

Getting Started: Strategies for DH Professional Development

Paige Morgan

(Originally published in *Doing More Digital Humanities: Open Approaches to Creation, Growth, and Development*. Edited by Constance Crompton, Richard J. Lane, and Ray Siemens. Routledge, December 10, 2019.)

Introduction

This guide is for anyone wanting to develop a professional identity and one or more credentials in the digital humanities or scholarship communities. By credential, I mean a specific achievement that is legible and intelligible to other people; something that could be listed on a CV or resume. Many of the people who want to do this are graduate students, but most of the recommendations below should be equally applicable to early career faculty and people working in libraries or academic centers, too. These recommendations are especially intended for people with little or no access to established programs, courses, or mentors with expertise in the digital humanities. That said, I hope many aspects of this chapter will also be useful to people who might be looking for a concrete opportunity to start putting their DH theory into practice while avoiding the temptation and pressure to learn “all the things.” I write this guide as someone who took a largely autodidactic route into DH; and at various times between my start in 2009, and my first DH job as a postdoc in a DH center in 2014, I worried about whether my experience would be sufficient in comparison with that of students from more established DH programs like those at George Mason University, the University of Virginia, and the Maryland Institute for Technology in the Humanities (MITH). I wondered how much of a difference it would make that my committee members (and letter of recommendation writers) might not be able to articulate my DH activity clearly enough to satisfy search committees. I still hear from plenty of people who feel pressure to “bootstrap” their DH training, and my hope is that this guide will make that easier to do. However, a good guide is honest about its limitations, so I need to acknowledge that there are no sure paths to success in the current job market; and that the recommendations that I make below engage with questions that do not have uniform agreement within graduate departments within the humanities.

I’ll start by outlining the aspects of the field of digital humanities that have influenced the strategies I’m offering. From there, I’ll offer an adaptable template for performing an environmental scan and using that scan to develop a Minimum Viable Project (MVP), which is a good descriptor of the scope of achievement that you should aim for when you’re just getting started.

From defining DH to defining success in DH

People pursuing DH careers need credentials that they might display or reference while on the job market or settling into a new job. But what constitutes a credential? At one time, the word referred to the school or program that an individual was associated with, and the degree that they

had obtained. In the wake of the current rise of DH, however, I've seen credentials come to include developing or participating in a DH project, or having expertise in one or more DH methodologies (topic modeling, GIS, database creation etc.) or tech skills (Python, R, TEI/XML, etc.). A few authors have commented on the dangers of credential creep into DH in the form of asking for too-long lists of skills (Priego, Gailey and Porter). Other less formal commentary in the same vein shows up in social media comment threads, often in response to posted job ads that are interpreted as asking one individual to do the work of a whole team.

Part of the challenge is that the field of DH lacks a clear idea of what constitutes success. In the broadest conception of the field, including people aware of but not practicing DH, the clearest measure of success is a major grant or a flashy website. There are other concepts of success, but they aren't as widely discussed outside the community of practice. The resulting articles (most recently Timothy Brennan's "The Digital Humanities Bust") put pressure on new digital humanists to accomplish even more, and often obscure the process of achieving that very limited definition of success.

This problem emerges from the fact that DH is a craft field, meaning, as Geoffrey Rockwell explains, that "It is undertheorized the way any craft field that developed to share knowledge that can't be adequately captured in discourse is" (par. 5). Put simply, the field is dynamic and locally inflected enough that theory can't catch up. This is further complicated by the fact that DH discourse is unusually diffuse compared to some other subjects: it takes place in printed books and anthologies and journals, as well as on social media, in Facebook and Twitter comment threads, and on Slack message boards. The writers commenting in the platforms with the broadest reach (i.e., the *Chronicle*, *The Atlantic*, the *Los Angeles Review of Books*, etc.) usually have an incomplete view of the scope of activity that is taking place, or may not be prepared to parse the different voices and spheres which are actively discussing and even theorizing diverse and fluid aspects of the work. In some cases, it is difficult for a reviewer to effectively assess both the scholarly and technical choices that project creators have made.

