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Sharing Authority in Collaborative Digital Humanities Pedagogy: Library Workers’ Perspectives

Chelcie Juliet Rowell and Alix Keener

Often collaborators come together to teach digital humanities (DH) in the hope of modeling for students what the humanities can be — generous, collaborative, publicly engaged. At times, though, collaborative DH pedagogy in fact reproduces power structures inherent in academic institutions, placing faculty, students, and staff in the same strict caste-based roles. Though the scholarly and professional conversation around digital humanities and libraries increasingly recognizes library workers as collaborators rather than service providers (Muñoz), library workers’ lived experiences do not always reflect these shared values (Risam and Edwards). On the contrary, it’s frustratingly common for library workers to report being condescended to or feeling disrespected when collaborating with disciplinary faculty. At times, the DH field even holds library workers at fault for failing to become full-fledged collaborators due to their “timidity” (Vandegrift and Varner) or the “ingraining of an organizational service mentality” (Nowviskie 58). But this explanation is insufficient; there are complex power dynamics at play when library workers and disciplinary faculty engage in collaborative teaching. As Roxanne Shirazi suggests, building upon Arlie Russel Hochschild’s work in *The Managed Heart*, “perhaps the problem is not service itself, but exploitation” (90). Hochschild emphasizes that exploitation takes place when recompense (“money, authority, status, honor, well-being”) is inequitably distributed among laborers (12). For library workers, including ourselves, exploitation can look like a lack of respect or disregard for our time and energy. One step toward modeling expansive and inclusive humanities practice requires understanding how library workers experience collaborative DH pedagogy — including, sometimes, as exploitation — so that all partners are accountable for creating mutually rewarding collaborative teaching and learning experiences.

To that end, we seek to understand the contours of partnerships between disciplinary faculty and library workers in DH pedagogy, which we define as both the incorporation of digital tools used for teaching as well as a simultaneous critical approach to those tools. When it comes to collaborative DH pedagogy, we also center Adam Banks’s definition of technology in *Race, Rhetoric, and Technology: Searching for Higher Ground* as not only the “instruments people use to extend their power and comfort,” but also the “systems of knowledge we must acquire to use any particular tool and the networks of information, economic, and power relations that enable that tool’s use” (40). As academic librarians ourselves, we are particularly interested in arguing for the perspective of library workers, as well as identifying actionable approaches for everyone to find firm footing in these kinds of teaching partnerships. In addition to Hochschild’s definition of emotional labor as “induc[ing] or suppress[ing]...
feeling in order to sustain the outward countenance that produces the proper state of mind in others” (7), the following questions guided our research:

1. What are library workers' affective experiences of collaborative DH pedagogy?
2. What do they see as characteristics of collaborative pedagogy that are mutually rewarding for faculty, library workers, and students?
3. How do they negotiate the shared labor of teaching? How do they delineate roles?

Through sixteen in-depth interviews with library workers across diverse institutions and titles, we began to discern patterns in the emotions, values, and strategies they described. The field of DH may “talk the talk” of collaboration, but the lived experiences documented in these interviews tell a different story: that library workers are often made to feel invisible in so-called teaching partnerships with faculty. Despite this, library workers are often teaching faculty how to do digital humanities at the same time that they are collaborating with those same faculty to teach these methods to students.

At its best, DH expands what people recognize and value as academic labor. In order for DH to be its best self, we must model caring collaboration in DH pedagogy. We hope that the experiences described here will suggest models for ethical labor and caring collaboration when library workers and disciplinary faculty partner to perform DH pedagogy. Indeed, based on these interviews, we recommend that library workers embarking on a teaching collaboration with a faculty member set a few common ground rules—or you may even think of them as boundaries! Discuss the motivations, the intent, the desired outcomes, and even how you expect each collaborators’ contributions to be credited. Be firm on asking for a minimum period of time for both you and your collaborator to prepare ahead of the course or project. Likewise, faculty who are interested in collaborating with library workers should be prepared to do the same, as well as to share authority in the classroom and include library workers early in the instructional design process. As collaborators learn from each other and begin — if not to share the other’s expertise, then at least to recognize it — they restructure or reframe their understanding of what the other collaborator’s contribution makes possible. As one of our interviewees (L10) put it:

