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Introduction

As Digital Humanities in the Library (2015) established, and this work continues to demonstrate, digital humanities (or DH) projects are inherently collaborative. While working collaboratively is rewarding, it is also challenging. Since the first edition of this book was published, there has been new and continued scholarship in librarianship and digital humanities on some of the difficult side-effects of this collaborative work, including the uneven distribution of emotional labor and an unhealthy reliance on precarious labor. Because of the interdisciplinary and hybrid nature of this work, it also gives rise to liminality and vocational awe. Each of these circumstances has the potential to contribute to burnout, turnover, and long-term project sustainability challenges.¹

The four contributors to this piece come from an academic background in library and information science and occupy staff roles as librarians, academic technologists, and a postdoctoral fellow in a dual staff/faculty role. Each brings experience working in the liminal spaces of librarianship and academic technology in higher education settings. We share a collective desire to shift digital humanities work from being grant-funded, temporary, and project-based to institutionally integrated, supported, and sustainable through initiatives that move beyond individually cultivated relationships.
This chapter reflects our experiences and observations as professionals working at Macalester College, a small private liberal arts college located in Saint Paul, Minnesota with an enrollment of approximately 2,000 undergraduates. The College places great emphasis on fostering transformational learning experiences among and across its campus community, affirming a commitment to “the intellectual growth of the students, staff and faculty through individual and collaborative endeavor.” Since 2014, the Digital Liberal Arts program, or DLA, has aspired to facilitate cross-disciplinary conversations and partnerships that contribute substantially to the scholarly and pedagogical landscape of Macalester. While this chapter focuses on activities occurring in the context of the College, the challenges and opportunities discussed are broadly applicable to other institutions incorporating a similar digital approach.

Although scholars and practitioners at Macalester have been using computational methods within various academic disciplines for some time, the college had the unique opportunity to formally dedicate time and energy to the development of a Digital Liberal Arts program when it was awarded a 2014 grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation entitled “The Liberal Arts in the Digital Age.” The term “digital liberal arts” may be less legible or familiar to some members of the academic community than the term “digital humanities.” The digital humanities (DH), stemming from humanities computing, has had decades to establish itself. DLA, meanwhile, is still a new term, one that seems to have emerged in the early 2010s, when it was attached to several Mellon grants. While DH and DLA are similar, the latter forefront the liberal arts and their emphasis on collaboration and interdisciplinarity. As William Pannapacker first suggested in 2013, and Kevin Butterfield later reiterated, DLA has the potential to embrace the entire liberal arts campus, including departments and divisions that may not be considered a branch of the “humanities.”

We discuss here challenges Macalester has faced in shifting from one-off project-based management and preservation work to ongoing maintainable infrastructures within the context of challenges common to other institutions: administrative support, funding, and staffing. Institutional structures in staffing as well as faculty/staff divides create challenges in terms of labor compensation, allocation of time, and academic freedom. It is also important to acknowledge the context in which this piece was written and the impact of the public health crisis on our environment. COVID-19 pandemic health measures have put additional strain on institutions for funds and on staff for time, while also limiting opportunities for relationship and capacity building.
We hope a discussion of these concerns will speak to the experience of readers in a variety of roles and institutions who are doing this work. We also hope this chapter provides some language and suggestions as a starting point for conversations about ongoing sustainability, staff longevity, and salary differentials.

**The Challenge of Sustaining the Digital Liberal Arts**

Despite existing in some shape or form for decades, the digital humanities and the digital liberal arts continue to evade precise definition. The US Department of Education published a definition as part of the 2020 Classification of Instructional Programs, but this does not encompass everything that may be considered DH scholarship. This ambiguity presents a challenge to administrators and other institutional stakeholders and reflects the myriad ways this work is defined, developed, and supported across colleges and universities.