Of course, reviewers disagree frequently. In the context of digital humanities and digital scholarship, differing perspectives about success and achievement are often the result of individuals coming from very different roles, and thus having contrasting or even conflicting priorities. Someone working in libraries may prioritize sustainability and scalability, while someone on a search committee in a humanities department may prioritize innovation or the likelihood of winning major grants, qualities related to the tenure process. I mention these contrasts because anyone pursuing professional development as a digital humanist will find themselves navigating these contrasting priorities. The skills and experience that you pursue are likely to align more naturally with some areas than with others. This doesn't necessarily mean that you are excluding yourself from jobs, but it will be up to you to articulate how and why your experience has prepared you for particular roles. As you do so, you are likely to encounter

various unequal power dynamics, expectations, and assumptions around labor and the processes of knowledge production in DH (Griffin & Hayler, pars. 13-16). Navigating these situations can be complex and uncomfortable, as both DH and broader academic communities are slowly finding ways to discuss conditions, and learning how to organize and advocate for positive changes.

For now, the most widely-recognizable credential in DH (besides program affiliation and letters of recommendation) is probably still a project that can take the form of a website or that can be thoroughly articulated in argument-focused research articles (Cassuto). This is a conservative assessment - I'm thinking of credentials as defined by the broader community of humanities academics as opposed to the authors represented in this volume, for example. That project-heavy focus can be a good thing *and* a bad thing. In the next section, I'll explain some of the advantages and risks before offering an alternative formulation for conceptualizing what a project is supposed to accomplish.

The mixed value of a DH project

What is a project? When a DH researcher first develops the idea for one, they might describe it in very specific terms: a website, a database, an exhibit, a map, that explores a particular topic or research question. One of the advantages of developing a DH project is that having something specific in mind can help you choose what tools and methods you need to learn. Another advantage is that a project can become a set of elevator pitches that allow you to connect with various people (including those outside of traditional academic departments).

Another advantage is that a project can be flexible and granular. Your one-sentence description doesn't capture the full range of components that are involved (including datasets and workflows), and that might be of interest to various communities. The various milestones can be elements of flexibility - you might add one in order to experiment with taking your project in a new direction if you become aware of a new methodology or source of material. It's possible to use a project to think about both short-term and long-term goals. The iterative value of a project and its granular components can be one of your greatest strengths because they allow you to adapt as you learn more about the technological options available and the different communities that you're interacting with. That raises the question of the relationship between your project and your dissertation.

Unfortunately, the iterative, flexible, and granular approach to project development that I've described above is more or less in conflict with the conventional concept of the humanities dissertation as capstone or proto-book. It's difficult to make a dissertation flexible when degree programs require you to define in an advance prospectus what you will accomplish sufficiently that a committee can assess it rigorously. A humanities PhD student at the prospectus phase has

generally completed 1-3 years of coursework, during which they've theoretically learned how to define what scope of achievement is possible -- but in most cases, they will lack the equivalent tech experience. Students may also find that their institution or department has strict rules about who is allowed to be an official reader or committee member; making it difficult or impossible to arrange for people who understand the technological achievements to have a say in officially evaluating the work. Ultimately, my sense is that trying to do a digital project as a dissertation means that it must be assessed both as a project *and* as a dissertation - though the latter assessment may or may not help you make progress with it. In contrast, having a much smaller digital project on the side can give you more autonomy to pivot when you need to.

Having a project to work toward can be incredibly valuable. Working to get a project "done" can be incredibly stressful, especially when you're balancing it with dissertating, teaching, or other aspects of your job. While some students may be able to balance producing both a "sophisticated website" and a "traditional print dissertation" at the same time (Cassuto), many will not have the support necessary to meet this high standard; nor is it clear that doing so is necessary. I think that we rarely acknowledge another idea of what a DH project is, and the point of starting one: it's a demonstration that you are actively participating and contributing to one or more communities, shaping and being shaped by them. Keeping that idea in mind can help ground your perspective as you proceed and allow you to avoid being overly focused on the idea of whether your project will or won't succeed. And the way that you begin accomplishing this alternative idea of your project is to start an ongoing environmental scan.

