific, Brian is on the tenure track (as "professional faculty" rather than "professorial"), and while his annual review wants to know about publications and invited or conference presentations, neither his publicly accessible syllabi and assignments nor his appearance in colleagues' classes meet the threshold of what the university considers a publication or presentation. Diane is in an alt-ac position, working within the library but affiliated with an academic program that allows her to teach as an instructor of record while she also supports faculty members in their own teaching. Her annual review process does not allow her to include any publication or presentation whatsoever. It also does not reflect upon any of the teaching she does in any context. The way in which we—both "we" the authors and "we" the DH pedagogy community—choose to teach DH is, in other words, inscrutable to our institutions. The efforts remain invisible not so much because the university *cannot* count them but because the university has *chosen* not to count them. In short, one reason that the work of DH pedagogy remains invisible is due to the fact that "some digital humanities values may clash with the norms of the academy" (Spiro 2012, 30).

But while DH, thanks to its values, does have avenues for recognizing such labor, we must also respond to our canny reader that these values concomitantly set up the expectation that one *will* participate in such praxes. After all, if you are a DH practitioner and you believe in these values, you would certainly want to do your part to advance them, right? Such an expectation is driven more by an individual's internal sense of collegiality (natch!) than it is imposed by the broader community. Nevertheless, this expectation for particular pedagogical behaviors means that when individuals engage in them, their efforts become less individually Herculean and more akin to muscle memory. And muscle memory, like the beating of our hearts or the contraction of our lungs, tends to escape our notice. The way in which the DH community's values end up enabling invisible labor—despite their clear intent to recognize such contributions—is perhaps manifest in Spiro's description of the value of openness: "a commitment to the open exchange of ideas, the development of open content and software, and *transparency*" (2012, 24, emphasis added). While we can understand "transparency" as the desire to make visible the workings of scholars and scholarship, teachers and teaching, it can simultaneously be understood as the making-invisible



of those same subjects. Transparency within DH becomes a hinge: the openness that leads us to discuss our values and to enact them in our teaching becomes the expectation that we will—of course—do so, making transparent the cost it exacts on all of us.

## CONCLUSION

In the end, it should not be surprising that there is invisible labor in digital humanities pedagogy since the structure of the university is such that pedagogical labor is always difficult to see. What sets DH teachers apart are the new categories of work that they have created for themselves in their efforts to teach as effectively as possible. Whether hosting guest speakers, taking part in a teaching cooperative, or sharing materials online, DH teachers participate in teaching activities that require even more effort than what tends to be expended in the classroom. What's more, we have found that a large number of those who teach DH engage in these practices.

We also believe that the shared values within the DH community help explain why so many DH practitioners spend the extra time to enhance their classes despite the fact that they will not be rewarded for doing so. When we teach collaboratively or share our materials with the broader world, we help build a more open, connected, diverse, and exploratory environment for our students and for our colleagues. Yet these values lead to expectations for this sort of labor, which in turn makes it more invisible in the end.

There is no easy solution to the problem of invisible labor within DH pedagogy. Academe as a whole chooses not to see pedagogical work. And while DH finds many ways to make it more public, it also increasingly produces a collective shrug, as we all continue to do things that would boggle the minds of those working in other fields but that seem just everyday occurrences as we try to live out our values. Perhaps the answer would be to add a new clause to the DH community's (imagined) value statement that explicitly states that these values should not be taken as edicts to be applied in all ways to all parts of our professional lives at all times. But who among us in DH is ready to ... just ... stop? How can we embrace and enact these values without it becoming the death of us?

In the end, this essay is our effort to make it possible to see what has been invisible. While we feel driven to encourage DH pedagogues to continue embracing the community's values, we also argue that these efforts be made as visible in as many ways as possible. Those who are in senior positions within the field should see and then advocate strongly for recognition of the extraordinary efforts DH teachers make. They should simultaneously encourage their junior colleagues to take a break once in a while. Those who are just starting out should not feel like they have to set up a website and publish a syllabus *and* invite guests *AND* create equal space for all instructors all at once. Try to take it one day at a time, but when that day is your annual review, insist on telling everyone what you've done!

## NOTES

1. In an essay in our forthcoming *What We Teach When We Teach DH: Digital Humanities in the Classroom* (University of Minnesota Press), Catherine DeRose discusses efforts to train graduate students to teach DH in a manner that builds on the model within graduate disciplinary departments.

2. Many of the professionals who developed these learning objects were no longer employed by the universities for which they taught the courses referred to. Some were uncertain what rights they still had to those materials if they were housed on a university's servers to which they no longer had access. (In the middle of the *Digital Pedagogy in the Humanities* review process, a complex blogging assignment that Jakacki had designed while a postdoc at Georgia Tech was deleted from a server, and it could only be recovered through screenshots saved on the Internet Archive's *Wayback Machine*.) Some had left the academy altogether.
3. Spiro suggests that DH values come from the different communities that are blended together in DH practice. These include the cultures of academia, information technology professionals, librarianship, and the Internet (see Spiro 2012, 19–23).
4. Of course one should point out that this labor wasn't purely magnanimous: many who did this sharing were simultaneously on the job market trying to demonstrate what DH courses would look like to potential employers, a fact that might have contributed to these efforts.
5. While not explicitly about DH pedagogy, the contributors to *Digital Pedagogy in the Humanities* by and large come from that field and many of the collection's artifacts derive from DH courses.

## REFERENCES

- Croxall, Brian, and Diane K. Jakacki. 2019. "Who Teaches When We Teach DH? A Survey." <https://hcommons.org/deposits/item/hc:27045/>.
- Croxall, Brian, and Diane K. Jakacki. 2020. "Who Teaches When We Teach DH? Some Answers and More Questions [Sic]." <https://hcommons.org/deposits/item/hc:31673/>.
- Davis, Rebecca Frost, Matthew K. Gold, Katherine D. Harris, and Jentery Sayers, eds. 2020. *Digital Pedagogy in the Humanities: Concepts, Models, and Experiments*. <https://digitalpedagogy.hcommons.org/>.
- DeRose, Catherine. Forthcoming. "Pedagogy First: A Lab-Led Model for Preparing Graduate Students to Teach DH." In *What We Teach When We Teach DH: Digital Humanities in the Classroom*, edited by Brian Croxall and Diane K. Jakacki. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press. <https://dhdebates.gc.cuny.edu>.
- Hirsch, Brett D., ed. 2012. *Digital Humanities Pedagogy: Practices, Principles and Politics*. Cambridge: Open Book Publishers.
- Radiohead. 2000. "How to Disappear Completely." *Kid A*. Parlophone.
- Sample, Mark. 2009. "Transparency, Teaching, and Taking My Evaluations Public." *Samplereality* (blog). August 4. <https://samplereality.com/2009/08/04/transparency-teaching-and-taking-my-evaluations-public/>.
- Spiro, Lisa. 2012. "'This Is Why We Fight': Defining the Values of the Digital Humanities." In *Debates in the Digital Humanities*, edited by Matthew K. Gold, 16–35. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press. <https://dhdebates.gc.cuny.edu>.
- Travis, Jennifer, and Jessica DeSpain, eds. 2018. *Teaching with Digital Humanities: Tools and Methods for Nineteenth-Century American Literature*. Illustrated edition. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.