Grant-funding is of tremendous importance to supporting innovative programming at institutions of higher education, but grant-funded programs and individuals cannot necessarily change underlying and long-standing campus infrastructures. Macalester’s current three-year grant cycle illustrates the limited and temporary human resources support given to DLA on our campus for approximately a decade. DLA leadership funded through the grant comprises a full-time postdoc and release time for a faculty director, although these roles were fused for the 21/22 academic year, as the faculty director went on sabbatical. The temporary funding of DLA personnel raises several opportunities and challenges for the DLA program in terms of long-term sustainability. As Miriam Posner and others have articulated, sustainability challenges are inherent to grant-funded programs. This issue of precarious labor looms large, as has been demonstrated time and again, “it is always the skilled people and the communities they build who will sustain programs and projects.” Although various and important activities occur while a program is active—curricula developed, workshops facilitated, equipment acquired, websites launched, and the like—sustained support of these activities remains unlikely without dedicated staff and funding. We will discuss in more detail the impact of support from senior administrators, institutional austerity in higher education, and human resources on DLA initiatives and proceed with a discussion of our own experience at a liberal arts institution.
Support from Senior Administrators

A major consequence of any three-year grant-funded project is that, in addition to their regular job duties, staff across campus may be charged with carrying forward the institutional memory of previous grant activities and continuing to provide specialized training or consultations without fair compensation or support. The literature strongly supports the need for senior administrator buy-in to develop sustained staffing and infrastructure to continue digital humanities initiatives. The Ithaka S+R report, *Sustaining the Digital Humanities: Host Institution Support beyond the Start-Up Phase*, outlines this need as one of the top success factors for a coordinated campus strategy in supporting digital humanities work, key to developing DH as an institution-wide priority with a cohesive campus-wide plan that draws from multiple campus units and departments. In addition, the report discusses the need for senior administrators to be able to understand what DH is and what makes DH research unique. Communication should work in both directions, and it is important for senior administrators to clearly communicate back to existing and new faculty on the importance and value of DH research, especially in terms of tenure and promotion. Many of the institutions surveyed mention support for DH work existing on campuses in “nodes” or “pockets,” as is the case at Macalester. Of note is the traction gained and resources secured at some liberal arts colleges by aligning DH goals with the existing institutional teaching-focused and student-centered aims and mission. This gives us much food for thought as Macalester enters a phase of institution-wide strategic planning under a president who joined the college in June 2020. Now seems like an ideal opportunity to use the digital skills grown during the pandemic to continue to bolster faculty’s confidence in using technology-enabled pedagogies such as those used with DH/DLA research methodologies.

Looking from the perspective of the librarians’ role in DH projects, Posner calls out the need for institutional support and incentives for “DH to flourish in a sustained way.” Specifically, she notes leadership buy-in for permanent staff, ongoing funding, dedicated work space, and the acceptance of failure alongside successes. In addition, Posner outlines what individual librarians need to fully support DH initiatives: training, support for librarian-conceived initiatives, time assigned as part of a position (not “add-on” duties), authority for those shepherding DH projects to gather resources and work hours from others, technical infrastructure that is flexible, incentives and recognition, and established equity in DH collaborations, especially across power structures.
Others have explored specific ways in which administration can support the organization of this work across multiple individuals and campus units. Through Vinopal and McCormick’s exploration of the issues of sustainability and scalability, they propose a tiered model of services to support digital scholarship. In addition to the need for selection and scoping of services and projects supported, the article discusses other challenges that are at the purview of the library and/or institutional administrative levels, such as organizing/reorganizing staffing, providing time and resources for staff professional development, funding, strategic vision, and guidance. The final challenge: “Authority and time to accomplish,” is offered as a critical provision so that those that manage digital scholarship services have the authority to work toward the established goals and vision. The authors call for “change in organizational mindset and practice” so that distributed and ad-hoc work is recognized and allocated time by the administration and supervisors.  

**Institutional Austerity in Higher Education**

The economic impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic exacerbate an ongoing trend of institutional austerity in higher education taking place since the 2008 Great Recession. The last decade brought a decrease in state funding to public institutions, budget cuts, and layoffs; these measures have, in turn, resulted in larger class sizes, increased student debt, and increased inequality. Although financial impacts have hit public institutions especially hard, private universities and colleges have not been immune to taking measures to balance the budget, such as hiring freezes, reducing class offerings, shutting down facilities, and eliminating lower enrollment programs—especially disciplines in the humanities such as arts and languages.