Environmental Scans for Digital Humanities Projects

An environmental scan is a detailed and wide-ranging investigation of the context(s) and communities that you're planning to become involved with. They're often used in business contexts as a key part of strategic decision making. Libraries use them to gather information about patron needs and plan or adjust their service offerings. Grant funders regularly request environmental scans in applications because they can quickly reveal the extent of applicants' background knowledge. Environmental scans are essential to DH projects because you want to feel confident that your project is a good fit for the users you hope to attract. You don't need a project in mind in order to start your scan - it's entirely possible that the scan will help clarify what a good project would be. Alternately, if you have an idea (or even a germ of an idea) for a project, the scan should help you refine your idea, making it more powerful and feasible. I strongly recommend going through one before you present your project at any conference, and certainly before you pursue any sort of fellowship or grant application based around your project. It will only help your chances. The loose template I'm providing in this article has a mixed focus -- the first four are specifically project-focused; the final two are more oriented towards learning about communities. For some people, it may make more sense to start with 5), and then swing back to questions 1) through 4).

Overview: Environmental Scan Questions

- 1) What projects already exist that deal with your subject matter or its general area?
- 2) Supplemental project questions:
 - How big are the projects you've found?
 - How long have they been in development?
 - What support have they received?
- 3) What format is the material that you want to work with currently in?
- 4) What tools, platforms, and methods are the projects working with your data and materials using?
- 5) What are the communities you want to be part of? What conversations are happening within them?
- 6) Where is writing about the sort of projects or topics that you're interested in taking place? What genres of writing do you see?

In some ways, the biggest challenge of doing an environmental scan in DH is that there isn't a single location that you can tap into. Google's customized algorithms may help sift information that's more relevant to you, but in other cases, that information may stay hidden unless you look a little harder. Google may also lead you to information about activity that is fairly established and institutionally-supported to the degree that colleges and universities are holding workshops, symposia, or conferences. But that isn't a full picture of the activity, and it may not even be the best way to get a sense of what the community is concerned and thinking about.

Performing an environmental scan involves asking a lot of different questions, and part of the value of asking questions is that you can write up what you discover and share it with other people, either in blog posts, twitter threads, conference papers, or journal articles. As you discuss and share your findings, you build up a network of people who see you as part of the community; and likewise, you can often point to the community to explain and illustrate the work that you're trying to do. You learn, in the process, what sorts of credentials are valued, and what sorts of jobs you might use those credentials to pursue.

Beginning this sort of public writing almost inevitably feels scary, and it is. It is research: you are gathering information about particular topics, and discovering how to fit that information together in order to make decisions. However, this sort of writing is also you practicing how to be a member of one or more communities (DH, libraries, museums, archives, faculty development, etc.), and practicing new skills or expertise in public usually feels awkward. If you choose not to start writing in public, then writing privately is still vital: it will allow you to practice articulating yourself in preparation for job interviews and conference presentations. Recording your experiences also allows you to document how your perspective changes over time. While you'll almost certainly discover misconceptions and mistakes, being able to draw on

those will make you a better mentor and teacher; moreover, they can be the basis of compelling anecdotes that highlight your ability to learn and adapt. Those anecdotes help to show that you not only have expertise, but also that you know how to situate it in order to help others learn.

What projects already exist that deal with your subject matter or its general area?

When you ask this question, it's good to start out focused: if you're working with poetry by Keats, then it's important to find out early whether there are other digital projects also focusing on Keats' poetry and other writing. This is only partly about avoiding reinventing the wheel or duplicating someone else's work. It's also about finding future collaborators and other members of the same community of people who are interested in the same topics and or methods. Those people are folks whose work you may build on, who may build on your work, who you may develop grant applications and projects with in the future, and if nothing else, people who you may be encountering throughout your career. Try to see them not as competitors who you need to beat out, but as community members (and potential friends) with whom you expect to work together on future projects, bounce ideas off of, and be a sounding board for.

Whether you do or don't find projects that are dealing with your precise subject matter, once you've finished, widen your net - if your interest is Wole Soyinka or Chinua Achebe, then expand to look for any DH projects that are focusing on Nigerian writers or Nigerian culture; then those that are dealing with African literature or postcolonial lit or any other major topic fields that your particular subject falls into. Any projects that exist are potentially part of one or more communities that you want to become part of.

