What Counts: Producing Knowledge in a Digital Age

A few years ago I delivered a paper at the College Art Association in New York on the future of digital knowledge and the impact the Internet is having on the distribution of discourse. Beginning with a 1979 book by Jean-François Lyotard, *The Postmodern Condition. A Report on Knowledge*,[1] I noted that the philosopher had been charged by a Canadian University to ponder the consequences of digitizing knowledge. At that time, individuals did not have personal computers and in the late seventies, the Internet was decades in the future, and, consequently, *The Postmodern Condition* was interpreted in the only way possible in the early 1980s—as a definition of Postmodernism. But that semantic shift—from diagnosing "the Postmodern condition" to "Postmodernism" as a definition--obscured the insights of the philosopher: that once knowledge was democratized, made available to all through computer technology, then the traditional monopolistic hold of state-controlled agencies and official institutions, which had once held sway over the distribution of knowledge was loosened, the "metanarrative" would become impossible. In the place of an official and sanctioned version of events, i.e., knowledge, there would be, Lyotard predicted, many "little narratives." [2]

The philosopher had died before his predictions came true, but today, thanks to the Internet, anyone can access knowledge and anyone can produce knowledge.[3] The existing controls, such as they are, are the firewalls of the academic databases, which most people ignore and bypass, and the desirability of utilizing materials from those deemed qualified to write and publish. The goal of my paper, which became a book by the next year, *New Artwriting. Creating a Culture of Cyber Criticism,* was to analyze the academic system as it faced a crisis and changes and challenges from the "creative destruction" promised by the World Wide Web.[4] The academic world that I had grown up with was watching the world shift beneath its feet and, as far as I could discern, was reluctant to accept the "little narratives," even from credentialed people.[5]

There was also a disciplinary blindness to the difficulties of publishing in the twenty-first century—the diminishment of opportunities as academic funding dried up—and an unwillingness to allow scholarly literature to become accessible to all.[6] An individual who recently ran for President of the United States, Harvard Law School professor, Lawrence Lessig,[7] one of the founders of the Creative Commons, is also one of the pioneers in this push to "open access" to people outside the cloistered corridors of universities.[8] "Open Access" implies the freedom to read and utilize the knowledge that is placed out in the open to everyone without the corporate restrictions of copyrights and, also, the ability of a inclusive community of contributors to create Knowledge for all to hold in common.[9]

Being a purveyor of Lyotard's "little narratives" through my website, *Art History Unstuffed* and my books, I have continued to watch the interaction (or lack thereof) between the academic world and the digital world with great interest. When I began thinking about what it means to be a "digital scholar" in an analog world in relation to the practices of "publish or perish" and "peer review," I returned to my earlier research on the distribution of knowledge. To my amazement, over the past two years since the publication of my book, the challenges to traditional academic approaches to scholarship and the production of knowledge have increased, and the amount of references to the ongoing struggle over academic production has exploded.[10] I realized that I must update my book in light of all the new material that has emerged.[11]

In researching the question on "what counts" today as acceptable academic work, I have noticed some rather odd gaps in the available research. First, there are few books on the topic of what precisely constitutes scholarship, even fewer on the basis and foundation of academic production of knowledge, and very little research on what peer review means in a digital age.[12] Second, the sparseness, particularly of up to date materials, of discussion on how knowledge is produced indicates that a discipline, the humanities, founded upon critique, is reluctant to critique its own methodology.[13] And third, there is almost no realization that publishing and publications are controlled not through a peer review process but by the economics of publishing and by publishers.[14] I am making a distinction between the lack of examination of the process by which materials have traditionally been published and the increasing attention given to the alternative, which is digital publishing. These intellectual lacunae on traditional academic publishing and the refusal to consider other modes of cultural production are quite remarkable in a field that prides itself on the rigorous production and control of knowledge[15] and claims the mantle of open-mindedness.[16] In the place of hard research, various disciplines use psychology to keep its disciples in line, shaming those who stray off the beaten path, demeaning their accomplishments, claiming that unless the candidates have knocked at the gates and have been bidden to enter, their work does not "count." Today, such tactics seem not only petty but also counterproductive to the furtherance of intellectual thought and the development of scholarship.[17]

To illustrate the profound reluctance to re-examine assumptions, I note that the most scathing examination of the encrusted mindset of the academic world came some years ago from the late Pierre Bourdieu. In *Homo Academicus* of 1984,[18] Bourdieu traced "peer review" back to the seventeenth century, where the term was code for government censorship of submitted materials, which would be vetted by the state before being approved for distribution as "official" (approved) "knowledge." Bourdieu noted that the entire system of academic authority rested upon a self-imposed belief system that controlling knowledge and that placing the growth, development and distribution of knowledge under the command of a few individuals actually "works," guaranteeing "quality" and is beneficial to society.[19] Thirty years later it is clear that, as with any belief system, the equation between "what counts" as "knowledge" and "scholarship" and what should be academically "approved" knowledge and the link with the ultimate distribution of certain selected elements allowed in the discourse is upheld only by the will of the believers.[20] And, despite all evidence that the system is flawed, the believers cannot come up with an alternative to peer review, so the tottering system remains. Indeed, as Richard Smith, a scientific writer, marveled in 2006,

> So peer review is a flawed process, full of easily identified defects with little evidence that it works. Nevertheless, it is likely to remain central to science and journals because there is no obvious alternative, and scientists and editors have a continuing belief in peer review. How odd that science should be rooted in belief.[21]

However, as the recent flurry of events and commentaries indicates, the reality of the twenty-first century is eroding the traditional distribution of knowledge at its very foundation. As I pointed out in my book, academic publishing is in a place of crisis. First, colleges and universities are having difficulty affording their academic presses and those institutions that have not abolished their in-house publishers are keeping their presses grudgingly and are maintaining them at a low level of monetary support.[22] Second, institutions are being financially bled dry by very expensive databases to the point where Harvard University, a very wealthy institution, has been asking its faculty to publish only in Open Source journals.[23] Third, publishers that print academic books are reluctant to produce books that sell to libraries almost exclusively. The numbers of such non-profitable volumes they are willing to print is growing smaller year-by-year and, to recoup losses, the books are priced very high, further financially stressing the libraries that must purchase them and the scholars who would like to read them. Academic journals are facing the same fate. Printed materials are becoming prohibitively expensive, and low-demand publications are difficult to sustain. The humanities, in particular, are in distress. Writing in 2012, scholar, Sheila Cavanagh sounded the alarm,

> ..numerous faculty members, department chairs, deans, and others involved in the faculty reward system continue not to understand the shifting parameters of research, teaching, and service that have been instigated by the digital revolution. Many of these individuals, in fact, remain unaware of their ignorance. Those who do not work in digital realms themselves often unwittingly contribute to an environment that impedes intellectual innovation. Despite the pressing need for reconfigured standards of evaluation and new approaches to mentoring, many of those holding the power to address this situation do not recognize the issues at stake.[24]

The result of what are economic changes in the publishing industry is a diminishment of opportunities for scholars. The situation of scarcity imposed by commercial publishers is unrelated to academic excellence or any other presumed "standards" and has profoundly shrunk the approved outlets for approved knowledge. But these economic realities and real-world conditions are not taken into account by colleges and universities who continue as if the world of academic publishing has not changed since the 1980s.[25] Meanwhile young scholars are increasingly shut out, not because their work is problematic, but because the nodes of distribution are shrinking and vanishing in the humanities.[26] These aspiring academics often have been and continue to be victims in schemes put forward by various publishers and conference organizers and publications that promised publication and exposure..for a price.[27] Their desperation in the face of what are becoming unreasonable demands for promotion and tenure is driving them to the fringes of a particularly exploitative corner of (non)academia that has sprung up to serve their need to get an article in print at any cost. This crisis is real, acknowledged, and discussed and yet there are few suggestions as to how to deal with what is a real intellectual problem.[28]

At a time when new thinkers and new thoughts are needed, at a time when the open and free Internet is accessible to all, the old ways are fiercely guarded. As a collaborative article written by Alex Galarza, Jason Heppler, and Douglas Seefeldt pointed out,

> Digital tools are transforming the practice of history, yet junior scholars and graduate students are facing obstacles and risks to their professional advancement in using methods unrecognized as rigorous scholarly work. Their peers and evaluators are often unable or unwilling to address the scholarship on its merits. Opportunities to publish digital work, or to even have it reviewed are limited. Finally, promotion and tenure processes are largely built around 19th-century notions of historical scholarship that do not recognize or appropriately value much of this work. The disconnect between traditional evaluation and training and new digital methods means young scholars take on greater risks when dividing their limited time and attention on new methods that ultimately may not ever face scholarly evaluation on par with traditional scholarly production.[29]

In my research,[30] I have come across academic institutions that consider anything published on a surface other than paper to be unacceptable.[31] The argument (not made but implied) is that knowledge is not knowledge unless it appears on a printed page. I have come across the argument, several times, that peer review is necessary because it provides a critique of the scholarship. True, but so do discussions among colleagues who routinely critique each other's work and exchange ideas. The line of thinking seems to be that only a person or persons unknown to the author are capable of providing a strenuous reading and only under the auspices of preferred publications. One of the recurring issues for someone who is working digitally is the difficulty of securing access to traditional methodologies for, as Todd Presner pointed out in 2011,

> Digital scholars are not only in the position of doing original research but also of inventing new scholarly platforms after 500+ years of print so fully naturalized the "look" of knowledge that it may be difficult for reviewers to understand these new forms of documentation and the intellectual effort that goes into developing them. This is the dual burden—and the dual opportunity—for creativity in the digital domain.

In fact, in his 2011 report on *Digital Humanities for UCLA*, Presner is one of the few educators to put forward proposals on how to evaluated digital projects. For example, he stated that rather than seek equivalency with the printed process,

> Reviewers should be able to assess the *significance* of the digital work based on a number of factors: the quality and quantity of the research that contributed to the project; the length of time spent and the kind of intellectual investment of the creators and contributors; the range, depth, and forms of the content types and the ways in which this content is presented; and the nature of the authorship and publication process."[32]

And yet despite this important rethinking of standards of acceptance and the wide range of such criterion, Presner's guide for evaluation has remained invisible, except in the world of digital humanities.

What has become clear is that, first, the world of digital humanities is a place for new kinds of scholarship that should be understood in terms that are at once familiar and more extensive than the traditional print formats, and that this world, while growing, is ignored when universities and colleges make their rules for tenure and promotion. These rules, as digital scholar, Sheila Cavanagh, pointed out, were designed for a system is five hundred years old.[33] So unsuited to today's world, these regulations, which constrict intellectual growth and development and retard the health of the discipline, are driving many scholars to find outlets that are more inclusive. The goal of digital scholars is to get their work out, not to "get published." Conversely, the goal of traditional institutions is to control the distribution of knowledge. Such a purpose—limiting the production of knowledge--was possible to achieve in an earlier age; today it is impossible to continue to guard the gates and to keep them closed. The problem with the old arguments--for example, a work must be peer reviewed for it to be acceptable for (print) publication, and that research is acceptable if and only if it is published in certain sites by certain publishers--is that they conveniently ignore the reported reality and the actual experiences we all have had with academic practices. As scholar Mario Biagioli observed in 2002,

> Public images of science cast peer review as the ultimate guarantor of good science: scientists evaluate their colleagues' papers for publications, grant proposals for funding, and their personnel files for promotion…Like all mythologies, the public image of peer review has a purpose. It provides a sense or order, almost a unifying principle, to an otherwise chaotic set of professional practices, institutions, and interests that make up one of the largest, most dispersed, and most unregulated enterprises in modern society…The mundane reality of peer review is quite different. Its actual scope is not as comprehensive, and its performance record not as impressive as one may be led to believe..Independently from their competence or probity, the referees' expertise is necessarily tied to the present (not future) state of knowledge and entails discipline-specific notions of relevance. This has resulted in documentable conservative biases in the system — biases that have tended to penalize innovative and interdisciplinary projects, including some that eventually led to Noble prizes.[34]

Biagioli was the rare scholar who attempted to interject a dose of the real world of academic publishing. A few years ago, I reviewed a book for a colleague and gave it a good report and explained why it deserved to be published. The publisher finally decided not to publish the volume, reasoning that there were "enough" books on women artists. After wasting years and enduring psychological distress, my friend published her work on her own. A respected university press turned down another friend on the basis that "only the French point of view" on her particular subject was accepted—her topic was *Italian* Futurism. She subsequently wrote a textbook, which, while finally published, was criticized by a reviewer who complained that an art history teacher using the book would have to "know the discipline." Such is the quality of thinking in the real world of academic publishing.

