<p style="text-align:center">Evaluation of Digital Scholarship at Dickinson[1]</p>

In its efforts to fairly evaluate digital scholarly activity and achievement,[2] FPC requests that faculty members who are undergoing a personnel review and who are involved in such digital projects to clearly explain them both to their departments and to the Committee. The items that faculty members should address include the following:

1. Any special technical requirements for accessing and viewing the work. (i.e. particular browsers, specific software, plug-ins, gaming systems, etc.) Faculty must make sure that the members of their department and the Committee are able to access the work in the medium in which it was intended to be used.

2. A detailed orientation to the work in writing, with images or screen shots, ideally a "walkthrough" of the project, detailing a sample sequence of how a user might use it.

3. A clear statement regarding the nature of the scholarly research involved in the work. For example, what is the faculty member's scholarly argument? What is the project's audience? What source materials were used? How was the data organized, and why? What scholarly decisions, including platform design, were made at different steps, and why? How does the project and the way it is presented advance the state of knowledge in the field? How does this intellectual contribution to the field relate to the scholarly landscape? What methodology was used? 4. A statement, if applicable, about how the project is relevant to teaching and service. Include whether the project has been used as part of courses at Dickinson or other institutions. How has it improved the course?

5. A summary of the impact of the project. Has it been utilized by others in the field in either teaching or research? Provide relevant statistics such as number of site visits, citations, or references to website reviews or forums where the project is discussed.

6. An explanation of the current status of the project is with regard to its "life cycle," as the nature of digital work can change significantly over time. How has the project evolved? If relevant, how can previous versions of the project be accessed? How might the project change in the future? Where will it be stored and how will it be accessed in the future? What is the long term plan for the preservation of the data when the current platform is no longer supported?

---

[1] Much of this document is based on the presentation of Todd Presner to the Faculty Personnel Committee, Dec. 2013 and Todd Presner, "How to Evaluate Digital Scholarship," *Journal of Digital Humanities*, 1.4 (Fall 2012). http://journalofdigitalhumanities.org/1-4/how-to-evaluate-digital-scholarship-by-todd-presner/ Dec. 20, 2013.
[2] While this document refers to the evaluation of digital scholarship, the same would apply to digital projects related to teaching.

7. A detailed relation of what, specifically, the faculty member did? How exactly was the faculty member involved in the initial conception of the project, the initial functional and technological design, interface design, grant writing, the execution of the project, writing content, editing content, researching content, and overseeing/managing any aspect of the above. How much time did the faculty member actually spend on the project, including time learning new technologies?

9. An explanation of how grants, if any were used to support the project.

All faculty members, especially junior faculty, are encouraged to seek advice from senior faculty with successful experience working on digital projects. Please contact the Provost, Associate Provost, or a member of FPC for further information.