The best faculty members understand where they need help. And they bring someone in, but they are also willing and encouraging for that person to offer different ideas of how this could work in the classroom, recognizing that they have skills and expertise beyond “Oh, you just make the website” or “You show the demo for Omeka and then I handle everything else.”

Background & context

Collaboration is widely recognized as a core tenet of the digital humanities (Spiro). In Digital Pedagogy in the Humanities: Concepts, Models, and Experiments, Licastro et al. lay out curated
artifacts and resources that illustrate collaborative pedagogy amongst not only faculty and other academic staff, but students as well, asserting:

...learning how to work together across differences is essential training for engaged citizenship and a robust democratic society. Collaboration is also critical in the professional environments that students will enter after earning their degrees. Teaching collaborative skills in the scaffolded environment of the classroom, then, makes sense not only in an effort to improve students’ learning outcomes but also to equip them to succeed beyond the classroom.

Unsurprisingly, then, the last several years have seen numerous case studies on library workers becoming involved in DH pedagogy, both within and outside of the library’s walls (Green, Rasmussen et al., Tracy and Hoiem). Stewart Varner posits that DH pedagogy presents an opportunity for library workers to partner with faculty, “not just because librarians excel at instruction but also because the library can provide access to the collections and tools that form the foundation of some of the most innovative assignments” (207). Harriet Green emphasizes that because DH is still emerging and growing, teaching students these research approaches necessitates collaboration between library workers and faculty. In an analysis of four case studies in collaboration and 28 student-generated digital projects, Green declares, “We move toward promoting experiential, creative modes of learning in our students that must engage all of us in the pedagogical practices” (197; our emphasis). Yet none of these case studies take as their central question the roles of teaching partners and their experiences, but focus instead upon the design of instructional services housed in libraries or the instructional design of DH assignments within courses.

Rasmussen et al. present five case studies of different ways that libraries approach teaching DH through interviews with five library workers. Like Varner, the cases they present describe the institutional context of each academic library — intended patrons, strategic directions, service models. Within these institutional contexts, they identify many of the activities that constitute library workers’ labor when teaching DH (80):

1. supporting faculty in developing syllabi and assignments for their for-credit courses
2. conducting guest lectures in for-credit courses
3. co-teaching or embedding into for-credit courses
4. individually teaching for-credit courses
5. teaching not-for-credit workshops

They conclude that “teaching digital humanities in the library cannot be a one-size-fits-all approach,” but rather requires significant tailoring to local context, including negotiating the “willingness and ability of local faculty to invite librarians into their courses for one-off or a series of guest lectures” (81). While Rasmussen et al. emphasize the importance of context, we look more closely at what it means for library workers to tailor teaching DH to that particular social and institutional context,
performing the complex labor of relationship building, coaching, and managing emotions that library
workers necessarily take on when partnering with disciplinary faculty to teach DH.

Paige Morgan eloquently calls attention to the work that she performs in “Not Your DH Teddy-Bear”
when consulting with researchers embarking upon DH projects, observing, “The way that I provide
guidance and information will have an emotional impact, and people will make better decisions if
they are feeling steady, resilient, and energized, rather than depleted, by their work.” Crucially, she
sees this emotional labor as essential not just for the success of individual projects but also for DH
programs to become deeply rooted in their local academic communities. Consequently, for Morgan,
acknowledging the expertise underpinning the emotional labor performed by, oftentimes, library
workers can “contribute to reframing the relationship between scholars and librarians as one of more
equal partnership, rather than mere service provision.” Morgan’s piece does not focus on the
emotional labor library workers perform in the classroom, specifically, but illuminates the dynamics
already at play when library workers enter into collaborative teaching relationships with faculty.