In early September 2015, a white male who could not get his poem published under his real name found success under a Chinese name.[35] The poem was included in the *Best American Poetry Anthology* for 2015. The Guest Editor was forced to apologize and explain the eagerness to publish a Chinese poet and not an American poet.[36] In a related but linked case, author Catherine Nichols[37] revealed that she had to publish under a male name to get her work published. One would imagine that in a world of poetry and fiction where subjective judgments are the last words about whether or not material should be published, abuses, such as selecting winners and losers on the basis of name and gender, would be common. But such abuses only reflect the inherent biases long known in job applications. The few serious studies that have been done on peer review have shown not efficacy but corruption and bias.[38] Not one positive study on peer review has, to my knowledge, emerged. The same papers were sent to the same publication under different names, and the male name would usually be chosen over the female. Also preferred was the name of the prestigious university attached to the manuscript. This slackness of critique extends to the sciences where one would think that more rigorous methods of analysis would be used. In fact, the news reports have been full of repeated stories[39] of failure the control the quality of scientific articles, even in the most prestigious publications.[40] On March of 2015 in the wake of a particularly embarrassing scandal, writer Fred Barbash wrote,

> Peer review is the vetting process designed to guarantee the integrity of scholarly articles by having experts read then and approve or disapprove them for publication. With researchers increasingly desperate for recognition, citations and professional advancement, the whole peer-review system has come under scrutiny in recent years for a host of flaws and irregularities, ranging fro lackadaisical reviewing to cronyism to outright fraud.[41]

What is extraordinary about the many stories from the scientific community is that the failure of oversight of content has cost money and has put lives at risk.[42] Scientific "results" have been either falsified or exaggerated to attract the attention of "prestigious" journals and due to the "name" of the publication, the conclusions of the study are believed. Despite a continuous stream of stories pointing to the persisting problems, the old methods of a few individuals reviewing a proposed manuscript are adhered to. The reasons are many—or so one can imagine---institutional inertia, the unwillingness to give up perceived power and control. In the fall of 2015, Paul Voosen wrote a full page article for *The Chronicle of Higher Education* entitled "Journal Publishers Rethink a Research Mainstay: Peer Review." He wrote of the issues facing today's scholars who are attempting to maintain a career that depends upon capricious circumstances beyond their control, circumstances that have nothing to do with "quality." Voosen, a reporter for the magazine wrote,

> At prestigious journals, it's not uncommon for submissions to sit for two years, going through four rounds of revision. Careers stall waiting for acceptance, or, even more crushing, rejection. Editors have ceded ever more independence to expert reviewers, who, in turn, can exhibit a host of problems. They show preference to papers showing positive results, or they're biased against authors from background unlike their own. They may prefer their own paradigms an stifle innovation. According to statistical models, their

> opinions are little better than chance at correctly evaluating a study for its scientific soundness.[43]

Voosen stated that, while a month earlier, " a small group of publishers held the first Peer Review week"---the first? In 2015? there was little appetite for reform. This writer was reporting on problems in scientific journals which seem to have more than their fair share of scandals and the lack of curiosity about its own methods in field of endeavor, which was built on curiosity is quite surprising. And this "hear no evil, see no evil, speak no evil" reluctance to examine process is also endemic to the humanities, again, a field that preaches Plato's axiom "An unexamined life is not worth living." The liberal studies have spent decades training scholars and students alike in critical thinking, preferably Marxist, and yet the disciplines have been remarkably impervious to self-critique and self-analysis, preferring to not have their consciousnesses raised. Despite the fact that the university culture is founded upon the resolve to question received wisdom, there also seems to be an unwillingness to do thorough investigations of the system itself, a system which leads to scholars of all stripes to continue to support what is obviously a flawed process. In a first of its kind book on peer review written in 2004, author David Shatz noted with amazement,

> ..one would expect that peer review would be existentially crucial and therefore be extensively discussed in print (peer reviewed or otherwise)..Philosophers and other humanities scholars...have not applied their approaches to..peer review itself, that is, to the very procedures and practices that produced much of the voluminous literature in ethics, epistemology, and so many other fields. Specialists in fields of the humanities have not organized and sparked a systematic and ongoing debate. Why is this?[44]

The only possible answer is that the system itself is deliberately Janus-faced, looking the other way—doing one thing and saying another—having it both ways. The reported problems with peer review become news stories[45] but not the topic of serious sustained investigation in universities.[46] Irritated and disillusioned, younger scientists and scholars are simply bypassing the slow and antiquated system of traditional publishing and are posting their work on the web to receive a wider and more strenuous review process from a larger number of their peers. New books have sprung up to rethink peer review as it might apply to this growing new field, called the Digital Humanities, or, more generally, to digital scholarship. In an article "Scholarly Publishing in the Digital Age," Pomona College[47] scholar Kathleen Fitzpatrick[48] noted that although we are trained to write for the limitations of print publications, these restrictions do not apply in cyberspace. In addition, she wrote that

> Some scholars have begun to talk at the notion that presses do peer review..and some of these scholars have begun discussing other means through which peer review might take place: in ambient forms such as exchanges during the drafting process, in collaborative revision, in discussions that take place at the point of reception."[49]

Presumably, the meaning of "reception" is that a wide audience of readers would discuss the work after being posted/published.

Meanwhile adventurous scholars have long since strayed into the greener pastures of the Internet, where no expensive paper is used, where their work can be seen and read freely and not locked behind the "firewall" of an enclosed database. They prefer open access[50] or open source publications, which are exactly what they define: "open." Open is not necessarily free and many of these journals require subscriptions and log-ins for access but the implication is that they are not hidden behind a database barrier operated by a library. The question is how to assess this new digital scholarship? As early as 2006, The American Association for History and Computing produced a new set of guidelines for digital scholars, which was open and open-minded and inclusive:

> *3. Document and Explain Your Work.*
>
> *Faculty members who work with digital media should be prepared to: make explicit the results, theoretical underpinnings, and intellectual rigor of their work. They should be prepared, to the same extent that faculty members in other fields are held accountable, to show the relevance of their work in terms of the traditional areas of teaching, research, and service. You should take particular care to Describe how your work may overlap or redefine the traditional categories. Describe the process underlying the creation of work in digital media (e.g., the creation of infrastructure as well as content). Describe new collaborative relationships with other faculty members and students required by your work in digital media. Documentation of projects might include recording sources of internal or external funding, awards or other professional recognition, and reviews and citations of the work in print or digital journals. The pace of technological change makes it impossible for any one set of guidelines to account completely for the ways digital media and the work done with them is influencing historical research, teaching, and publication. The principle underlying these guidelines is that when institutions seek work with digital media and faculty members express interest in it, the institution must give full regard to this work when faculty members*

> *are hired or considered for reappointment, tenure, and promotion.*[51]

In my investigation of numerous faculty handbooks[52] from a random sample of colleges and universities available, none of them even mention digital scholarship or the digital humanities. Given that this new form of scholarship and publication has been growing for years[53] and that it is reaching a critical mass that is roiling academia, it is very strange that guidelines for tenure and promotion[54] are literally not allowing scholars to take advantage of the opportunities available to them on the Web. The continued resistance to "counting" digital scholarship and this refusal to consider the guidelines already in place is remarkable, particularly in smaller colleges that are not well funded research institutions.[55] Some years ago, a colleague of mine did an informal but infamous study of publications accepted to the "prestigious" art history journal, *Art Bulletin*, where many art historians have knocked only to find the door closed. Although this journal is paid for by the members of the College Art Association, it is inaccessible to all but those who are on the faculty of only twenty colleges, according to the survey done by Vanderbilt artist Michael Aurbach. However, in recent years, the College Art Association itself has recognized digital scholarship and has presented guidelines for how it should be viewed and considered. Time-wise the CAA was sadly years behind the Modern Language Association, which considered scholarship in new media as early as 2005, stating,

> Recognition for work published in digital formats remains limited, however, and high percentages of departments report little experience with scholarship produced in new media. Digital monographs still remain more prospect than reality in our field, and departments' lack of experience may reflect the paucity of examples that have been produced to date. Even so, it seems clear that departments need to take special care not to treat scholarship produced in new media prejudicially.[56]

In fact, in 2010, the very "prestigious" sixty year-old journal, *Shakespeare Quarterly*, opened itself to on line peer review with varying success. In reporting the story in 2010 in *The New York Times*, Patricia Cohen wrote,

> Now some humanities scholars have begun to challenge the monopoly that peer review has on admission to career-making journals and, as a consequence, to the charmed circle of tenured academe. They argue that in an era of digital media there is a better way to assess the quality of work. Instead of relying on a few experts selected by leading publications, they advocate using the Internet to expose scholarly thinking to the swift collective judgment of a much broader interested audience. "What we're experiencing now is the most important transformation in our reading and writing tools since the invention of movable type," said Katherine Rowe, a

> Renaissance specialist and media historian at Bryn Mawr College. "The way scholarly exchange is moving is radical, and we need to think about what it means for our fields."[57]

Over the past few years, the field of humanities itself has divided. There is the traditional world that one finds in the criteria for tenure[58] in various faculty handbooks[59] and then there is the digital world, which seems to have developed a separate space all unto itself. In contrast to traditional academia, which is still defied by specific disciplines, digital humanities, "created" in 2001, is, as author, Matthew, Gold described it,

> ..more akin to a common methodological outlook..Yet digital humanities is also a social undertaking. It harbors networks of people who have been working together, sharing research, arguing, competing and collaborating for many years.

This idea of sharing is directly related to the technology itself. In the tech community, sharing and collaborating and making information/knowledge open to everyone are founding ethical principles. Without the principle of "share ware," technology could not flourish. In comparison, within art history, certain topics and fields are "guarded" and "closed" and to enter therein, one must literally ask for "permission" to study in these areas from the presiding guardian scholar. As Gold points out there is a certain amount of rebellion on the part of digital scholars, who are seeking a better way to be intellectuals. Gould stated,

> Digital humanities has also, I would propose, lately been galvanized by a group of younger (or not so young) graduate students, faculty members (both tenure line and contingent) and other academic professionals who now wield the label 'digital humanities' instrumentally amid an increasingly monstrous institutional terrain defined by declining public support for higher education, rising tuitions, shrinking endowments, the proliferation of distance education and the for-profit university, and underlying it all the conversion of full-time tenure track academic labor to a part time adjunct workforce.[60]

This growing number of scholars—"academic labor"--who will never get full-time jobs, work on a contractual basis with no chance of tenure and have no investment in an old system that is not only outmoded but is also vanishing through attrition.[61] They have nothing to lose and can afford to seek the new possibilities offered by digital scholarship. There is, therefore, another divide within the humanities and presumably among the sciences, between those who have invested in a system that has served them well and those who have no investment in promotion and/or tenure at all. In his book, *Do we still Need Peer*

Review?: An Argument for Change, Thomas H. P. Gould wrote,

> Rather than falling back on what we already know to be a failed system of peer review as practiced today, academic needs to move ahead aggressively to a new review method, one that neutralizes the power of an individual by holding the editor publically responsible, while enlisting the broader scholarly society."

Gould mentioned that Carl Sagan used an analogy of a connective bridge to explain how people absorbed new ideas. Gould wrote that

> ..we learn to add to what we know by association with what we already know. New connections are built to connect to existing connections. This may be the rationale behind our clinging to an outdated, ill designed, poorly operated peer review system. The grudging willingness to accept marginal changes to the existing system of peer review may be nothing more than a tradition born of convenience.[62]

Years before I wrote my paper on Lyotard, I gave another paper at CAA, attempting (unsuccessfully) to convince my art historical peers to become digital scholars with me. I pointed out the irony of being in a discipline that celebrated the *avant-garde*, the rebellious creator, the provocative renegade, the shocking innovator, and those brave few who ran ahead of the crowd and blazed a trail to the future, while those very same "educators" refused to accept a different way of distributing knowledge—culture--in their own time. Despite the growing number of writers and scholars who, admittedly very recently, have had to acknowledge that there is a new system of scholarship and publication called digital humanities taking place on the Internet,[63] traditional policies and practices have yet to catch up. What is present in the numerous faculty handbooks is a system that relies upon "counting." Some of the guidelines are very elaborate, "counting" some kinds of publications as only a "half" compared to a "whole," while the hapless applicant for promotion or tenure is not given a specific number to aim for.[64] Other guidelines seem to be written based on a set of shared but unwritten assumptions that appear to be unexamined and tacit.[65] As Laura Mandell of Miami University said,

> A big part of the problem is that for the past 50 years, what people have done on promotion and tenure committees is to say 'OK, this was accepted by Cambridge University Press. I don't need to read it because I know its quality. That's been the shortcut we've been using. In the past, we have been paying presses to do our promotion decisions.[66]

What should be noted is that a gap exists between the more open-minded and inclusive approach to the digital humanities by the organizations that oversee the disciplines, such as the guidelines for CAA[67] and the MLA, and the rules set up by the individual colleges and universities themselves. The College Art Association allows "Definitions of scholarly accomplishment must be clarified by the institution."[68] But there is another curious silence in the faculty handbooks. Rarely is any publication "judged" on the expertise of the author or his or her accomplishment or contribution to the profession, something that might be called "quality." But anyone seeking solace or guidance by investigating handbooks will find little objective information.[69] Faculty Handbooks that seem to specify rules are laced with vagueness and subjectivity. It is easy to deconstruct the rules and standards, which, on one hand, purport to be objective, that are, on the other hand, resting upon a subtext of baseless assumptions. There is a dizzying incoherence of standards, which range from the extremely precise to the open and non-committal. It is hard to ascertain whether a particular university is attempting to make a last stand for certain criteria or if the handbook has just not been revised, or if a college is aware of changing practices and is attempting to accommodate the future. What is lacking is a consensus in criteria, which, if one is to believe the College Art Association, are currently under study and will be announced in the near future.[70]

In contrast, on the Web, one is buffeted by very real peer reviews, offered unsolicited, by thousands of people, not just a few readers that decide (or not) to consecrate the article. The Web "judges," if one can use such a term for the Internet, according to content, its quality, its reliability, its accessibility and its availability. Oddly enough, "content" is rarely if ever mentioned in the many faculty handbooks, which rely on a process, peer review, that is, if not outmoded if not discredited, is, at least, universally under re-evaluation---outside of the Handbooks, that is. Meanwhile in Cyberspace, content is King. Today for content to be read, it must appear on the Internet as an easily accessible learning object. In 2016 scholars are faced with real and devastating choices: wait for years while their work in being "peer-reviewed" and then wait even longer for their work to be published. For a scientist, and even for someone in the humanities, such delays can mean that outdated research is published and/or in the interim, the writer has acquired more information or additional insights, which cannot be incorporated in the final work. Meanwhile, promotion or tenure has been denied, not because of lack of productivity or any slackness of research, but because the slow system if clogged with manuscripts from the hopeful.