While one set of projects that you might be looking at is based around humanities research topics, other sets you could seek out and scan are those based on research methodologies or tools: the folks who are text mining or building databases; the people using ArcGIS or Tableau; the group that's working with linked open data. When you're scanning projects via methodologies and tools, you can watch for projects that you might emulate (while still acknowledging the inspiration, of course). A digital history project that's focusing on an entirely different period and topic than yours might still provide a provocative method of combining and connecting sources, or might introduce you to a tool that provides the sort of experience you want your users to have. Ideally, as you scan for projects that focus on the humanities topics you're interested in, you'll get a sense of what the methodologies in use are, and then you can search along those lines.

How big is each project? How long has it been in development? What kind of support is it getting?

These questions aren't a test of prestige. They're more about being aware of what sorts of challenges might have been involved in processing and presenting the material, being aware of workflows that might exist, and that people might be willing to share, potentially making other

people's labor visible, and finally, being aware of granting organizations that might be interested in your project at some point in the future.

As you find projects that relate to your subject or planned methods, don't simply make a list of them. You need to read them, and try to get a sense of what need(s) they see themselves as fulfilling, what research question(s) they're engaging with, which audiences they want to connect and communicate with, and what strategies they use to articulate these things. What you discover as you read can help you think about your own answers to these questions for your own project idea.

What format is the material that you want to work with currently in?

You could start your scan with this question, rather than beginning by looking for existing projects. Depending on your subject matter and your goals, this question could have a lot of different answers, with different implications for your project. What you're interested in finding out is how much material is available as machine-readable data, ready to be incorporated into a DH project. By researching this question, you're also gauging the amount of labor necessary to create a project around your desired material as well as identifying potential needs that you could tackle as granular components of your project.

I think of readiness as a spectrum ranging from "not ready at all" to "so ready that you can dump the data into a particular tool and start analyzing it" without needing to do any cleaning or enhancing at all. It would be almost impossible to describe the details of the spectrum for every potential source of material, so I'll illustrate with a few key examples.

At the rough end of the spectrum, material is not ready for DH work at all because it does not yet exist in a machine-readable digital format. If it's in the form of text, it is in print and has not been digitized. For images, similar issues exist: perhaps the images are in an older book that has never been scanned. Or perhaps the images are ephemeral, say, urban graffiti in a particular town. No one is in charge of photographing them, so they could disappear at any time - creating metadata describing the instances of graffiti could be tricky (involving not only geographical coordinates, but sometimes additional description - and what if the graffiti is on a mobile object like a truck or a train car?). How do you identify the author of the author if the author uses a tag that isn't easily spelled out? These sorts of complexities can exist in other ways for a variety of ephemeral items that you might want to work with. Another set of complications involves copyright, which may be part of the reason that the material is not online. While fair use laws support scholarly and educational uses generally, material that you want to work with that is under copyright may involve more complexity, both in terms of fulfilling legal requirements and being respectful of the creators. The same sorts of questions are true for privacy.

Being at the rough end of the spectrum isn't necessarily a red flag that you should stay away from a particular set of sources. The amount of work that needs to be done makes them higher risk, but there's also more potential to generate excitement by working towards making the material ready for analysis.

Moving from the rough end of the spectrum, you might want to work with material that has at least been digitized - though if text is involved, then the question is whether or not it's been processed using Optical Character Recognition (OCR), so that the text can be imported into analysis software. The resolution of the photograph may determine how easy it is to produce good OCR from the material, as may the condition of the material itself (whether the text is faded, blurred, printed with rough or warped type, or a stylized font. There's also the question of whether there are lots of images of the material you want to work with. For example, let's say you want to do a project on early 20th century American advertising. How many different images of ads that you might want to include in your project can you find online? Are they in the tens? hundreds? thousands?

I think of the midpoint of the readiness spectrum as populated by small datasets. By small, I mean somewhere between 10 and 100 items. In many cases, these datasets aren't big enough to be representative in a major argument, but they're ready for you to play with. They can be convenient for using as you get accustomed to a particular tool, and are also convenient for you to contribute to by processing and adding more material. Another advantage to small datasets is that their size makes it feasible for you to change or adapt some aspect of them. Perhaps you disagree with the controlled vocabulary that the creator originally used - if the dataset is under 100 items, then recoding can be relatively quick.