To date, while there have been studies on research partnerships between library workers and faculty
(Keener), there has been no in-depth study of DH pedagogical partnerships and the ways in which
workers occupying these different roles in the university collaborate to plan and perform instruction.
Our work seeks to fill that gap. We not only explore collaborative pedagogy between library workers
and disciplinary faculty but also examine closely the affective experiences of library workers,
surfacing the emotional labor they perform when undertaking these partnerships. To arrive at a more
ethical and caring model of collaborative DH pedagogy, we argue, all individuals in a potential
teaching partnership must acknowledge potentially uncomfortable realities and begin new
collaborations with a frank discussion of the power dynamics between them, as well as how to
anticipate, prevent, and heal from harmful behavior.

Our work stems from 16 in-depth interviews we conducted in fall 2016 with library workers who
partnered with disciplinary faculty members to perform collaborative digital pedagogy, sampled from
the Digital Library Federation (DLF) Digital Library Pedagogy Working Group (more commonly
known as #DLFteach). Our interviewees ranged in job title (both subject specialists, such as English
or history librarian, and functional specialists—i.e. digital scholarship librarian, metadata librarian),
credentials (both MLIS and PhD), and type of institution (both liberal arts colleges and research
universities). We assigned each participant a unique, anonymous identifier, such as L01, L02, etc.¹

We focus here on lived experiences of library workers—the role we, the authors, occupy. We focus,
too, on the power dynamic based on roles within the university organization. However, we

¹ See Appendix 1: Demographics for more details about the educational experience, institutional context, and
instructional experience of each participant.
acknowledge that white supremacy, patriarchy, and classism also shape encounters between collaborators in digital humanities pedagogy.

“Always giving”: Library workers’ negative experiences of collaborative pedagogy

Although DH as a field espouses collaboration, library workers shared with us their experiences of disciplinary faculty seeking out teaching collaborations while in fact refusing to collaborate. When asked to describe their ideal partnership in digital humanities pedagogy, one participant (L12) replied, “For me, a dream scenario is mutual respect” — implying that their lived experience of such partnerships does not always include a felt sense of respect. Another participant (L04) said, “You know, a partnership where I didn’t feel like I was always giving.”

About working with faculty to prepare, participants described being “at the mercy of their process” (L02) and expressed frustration at not being able to “weave organically what we [the participant and faculty] wanted to do” (L01). Certainly, disciplinary faculty face challenges of their own, including demands on their time. One participant (L07) observed, “Faculty have a desire to learn about the techniques and whatever associated thinking, modeling, theorizing, and they try” — but when the instructor has limited time to engage, the collaboration runs the risk that the library worker carries a heavier burden of preparatory labor and, furthermore, that the DH project assigned to students becomes an “appendage” (L07). Without that preparation, without deep engagement in the “why” of bringing a particular DH method to bear in a particular course, participants sensed that learners questioned the relevance of their expertise. For example, one participant (L03) reflected, “It’s almost as if I’m some sort of magician with a bag of tricks that I can bring out, and each one is more enticing and surprising than the last. And sometimes as arcane as a magic trick.”

Participants’ experiences managing faculty and learner frustrations with experiential learning involving technology resonate deeply with Hochschild’s definition of emotional labor. For example, one participant (L01) recalled a class session when the faculty member was “expecting the technology to always work, and the students were grumbling because we didn’t prepare enough” — because of the perhaps-unreasonable expectations of the faculty, and their lack of commitment to prepare (described further by L01), the students’ dissatisfaction fell on the library worker. Likewise, another participant (L12) described the demand placed on the teaching partner more expert in the particular technology to project calm when things don’t go as expected — being the one tasked, explicitly or implicitly, with “managing the feelings” and “managing people’s anxiety” when the technology constantly goes wrong. The emotional labor that library workers perform, then, in the role of teacher of technology, is to assure both faculty and learners that the learning environment is a safe place to try, fail, and try again.
This labor is considerable and sometimes leaves library workers feeling spent, as one participant (L08) recounted:

That particular collaboration was really pretty labor-intensive and exhausting. It began very shortly after I began my job here, so I was in some ways not in a position to set many boundaries. If it were to happen again, I would set more.