Additional COVID-19 pandemic era economic impacts have manifested on campuses as budget cuts, staff dismissals, unpaid furloughs, early retirement options, hiring freezes, merit pay freezes, reduction of institutional endowments, delayed student enrollment, and losses of revenue due to students studying remotely—such as refunds of room and board and student campus fees. Macalester College, as with other small liberal arts institutions in its peer group, enacted a “hiring chill” with few open or new positions being filled, early retirement packages, salary reductions for senior staff, and a temporary suspension of the college’s retirement contribution to employees.

In addition to these financial impacts, the stress of quickly adjusting to address new modes of teaching and learning online was significant, especially considering how slowly higher education, in general, can be to enact change. Macalester, as a small private liberal arts college, emphasized in-person
instruction prior to being forced to make changes due to the pandemic. As private liberal arts colleges grapple with the changes in instructional delivery and student expectations, there is a palpable sense that some sort of line was crossed and that things can’t go back to the way they were. There is continued speculation in higher education about whether online and in-person learning opportunities woven into course structures, such as blended and hybrid learning models, will become the new normal for all institutions, altering pressure points for budgets and funding. As the pandemic brought higher education structural inequities to the forefront, campuses that were already working toward “digital transformation” (Dx) fared better in what seemed like an almost instantaneous shift to online courses and remote work. EDUCAUSE defines digital transformation as “a series of deep and coordinated culture, workforce, and technology shifts that enable new educational and operating models and transform an institution’s operations, strategic directions, and value proposition.” Some shifts that EDUCAUSE points out as leading to Dx are a focus on institutional alignment to a central strategy, embedding IT into those institutional priorities, continuous adaptation of worker roles to keep pace with evolving campus needs, and expanding the role of data and technology in not only administrative activities but also research, teaching, and learning.

Austerity and emergency pandemic measures have institutions cutting budgets across the campus, including Information Technology (IT) budgets. An institution’s ability to support DLA is dependent on its ability to invest in and support untried technologies and these austerity measures hamper that potential. An October 2020 poll found that 65 percent of the colleges and universities surveyed reported a median IT budget decrease of 10 percent with additional cuts anticipated. These cuts come at a time when there are growing and continuously evolving campus IT needs to support core campus operations and student learning. These sometimes-competing technology needs include security, privacy, learning analytics, learning management systems (LMS), hardware repair and replacement, software, interoperability between systems, single sign on, and the list continues. This can put software purchases and support for more niche research needs low on the priority list. The one-off approach often employed with DLA activities, fitting the technology to the research need, may also be at odds with growing trends in higher education to incorporate campus-wide, cookie-cutter approaches to curriculum design by employing adaptive learning technologies and student learning analytics. Macalester has managed to continue to prioritize both—providing institutional-level solutions and matching tools to needs. Although
the technical aspects are integral to supporting DLA, especially in keeping current with the evaluation, purchase, and tech support of emerging technologies, supporting individuals that are new to these technologies and methods is equally or more time consuming.

**HUMAN RESOURCES**

From a human resources perspective, collaborative DH or DLA work can be difficult to accomplish in a work environment where there are many administrative structures to consider. Reporting lines, faculty or staff status, and perceptions of the value of the work itself can diminish productivity or lead to missed opportunities through lack of intentional consultation and coordination.

At Macalester, we have a highly collaborative relationship between the library and ITS staff despite separate reporting lines: ITS is newly in its own reporting line after being previously situated in the finance reporting line, while the library is within the academic line. Librarians and educational technologists both see the importance of developing student, faculty, and staff digital literacies that enable efficient and ethical use of technologies, and frequently meet both inside and outside DLA working group structures to discuss support mechanisms for projects as they develop. Individuals from ITS and the library work together to explore how campus community members build these and other meta-literacy skills in tandem with the work of the DLA team as a parallel, but related, system of support meshing well with existing library initiatives of building student information and meta-literacies. Nonetheless, librarian and educational technologist professional development is often conducted at the individual level, and competing commitments often derail the best intentions of “train the trainer” plans. This makes sustainable skill building across the whole team difficult.

At Macalester we do see some of these cultural and workforce trends starting to evolve and influence how the institution as a whole approaches its priorities—including the role of technology on campus. As our campus has returned to mostly in-person courses in the 2022 academic year, we hope that our community continues to build on the skills and digital literacies that were gained in the sudden shift to online learning.