In 2002, Marshall Poe, then a scholar at Harvard, recounted his experience comparing working with a conventional publisher and publishing his own work. He summed up the experiment:

> The book I published with a university press took more than three

> years to produce, is available only on paper, and costs almost $50; my e-book took about three months to produce, is available to everyone, and costs nothing. Hypothesis confirmed? Certainly not everyone would agree. I was able to opt for the efficiency of self-publication over the prestige of the university-press production. Faculty members do not have that luxury. No junior scholar would, or could, self-publish a manuscript on the Web instead of sending it to a university press. Even senior scholars with nothing to lose in terms of advancement would not venture down that path. The professional and psychic costs of going against the publishing grain and the academic culture are too high for most scholars to bear.[71]

It is interesting that Poe used the word "psychic costs." The system that enforces such anti-intellectual and inefficient methods that harm scholarship and cripples careers does so through a discourse is not written down, that is, published, but acts through a spoken cant passed along in terms of threats and and warnings, all the more psychologically lethal to the true believers, who have drunk the academic Koolade that produces an irrational response from otherwise rational adults. In 2010 anthropologist Jan Armstrong observed such punitive behavior among her colleagues. Armstrong used the term "writing small" with the idea of counteracting traditional academic strategies that reinforce the metanarrative.

> I use the term *writing small* strategically to disrupt and interrogate a small herd of sacred cows. When authors choose to write essays, book reviews, commentaries, editorials, conference papers, web pages, blogs, and columns for professional and community newsletters they are "writing small." Writing small means valuing the time, effort, and resources required by the publication process. It means writing only when one has some- thing new, important, and interesting to say and contributing to the profession in other ways when one does not. It means moving beyond the dominance hierarchy that ensures continuing privilege and prestige for those who pound endlessly the same drum as though there were virtue inherent in redundancy. It means questioning the reward system in higher education that leads us to *count* our colleagues' publications rather than to try to understand and reflect upon their ideas. It may even mean decoupling academic publication from the promotion and tenure process, as discussed below. Above all, it means taking a chance on colleagues who, for various reasons, dislike grandstanding, competition, and the three As of adversarialism, abstraction, and arrogance embodied in conventional displays of academic prowess. Writing small is thus a double metaphor referring not only to brevity, but also to a "mindfully conservative" stance toward scholarship that questions and resists the academic

> status quo, challenging “what counts” in the political economy of academic writing practices. The case for valuing alternative writing practices can be made on economic, professional and moral grounds.[72]

The negative institutional costs in terms of lost productivity and loss of ideas to the disciplines reliant on peer review and its twin publish or perish are well known, the chief of which is the stifling of innovative thought. In 2005 Mark de Rond and Alan Miller investigated the cause and effect of publish or perish upon business schools and found that what was published in the “good” journals was largely theoretical and thus of limited use in the real world, creating a feedback loop of reinforcement that fed academic success but not the practical uses. The team concluded,

> We do worry about strangleholds on what it takes to gain promotion, tenure, and mobility, as a consequence of institutional demands and, more subtly, the persistence of mainstream criteria to defining so-called good research. We also worry about barriers to innovation in publishing because of deeply engrained commitments to so-called normal science research.[73]

To conclude where I began, Lyotard correctly predicted that postmodernity would bring about a new epistemology and would generate new ways of constructing discourses. For the first time in a long history of discursive control, the authorities no longer have containment. Little narratives are pouring out and it is hard to argue that creating and presenting more knowledge is detrimental to society and culture. Faced with economic conditions that do not favor the old models of publication, scholars are faced with a crisis—but this crisis in publication of which so much has been written—has a solution. And that solution is the boundless Internet. It is no coincidence that the alternatives to traditional academic publication used words, such as “commons” or “open” or “access,” indicating that the new generation considers intellectual activity as a free good, suggesting that thinking is a cultural product that should be freely available. On November 5, 2015, a feud over how an open access journal should be run broke out between the scholars and the database that controlled its publication. Ellen Wexler reported,

> Last week all six editors and all 31 editorial-board members resigned from *Lingua*, a prominent linguistics journal, after a disagreement with the journal’s publisher, Elsevier. The announcement re-energized concerns about the relationship between academics and for-profit companies, and the future of scholarly publishing. *Lingua*’s editors were worried that some libraries could no longer afford the price of the publication. In a "renegotiation" letter they sent to Elsevier in early October, citing a

> "changing academic-publishing paradigm," they laid out a number of conditions. At the top of the list: *Lingua* would become a fully open-access publication, and Elsevier would grant the editors ownership of the journal. But Elsevier rejected those proposals, and it plans to continue publishing *Lingua* under a new team..On Monday the Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities issued a statement in support of *Lingua*'s editors. Electronic publication should reduce costs, the organization argued, but subscription fees are going up. "Publishers sell back to the universities the very content they as a group produced, and at steadily higher subscription prices," the statement said. "The system is fundamentally broken."[74]

Hardly a week goes by without more bad news for traditional academia, as the field of academic publication becomes more and more corporatized. On December 11, 2015, *The Chronicle of Higher Education* published a below the fold article about the gobbling up of Ashgate Publishing by Informa, a company, that, as the author explained, “also organizes trade shows and sells “business intelligence” products. This corporation which is a “publically traded company” had taken over a small and cozy “family owned” enterprise dedicated to furthering academic writing.[75] On the next page, above the fold, a new article complained about the unseemly growth of *Academia.edu*. a site where scholars can post their work. For some academics, this site poses real problems because it is a for-profit venture that “does not contribute to the system” that produces the works it displays, but for writers, the advantages outweigh the moral qualms—on *Academia.edu* one's work can be seen and read.[76] The question of accessibility is becoming more and more acute as for-profit databases lock scholarship away and then re-sell it for a high price, encouraging most cash-strapped university professors to simply skip over sources that had once been available for free and look for knowledge that is in circulation. Rarely is the impact of preventing researchers from doing their fundamental jobs discussed in terms of the effect on future scholarship. Rarely does one come across a writer raising an alarm that the more the humanities are hidden behind a retaining wall, the less relevant those studies become to society.

In the twenty-first century, two problems face the university community: the combined forces of the corporate interests which sell knowledge for a price and the vested interests motivated to constrain the generation of intellectual thought. There are a real and far-reaching consequences to the current practices in academia which continue to constrict the field of cultural production and attempt to curb scholarly growth and development of ideas. The impact of stopping and thwarting publications rebounds to the very departments that produce the fledgling scholars. Professors produce fresh young PHDs, who are then denied access to the avenues which create careers, i. e, “approved” publishing outlets, which means that they will then be unable to obtain a job in a dwindling market. In 2015 Leonard Cassuto wrote a book in the sad state of graduate programs, “The Graduate School Mess: What Caused it and How We Can Fix It,” and in a summary article in *The Washington Post*, he described the bleak future of fresh minted Ph. Ds by describing the workplace that trained them—graduate schools—as “irrational.” He noted the results of a professorship that refuses to acknowledge the discrepancy between the education and the prospects for the students:

> The professors at graduate schools teach their students to want the kinds of jobs that they themselves have. Those positions center on research, with teaching having secondary importance. Those jobs, the ones that gave rise to the “publish or perish” cliché, accrue the greatest amount of respect—but they are comparatively few in number. Graduate students long for them because those are the jobs they see their teachers doing. It’s time to put a stop to this crazy distortion of lives and livelihoods. If we teach graduate students to disrespect the majority of the jobs that they are likely to compete for, then we are doing nothing less than teaching them to be unhappy. That’s not must unethical—it’s immoral.[77]

The lack of ethics and morality that is now part of graduate programs in the humanities has become so pronounced that it is hard to justify dispensing Ph. Ds to humanities students except to provide jobs for the the tenured professors who teach them to dream of the impossible. The situation has become a viscious circle that will eventually turn upon itself when humanities departments can no longer justify themselves. In fact, those who have graduated recently face such a bleak future that this lack of prospects has led possible future students to vote with their feet and to walk away from the humanities. The shrinking demand for the liberal studies means that the humanities departments in colleges and universities have fewer students, and with decreased demand for French Studies, for example, the very existence and status of these disciplines becomes precarious.[78] This tenuousness is not just within academia itself, and the apparent irrelevancy of the Liberal Arts has become a matter of public debate.

America lacks the tradition of the “public intellectual” and when the disciplines of the humanities keep themselves shielded behind closeted databases and when the scholars write in a deliberately obtuse manner and when the departments deny the efficacy of digital scholarship, the isolation of the liberal arts is only furthered. With education becoming increasingly instrumental, the eventual outcome could well be at best a marginalization for the foundation of knowledge—reading, writing, thinking and creating. To the public, “knowledge” is without merit if it is not practical and functional. If one is thinking in terms of monetary return to the larger society, then spending years reading about

Shakespeare or decades writing about the vases of ancient Athens or a lifetime writing short stories has less social utility than designing video games for adolescents. In a time where the taxpayers are increasingly concerned about "waste, fraud, and abuse," there is little patience for studies on the impractical and the intellectual. For years, the *Chronicle of Higher Education* had sounded the alarm. In a 2013 article, Michael Bérubé warned,

> The revolution in scholarly communication has consequences for the future of the dissertation, as the former MLA president Sidonie Smith has been arguing for the past few years. Smith's work follows in the wake of, and extends, the 2006 report of the MLA Task Force on the Evaluation of Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion, which urged that the relevant criterion for peer-reviewed scholarship be the intellectual quality and originality of work, not the container it comes in. There is one overwhelmingly obvious implication of that argument: If we have all these new forms of scholarly communication, why are we asking our graduate students to write proto-monographs for a system that no longer supports monographs? (I am referring, of course, to the reduction or elimination of subsidies for university presses and university libraries.)[79]

This isolation of the Humanities from the public and its subsequent decline in colleges and universities is often attributed to what are often considered plebeian demands that academic courses should lead directly to a job.[80] While such demands for employment are understandable in a culture laden with student debt, the demise of studies in the liberal arts is not necessarily linked to a simple supply and demand model.[81] When demand for a product wanes, it is an indefatigable sign that something is wrong and that the product needs to be retooled. Those who object to the notion that education is a business are still missing the point. The issue is not one of an English degree leaving a graduate with few prospects for the future, it is an issue of the (in)visibility of the Humanities, leaving the professors fighting a rear-guard action, insisting that they are teaching "transferable skills" that are excellent for "lifelong learning,"[82] but not providing examples of the impact of or the need for sonnets in society. While these justifications for continuing the existence of the Liberal Arts on the grounds of intellectual necessity are defensible, they are off the mark. As Peter Suber suggested, knowledge is a public good that should be shared and made accessible. In 2009, he wrote,

> Knowledge is also non-excludable. We can burn books, but not all knowledge is from books. We can raise the barriers to knowledge, through prices or punishments, but that only creates local exceptions for some people or some knowledge. When knowledge

> is available to people able to learn it, from books, nature, friends, teachers, or their own senses and experience, attempts to stop them from learning it are generally unavailing.

When Suber discusses texts and books, he does not mean text-books but discourse itself, and his argument is that only recently has it become possible—technologically speaking—for information, i.e. knowledge to become, as he put is, non-excludable. And yet traditional academic routinely excludes a wider audience by refusing to participate in public discourse. As Suber explained,

> Texts on paper, skin, clay, or stone are rivalrous material objects. Even when we use an inexpensive medium like paper and an inexpensive method of reproduction like xerography, the product is rivalrous. All texts were rivalrous before the digital age. But digital texts are non-rivalrous. With the right equipment we can all have copies of the same digital text without having to take turns, block one another, multiply our costs, or deplete our resources. This may be the deepest transformation wrought by the digital revolution. For the first time in the history of writing, we can record our non-rivalrous knowledge without turning it into a rivalrous material object. The same revolutionary liberation from rivalrous media affects sound, images, and video. No matter how we record knowledge today, the recording can be as non-rivalrous as the underlying knowledge itself, something new under the sun.[83]

The public that pays for the education of their children through their hard-earned tax dollars, which fund even the so-called private institutions, naturally expects an accounting. A public accounting is precisely what the Humanities resists by refusing to open its scholarly archives, allowing access to all, whether as readers or as contributors. This intellectual retreat, this reluctance to share the fruits of public funding with the contributors themselves fuels the embedded idea that scholarship in the humanities is an ivory tower pastime, little related to the real world.[84] The result is a slow death spiral: to preserve the “prestige” of the profession, academia retreats behind the fortress of secrecy and inaccessibility, thus alienating itself from the very consumers that it needs to attract in order to survive. The Humanities become irrelevant, a fate it has brought upon itself.

But it would be more precise to say that the Humanities as they exist in the confines of the universities and the colleges have become irrelevant, but outside the patrolled borders of academia, the humanities abound and the liberal arts are freely practiced.[85] Lyotard imagined a world of paralogy or a system of continuing conversations or intellectual discourses, plural, that would, today, be hyperlinked. Paralogy, by definition, cannot be contained, for it is ongoing and demands an open platform upon which to perform.[86] One of the fears of publishing on the

Web is the very lack of closure or the absence of a final version. But this lack of *fini* is the nature of paralogy. Lyotard's idea of paralogy, or the injection of dissent into a canonical consensus, stood in opposition to the dictates of academic convention, which are based on performance. One might imagine a stage play in which one player refuses to say the lines correctly and the other players move, gripped with what Lyotard calls "terror," to silence the dissenter. In academia, the consequences of not following the script are grave indeed, but, for the first time, the rewards for renegades are becoming attractive. As Niels Brügger wrote,

> The answer to whether paralogy can act as a legitimatizing criterion within the social bond thus seems to be "yes," paralogy being presented as the only one of three kinds of legitimation that fulfills the above mentioned demands: a justice that makes room for multiplicity, incommensurability, and local concerns.[87]

For Lyotard, paralogy was both justice and a dissenting move against hegemonies and their unchecked power. But more than than, paralogy was also postmodernism, now understood as the proliferation of *petits récits* or little narratives.[88] On the Internet, knowledge is being created, used or discarded, accepted or rejected, catering to niche markets not recognized by academic publishing, and thriving on the open range of Cyberspace. Ironically, while the liberal arts are fighting for their lives in colleges, while the humanities are diminishing in the universities, the very sphere rejected[89] by traditional academia, the world of digital humanities, is where the seven arts are thriving. Writers who participate in the Digital Humanities[90] usually do so out of a desire to share their scholarship and their research with their peers, caring little for symbolic capital or for prestige, the elements that "count" for traditional systems of evaluation.