As you get closer to the other end of the spectrum, material is available in formats that are ready to be used with various DH tools and methodologies because people have done the work of preparing it as machine-readable data. If it's textual material, it's available in plain-text files, potentially available either as full novels or anthologies or broken down by chapter, poem, essay, etc. If it's images, they've been grouped together in categories (with very basic metadata, or filenames that are structured to be both human and machine-readable (ex: http cats)).

At the very far end of the "ready to work with!" spectrum, you have material that is available as carefully structured data that has been cleaned and processed with the intent of using it to work with. A good example of this finely processed data are the Folger Shakespeare Library texts that have been carefully encoded in TEI XML, right down to the punctuation marks. Other datasets that are available, like those in Jeremy Singer-Vine's *Data is Plural* newsletter, are equally good examples. Depending on the context and the specific data, these datasets are ready for you to use, or ready to adapt and augment further, with far less labor and effort involved than if you were starting from scratch.

What tools, platforms, and methods are the projects working with your data and materials using?

Answering this question can be the most straightforward way to determine the tools, platforms, and/or methods that you could adapt for your own project (giving the originators credit, of course). It might feel as though you need to come up with an incredibly new never-used methodology, but I would advise resisting that temptation for your first project. Using a more familiar method means greater access to people who are also using it and thinking through critical aspects in the process.

What are the communities you want to be part of? What conversations are happening within them?

Connecting with communities can be vital, because those communities probably contain your users, and you need a detailed understanding of their needs. But if your project is mainly a vehicle for you to learn and to develop your career, then community research is about discovering what professional roles exist, and what roles you might want to pursue. There are large communities: the big tents of Digital Humanities/Scholarship, English or History or Classics researchers, grad students - but there are also relatively smaller communities with much narrower interests that are more likely to align with your own. These communities can be topic-, method-, tool-, or organization-based, to name a few points of alignment. My own communities include focal points like linked open data, feminist DH and technology, and DH/DS scholars working in library roles. The HASTAC community is welcoming and supportive of newcomers - likewise, DH interest groups or caucuses associated with major conferences that you plan to attend.

However, attending conferences isn't always economically feasible, and showing up in person isn't always necessary to start finding your communities and developing your networks. Twitter is probably the easiest place to start looking, though there are also Facebook groups and social sites like the MLA's Humanities Commons. The advantage of Twitter is that you can find the most varied assembly of community members for your interests that cut across geographical, disciplinary, and professional boundaries. This means more information to sift through, but also allows you to see a part of your community in relief. For example, it's been valuable to me to see the different perspectives on linked data from digital humanists vs (non-DH) librarians vs the non-academic software development community.

While many guides to engaging with Twitter as an academic exist, few of them address what sorts of strategies you might use to find the communities you want to join - and for an environmental scan, having a strategy is important. The People tab in Twitter search results allows you to see people who have listed particular interests in their profiles, but not all the people who are talking about your interests will do that. The "Latest" tab is my usual lens. I have searched for broad and obvious keywords like "Victorian DH" (no quotes) or "medieval data

project.” Twitter tends to be an emotional space: people on it are talking about what makes them excited or frustrated, what problems and opportunities they see. Paying attention to the emotional dynamics in a community can give you a clearer sense of what sort of needs exist. Your Twitter searches aren’t likely to reveal instantaneous and immediate insights, though I’ve certainly found projects and articles that I don’t think I’d have discovered otherwise. The point is to begin finding the people to whom you want to listen, who share the same values you do, and the conversations that you want to join into (or start discussing in your own spaces). If you don’t have access to regular in-person DH meetups (and most people won’t), then finding these discussions via social media can be your best option for developing insights as you work towards your project and your career. Even if you are fortunate enough to be part of a DH program, or close enough to attend its events, learning to see beyond your local conception of digital scholarship is important.