There is evidence that faculty are becoming more comfortable with incorporating learning technologies into their curriculum. Self-proclaimed “luddites” are now able to navigate and successfully host class sessions via conferencing software, for example. Prior to the pandemic, the DLA post-doctoral fellow committed to four formal faculty consultations per academic
year. With the many changes necessitated by the public health crisis, she experienced an increase in the number of faculty consultations and class visits as more individuals took on the challenge of incorporating digital projects into their coursework and scholarship. Indeed, during the 2020/21 academic year, the DLA postdoctoral fellow consulted with approximately fifteen different faculty members and was embedded in two courses in Spring 2021 (in addition to teaching her own class). Although capacity for engaging in digital projects has decreased somewhat during the Fall 2021 semester, as faculty and staff have been endeavoring to readjust to in-person teaching during a pandemic, the demand for support of digital scholarship and digitally inflected assignments remains high.

While educational technologists are generally professional staff positions in most institutions, librarians can have a variety of job classifications. At Macalester College, librarians are classed as staff alongside academic technologists. This can mean limited support opportunities for most of the individuals that sustain DLA work on campus as grant programs frequently limit staff access to funds and instead prioritize funds going to faculty or students. The divisions between faculty and staff can also create limited relationship-building opportunities, as librarians and educational technologists aren’t always in the same faculty circles on campus, such as curricular committees. In addition, librarians occupy a liminal space on campus, providing student support as well as classroom instruction and faculty support in a variety of capacities. Educational technologists at Macalester also provide student support and classroom instruction but with a larger emphasis on faculty support. In addition, educational technologists have offices dispersed across campus within the academic buildings and near the faculty they work with. Librarians are siloed within the library building. This can exacerbate the faculty/staff divide, making librarian outreach to faculty more challenging as the librarian has to insert themselves in situations that put them in proximity with faculty for project discussions and lean on outreach from the educational technologists to bring them into projects.

Another staffing challenge is that while the librarian and the educational technologist are often bringing similar levels of professional expertise to projects, librarians are often paid less on a college campus. Although in digital humanities work, the level and value of support that both librarians and technologists bring to the work is similar, average pay is $63,654 per year for Digital Initiatives Librarians and $55,883 for Research & Instruction Librarians compared to $73,191 per year for Instructional Technology Faculty Support Managers and $58,828 for Instructional Designers, according to
the 2019–20 Professionals in Higher Education Survey. In addition, this salary data includes librarians who have both faculty and staff status. At Macalester, this is echoed in the salary ranges for librarians and educational technologists, with the 2021 librarian range being $51,477–$77,215 and the educational technologist range being $56,259–$84,388.

Digital humanities projects can work best when librarians are full collaborators or the researchers themselves, as Muñoz and Posner assert, but this type of research or project work is rarely built into the structure of librarian jobs. This is a reminder of the differences in how faculty and staff are expected (or not) to engage in research projects, and in institutions where librarians are staff, librarian-driven research can be even more difficult. Logsdon et al. note that the librarian’s breadth of experience across disciplines is our expertise; that rarely leaves an opportunity for in-depth research and focus. Posner discusses the difficulty in creating the space for that type of research to be conducted by librarians as a lead on a project, particularly for librarians who don’t have digital scholarship in their job title. This distinction between faculty research expectations and the dual role of librarians and other staff in both facilitating and leading such research can result in a lot of starter projects often focused on classroom pedagogy, and few deeper projects. This focus on DLA projects related to classroom pedagogy creates a great deal of student interest in continuing this sort of work, but most grants are not set up to reward staff-driven and student-led projects.

**DLA in Third Spaces**

The DLA Team, created near the culmination of the first grant, continues to provide the foundation for curricular and scholarly innovation, even and especially during the COVID-19 pandemic. Particularly in the remote work environment necessitated by the public health crisis of 2020–2021, the team operated according to a “network model.” This mode, according to Nancy L. Maron and Sarah Pickle, “might have a strong hub at its center …and many nodes supplying specialist support as needed.” At Macalester, the team is distributed across campus, incorporating Information Technology Services (including Academic Information Associates), the Library, Civic Engagement Center, geography, and the Jan Serie Center for Scholarship and Teaching.