Postmodernism has taught its children to look at not what is present but also at what is absent. This study has produced its own absences: not one positive review of the process of publish or perish, not one assertion that such a practice benefits scholarship; not one positive article on peer review, not one assertion that such a practice benefits knowledge. And, ironically, these absences have produced other disjunctures concerning "what counts" as "quality." It is still entirely possible to assert that most of which is published under peer review is inherently "good" and that the rejected projects were "bad," but such assertions are, in fact, just that--assertions not valid arguments. These assumptions are founded upon a belief system in the validity of peer review that, while laudable, has no empirical basis.[91] It is, therefore, impossible to state with any certainty that unapproved or articles or refused books are inferior to those pubished, because we simply do not know this statement to be accurate. Manuscripts rejected are manuscripts locked away; articles not published are articles tossed aside, songs not sung are songs silenced. Rejection leaves only a void. And given the lack of evidence, we will never know the quality of those lost thoughts, those silenced voices, those unshared contributions. A rejected article, a refused book vanishes into the disappointment of the author and his or her thwarted career. But these gaps in the fabrication of knowledge need no longer exist. There is an alternative to being shut out—there is the open door of the Internet. Those of us who are digital scholars respect and acknowledge the achievements of those who chose the long and laborious process of trekking from publisher to publisher, from journal to journal, and finally after years of effort, getting a publication in print. We salute you. All we ask is the same respect in return. We are, after all, the future.

---

[1] Lyotard's first chapter is very clearly titled, "The Field: Knowledge in Computerized Sciences." His last chapter is, however, the most striking for today's world, "Legitimation by Paralogy." The book begins with computers and ends with the consequence of digitized knowledge, which is paralogy, that which disturbs the universe of reason and epistemology. Lyotard outlined the profound consequences as he saw them in 1979:

> We no longer have recourse to the grand narratives—we can resort neither to the dialectic of Spirit nor even to the emancipation of humanity as a validation for postmodern discourse. But as we have seen, the little narrative (*petit récit*) remains the quintessential form of imaginative invention, most particularly in science..

Lyotard was very concerned with the issue of legitimation and that which "legitimates the system—power," as he put it. He continued,

> The problem is therefore to determine whether it is possible to have a form of legitimation based solely on paralogy. Paralogy must be distinguished from innovation: the latter is under the command of the system, or at least used by it to improve its efficiency; the latter is a move (the importance of which is often not recognized until later) played in the pragmatics of knowledge..Research that takes place under the aegis of a paradigm tends to stabilize; it is like the exploitation of a technological, economic, or artistic "idea." It cannot be discounted. But what is striking is that someone always comes along to disturb the order of "reason."

Jean-François Lyotard. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge.* Translation for the French by Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi (Paris: Les Editions de Minuit, 1979 and Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1984).

[2] John J. Regazzi wrote about the emerging trends in academic publishing today. This is a very current and very significant book, one of the few to study the changes confronting academia today. Some of his chapter titles include, "The Birth of Online: The Internet and the Web Change Scholarly Communication" and Traditional Economics of Academic Publishing." He makes the link between the economy and the control of libraries and publishing over the system of peer review.

> A major issue is managing the large volume of informal scholarly communication found in blogs, social media, e-mails, and so on. The increased accessibility afforded by the Internet has encouraged a school of thought that believes that capturing the informal scholarship is an important as capturing formal scholarly publishing..Self-publishing on public websites is a trend that is expected to accelerate..Another trend that is accelerating is that cash-strapped libraries will likely not continue to serve as gatekeepers to scholarly research. Right now, the traditional publishers maintain tight control over the peer-review process. However, as more scholars simply publish their materials online, that control will loosen. The day that the universities begin to consider self-published materials for purposes of tenure, rewards, and so on, the grip of the commercial publishers will loosen further.

John J. Regazzi. *Scholarly Communications. A History of Content as King to Content as Kingmaker* (Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015) 100.

[3] The author of *The Passive Voice* explained why he published his own works,

> I chose to self-publish simply because I had no interest in waiting around for months or years to first find a willing publisher, then for them to get it out into print. Self-publishing, for me, was the most expedient way to get the book in the hands of a wider audience.

Dr. Morgan Giddings. *The Passive Voice. A Lawyer's Thoughts on Authors, Self-Publishing and Traditional Publishing.* "Peer Review, Self-Publishing, and Blowhards." (July 19, 2014)

[4] The proceedings of a 2013 conference in Charleston included a panel discussion moderated by Robert P. Holley, "Finding Balance in Humanities and Social Sciences Acquisitions." The conference overall was a very thorough investigation into the impact of the Internet and digital publications on the world of academia and upon libraries. The summarization of Professor Holley's study of self-publishing in academics read as follows:

> Holley cited an NPR program that estimated that 750,000 of 1,000,000 titles were self-published last year, and, in 2015, it is predicted that 600,000 will be self-published. Holley cited a number of advantages to self-publishing for academics. Self-publishing allows increased control and freedom over the finished product, whether dealing with including more databases and graphics of allowing more extensive documentation. Some academic publications are not suitable for print, and self-publishing via a digital platform circumvents this problem. Materials can be distributed at no cost with some publishing platforms, with the potential for profit if selling the product is an option. As far as disadvantages are concerned Holley primarily centered on issues of tenure and open access. Open access materials give authors more opportunities for citations and dissemination of their work, but self-publishing open access materials cuts the potential for profit. When self-publishing works of academic are more likely than likely not considered in the tenure system. Holley, along with several other members of the preconference, agreed that the current tenure and vetting system would need some rethinking in the future world of academic publishing.

Too Much is not Enough! Charleston Conference Proceedings 2013. Edited by Beth R. Bernhardt, Leah H. Hinds, and Katrina P. Strauch. (Against the Grain Press, LLC, 2014) 516.

See also Dr. Robert P. Holley. "Self Publishing and Academic Libraries," which discusses the phenomenon of self-publishing in more detail.

> One principal reason for self-publishing is that university presses and trade publishers no longer find some research to be economically viable. Even if the scholarship is impeccable, the focus of specialized re- search in the Humanities and some Social Sciences is so narrow that only a handful of scholars will be interested in reading about the subject. Many larger university libraries used to purchase automatically all publications from university presses within their collecting areas. With the decline in library resources coupled with the increased reliance on patron driven acquisitions, most academic libraries now purchase only those university press titles with demonstrated demand from their user re- search, self-publishing is the only choice other than open access, which does not provide any economic reward for the author and does not get the broader distribution that Amazon and other sites provide.

Dr. Robert P. Holley. "Self Publishing and Academic Libraries."

[5] In a survey I don't have access to, Zheng Yang and Yu Li investigated the attitudes of faculty towards open access publishing (OA).

> Survey results suggest that tenured faculty are more engaged and interested in OA publishing topics in general, and tenure-track faculty are more willing to adopt new initiative such as Open Textbooks. Overall, the responding TAMU faculty are willing to consider publishing in OA publications, and almost half of them believe OA journal publications are acceptable for consideration of tenure and promotion in their departments. Despite their positive attitudes towards OA publishing, they are not so positive towards OA mandates.

Zheng Yang and Yu Li. "University Faculty Awareness and Attitudes Towards Open Access Publishing and the Institutional Repository: A Case Study." *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication* (Volume 3, Issue 1, May 26, 2015)

[6] Academic Vice President and Dean of the University of Puget Sound, Kristine M. Bartaen wrote a really interesting and comprehensive account of digital scholarship, which summarizes and quotes a nice range of the literature on the subject. What is interesting about this article is that she points to a "robust" amount of writing on this topic and yet, as I have pointed out, little if any of this discussion has found its way into Faculty Handbooks. She began,

> Many liberal arts college faculty members are interested in and increasing their use of digital resources in teaching and scholarly work. Some have been developing digital teaching resources for nearly two decades, some have begun to publish scholarship in on-line journals and other digital venues, and some are doing ground-breaking work in open source, collaborative scholarly projects. Others, particularly pre-tenure or pre-promotion faculty, are reticent to venture into digital work out of concern for how that work will be acknowledged, valued, and rewarded in existing faculty tenure, promotion, and merit award systems. That reticence lives in tension with recognition that advances in technology-enabled teaching and scholarship are progressing in other institutions – academic and non-academic alike – and that professional currency in the academy demands new or amended frameworks in the liberal arts college for evaluation of digital work.

Kristine M. Bartaen. "Digital Scholarship and the Tenure and Promotion Process." *The Academic Commons For the Liberal Education Community* (July 24, 2014)

[7] Bret McCabe discussed the situation with Harvard and other institutions who are now unwilling to bear the financial burden of academic publishing. He wrote,

> The most sobering reminder of this crisis came in April 2012 when the faculty advisory council of the Harvard Library issued a memo addressing the "untenable situation" of buying serials. The memo argues that "large journal publishers" have made the costs of providing researchers with the publications they need "fiscally unsustainable and academically restrictive." The memo notes that the library's annual journal costs are nearly $3.75 million. Project MUSE's Smith and Queen work with both publishers and libraries, and so they understand the various parties' points of view. Publishers need revenue from journals to support their book and monograph publishing. The rising cost of serials eats into libraries' new book acquisitions, and their operating budgets are year-to-year flat or constricting. In the middle are the researchers and scholars themselves, whose tenure pursuits are tied to their published output. They create and consume the products publishers distribute and libraries archive.

Bret McCabe. "Publish or Perish: Academic Publishing Confronts its Digital Future." *Johns Hopkins Magazine* (Fall 2013)

[8] The activities of Lawrence Lessig in opening a "creative commons" for publishing and the exchange of ideas are well known. While his work is not necessarily directly connected to the crisis in academic publishing, his efforts are symptomatic of the larger problems in supporting creativity and the free distribution of ideas. Some good sources include:

Lawrence Lessig. *The Future of Ideas. The Fate of the Commons in a Connected World* (New York: Random House in 2001, now licensed by Creative Commons) See also his TED talk, "Laws that Choke Creativity" and "Prof. Lawrence Lessig Explains Creative Commons Licensing."

[9] A 2009 article by Peter Suber defined knowledge as a public good in the following terms,

> One of the most durable arguments for OA is that knowledge is and ought to be a public good. Here I don't want to restate or evaluate the whole argument, which is complex and has many threads. But I do want to pull at a few of those threads. What is a public good? In the technical sense used by economists, a public good is non-rivalrous and non-excludable. A good is non-rivalrous when it's

> undiminished by consumption. We can all consume it without depleting it or becoming "rivals". Radio broadcasts are non-rivalrous; my reception doesn't block yours or vice versa. A good is non-excludable when consumption is available to all, and attempts to prevent consumption are generally ineffective. Radio broadcasts are non-excludable for people with the right equipment in the right area. Breathable air is non-excludable for this purpose even though a variety of barriers, from pollution to suffocation, could stop people from consuming it.

Peter Suber. "Knowledge as a Public Good." *SPARC* (November 2009)

[10] A recent article published in 2013 by Philippa Chong attempted to apply the so-called objective criteria of scientific review to that of art, specifically fiction. In the process of discussing the review process, Chong uncovered another related situation: the diminished opportunities for reviewing books in print. The vanishing of substantial book reviews not only penalizes authors but also penalizes the academics, who depend on such publications for promotion and tenure. Her article concluded that books were reviewed very much on the basis of the reviewer's emotions felt while reading the book.

Philippa Chong. "Legitimate judgment in art, the scientific world reversed? Maintaining critical distance in evaluation." *Social Studies of Science* 43(2) 265–281.

[11] Writing on "Impact—Reward and Tenure," Linda L. Eells said,

> A related question paramount in universities today is, how will the movement to e-journals impact the academic recognition, reward, and tenure system? E-journals are very slowly gaining acceptance and credibility in the academic community, with that acceptance being enhanced y the support of large scholarly associations that are widely respected and continue to maintain the same standards for their online as they would for a print publication. However the primary factor limiting factor in the wide acceptance of these models is the reluctance of faculty members to fully support publications and peer-review models that operate in electronic-only format due to the status and importance of certain academic journals in the academic review and tenure process..The academic community is reacting to an increased awareness of the serials crisis by moving to examine traditional methods for evaluating scholarly potential and progress in academia. Review and tenure procedures grounded in the publication of journal articles in core peer-reviewed journals some scholarly publishing firms have imposed on institutions over the past few decades. The potential for

> self-publishing, whether by an institution or by an individual, has resulted in the proliferation of a number of relatively new and different publishing models.

Linda L. Eells. "For Better or for Worse: The Joys and Woes of E-Journals." *Emerging Issues in the Electronic Environment. Challenges for Librarians and Researchers in the Sciences*. Edited by Jeannie P. Miller (Routledge, 2013) 48-49.

[12] The topic of electronic publishing, as it was called in the beginning, has been discussed since the 1990s. These old articles, now outdated, provide a window into how long this topic has been under consideration for the past twenty years, without any consensus yet. This particular article uses data from the late nineties and is published in a journal that had been discussing online publishing for years.