Yes, library workers can try to set and enforce boundaries; they can take this step as individuals. However, they would need their supervisors, their library directors, and their institutions to back them up. We believe that in collaborative teaching relationships, the disciplinary faculty who are the library workers’ teaching partners should share the labor of making their collaborators (both library workers and learners) feel cared for — in other words, that their time and energy are valuable and worthy of respect.

“So, that dance continues”: Strategies library workers deploy to align collaborative pedagogy with their values

When invited into a humanities classroom to teach a digital scholarship tool or method, library workers hold considerable responsibility for creating a learning environment where students can feel safe and supported while they practice using an entirely unfamiliar tool or method for the first time. However, they don’t have sole authority and autonomy to create the conditions they see as necessary for learners to reach meaningful access to a particular technology through experimentation and play and sharing of authority. Our interviews surfaced strategies that library workers deploy in order to create more rewarding experiences for their learners, their teaching partners, and themselves.

Multiple participants described advocating for appropriate scaffolding for learners. At times, this advocacy requires frank discussion between collaborators at the planning stages. For example, one participant (L13) recalled a faculty member who wanted to do a topic modeling module in a Victorian literature class; the library worker advised the faculty member that topic modeling would require a basic literacy of text as data, so they suggested approaches that would give students firmer footing, and together they agreed upon a different approach. Likewise, another participant (L09) shared with us:

If someone were resistant to providing scaffolding, I would potentially be willing to back away from that collaboration. I’ve never had that happen, but I’m always really upfront that we can’t expect students to instantly adapt their conceptions of what scholarship means to different mediums; we have to give them time to practice and find their new voice.
Other times, if trust is still being established between collaborators, the opportune moment to articulate the need for appropriate scaffolding comes later in the collaboration. One library worker (L16) recounted sitting down for a retrospective with the instructor of record and sharing their perspective that too many tools and too many assignments were “stresses of that class” and that in the future they would like to provide “greater collaborative support.” Library workers who become a part of a course are positioned to share not only their own perspectives but also the perspectives of students. As one participant (L12) told us, not being the grader invites candor from learners, and, “If you have a good relationship with the faculty member, you’re a conduit to talking to them about what the actual sticking points are with a given assignment.”

There’s only so much a library worker can do if their faculty collaborator isn’t willing to acknowledge their expertise and observations. During their first time working with a particular faculty collaborator, one participant (L02) pressed back against the proposed timing of their appearance in the course, to no avail. Their prediction that the timing wouldn’t work held true, and in the midst of planning for a future iteration with the same faculty member, and revisiting the question of timing — which is fundamentally a question about scaffolding — they remarked to us with a touch of weariness, “So that dance continues” (L02).

Successful collaborations require that each collaborator is both frank and willing to trust in the process and each other, as described by one participant (L07):

> We were both really honest with each other going into it that we weren’t quite sure how it would work out. That was a huge success for me because it is almost never perfect the first time around and if you can just build that relationship with somebody where you...say we’re going to do the best we can, and we’ll just take whatever learning we can get from it and get it better the next time around.

Participants deployed many strategies to shape their collaborative relationships around their values as educators. But the responsibility for caring collaboration doesn’t rest solely with the library worker. Together, both collaborators should perform the emotional labor of creating a mutually rewarding teaching and learning environment for their learners and for each other.