In addition to these staff, several spaces on campus support digital liberal arts work in different ways. Spaces that serve the campus more broadly and are located within the campus library are the Digital Resource Center (DRC)
and the Idea Lab, one of which has undergone substantial changes over the past few years, the other of which is new to campus. Spaces with more limited access include the Interdisciplinary Media Lab, a video production space that is primarily used by students and faculty in the media and cultural studies department (MCST), and lab spaces in theater, art, and the sciences.

The Idea Lab, located on the second floor of the library, is managed through the Department of Entrepreneurship and Innovation in collaboration with the DRC, and is staffed by twenty student workers, and currently two full time staff. The Idea Lab provides access to a variety of tools within the space, including sewing and craft supplies, computers with specialized software, vinyl cutters and more—and regularly hosts small low-stakes student-hosted workshops along with larger workshops. This space opened following a renovation of the second floor of the library in summer 2017, although in-person activities were suspended between March 2020 and the start of the 2021/22 academic year. The space provides a location for the intersection of the digital and physical, is regularly used as part of courses in brainstorming and planning projects, and is heavily used by students.

Situated departmentally in ITS, the Digital Resource Center has evolved considerably since it was established in the 1980’s as a language lab. The DRC is now a part of Academic Technology Services alongside the Academic Information Associates, and provides access to audiovisual equipment and laptop checkout, 3D printing and scanning support, poster printing, audio recording space, and flexible computer lab space with specialized software. The DRC is staffed by 30 student workers who are trained in software and hardware to support classroom projects and is managed by one full time staff member. In addition to the DRC Manager, the current DLA Director and postdoc also have offices in the DRC.

Within the past five years, the DRC space and staffing have undergone considerable changes. Since 2017, departmental reorganizations within ITS shifted the management of the space from a combined role of Academic Information Associate and DRC manager to AV event support and DRC manager, and then finally to a dedicated DRC manager role in 2019; during this same period, a total of four different individuals served in these roles, creating both instability in student worker training and support for the campus. This also presented the opportunity to reimagine the space and how it served campus. In 2019, an initial proposal titled “Reimagining the Digital Resource Center” began the process of rethinking both location and services of the space, with the library identified as a strong candidate for relocation. This initial proposal led to a larger plan and proposal focused
on reimagining the whole library space, and ideally co-locating the DRC and Idea Lab within the library. Preliminary planning for this project was completed in March 2020, just prior to the campus shutdown at Macalester due to the COVID-19 pandemic lockdown. These plans were postponed indefinitely as the scope of the pandemic grew, but space constraints in the existing DRC and the desire for stronger collaboration between the library, DLA, and DRC remained.

In January 2021, ITS, the Library, and Facilities Services began the process of planning a move of the DRC into existing spaces in the library’s lower level with minimal renovation focused on increasing ventilation for 3D printing. The DRC moved in May 2021 into a restructured space and location in the library. The new space better supports the reimagined mission of the DRC to “provide students, faculty, and staff with access to expertise and resources to help them actively engage with technology as a part of their scholarly lives.” The library is more centrally located at the heart of campus, and the DRC space offers one physical location that can serve as a hub for DLA on campus. The director of the library sees these shared spaces and cooperative programming as helping to create collaborations rather than having them reside within the library as “tenants.” However, Macalester’s DLA team has not been able to leverage these third spaces yet in a comprehensive fashion, in large part due to the pandemic.

**Working in the Now, Looking to the Future**

In the past several months, the Macalester DLA Team has had to adjust plans and rearrange budget lines to respond to the realities of a global pandemic. Travel was impossible, and many conferences and workshops were (and still are) held in a virtual environment, so some of our faculty and staff development funds were left unspent. These challenges did offer space for some new ideas and opportunities to emerge. For one, the DLA Team decided to implement a new Faculty Fellows initiative during the 21/22 year. The DLA Faculty Fellowship is a cohort-based opportunity designed to enhance DLA capacity in relationship to faculty scholarship and teaching. This year, the program received seven promising applications, and was able to fund a larger cohort than initially imagined. The first cohort features a range of projects, including an interactive web-based documentary, an open educational resource for figure drawing, a virtual exhibition, and a digital map featuring interviews about a regional park. Our hope is that Faculty Fellows, through exchanging ideas, resources, and questions with one another, will begin to
foster a support system that will help sustain this work moving forward. The program will also further increase the visibility of DLA on our campus and perhaps persuade stakeholders that the broader initiative is worthy of permanent funding.