Aldrin E. Sweeney. "Tenure and Promotion: Should You Publish in Electronic Journals?" *The Journal of Electronic Publishing* (Volume 6, Issue 2, December 2000)

[13] In his introduction to a very interesting book about the impact of the he edited, Todd Dufresne wrote,

> Books, like other products are also subject to the vagaries of fashion and consumer desire. Expectations about length and design change over time and so too do intellectual styles and ideas. The late 1970s and 1980s were golden years for what was called "high theory" a time when the very best academic produced philosophically sophisticated works about the foundations of knowledge. Things changed in the late 1990s and in the new century. Fashions are reactive; moreover, one chaffs, as Thomas Kuhn has it, at the increasingly limited room for new insights (and consequently job prospects, tenure, promotion, etc.) within the old paradigm. Hence the rise of "practical" scholarship, which in the extreme is modeled on "participatory action research;" only not only walks away from abstract theorizing, but one engages concretely in a community activism where the book becomes (in the ideal) a product of community values and authors..The Economy as Cultural System is a return to conjecture, speculation and interpretation—to analysis and critique—and as such inaugurates a return to fundamental theoretical questions, not just about "late capitalism" today but about what it means to think about "the economy" in the context of an academic culture that is complicit with neo-liberalism—big business too often run by functionaries, not visionaries, and stripped of its former glory as a preserve for

> curiosity-based research and informed debate about eternal, fundamental questions.

Todd Dufresne. "Preface." *The Economy as Cultural System: Theory, Capitalism, Crisis.* Edited by Todd Dufresne and Clara Sacchetti (2012) xiv.

[14] Craig Lambert outlined the current situation:

> The current reduction in library purchases of specialized titles, for example, is squeezing monographs out of the market, and in this way affecting the academic job market. A monograph has typically been a young scholar's first book, often developed from a doctoral dissertation. Although uncommon in academia prior to the 1920s, monographs served as a staple of tenure reviews in American universities in the second half of the twentieth century, especially in the humanities. Academic presses now publish many fewer of them, and their disappearance creates a dilemma for junior scholars already worried about the scarcity of jobs: if there is no monograph, what evidence do you adduce to support your case for tenure?

The Librarian of Harvard University, Robert Darnton, as interviewed for this article, remarked,

> We have to try to limit the predatory activities of big publishers like Elsevier and Wiley. It is a crazy situation of monopolistic abuse, and is costing libraries huge amounts of money..Commercial interests have taken over the communication of knowledge, and we academics have to fight back.

Craig Lambert. "The Wild West of Academic Publishing. The Trouble Present and Promising Future of Scholarly Communication." *Harvard Magazine* (January-February 2015)

[15] In a long study from 2013 attempting to explain the decline in interest in the Humanities, a group of Harvard scholars wrote a very interesting report which contained the following assertion,

> The most powerful currents in Humanities research and teaching over the last thirty years have been inflected by moments of collective disillusion and pessimism (notably by the experience of the Vietnam War). Those moments provoke scholarly skepticism and distrust, or what has been called hermeneutic suspicion, of the official line. Those historical experiences tend to produce a Humanities teaching that stands back from the collective project to

> critique its premises. The task is to unmask the operations of power.

It seems that unmasking power does not begin at home.

The Teaching of the Arts and Humanities at Harvard College: Mapping the Future (2013) 19

[16] In a long and rigorous study of scientific publications and the control of publishers over the process, authors Stefanie Haustein and Philippe Mongeon paused to discuss the humanities,

> On the other hand, papers in arts and humanities are still largely dispersed amongst many smaller publishers, with the top five commercial publishers only accounting for 20% of humanities papers and 10% of arts papers in 2013, despite a small increase since the second half of the 1990s. The relatively low cost of journals in those disciplines—a consequence of their lower publication density—might explain the lower share of the major commercial publishers. Also, the transition from print to electronic—a strong argument for journals to convert to commercial publishers—has happened at a much slower pace in those disciplines as the use for recent scientific information is less pressing. Moreover, these disciplines make a much more important use of books and generally rely on local journals, all of which are factors that make it much less interesting for big publishers to buy journals or found new ones in the arts and humanities.

Stefanie Haustein and Philippe Mongeon. "The Oligopoly of Academic Publishers in the Digital Era." *PLOS One* (June 10, 2015)

[17] Deborah Lines Andersen attempted to discuss the questions of publication along the line of "social informatics." She wrote, stating the obvious, that

> The medium of publication—paper or electronic—does not influence its core scholarly content. The quality indicators, combined with the publicity and access of a document, determine the strength of publishing. While the temptation (due to time limitations) for surrogacy is ever present, the use of simplified evaluation criteria, such as on-line publishing, does not give a fair look at a scholar's work. E-publications should not automatically be deleted. In fact, a broad continuum of publishing, both in paper and electronic form exists, and the Kling/McKim framework, though not definitive, is useful for tenure, promotion, and review evaluation

> purposes. Within this framework, we see that overall the strength of e-publishing differs from p-publishing in two major areas: publicity and accessibility.

Andersen is referring to an article by Rob Kling, Lisa Spector, and Geoff McKim. "Locally Controlled Scholarly Publishing via the Internet: the Guild Model," published in the *Journal of Electronic Publishing* in 2002. In a related article in the edited book, Kathleen Carlisle Fountain also offered a rough guide of sort to help those unfamiliar with electronic and digital materials evaluate the work presented them. She mentioned such criteria as "Difficulty," "Originality," "Transferability," and "Usefulness," adding,

> Many of these questions could be asked of traditional scholarly endeavors. Perhaps that is the point. In order to understand traditional scholarship and evaluate its contribution to the field, one must know what has come before. The same holds true for digital scholarship. One crucial issue for universities, and one goal of this book, is to educate academics about the nature of digital scholarship—how it is created, structured, and presently evaluated—in order to make informed decisions about its worth in the university setting.

Deborah Lines Andersen. *Digital Scholarship in the Tenure, Promotion, and Review Process.* Edited by Deborah Lines Andersen. Kathleen Carlisle Fountain. "To Web or Not to Web? The Evaluation of World Wide Web Publishing in the Academy" (Routledge, 2004) 7 and 99.

[18] I discuss Bourdieu's book at some length in my own book *New Artwriting*.

Pierre Bourdieu. *Homo Academicus* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1984)

[19] In introducing his interview of Pierre Bourdieu about this book, Loïc J. D. Wacquant wrote,

> ..the greatest value of *Homo Academicus* lies perhaps in the threat it poses to the present "working consensus" between "theorists" and "researchers" that allows each side to ignore the other while paying lip service to the necessity of the integration of conceptual and empirical work. By consistently effacing this sacred divide, Bourdieu forces us to critically re-examine not only the institutional conditions of our professional conduct, but also the *scientific unconscious*, which regulates our daily practices as symbolic producers.

Although Wacquant hoped that the book would have an impact in America, then as now, empirical information cannot disrupt the *scientific unconscious* also known as the status quo.

Loïc J. D. Wacquant. "For a Socio-Analysis of Intellectuals: On "Homo Academicus." Berkeley Journal of Sociology (Volume 34, Symposium on the Foundations of Social Science, 1989)

[20] Writing on the occasion of the launch of *Digital Humanities Quarterly*, Joseph Raben mused in 2007,

> This reluctance to provide wider and less costly access to humanities scholarship represents a disjuncture with the expectations of the potential audience for this information. The generation of students in our graduate schools today has already become completely at ease with computers and online communication. Even in their non-academic activities, theses students rely increasingly on computers for access to information of almost every sort. In their academic activities they download electronic information to such an extent that their instructors must plead for at least the partial use of print media. Now, with the drive promoted by Google to scan the contents of several major university and public libraries, the time is drawing close when very few reasons will remain to argue the superiority of books and print journals over online databases. Thus the arguments for directing publishing scholars toward the devious route of publishing new material in print, only to have it then scanned for online access become increasingly illogical. The time it will take for the academic establishment to recognize the value of online publication is a function of its willingness to accept the replacement of a system that has seemed to operate relatively well until now. Books and print articles have been the stairs leading to the tenure, promotion, higher salaries and reduced teaching loads that are the system's rewards for scholarly industry. When deans and even chairs are incapable of evaluating the content of such publications, they have been able to rely on the number of a candidate's publications, their substance, the prestige of their publishers and (to a limited extent in the humanities) the number of times they are cited elsewhere. With understandable ergophobia, these administrators do not eagerly anticipate learning a new system without these comforting means of measuring accomplishment. The latest newsletter of the Modern Language Association announces that "40.8% of departments in doctorate-granting institutions report no experience in evaluating refereed articles in electronic format, and 65.7% report no

> experience in evaluating monographs in electronic format." How daring must a pioneering candidate for tenure and/or promotion be to risk career advancement in this dangerous environment?

Joseph Raben. "Tenure, Promotion and Digital Publication." *Digital Humanities Quarterly* (Volume 1, Number 1, 2007)

[21] Richard Smith. "Peer review: a flawed process at the heart of science and journals." Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine (2006 Apr; 99(4): 178–182.)

[22] In 2013 Tanya Roscorla wrote about the high price of traditional scholarship and what it costs universities and libraries. Her article concentrated on the University of California system. She wrote,

> Getting published in a prestigious scholarly journal is a big deal in academia because it's one of the ways that universities decide who will be promoted and receive tenure. But in this traditional publishing process, authors usually sign away exclusive first publishing rights to the journal. The journal makes its money by charging subscription fees to university libraries and others, and doesn't allow the research to spread outside of its publication for a year or two. Until now, large research university libraries have paid for subscriptions, no matter what the cost. But deep budget cuts and skyrocketing subscription costs have prompted libraries to reconsider how they obtain access to scholarly work.

Tanya Roscorla. "Open Access to Scholarly Work Gains Steam in California Universities." *Center for Digital Education* (August 8, 2013)

[23] Gabriel Fisher reported in 2015 that

> ..For anyone in the publishing industry looking to get rich quick—or, at the very least, turn a profit—the secret to success is in academic publishing. Or, to be more exact, the five for-profit academic publishers that now control more than half of the science research produced worldwide. the big publishing houses are not only the owners of important academic journals, but gatekeepers to success in academia.

Gabriel Fisher. "Monopoly on Truth. Five For-Profit Companies Control More than 50% of Academic Publishing." *Quartz* (July 2, 2015)

[24] Shelia Cavanagh. Living in a Digital World: Rethinking Peer Review, Collaboration, and Open Access. *Journal of Digital Humanities.* Volume 1, Number 4 (Fall 2012)

[25] In their qualitative study of tenure Jerrell D. Coggburn and Stephen Neely wrote of the plunging number of tenure jobs at universities.

> With fewer tenure-track lines, the competition among scholars for tenure- granting positions has grown fierce, allowing departments and institutions to further increase expectations and raise tenure standards. In the aggregate, these labor market trends have served to exacerbate the growing competitive pressures within higher education, contributing to the sense among faculty members that tenure is now harder than ever to obtain.

Jerrell D. Coggburn and Stephen Neely. "Publish or Perish? Examining Academic Tenure Standards in Public Affairs and Administration Programs." *The Journal of Public Affairs Education* (Volume 21, No. 2 Spring 2015) 199-214.

[26] The situation in the sciences is almost the reverse. Publishing in scientific journals has "proved" to be something of a scandal because results can be verified and the articles that promoted the data can be discredited, undermining the very notion of peer review. But scientists are desperate to be published and multiple publications have sprung up to oblige. To maximize their output, scientists slice their work into small pieces, each to be published separately. As a result, writers self-plagiarize and diminish their own research. In one of the many articles on this problem plaguing the scientific community, the editorial board of *Nature Materials* explained,

> It is the best of times and the worst of times in the world of scientific publishing. The explosion in the number of scientific papers being published, and in the number of journals in existence, is a positive sign of the overall healthy state of research. However, the increasing cost of this growth — both financially and in terms of the increasingly onerous burden on referees — has led to a crisis that threatens the sustainability of scientific publishing as we know it[1]. This situation is made worse by the practice of fragmenting single coherent bodies of research into as many publications as possible — the practice of scientific salami slicing..Much of the problem arises not from an inherent desire among researchers to maximize their publication count, but from the conditions that are set by funding and appointment bodies, which determine what gets funded and who gets tenure. In the 'publish or perish' climate that has evolved over recent decades, overemphasis on the size of an

> individual's (and, increasingly, entire research group's) publication record as a means of quantifying their research output inevitably rewards quantity over quality. Moreover, this has the effect of abdicating responsibility for such assessment to the journals in which they publish — a responsibility that is neither appropriate nor desired.

---"The Cost of Salami Slicing." *Nature Materials* (Volume 4, Number 1, 2005)

[27] It is difficult to separate the legitimate "ask" for supporting the unavoidable labor that goes into maintaining a journal which is not supported by a university and those demands that are illegitimate. An example of what seems to be a perfectly benign request can be found on the website of a Swiss journal, *Humanities*, which states,

> *Humanities* (ISSN 2076-0787) is an Open Access journal, which is free to access and read on the Internet. MDPI guarantees that no university library or individual reader will ever have to buy a subscription or buy access through pay-per-view fees to access the articles published in the journal. Hence, MDPI does not have any income from selling subscriptions to the print or online version of this journal or from pay-per-view fees. In order to cover the costs of providing and maintaining a publication infrastructure, managing the journals, and processing the manuscripts through peer-review and the editorial procedure, the journal uses a form of conditional submission fee referred to as Article Processing Charge (APC). *Humanities* (ISSN 2076-0787) is a new journal and publication fees are fully waived for papers submitted in 2015. However, a fee of 250 CHF may apply for those articles that need major editing and formatting and/or English editing.

Humanities.

[28] In one of many articles revealing bad practices in the peer review process, Pete Etchells and Chris Chambers wrote,

> One of the most frustrating things we see as researchers is the glacial pace at which attitudes change in academic science. A culture of hidden peer review, hidden data, pay walled journal articles and performance-related bean counting undermine transparency and robustness in science. In some cases, gaming of research practices can reach the point where it threatens the integrity on which science so crucially depends. Unfortunately, the

> people who shine the light on such behaviour often become the target of baseless criticism and attack.