Not “This person’s better at this, this one’s better at this”: Integrating and deepening both library workers’ and disciplinary faculty’s expertise

Throughout these interviews, we heard participants grappling with how to define their own expertise and that of their collaborators — and as a result how to understand their respective contributions to
collaborative DH pedagogy. Many spoke to a seemingly natural division of labor of disciplinary faculty member as subject–matter expert and library worker as process expert. However, we contest that assumed division of expertise and subsequent division of labor based on what participants shared with us about their ideal collaborative teaching experiences, and based on our own experiences: there are areas where we hold subject–matter expertise ourselves (as do many library workers), and we have also worked with faculty who have technological expertise or other types of process knowledge. Christine Tardy’s work on genre knowledge illuminates how a division of expertise is impossible. Tardy asserts that a person moves from novice to expert in a particular genre by deepening their knowledge in four overlapping domains (22): subject–matter knowledge, process knowledge, formal knowledge (i.e., knowledge of formal characteristics), and rhetorical knowledge (i.e., knowledge of audience). Expertise in a particular genre requires knowledge in all four domains, but as someone becomes more expert, they recognize these domains of knowledge as inseparable. In other words, as someone gains knowledge in one domain, they completely restructure their understanding of other domains. Tardy’s work describes genre expertise that individuals attain; we use her model to understand the learning about genres of digital humanities that takes place within collaborative teaching relationships. Perhaps a disciplinary faculty member comes to a teaching partnership with considerable subject–matter knowledge but less process knowledge for the particular genre they wish to assign to learners. Perhaps it is the reverse for the library worker. When these two individuals collaborate, the disciplinary faculty will deepen their process knowledge and understand their existing subject–matter knowledge differently. At the same time, the library worker will deepen their subject–matter knowledge and understand their existing process knowledge differently. During the most rewarding partnerships in digital humanities pedagogy, this is the process that unfolds for all collaborators. When the collaborators in teaching roles are so comfortable with unlearning and relearning, they are in turn better equipped to help learners in a course to “occupy realms of authority,” as one of our participants described (L12).

When asked about the distinct expertise that library workers tend to possess, two participants anticipated the view later espoused by Kear and Joranson that library workers possess knowledge of the “material and social practices of academic labor” (xxi). One participant (L03) asserted that library workers understand “intimately how scholarship works from the very beginnings of the idea formation process to publishing and archiving the works of a professor emeritus.” Similarly, another participant (L15) said that library workers know “what the library has that can be fodder for digital scholarship.” Other participants emphasized the wide-angle lens view of research, teaching, and learning afforded by their position within their campus communities and the nature of their work. One participant (L12) observed, “What I see as a librarian is things in the aggregate. So, tons of syllabi, tons of teaching, tons of students.” Similarly, one participant (L11) speculated that disciplinary faculty don’t “need to be familiar with a wide variety of information and digital resources and tools,” in contrast to library workers who pick things up in the course of working with a range of
classes and departments. They (L11) continued, “My next-door neighbor is our research data librarian. If I have a question about GitHub or Python or R, I’ll just ask.”

It might be tempting, then, to associate library workers’ knowledge with only some of Tardy’s domains of knowledge — certainly process knowledge, e.g., use of particular digital tools and methods, and perhaps to a lesser extent subject-matter knowledge, rhetorical knowledge, or formal knowledge. But what we heard from our participants about how good partnerships work reveals how difficult it is to disentangle these forms of knowledge from each other. One participant (L09), describing a graduate digital humanities seminar that is always co-taught by a disciplinary faculty member and library worker, reflected that bringing in “different disciplinary perspectives and different ideas on ways of working...helps students make sense of what the digital can mean for them in terms of imaginative and speculative possibilities.” Another participant (L06) echoed this perspective, saying:

As long as you’re learning from each other, that’s benefiting the students, as well, that they aren’t viewing it as “Oh, this person is better at this, this one’s better at this,” but “Both of these people, their backgrounds are blending in a really nice way.”