The DLA Team also created and deployed workflow guidelines and a “stock agenda” for faculty consultations, partly through delving deeply into a 3D workflow plan during the Institute for Liberal Arts Digital Scholarship (ILiADS) in Summer 2021. These guidelines are intended to not only facilitate individual meetings between staff and faculty, but to provide a template that can be used and understood across disciplinary boundaries. With this template, we hope that the labor necessitated by these ambitious curricular and scholarly projects is distributed more evenly and can be replicated and iterated by individuals who may join the institution in years to come.

However, we find ourselves in a largely reactive place still, having had little time for reflection and planning, especially since March 2020. Workflow guidelines do not resolve the staffing issues and concerns about compensation, but the guidelines do mitigate some of the concerns about uneven labor distribution and ongoing sustainability of portions of the support ecosystem. While constant iteration and states of perpetual beta testing can bring forward great creativity, when done in a continually reactive mode, it only creates disjointedness. There is much still to do to nurture an ecosystem of support that sustains and acknowledges staff expertise, collaborative relationships, and innovative programming. This brings us to where we are now, with many more questions than answers.

Going forward, are there meaningful ways to incorporate other campus conversations and needs such as the relationships between DLA teaching methods and community engaged research, textbook affordability issues, or inclusivity in pedagogies and course materials? We are inspired by Caro Pinto and her assertion, “We should disrupt toward solidarity and innovate toward communities of practice in the digital humanities.”22 These connections could center DLA as a curricular nexus where students learn to think critically and communicate multi-modally, all while embracing educational practices and learning methodologies that work toward a more inclusive and equitable learning environment. For example, Michigan State University has found ways to connect multiple learning-focused initiatives in creating the Lab for the Education and Advancement in Digital Research (LEADR) which focuses on the learning objectives of information literacy, digital literacy, data literacy, and computational analysis.23 At our institution, this type of framework could help tie together other collaborative and curriculum
support already happening at the staff level of the library and ITS; it may be a productive way to frame, model, and scope collaborative instruction and projects with campus instructors. In addition, it may help raise awareness at the administrative level to DLA successes, in terms of measurable student learning. Meanwhile, individuals doing the work could build the collaborative infrastructure and garner institutional support needed to scale and sustain DLA work. Perhaps in framing DLA within these other closely related topics and growing campus concerns, we can make the case for the digital liberal arts as a campus-wide initiative.

Postscript

This chapter, originally drafted in late 2021, addresses the challenge of precarious labor and the sustainability issues that are inherent to grant-funded programs. In the intervening time to press, the authors are happy to report that Macalester College has made an institutional commitment to DLA by creating a new and permanent position in the library. This position, DLA Librarian and Program Manager, reports to the Director of the Library and facilitates the work of the DLA Team, coordinates the Faculty Fellows program, and teaches two courses a year. In addition, the college provides support for two part-time DLA Student Assistants, who help manage the DLA Newsletter, support faculty projects, and lead student-focused workshops. Macalester’s commitment has allowed DLA to continue its work with the network model described in the chapter. Also in the time since this chapter was written, Macalester not only lifted their suspension of the College’s retirement contribution, but also reimbursed employee retirement accounts for any contributions lost during the suspension.

Notes


3. “The Liberal Arts in the Digital Age: Macalester College,” Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, December 4, 2014, www.mellon.org/grants/grants-database/grants/macalester-college/41400641. The first Mellon grant, managed by the Jan Serie Center for Scholarship and Teaching, supported the work of a faculty director and postdoctoral fellow for three years, and raised awareness of DLA on campus. The director and postdoc as well as librarians, campus educational technologists, and staff from the Civic Engagement Center and geography department consulted on various digital projects, and began to organize as a DLA working group. On the heels of “The Liberal Arts in the Digital Age,” the College received a “Making Meaning” grant in 2018 partly to further the work of DLA. This second Mellon grant also supports a faculty director and postdoctoral fellow, in addition to faculty research and staff professional development grants. Further, the hope with this second influx of funding has been to develop a more sustainable DLA program that may persist beyond this grant cycle.
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