Pete Etchells and Chris Chambers. "The Games We Play: A Troubling Dark Side in Academic Publishing." *The Guardian* (March 12, 2015)

[29] Alex Galarza, Jason Heppler, and Douglas Seefeldt. "A Call to Redefine Historical Scholarship in the Digital Turn." *Journal of Digital Humanities.* Volume 1, Number 4 (Fall 2012)

[30] Using keyword such as "tenure and promotion," I searched for Faculty Handbooks from various universities and colleges that were publically available. It is my presumption that these institutions would stand by their decisions and would not wince at the observations of one of their peers.

[31] My research turned up a surprising non-correlation between the "prestige" of the university and the stringency of evaluating applicants for promotion and/or tenure. A few years ago, two scholars investigating publish or perish noted the same odd discrepancy between the requirements for research institutions and colleges that cannot afford to fund research and yet require the same level of publication for their faculties. As Coggburn and Neely noted,

> Surprisingly, these trends have not been limited to large, doctoral-granting, or research-intensive universities. Several studies have found this heightened focus on research-based criteria to increasingly be the norm across various institutional types, including those traditionally identified as teaching-oriented or "comprehensive" institutions (Boyer, 1990; Youn & Price, 2009) Youn and Price (2009) suggest that this may be partially due to the presence of strong institutional or isomorphic pressures. Institutional theorists (e.g., DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Meyer & Rowan, 1977) suggest that actors within a given domain tend to adopt the prevailing rules and procedures (such as tenure standards) of the domain's most influential institutions in an effort to gain legitimacy within the broader social and institutional context. In the field of higher education, this is consistent with the observation that "all types of higher education institutions increasingly emulate research institutions in pursuit of prestige" (Backes-Gellner & Schlinghoff, 2010).

Jerrell Coggburn and Stephen R. Neely. Op. cit. 199-214.

[32] Todd Presner. "How to Evaluate Digital Scholarship." [UCLA's Digital Humanities program (September 2011)]

[33] In an article for *Insider Higher Ed*, Scott Jaschik discussed the "horror stories" faced by digital scholars who are confronted with an older generation who do not understand digital scholarship. The Modern Language Association began as early as 2009 to deal with the implications of digital scholarship. As Jaschik reported,

> In many respects, organizers of the effort say, this shift isn't just about the digital era, but about tenure committees being forced to learn much more about candidates and how their work was evaluated than has been the norm for decades. So many tenure decisions have been made on the basis of assuming that a university press has a sound peer review system -- and one that can be relied upon -- that tenure has been outsourced, some say. Now, new models of scholarship are forcing these committees to closely consider how they know a candidate is producing good work.

Scott Jaschik. "Tenure in a Digital Era." *Inside Higher Ed*. (May 26, 2009)

[34] Mario Biagioli. "From Book Censorship to Academic Peer Review." *Emergences: Journal for the Study of Media & Composite Cultures.* Volume 12, Number 1 (2002) 12, 13, 14.

[35] Katy Waldman. "The White Poet Who Used an Asian Pseudonym to Get Published Is a Cheater, Not a Crusader" *Slate.com* (July 30, 2015)

[36] Sherman Alexie. "Sherman Alexie Speaks Out on The Best American Poetry 2015" (September 7, 2015).

[37] Catherine Nichols. "*Homme de Plume*: What I Learned Sending My Novel Out Under a Male Name." *Jezebel* (August 4, 2015)

[38] Writing in the *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, as early as 2006, Richard Smith related one well known result,

> The evidence on whether there is bias in peer review against certain sorts of authors is conflicting, but there is strong evidence of bias against women in the process of awarding grants. The most famous piece of evidence on bias against authors comes from a study by DP Peters and SJ Ceci. They took 12 studies that came from prestigious institutions that had already been published in psychology journals. They retyped the papers, made minor changes to the titles, abstracts, and introductions but changed the authors' names and institutions. They invented institutions with

> names like the Tri-Valley Center for Human Potential. The papers were then resubmitted to the journals that had first published them. In only three cases did the journals realize that they had already published the paper, and eight of the remaining nine were rejected—not because of lack of originality but because of poor quality. Peters and Ceci concluded that this was evidence of bias against authors from less prestigious institutions.

Richard Smith. Ibid.

The gap between the realization that the peer review process is corrupt and the willingness to act upon the numerous examples and many studies of the active biases within the system itself is very wide. The problems are known—all one has to do is to read academic journals and to keep up with reporting on the practices of academia—but reforming peer review seems to be a bridge too far for those in charge. Anthropologist Jan Armstrong wrote that

> Thus, a good deal of evidence supports the claim that the peer review process does not guarantee that articles selected for publication will be of uniformly high quality. But the problem runs deeper than this. Because reviewers are often members of relatively closed networks of White, middle class individuals, critics have questioned the openness and legitimacy of the whole academic publishing enterprise. Indeed, the peer review process is less problematic than the professional discourse and worldviews that valorize it (to the exclusion of other scholarly writing and publishing practices). I suspect that the celebration of competition, selectivity, meritocracy, and prestige that characterizes much of the discourse on publishing in academic journals may work to exclude faculty and students of color, gays and lesbians, and women from full membership, participation, and advancement in the education professoriate, as they may have little interest in such "tournaments" and know very well the system is not fair..Although faculty and administrators tend to consider peer review as an inherently good and necessary aspect of professional life, it is not a guarantee of quality, and to the degree it fosters conformity to traditional scholarly ways of thinking and writing, it may reduce creativity and innovation.

Armstrong's remarks reflect many other observations, suggesting that the peer review process which controls publication narrows the field of those who are allowed to publish and in the process silences the voices of minorities and women and other outsiders.

Jan Armstrong. “Political Economy of Writing Practices.” *Journal of Thought* (Spring Summer 2010)

[39] The *Economist* reported in 2013 that, regardless of errors found in published papers that had been “primed” or published for reasons unrelated to “quality” there was a bias towards not being rigorous. As the magazine stated,

> Various factors contribute to the problem. Statistical mistakes are widespread. The peer reviewers who evaluate papers before journals commit to publishing them are much worse at spotting mistakes than they or others appreciate. Professional pressure, competition and ambition push scientists to publish more quickly than would be wise. A career structure which lays great stress on publishing copious papers exacerbates all these problems. “There is no cost to getting things wrong,” says Brian Nosek, a psychologist at the University of Virginia who has taken an interest in his discipline’s persistent errors. “The cost is not getting them published.”

---“Unreliable research. Trouble at the Lab. Scientists like to think of science as self-correcting. To an alarming degree, it is not.” *The Economist*. (Oct 19th 2013).

[40] Charles Seife reported the release of “SciDetect, a computer program that spots a particular category of phony papers that has been plaguing computer science publications. (Just last year Springer had to pull 18 fake papers, while another publisher, IEEE, had to pull more than 100.)”
In explaining why such a trolling of scientific journals was needed, the author continued, calling scientific publication “a scam,”

> The answer to that question exposes the dirty secret of modern scientific publishing. It is that secret, not the occasional publication of fake papers, that the scientific publishing world should be mortified about, for it is damaging the underpinnings of the whole scientific endeavor. When something at the core of scientific publishing begins to rot, the smell of corruption quickly spreads to all areas of science. This is because the act of publishing a scientific finding is an essential part of the practice of science itself. You want a job? Tenure? A promotion? A juicy grant? You need to have a list of peer-reviewed publications, for publications are the coin of the scientific realm. This coin has worth because of a long-standing social contract between scientists and publishers. Scientists hand over their work to a publication for free, and even sometimes pay a fee of several hundred to several thousand dollars for the privilege. What’s more, scientists often feel duty-

> bound to vet their colleagues' work for little or no compensation when a publication asks them to. In return, the publications promise a thorough review process that establishes that a published article has some degree of scientific merit. Just like modern coinage, most of scholarly publications' value resides in a stamp of approval from a trustworthy body. However, it's a coin that's easy to counterfeit, especially now that anyone with an Internet connection and publishing software can cobble together a respectable-looking "publication" in a few hours. Take the scientists' work, charge them a hefty fee for publishing it, but skimp on (or do away with) the review process. It's a goldmine. Just slap up pretty much every submitted paper, no matter how poor the quality, and you've got a steady stream of income with almost no expense.

Charles Seife. Science's Big Scandal. Even Legitimate Publishers are Faking Peer Review." Slate.com (April 2015)

[41] Fred Barbash. "Major Publisher Retracts 43 Scientific Papers Amid Fake Peer-Review Scandals." *The Washington Post* (March 27, 2015)

[42] Jalees Rehman. "Cancer Research in Crisis: Are the Drugs we count on based on Bad Science?" *Salon* (September 1, 2013)

[43] Paul Voosen. "Journal Publishers Rethink a Research Mainstay: Peer Review." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (October 15, 2015) 8 and 10.

[44] This book by David Shatz was published in 2004, and the book opened with an observation by the author, "Surprisingly, this is the first book-length study of peer review that utilizes methods and resources of contemporary philosophy. In fact, it is the first wide-ranging treatment of the subject by a scholar in the humanities." Of course, this book is now outdated.

David Shatz. *Peer Review: A Critical Inquiry* (Latham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2004)

[45] One of the most widely publicized examples of the publication of bad science was the scandal surrounding ambitious graduate student Michael LaCour. Called "one of the biggest scientific frauds in recent memory," the scheme pulled in "Donald Green, a highly respected political-science professor at Columbia." As writer Jesse Singal reported,

> ..when LaCour and Green's research was eventually published in December 2014 in *Science*, one of the leading peer-reviewed research publications in the world, it resonated far and wide. "When

> contact changes minds: an expression of transmission of support for gay equality" garnered attention in the New York *Times* and a segment on "This American Life" in which a reporter tagged along with canvassers as they told heart-wrenching stories about being gay. It rerouted countless researchers' agendas, inspired activists to change their approach to voter outreach, generated shifts in grant funding, and launched follow-up experiments.

The fraud was uncovered by a graduate student, David Broockmann, after two years of well intentioned attempts to replicate the results. The story ended with embarrassment all the way around. As Singal wrote, "On May 20, the well-read science blog *Retraction Watch* broke the news of the scandal, which would eventually bring the site so much traffic that it crashed. That was it: The news was out, and David Broockman's name was all over it." This writer also pointed that it was difficult for investigators to investigate. Such investigative work wins no friends and ruins careers so egregious results are often allowed to stand in hope that in the future someone else will correct the problems. However, due to the growing number of scandals, more scientists are attempting the replicate results of previous "studies."

Jesse Singal. "The Case of the Amazing Gay-Marriage Data: How a Graduate Student Reluctantly Uncovered a Huge Scientific Fraud." *The Science of Us* (May 29, 2015)

[46] Although it discusses science and medicine and is outdated, *Editorial Peer Review: Its Strengths and Weaknesses* is one of the few discussions of peer review extant in book form.

Ann C. Weller. *Editorial Peer Review: Its Strengths and Weaknesses* (Medford, New Jersey: American Society for Information Sciences and Technology, 2001)

[47] The Faculty Handbook of Pomona College states in its section "Criteria for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure" that

> *Professional achievement, defined by excellent work in one's field recognized outside of Pomona College. The most obvious form of such work is scholarly productivity in the form of books, significant articles, the completion of publishable manuscripts, or artistic creation or performance.*

Later on the *Handbook* adds,

> In addition to the evaluation of scholarly and/or artistic accomplishment made by other Pomona College faculty and summarized in the department's recommendation to the Faculty

> Personnel Committee, the department will seek written appraisals from recognized experts outside the College.

Pomona College Faculty Handbook. *2015-2016.* 28 and 31.

[48] Dr. Fitzpatrick is an interesting story in her own right. She was on the verge of publishing a book and on the strength of the anticipated publication was going forward for tenure. Suddenly, for economic reasons, the publisher pulled the book. In response she published the book on her own and has been a strong voice for academic freedom and has continued to have a very successful career.

[49] Kathleen Fitzpatrick. "Scholarly Publishing in the Digital Age." *Between Humanities and the Digital*. Edited by Patrik Svensson and David Theo Goldberg (Cambridge, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2015) 462.

[50] The best source of discussion on new forms of publication is APE, which has meetings annually. At the 2008 conference, *Academic Publishing in Europe, Quality and Publishing* presented a number of interesting papers, including one on Open Access by Arne K. Richter. Richter concluded,

> Open access is a mission for modern, online publishing of academic work with great potential and advantages for all sides involved: the researchers (subscribers), the authors and the publishers. Based on the continuous increase in the subscription fees by about 13% per year and the resulting decrease in the availability of quality publications in the academic libraries, the general opinion was voiced that at least the work on the internet should be open accessible, i.e. barrier-free accessible and freely usable for any derivative work to proper attribution of authorship. Certainly, such a mission guarantees maximum worldwide distribution and impact of academic work and a number of simplifications and savings with regard to the tasks and responsibilities of publishers.

The author continued, "On the other side, however, it causes new, even more severe problems.." which were financial. As he explained,

> For most of our scientists worldwide it will be absolutely impossible to pay such a high price. Even more, in the previous subscription model in which publishing was free for authors, the "richer" colleagues could distribute copies, preprints and off-prints of their work to their "poorer" colleagues. In the new open access world reading would be free but publishing practically impossible for most of our colleagues. Thus, as long as the number of genuin (sic) publications in journals of high reputation is one of the key measure

> for the quality of a scientist, open access so far would only favour the rich but not necessarily the best scientists.

The proceedings of this conference are hard to find but worth searching for.