*Where is writing about the sort of projects or topics that you’re interested in being published?
What kind of writing is it?*

Depending on your context, you may feel pressure to publish journal articles, vs. less formal blog posts. Either way, finding out the different avenues for publication is an important step that lets you target the work that you’re doing towards specific goals. Especially if you’re relatively new to DH work, getting a sense of the different genres of essays (both formal and informal) can be enlightening in demonstrating that you do not need to produce a 5,000-word traditional argument-focused essay to be seen as contributing to the community.

Ending the first iteration of your environmental scan

What you discover during your environmental scanning should have a major impact on your Minimum Viable Project. In essence, you are building it for the communities that you have identified and begun participating in. There isn’t a strict point at which you call your environmental scan complete, and then move onto project building. The research focused on finding your communities should be ongoing - especially if your goal is to start participating in them. Spending more time isn’t always better though, because one reason for doing an environmental scan is to develop a project plan that will fit the amount of time you have (and you may not have much). Even if you have a sizable chunk of time, I would argue that your goal should be to develop the smallest DH project that allows you to discuss the greatest number of interesting facets of it.

Developing a Minimum Viable Project

An MVP could have many forms, depending on what your idea is. I would define it as a prototype version that can be used to give audiences a sense of what the project might become, and that can be used to talk about the critical questions and interpretive decisions that take place in the project. Miriam Posner’s *How Did They Make That?* encourages audiences to think of projects as “sources, processed, and presented.” In those terms, an MVP needs to provide a few

examples of the sources that you intend to use in the project, the critical decisions and work involved in processing them, and a sense of how they are being presented. Your MVP can take varied forms - the smallest might be a spreadsheet showing some of the material and metadata that you are working with. It might have as few as 10 items in it - the point is to be able to show it to people and have some concrete specifics to reference. If you can do a research consultation with a librarian who provides DH/DS guidance, then bringing along a spreadsheet showing/describing some of the material you want to work with, and the sorts of categories or facets you might want to include. If “categories” feels too computational a word, think “aspects” - as in, aspects of the material that you want your users to be able to navigate with. If you were developing a project on South African authors, you might want to highlight the specific towns where the authors lived while they were writing, the genres, their publishers, as well as other information.

Creating this spreadsheet gives you something to show someone else, as well as helping you start to think through the scale and complexity of the project that you’re trying to build. If you find that you have many different aspects (more than six), then identify the ones that are most critically important to the main research question that you want to answer. If the objects you’re trying to explore have very different categories, that can indicate that you’re trying to juxtapose complex material, and that has implications for which tools will be a good fit. Use the spreadsheet to help you explore different DH tools that you’re aware of, looking at the demos and seeing whether you could imagine replacing the content in those demos with your own information.

What I’ve described here is applicable for any projects that are about presenting material. The MVP version of a text analysis project would work a little differently, but not substantially. Your goal is still to find the smallest version of a corpus that you could start working with that would start allowing you to identify trends. Maybe that corpus is all the works by a single author - or if you’re working with newspaper data, all the articles from one month of the paper. Or one week. You can always make your corpus bigger, but starting small is what allows you to start learning how much time it takes to get material ready, and to start figuring out what sorts of questions you can ask.

Your MVP allows you to have something that you could show at a conference or colloquium instead of just an idea in your head. Its real value, though, is that it presents an occasion for you to write and discuss an almost infinite number of topics, including:

- What research question are you exploring in this project? Why is it a digital project, rather than a printed essay?
- How did you choose your platform? Why was it the best choice for this research question and this material?