Indeed, understanding the use and application of a particular digital tool or method or the kinds of iterations particular to composing in certain mediums — what Tardy might call process knowledge — can never really be separated from the possibilities they create for certain disciplines or communities. One participant (L04) expressed this particularly well:

I think generosity of ideas needs you to embrace new and different ways of asking those questions, so the most successful collaborations I’ve had with faculty are with those who are open to seeing my role and the role of technology as being a productive one that opens up questions rather than one that closes down questions.

This participant acknowledges two kinds of knowledge, which both collaborators don’t necessarily possess at the outset of their collaboration. One collaborator who understands the affordances of a tool or method can partner with someone with deep disciplinary knowledge so that together they can understand the bearing of a particular technology on the questions of a particular scholarly community. If the process expert isn’t able to wrap their head around the questions of the discipline, or if the content expert isn’t able to grasp the affordances of the technology, together they won’t be able to communicate to learners the relevance of the method to the question, nor will they be able to model effective collaboration. They risk learners seeing the assignment as an “appendage” (L07) and the library worker as a “magician with a bag of tricks” (L03). In time, though, as teaching partners learn from each other, they bolster each other’s nascent knowledge in different domains and together move toward expertise in a new genre.
The work that library workers do to deepen faculty expertise (in addition to student expertise) is part of their work as educators. We heard this from participants who deliberately take a train-the-trainer approach to their collaborations in digital humanities pedagogy — whose faculty collaborators become so proficient in the technology that they’re teaching that “maybe in the future [they] wouldn’t even necessarily want or need me to come in again” (L03). Another participant (L06) told us:

As we were planning the course in the fall semester, I was also teaching him TEI the first time...By the time we had the second iteration of the course, we made a lot of improvements to the course that clearly reflected his deeper understanding of text encoding.

Furthermore, to work closely with a faculty member until they attain a certain level of integrated genre expertise, thus freeing up the library worker to partner with others, is labor that brings an ethos of generous collaboration to the classroom and campus scholarly communities. And it’s administrative labor that requires the library worker to bear in mind sustainability and scalability. As one participant (L09) told us, their job is “building socio-technical supports: so, people, policies, technologies, communities to enable a culture of radical transformative collaboration.”

“We’re in this boat together”: Examples of best practices

Reflecting upon what the term “digital scholarly pedagogy” evokes for them, one participant (L15) said:

I think of experimentation in groups. I think of collaboration. I think of learning by doing. And doing together. And supporting each other through that process. It helps if somebody knows a lot about certain tools or methods…but not always is that the case, and so it’s a “We’re in this boat together” process.

Participants spoke warmly of collaborative teaching experiences when they felt that they were included in the design process and their expertise was acknowledged. Those inclusion and acknowledgment practices are core to successful partnerships, and we urge our faculty collaborators to consider doing the same when asking a library worker to teach with them. To wit, one participant (L04) nodded to the “faculty-centered culture” at their institution but appreciated one faculty collaborator in particular who “saw herself as assembling a team.” Similarly, another participant (L14) said of their faculty collaborator, “Writing in librarians or archivists into the grant shows that he values those people in their human expertise, so I always felt that he perhaps saw us as equals or partners.”
Instructors who are new to a particular technology may feel intimidated by the task of providing learners with meaningful access to unfamiliar tools, but in fact their very newness is a strength. It connects them with their students’ experience as learners and, further, invites them to make visible to their students the awkwardness that is necessarily a part of learning new skills (Banks 139). Recalling a rewarding collaborative teaching experience around video games, one library worker (L12) said that their faculty collaborator brought a “beginner’s mind,” which in turn framed the relationship between teachers — whether faculty or library worker — and learners:

Having the professor present broke the ice and made other people feel more comfortable; it is modeling good behavior. I think the sessions go better and the work product is better because the faculty is collaborating with the students to create something, unlocking the process of how people do this work. But also it was allowing the students to occupy realms of authority that helped them have really positive learning experiences because they were learning alongside them and it wasn’t just critique, critique, critique.