Arne K. Richter. "Open Access—A Never Ending Story." *Academic Publishing in Europe, Quality and Publishing* (Volume 28, Number 2, 2008)

[51] "Tenure Guidelines." In "Guidelines for Evaluating Digital Media Activities in Tenure, Review, and Promotion." The American Association for History and Computing (2006)

[52] Oregon State University updated its criteria for promotion in June of 2015, stating that,

> Research is the active pursuit of new ideas and knowledge. Research may add to our theoretical understanding of an area or may focus on the improved application of existing knowledge or methods. Scholarship related research results are demonstrated by characteristics such as peer review affirmation (see below). However, there are other outcomes of research activities that should be accommodated accurately in our system. Many faculty in technical fields are expected to participate actively in research. The exact definition of research for the purposes of promotion and tenure decisions, however, is discipline-specific. Thus, research may also include interpretation and application of new ideas or new methods that may have outcomes that are not peer reviewed but are consistent with the goals of the research project. Expectations and outcomes should be clearly understood by faculty within their specific discipline and delineated in faculty position descriptions, including the proportion of their research activities that are expected to have (or not to have) scholarship as outcomes.

Oregon State University Academic Affairs. *Faculty Handbook*: "Promotion and Tenure Guidelines."

[53] One of the reasons why handbooks may have failed to come to terms with digital scholarship is that it falls outside the parameters of traditional practices. As Roopiki Risam stated,

> On the other hand, "digital scholarship" is its own animal, a chimera that defies the conventions of print scholarship. Three principle differences between digital and print scholarship in the humanities require a radical revision to how we review and assess scholarly production and to how scholarly work accrues value: digital

> scholarship is often collaborative, digital scholarship is rarely finished, and digital scholarship is frequently "public." Each of these qualities of digital work invites particular concerns for review, rendering digital scholarship not readily legible to tenure and promotion or hiring committees.

By "public" Risam means that the work is rarely in academic databases and is readily available to the larger public.

Roopika Risam. "Rethinking Peer Review in the Age of Digital Humanities." *Ada. A Journal of Gender, New Media & Technology*. Number 4. "Publication and its Discontents." (2014)

[54] Texas A&M University demands a thorough investigation of the precise nature of the journals and books published related, not to the contents but to the publishers.

> Contextual information regarding presses or series in which books are published if the press is not universally recognized as a leading one (e.g., other authors who have published in the same venue, impact on the discipline of other books in same venue).
>
> Information on the quality of venues for exhibitions or performance of creative works. The standards and status of scholarly presses and journals vary considerably. Therefore, each dossier should contain a discussion of the quality of the press or journals in which the scholarly work appears, e.g., standing in the discipline or subdiscipline, acceptance rates, critical standards, and readership.

So it is not what is published but where it appears that counts.

Liberal Arts. Texas A&M University. *Faculty Review, Tenure and Promotion Procedures* (for 2015-2016) 12.
The University of Nebraska at Omaha seems to have the same criteria. The handbook states,

> The following activities are examples of research. However, each item listed requires explanatory evidence such as being peer reviewed; being regional, national, or international in nature; and having a reputation as a forum for scholarship in a particular discipline or area.

The emphasis is on the process, rather than the work, defining scholarship as that which has been peer reviewed only.

The University of Nebraska at Omaha. College of Communication, Fine Arts and Media. “Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure.”

[55] The University of North Carolina at Charlotte, like many institutions keeps the criteria vague, whether because this department included art and art history or because the faculty wishes to maintain some flexibility.

> Professional activity. Production, exhibition, performance, and publication of original art or design work; production and publication of scholarly manuscripts; and active pursuit of professional research are typical forms of professional activity. Other examples are presentations at professional meetings; lectures; service as a guest artist; acting as chair or discussant on a professional panel; acting as evaluator or adjudicator of professional work; acting as a paid consultant; receiving grants of fellowships; and holding office in a professional society association, if the activity requires extensive professional expertise.

“Department of Art & Art History Tenure Policies, Regulations and Procedures.” University of North Carolina at Charlotte. 4.

[56] “Selected Findings from the MLA. “Tenure’s 2005 Survey of Tenure and Promotion.” *Modern Language Association, Report of the Task Force on Evaluating Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion.* (2007)

[57] Patricia Cohen. “Scholars Test Web Alternative to Peer Review.” *The New York Times* (August 23, 2010)

Another interesting and informative article searches for an alternative to the old-fashioned peer review. As Martin Paul Eve noted,

> The first thing that it is important to note is that some of the original purposes of peer review have now been lost. This has come about because of the internet and the arise of nonrivalrous commodity exchange (my apologies for using the term “commodity” to refer to your journal articles but, it is, I'm afraid, to some extent the truth). In this new mode, the “ownership” of an item does not come at the expense of another person not owning it..However, the transition to a mode where there are no longer the constraints of print has wide implications for peer review. Much of the historical function of peer review is that of the gatekeeper and one of the gatekeeper's functions was to reduce the quantity of material that was allowed through, not because academics would be overloaded by the quantity of information, but rather because of the page budget in the issue of a journal. With physical commodities, there is a need to limit the intellectual material that goes into the printed artefact

> because there is a material cost for each page that has to be printed and distributed. This is no longer the case with the internet. Instead, we can distribute more with a negligible increase in cost.

Martin Paul Eve. "The Future of Peer Review." (2013)

Eve has also written a book *Open Access and the Humanities* that has an interesting discussion on the economic issue of publishing and how publishing in books or journals provides symbolic capital to the scholars and real money to the publishers themselves.

Martin Paul Eve. *Open Access and the Humanities* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014)

[58] The University of the Arts in Philadelphia stipulates in its section on promotion that

> The mission of the University as well as effective teaching necessitate active involvement in creative and scholarly developments in the individual's field. An individual faculty member's creative or scholarly work should be evaluated in terms of its quality, its level of recognition among peers, and its significance to the particular discipline.

The University of the Arts Faculty Handbook. 6.

[59] The College of Design, Architecture, Art and Planning of the University of Cincinnati provides copious lists of what should be included in a candidate's dossier but the basis for criteria is unclear. These lists are found in the section "Content/Format of Dossier" starting on page 31. The handbook posted on the Internet dates from 2006.

DAAP Faculty Handbook.

[60] Matthew K. Gold. *Debates in the Digital Humanities* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2012) 8.

[61] Typical of this new type of academic, Brad King, a digital journalist, wrote,

> I believe in science, but I spend almost no time reading the academic literature where the science of my craft (journalism) has traditionally been published. I spend even less time trying to craft research that would get published in those outlets. For most normal human beings, this is not a controversial stance. As a tenure-track professor, this cuts against the grain of how you are normally told to

> proceed. In the Academy, professors traditionally are expected to do research and then publish that research in one of a number of peer-reviewed journals. A growing number of faculty, including myself, have begun to reject that road to tenure. The reason: the academic publishing system is built around a 1-2 year publishing process that requires the best and brightest minds to turn over all of their intellectual property without any compensation for that work.

As an outsider, King reported on what he felt to be the absurdity of the system:

> Professors have long been at the mercy of big academic publishers. The tenure system, rightly built on the idea that scholars must add to the collective knowledge of their discipline in order to demonstrate their worth, demands that academic publish results of their research so that others might evaluate it.
> Until recently, pre-tenure faculty had little choice in this system. You were expected to shut your mouth and toil away at your research, collecting data, and writing up your conclusions. Once finished, you would ship those findings off to journals, which would send those manuscripts out for review. If the paper met the criteria of the publication, it would be published. The culmination of this long process came with the realization that your work was going to reach a limited audience. In fact very few people could afford access to the very best journals, which meant counter-intuitively the more prestigious and important your finding, the less likely it would find a wide audience.

Brad King. "Why I Won't Try to Publish as I Move Towards Tenure." *Brad King: The Appalachian Tech* (Sunday, September 1, 2013)

[62] Thomas H. P. Gould. *Do we still need Peer Review?: An Argument for Change* (Lanham, Maryland: Scarecrow Press, 2013) 123.

[63] The Department Evaluation Committee for the Central Connecticut State University Department of Art adopted a slightly more open policy towards art history publications in 2009, writing

1. Art History faculty applying for promotion to Professor must provide evidence of a substantial and significant record primarily of significant scholarly publication but also of professional presentations and research.
2. b) All publications must be refereed and must appear in venues of demonstrated high quality within the candidate's discipline.
3. c) Candidates working in alternative and/or nontraditional creative activity should be certain to provide adequate material to document the scope and significance of their work.

Central Connecticut State University Department of Art. “Promotion and Tenure and Guidelines.”

The University of North Alabama’s Department of Arts and Sciences also has a more open-ended polity towards promotion and tenure, creating these guidelines, which were approved in 2012:

> *Scholarship and creative accomplishment are essential for the academic profession. Every successful candidate for tenure or promotion is expected to provide convincing evidence of a pattern of scholarly or creative accomplishment appropriate to his or her discipline during the period of employment at UNA. Scholarship should include research or other forms of intellectual discovery made available to professional peers through publication and/or presentation beyond this university and to the local area.*

University of North Alabama. Department of Arts and Sciences. “Tenure and Promotion Guidelines Applicable to all College of Arts and Sciences Faculty.”

The University of Nebraska-Lincoln also seeks to remain open to different criteria in different disciplines, leaving it up to the departmental chairs to establish local standards while remaining within certain parameters. This university stresses “creativity” in faculty work.

> Excellence in creativity and in significance of contribution is the most important standard by which to judge the extent of a faculty member's achievement (*Guidelines*, III.C.). Since what constitutes excellence in particular cases is a matter of judgment that varies from discipline to discipline, faculty members must be given reasonable assistance to understand the components of judgments of excellence. The A&S *Handbook* refers to the need to apply criteria flexibly because the importance of teaching effectiveness, research productivity, or creative activity and service varies among disciplines. However, it requires all faculty members to show evidence of satisfactory teaching or associated activities, intellectual or creative activity related to their disciplines, and responsible participation in service or associated activities.

University of Nebraska-Lincoln. College of Art and Sciences. “Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.”

[64] This extremely complex and detailed set of criteria can be found in the handbook for Clayton State University, describing itself as, “Clayton State University is a public university in Morrow, Georgia, serving Metro Atlanta,” and is

part of the University of Georgia system. The Handbook seems to be specifically for Clayton. In the "Overview of the Faculty Evaluation Process: Department of Humanities" the chapter begins by stating that criteria depends upon checks in boxes,

Exceeds expectations: faculty member has either a. one box more than required *checked or b. has two checks in one box*

Superior: faculty member has either
a. two boxes more than required checked;
b. one box more than required checked and two checks in one box check; or c. two checks in two different boxes

More detailed analysis on what is "half" or "whole" follows.

"Overview of the Faculty Evaluation Process: Department of Humanities." Clayton State University

[65] For example, at Marshall University, the College of Liberal Arts asserts that

> *For all forms of scholarship, presentation of one's scholarship in a peer-reviewed venue that is open for public scrutiny is the sine qua non for demonstrating one's scholarly and creative work. Unless there are compelling considerations, publication in a peer-reviewed venue is generally the highest academic achievement. Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion must provide evidence of:*

- *publications;*
- *scholarly presentations;*
- *creative presentations/performances;*
- *grants and contracts;*
- *applied disciplinary research;*
- *notable professional recognition in one's major area(s) for scholarship and/or creative activities;*
- *serving as the editor of a discipline-respected journal in which the editor's primary role is editorial review and manuscript selection; college, university, state, or national awards for scholarly and/or creative activities.*

This document seems to have been written in 2005 and is not be used after 2012, but it is unclear what has replaced the guidelines above.

Marshall University, College of Liberal Arts. "Promotion and Tenure."

[66] Scott Jaschik. Ibid.

[67] The College Art Association has acknowledged a need to revise its guidelines and is in the process of using a $90,000 grant to investigate the issue. As the website states,

> The need for evaluative guidelines has been expressed by professors of art and architectural history who have developed research and/or publications using digital technologies, have created new digital tools for interpretation and understanding of art-historical and place-based subjects, or have collaborated with other scholars to develop digital archives and resources; by professors and administrators who have responsibility for dissertations and promotion and tenure committees but lack the necessary tools to assess digital scholarship; by CAA's and SAH's editorial boards and advisory committees, whose journals and online academic resources now require guidelines to facilitate critical reviews of digital scholarship; by CAA and SAH publication and award juries who need protocols for judging the quality of digital scholarship to determine awards; by academic publishers; and by other disciplines and their learned societies.

"Mellon Foundation Awards Grant to CAA to partner with SAH on Digital Scholarship Guidelines." *CAA News,* October 29, 2014.

[68] College Art Association. *Standards and Guidelines.* "Standards for Retention and Tenure of Art Historians." Found under a heading that is not recognized as a hyperlink: http://www.collegeart.org/guidelines/tenure

[69] The lack of specifics embedded in the apparently specific requirements spelled out in faculty handbooks is reflected in the real world where the means of "counting" accomplishments is very confused. In a short article Joanne Doyle and Michael Cuthill wrote that

> The academic publishing process is important for communicating research findings and demonstrating research quality, and has remained an academic imperative encouraged by research funders and institutional leaders (Colquhoun, 2011). Professional recognition is achieved by publishing in high reputation journals that are regarded as prestigious. Academia tends to reward those with the longest CVs and the most publications (Neill, 2008). Yet there are multiple issues with using academic metrics for determining research quality. For example, citation analysis is regarded as a poor substitute for qualitative review and peer assessment (Nightingale & Marshall, 2012) and focusing on impact factors may be a disincentive to pursue innovative research that has longer

> publication time-frames (Alberts, 2013). Quantity does not imply quality and as Gad-el-Hak warns, 'counting the publications of individuals should not be used to evaluate them' (Gadel-Hak, 2004, p. 61).

The authors put forward an alternative suggestion,

> In the looming shadow of the impact agenda, a better understanding of how research impacts society would make it easier for academics to release themselves from the 'publish or perish' imperative to embrace a broader approach which actively seeks to support positive real-world impact. In a Higher Education environment characterized by co-production of knowledge, digital scholarship and community engagement, the research impact/research quality nexus is more complex and more important than ever before. The philosophy of 'get visible or vanish' is gaining momentum. But is it the new academic mantra? Are bibliometrics and altmetrics able to replace the traditional peer-review process in assessing research quality? Perhaps the tongue-in-cheek Kardashian Index (Hall, 2014)–that measures the discrepancy between a scientist's publication record and social media profile based on comparing numbers of citations and Twitter followers–isn't so crazy after all? Is 'being visible' enough to sustain an academic career in a sector embracing the digital revolution yet still dominated by ancient traditions?