- What project(s) inspired your own project idea? Why do you think those projects are good exemplars? What aspects of them do you think would be helpful for your peers (whether grad students, librarians, or faculty) to be more aware of?
- If you're working with categories, how did you determine which categories would be important for researchers who might be interested in your project? If you're classifying objects, where did those classifications come from? How do they connect with other scholarships? If you think about slightly different but related research topics, could someone building a DH project around one of them use your categories instead of developing their own?
- How does your project connect with other digital projects? These could be other DH projects, or digital projects within the GLAM community, and the connection could be simply that your project complements another to create a more nuanced picture of a period or topic.
- What kind of data/material would you want to incorporate into this project if you enlarged it? What process would that material have to go through in order to become machine-readable and refined into the categories you're using?
- Could you teach an aspect of this project in a course and have students use your MVP in exploring it? What would the activity or assignment look like? What concepts would it introduce, and what course outcomes would it fulfill?
- Who are the potential audiences for this project, and why? How does this project connect with interests, questions, and concerns within the communities?
- Imagine a version of this project that was oriented towards non-academic audiences - what would it look like?
- Imagine enlarging your project and producing more data, and then releasing that data for others to use. What sorts of research questions might people be able to use it for? Can you imagine someone using part of your data (your basic categories), and then building on them to develop the data in a different direction?
- What aspects of working with your material were difficult? Is there something about the material that makes it hard to model with machine-readable data? What hard choices did you have to make, and how did you resolve them?

As you develop your Minimum Viable Project and find occasions to discuss it either in person or in writing, it will grow and change. It might get bigger - alternately, you may end up making a few different versions using different platforms in order to figure out which interface and experience conveys your research most effectively, and works best for your audience. You may abandon your original idea to start with an entirely different one. You may run further iterations of questions from your environmental scan. Ultimately, the point of both the environmental scan and the MVP is to sharpen your sense of various parts of the larger field of digital humanities so that you can be aware of the choices that you need to make, and be able to think through why you would choose one option over another. While a distinct DH project with a name, a URL, and

a line on your CV may seem like the most legible sign of professionalization, the less visible processes that led to its creation may ultimately be more valuable.

Works Cited

Brennan, Timothy. "The Digital-Humanities Bust: After a Decade of Investment and Hype, What Has the Field Accomplished? Not Much." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, vol. 64, no. 8, Oct. 2017, pp. 1–1.

Cassuto, Leonard. "The Job-Market Moment of Digital Humanities." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Jan. 2017. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, <https://www.chronicle.com/article/The-Job-Market-Moment-of/238944>.

Coble, Zach, et al. "Process as Product: Scholarly Communication Experiments in the Digital Humanities." *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication*, vol. 2, no. 3, Aug. 2014. *jisc-pub.org*, doi:[10.7710/2162-3309.1137](https://doi.org/10.7710/2162-3309.1137).

Gailey, Amanda, and Dot Porter. *Credential Creep in the Digital Humanities | #alt-Academy: Alternative Academic Careers*. <http://mediacommons.futureofthebook.org/alt-ac/pieces/credential-creep-digital-humanities>. Accessed 21 Jan. 2018.

Griffin, Gabriele, and Matt Steven Hayler. "Collaboration in Digital Humanities Research – Persisting Silences." *Digital Humanities Quarterly*, vol. 12, no. 1, 2018. <http://www.digitalhumanities.org/dhq/vol/12/1/000351/000351.html>.

Posner, Miriam. "How Did They Make That?" *Miriam Posner's Blog*, 29 Aug. 2013, <http://miriamposner.com/blog/how-did-they-make-that/>.

Priego, Ernesto. "Various Shades of Digital Literacy: The New Digital Divides." *HASTAC*, <https://www.hastac.org/blogs/ernesto-priego/2012/10/22/various-shades-digital-literacy-new-digital-divides>. Accessed 21 Jan. 2018.

Rockwell, Geoffrey. "Inclusion In The Digital Humanities." *Philosophi.Ca*, 7 Sept. 2011, <https://philosophi.ca/pmwiki.php/Main/InclusionInTheDigitalHumanities>.

Scheinfeldt, Tom. *Toward a Third Way: Rethinking Academic Employment | #alt-Academy: Alternative Academic Careers*. <http://mediacommons.futureofthebook.org/alt-ac/pieces/toward-third-way-rethinking-academic-employment>. Accessed 21 Jan. 2018.

(Originally published in *Doing More Digital Humanities: Open Approaches to Creation, Growth, and Development*. Edited by Constance Crompton, Richard J. Lane, and Ray Siemens. Routledge, December 10, 2019.)

Singer-Vine, Jeremy. "Data Is Plural." *TinyLetter*, <http://tinyletter.com/data-is-plural/archive>. Accessed 30 Jan. 2018.