We heard again and again that acknowledging one’s own newness goes hand in hand with acknowledging the growing expertise of other collaborators (and we have certainly appreciated this when working with a new collaborator in our own work). When teachers embrace their own newness to a particular technology as a strength, rather than a deficit, it becomes natural to also see learners as equal contributors to the learning environment. The same participant (L12) credited their faculty collaborator with “setting a tone that she is constantly sharing authority in the classroom and thinks that everyone is a collaborator in learning.” One participant (L15) described the dynamic among disciplinary faculty member, library subject liaison, and library liaison in digital humanities:

We all played equal parts in teaching everyone how to do things. We would work on our own for some of it, then come back to the group and say, “This is how we did this. You can look at this tutorial or you can use this version of this tool.” And then you might say, “These are the things that might go wrong along the way, but this is how you fix it or do a workaround.” So all three of us really played a really equal part in educating ourselves and each other.

As these participants suggest, acknowledging the considerable expertise of a collaborator certainly contributes to a more rewarding experience for the person acknowledged, but also models a particular way of practicing membership in a scholarly community, one that is ever curious and ever generous.
Conclusion

These interviews illustrate how library workers navigate the power dynamics they encounter when collaborating with disciplinary faculty to perform digital humanities pedagogy. We’ve drawn attention to power differentials that exist between faculty member and library worker, between instructor of record and invited guest; we haven’t begun to examine factors beyond the academic caste system that further shape these power dynamics, such as race, class, and gender. We recognize that the particulars will vary from collaboration to collaboration, depending upon the education, experience, and social position occupied by each collaborator. Regardless, the work of bridging the gap between values and actions doesn’t lie solely with library workers. All collaborators, including disciplinary faculty, should share the labor of laying the groundwork for mutually rewarding collaborations, both for learners and each other. All collaborators should deepen their knowledge across various domains in order to help students see the “imaginative and speculative possibilities” a particular technology has on the questions that matter to them (L09). To that end, we make the following recommendations when undertaking collaborative digital humanities pedagogy:

1. Disciplinary faculty and library workers, have a conversation about your power dynamic and the “underlying system of recompense” per Hochschild. Where do you each hold power? Feel vulnerable? How can you share power? Equip or embolden each other? What forms of recompense are each of you seeking—whether “money, authority, status, honor, well-being” or something else? How can you help each other to secure that recompense? Much work has been done on how project charters and memorandums of understanding “express intellectual and even emotional support for projects; these agreements universalize intent” (Burress and Rowell 305). But here we suggest that collaborators discuss not only the intent of the project (e.g., what they hope learners will know or be able to do) but also their intent as individuals — their motivations and the forms of credit they are seeking.

2. Teaching partners, try doing your own assignment if you haven’t. Understand the relevance of the method to the guiding questions of the course and the relevance of those questions to the method.

3. Disciplinary faculty, work towards “graduating” from your collaboration with library workers for a particular course or method. That’s not to say that you’ll never collaborate with that person again! But take on the responsibility of deepening and integrating your own knowledge across multiple domains (subject-matter, process, formal, rhetorical) so that you are equipped to teach a particular tool or method independently. Library workers are thinking about scalability and sustainability of their collaborative teaching across the entire campus community.

Practicing generous collaboration helps us to model for students what the humanities can be and helps us to create more just campus communities.
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Appendix 1: Demographics

Note to editors: We plan to deposit these appendices, as well as anonymized interview transcripts, in an open data repository and supply the DOI(s) to be used in the print version of this book chapter, in order to save space within our allotted 4000 words. However, for the purposes of peer review, it was quicker and easier to provide the appendices within the document of the draft submitted. Also, please note that the data values provided below for Carnegie Classification are drawn from the [2015 edition of the Carnegie Classification](http://example.com) [XLS], the current edition as of the time when our interviews took place in fall 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>MLIS</th>
<th>MA/MS</th>
<th>PhD</th>
<th>Public or Private</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Carnegie Classification of Institution</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Sole Instructor</th>
<th>Co-Instructor</th>
<th>Embedded Librarian</th>
<th>Guest Lecturer</th>
<th>Ongoing Consultant</th>
<th>One-Off Consultant</th>
<th>Point-of-Service Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L01</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Doctoral Universities: Highest Research Activity</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L02</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges: Arts &amp; Sciences Focus</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L03</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Master's Colleges &amp; Universities: Larger Programs</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L04</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Doctoral Universities: Higher Research Activity</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L05</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Doctoral Universities: Highest Research Activity</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L06</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges: Arts &amp; Sciences Focus</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L07</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Doctoral Universities: Highest</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L08</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Research Activity</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L09</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Doctoral Universities: Highest Research Activity</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Doctoral Universities: Highest Research Activity</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L11</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Doctoral Universities: Highest Research Activity</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges: Arts &amp; Sciences Focus</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L13</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges: Arts &amp; Sciences Focus</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L14</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Master's Colleges &amp; Universities: Larger Programs</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L15</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Doctoral Universities: Higher Research Activity</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L16</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Special Focus Four-Year: Arts, Music &amp; Design Schools</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Interview Instrument

Note to editors: Some of the terminology in our interview instrument differs from the language we use here in our book chapter. In our interviews, we used the term “digital scholarship pedagogy” rather than “digital humanities pedagogy.” The latter is used more commonly, but when we embarked upon our research we were trying not to limit our exploration to humanities disciplines. Given the volume in which this chapter appears, we choose to use the term “digital humanities pedagogy,” and we don’t believe the shift in terminology invalidates our conclusions. Also in our interviews, we used the term “librarians.” However, in our chapter we are using the term “library worker” to acknowledge that people who are employed by academic libraries have a variety of academic and professional backgrounds, as the demographics of our participants demonstrate, and not everyone would identify as a “librarian,” a term which is often used to distinguish those who have a master of science degree in library and/or information science.

1. What is your job title? What are your main responsibilities in your position?
2. How do you define ‘digital pedagogy’?
3. How do you define ‘digital scholarship pedagogy’?
4. Do you use any related terms for digitally inflected pedagogy? If so, what? How do you define these other terms you use?
5. Can you tell me about a ‘typical’ partnership with an instructor or faculty member to perform instruction related to digital scholarship?
   a. What did you see as your role?
   b. What did you see as your partner’s role?
   c. What do you think your partner saw as your role?
   d. How were syllabi, assignments, assessment strategies developed?
   e. How did each collaborator, including you, receive credit for this project?
6. What motivated you and your collaborator to partner with each other?
7. What motivated you and your collaborator to integrate digital tools and methods into the course?
8. Were learning outcomes identified for this project? If so, what were they?
   a. Which were identified by the faculty member, and which by you?
9. What successes resulted from this partnership?
10. Did you perceive differences in how you and your partner defined success? If so, tell me about those differences.
11. What challenges emerged during this partnership?
    a. How did you and your partner address these challenges?
12. How much time did you spend on this project compared to your other responsibilities?
13. What expertise(s) do you think librarians bring to teaching and learning about digital scholarship?
14. What expertise(s) do you think faculty bring to teaching and learning about digital scholarship?
15. How are disciplinary knowledge and digital literacies intertwined?
16. How are research and teaching intertwined, specifically research and teaching with digital inflections?
    a. How are faculty teaching their research interests?
    b. How are faculty engaging students as research partners?
c. How are students contributing to faculty’s larger research projects within the context of courses?

d. How are students conducting digitally inflected research?

17. What would your ideal partnership in digital scholarship pedagogy be like?

18. Is there anything we didn’t ask about that you’d like to share?