Joanne Doyle and Michael Cuthill. "Does 'get visible or vanish' Herald the End of 'publish or perish?'" *Higher Education Research & Development*. (2015 Vol. 34, No. 3) 671-674.

[70] Meanwhile an interesting paper has been published on Open Access. In response to the realization that the current system of academic publication is outmoded and is no longer working as it should, Rebecca Kennison and Lisa Norberg published "A Scalable and Sustainable Approach to Open Access Publishing and Archiving for Humanities and Social Sciences. A White Paper." The duo states,

> Sharing, curating, and preserving scholarship is imperative for the advancement of research, just as openness is central to the development of new modes of teaching and learning. Deep structural changes to the scholarly communication system are needed not only to respond to the current funding crises in higher education and the emerging forms of scholarship in the digital age, but also to foster and deepen the connections between the academy and the wider public. Only a model that builds

> collaborative alliances across a wide variety of institutions and that engages a range of stakeholders can provide a fair and equitable path to truly open and sustainable forms of scholarship.

This study is quantitative and one of the few in which the humanities are examined. The goals and aims are laudable and one can only hope that they will be given serious consideration. However, based upon my reading of articles published twenty years ago, recommending changes to the publish or perish system, for example, good suggestions and common sense are rarely followed. The key words that suggest that this white paper will remain untenable are "sharing" and "deepen the connections between the academy and the wider public," words that are alien in the Ivory Tower.

[71] Marshall Poe. "E=Publish or Perish." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (May 3, 2002)

[72] In 2010 Jan Armstong wrote of the impact of a belief system that is based upon negativity,

> A few years ago, a colleague and I spotted an article posted in a departmental display case. My friend peered at it through the glass and said with a sneer: "Ha! It's just a think piece!" As an anthropologist and social foundations scholar, I have been much impressed by the intensity with which members of various academic tribes valorize particular kinds of scholarship while denigrating others. My colleague's training in educational psychology had taught her to value only data- based reports in national and international refereed journals and to view other writing projects with contempt. Such differences cause serious misunderstandings within Colleges of Education, limiting prospects for faculty collaboration across departments and program areas. They also foster a competitive milieu that may dissuade minority students and women from pursuing academic careers.

Jan Armstong. "Political Economy of Academic Writing Practices." *Journal of Thought* (Spring-Summer 2010)

[73] Mark de Rond and Alan N. Miller. "Publish or Perish. Bane or Boon of Academic Life?" *CiteSeer*

[74] In point of fact Elsevier has a, shall we say, unpleasant reputation among databases, a group of corporate re-publishers that have a bad name in general.

Ellen Wexler. "What a Mass Exodus at a Linguistics Journal Means for Scholarly Publication." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (November 5, 2015)

---

[75] Steve Kolowich. “Fight Over Academic Publisher is Stoked by Fear of Corporate Values.” *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (December 11, 2015) A8.

[76] Ellen Wexler. “As Academia.edu Grows, Some Scholars Voice Concerns.” *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (December 11, 2015) A10.

[77] Leonard Cassuto. "How Graduate Schools are a Complete Disaster—how we can Fix That." *The Washington Post* (September 15, 2015) This article was also reprinted in *The Los Angeles Times*, November 30, 2015.

[78] The great historian Lynn Hunt wrote an expansive analysis of the declining appeal of the humanities, citing the “feminization” of the field and its consequent drop in prestige relative to the “hard” sciences, as opposed “soft’ liberal studies. The story of the humanities in the twenty-first century, then, mirrors the fate of other professions when women entered---secondary school teaching, nursing, and secretarial work---salaries immediately dipped and the value of the positions in society plummeted. When the humanities became “feminine,” it also became “frivolous” and unnecessary. As White wrote almost twenty years ago,

> The “feminization” of the humanities (and to some extent of higher education more generally) raises serious questions about long-term consequences, for the feminization of work almost always has led to a decline in skill status in other occupations in the past..There is a correlation between relative pay and the proportion of women in a field; faculty in those academic fields that have attracted a relatively high proportion of women are paid less on average that those in fields that have not attracted women in the same numbers..As more and more positions go part-time or temporary and more and more teaching is done by lecturers and adjuncts, the social structure of the university faculty is likely to become proletarianized at the bottom. There are intellectual consequences as well. A recent study of full-time but non-tenure track faculty has shown that compared to untenured faculty on a tenure trace they had less interest and engagement in research, less of a sense that they could influence matters in their department, and more of a sense that they had made the wrong career choice and might soon leave academia.

Lynn Hunt. “Democratization and Decline? The Consequences of Demographic Change in the Humanities.” *What Happened to the Humanities?* Edited by Alvin Kerman (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997) 21.

[79] Michael Bérubé. “The Humanities Unraveled.” *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (February 28, 2013)

---

[80] As early as 1977 Walter Kaufmann wrote bluntly,

> The humanities are in deep trouble. Those whose business is with higher education agree that something needs to be done. But as yet there has been insufficient discussion about what has gone wrong and about goals..it has suddenly become almost hopeless for young people with a doctorate in the humanities to find jobs as teachers.

In retrospect the 1970s are seen as the last Golden Age for teaching jobs.

Walter Kaufmann. *The Future of the Humanities. Teaching, Art, Religion, Philosophy, Literature, and History* (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1977) xxx.

[81] Tamar Lewin wrote of the crisis in the Humanities at the universities.

> Parents, even more than students, often focus single-mindedly on employment. Jill Lepore, the chairwoman of Harvard's history and literature program, tells of one young woman who came to her home, quite enthusiastic, for an event for students interested in the program, and was quickly deluged with messages from her parents. "They kept texting her: leave right now, get out of there, that is a house of pain," she said. Some professors flinch when they hear colleagues talking about the need to prepare students for jobs. "I think that's conceding too quickly," said Mark Edmundson, an English professor at the University of Virginia. "We're not a feeder for law school; our job is to help students learn to question." His university had 394 English majors last year, down from 501 when he arrived in 1984, but Professor Edmundson said he does not fret about the future. "In the end, we can't lose," he said. "We have William Shakespeare." But for students worrying about their own future, Shakespeare can seem an obstacle to getting on with their lives.

Tamar Lewin. "As Interest Fades in the Humanities, Colleges Worry." *The New York Times* (October 30, 2013)

[82] A 2013 article on the Digital Humanities quotes a scholar as making the case that the Humanities are applicable to today's world.

> We want to show both undergraduates and graduates that studying the humanities in all its forms is an extraordinarily useful way of

getting ready for the outside world. Humanistic learning gives you habits of mind with posing questions, with making arguments, and a certain rigor in dealing within climates of diverse opinions," said Diana Sorensen, James F. Rothenberg Professor of Romance Languages and Literatures and of Comparative Literature. "One of the most vibrant areas of development is the area of the digital humanities. It's not just turning to a medium in order to produce knowledge in different formats, it really is revolutionizing the way we think, the way we produce knowledge.

Colin Manning. "Humanities in the Digital Age." *Harvard Gazette* (April 3, 2013)

[83] Suber. Op cit.

[84] In a brief but interesting article, Joseph Esposito wrote about "The Market for Social Sciences and Humanities Publications," in reference to a 2013-2014 report,

> The publishing trend away from the SSH fields is likely to continue, in large part because the funding–institutional, governmental, and philanthropic–is either being reduced or increasingly directed to STM areas..While STM publishing is almost entirely focused in journals, books play a very large role in SSH.. While STM publishing is dominated by a few very large companies, the market for SSH is fragmented, with no single company having a dominant position. While not-for-profit organizations are a major participant in all areas of research publishing, the university press world is heavily tilted toward SSH. Library budgets increasingly are being skewed toward STM on one hand, journals on the other. The deep affiliation between STM and journals publishing is a part of this..I came away from reading this report with the conviction that SSH publishing needs a new idea. Some people believe that open access (OA) is that idea, but I doubt it. OA has problems operating in the SSH area for a number of reasons, not least the absence of funding to pay for Gold OA. But in any event, when you study library circulation records, the problem for many humanities publications is weak demand, not barriers to access. If scholarly monographs are languishing on the shelves at major research universities, why would making them accessible to people outside the academy meaningfully drive up usage..My personal hunch is that growth in these fields may require the ramping up of initiatives to reach out in two directions: into the classroom, with new publications and formats designed to aid in undergraduate education (because we do care about our history and how the

> world came to be as it is), and beyond the walls of the academy. That latter effort, popularization, is not high status (today), but it is linked to the public's support of SSH education and research.

Joseph Esposito. "The Market for Social Sciences and Humanities Publications." *The Scholarly Kitchen. The Market for Social Sciences and* Humanities (January 28, 2014)

[85] In an excellent if ambiguous article on the digital humanities, David Theo Goldberg wrote, beginning his essay with the following sentences,

> Digital humanities has become a given. Perhaps much more a given than the humanities at large, which seems ever in crisis, even under duress. The humanities, if you believe *The New Republic* is even under "deathwatch" these days, as it seems to have been almost perennially..The tables are turned when digital humanities is moved to advocate for the humanities at large, for the humanities under duress. There was never a great deal of reciprocation; the humanities at large, at least early one, was more often disdainful of the digital, viewing it as a convenient technology, nothing more—not a principled commitment or intellectual practice for which to advocate. The brother from the same mother but perhaps a distant father was never a sibling considered quite one of us. Especially when, resentfully observed, the costs of digital humanities' production outstripped multifold that of the humanities conventionally understood save when grants more comparable to the applied sciences were produced with some regularity.

Towards the end of the article, Goldberg pondered the state of the digital humanities.

> The digital humanities, then, is sometimes taken, whether explicitly or more readily implicitly, as the—or even a—compelling solution to the current institutional challenges of the humanities..the instrumentalities of the digital have steadily cohered under an assumed discipline apart. It has developed its own specialist language, technologically inspired, its driving concerns, its associations and networks, practices and privileging. It has, in short, taken on all the bad habits of self-containment and, by extension, constraint, even the arrogant self-assurance of a reifying practice in denial. Digital humanities, it turns out, has become its own discipline: it speaks its own language, normativizes the sorts of questions and projects to be pursued, has its own journals and associations and networks and book series, and often its own

> divisions or offices at major humanities funding agencies and foundations.

Goldberg articulated the great fears of people who pursue scholarship on the Internet: the digital humanities is merely the shifting of the humanities onto the web, where the practices of old are replicated, thus stifling the technological capabilities of the endless spaces of cyberspace by establishing the old familiar barriers.

David Theo Goldberg. "Deprovincializing Digital Humanities." *Between Humanities and the Digital*. Edited by Patrik Svensson and David Theo Goldberg (Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2015) 163 and 168.

[86] Andrew Prior, a specialist in "noise aesthetics," wrote,

> It must be said at this point that performative and paralogical legitimation are not mutually exclusive: research might be in the best interest of the institution even whilst it is critically aware; artistic processes may be antagonistic and self-reflexive and nevertheless benefit the systems of legitimation they exist within – for example through incorporation into art markets, festival circuits, commercial products, the language of film, television and music. Moreover, paralogy need not be confined to the arts. For Lyotard it can be used across disciplinary boundaries and beyond academic contexts. One might say that in any given field it reverses the cybernetic model, foregrounding the specifics and granularity of knowledge over its systemic characteristics.

Andrew Prior. "Glitching Paralogy." *APRJA Journals/Newspapers* (November 20, 2012)

[87] Niels Brügger. "What About the Postmodern? The Concept of the Postmodern in Lyotard." Robert Harvey and Lawrence R. Schehr. Editors. *Jean-François Lyotard: Time and Judgment* (2001) 84.

[88] Stephen Barker. "The Weight of Writing: Lyotard's Anti-Aesthetic in À l'écrite bâté." *Rereading Jean-François Lyotard: Essays on his Later Works.* Edited by Heidi Bickis and Rob Schields (Surry, England: Ashgate Press, 2013)

[89] Harvard College's report on the fall of the Humanities and the plan to save the Liberal Arts was written in 2013 and reads as if it were written twenty years ago. Although the report indicates awareness of contemporary technology, the lone paragraph devoted to a very important change in the development of discourse is astonishingly obtuse and seemingly uninformed as to the current state of affairs.

> This constantly changing technological context presents challenges born of new content, new tools, new competences, and new interpretive challenges. The great movement of critical philology in the fifteenth century was energized and challenged by the information technology revolution of printing; we feel energized by the transformative challenge of putting our traditions of interpretation to the work of navigating our exhilaratingly expanded archives. Content and interpretation are and have always been inextricably connected in humanistic studies. Archives are themselves cultural artifacts that must be built and interpreted with the expertise appropriate to their nature. Further interpretations are then produced from engagement with the archive, and are tested, refined and refuted either by re-examining the archive, or by reference to additional materials.

The Teaching of the Arts and Humanities at Harvard College: Mapping the Future.

[90] N. Katherine Hayles discussed the divide between the traditional humanities and the digital humanities:

> If, as public opinion and declining enrolments might indicate, the traditional humanities are in trouble, entangled with this trouble is an opportunity…Neither the traditional nor the digital humanities can succeed as well alone as they can together. If the traditional humanities are at risk of becoming marginal to the main business of the contemporary academy and society, the digital humanities are at risk of becoming a trade practice held captive by the interests of corporate capitalism. Together, they offer an enriched, expanded repertoire of strategies, approaches, and assumptions that can more fully address the challenges of the information age than can either alone. By this I do not mean to imply that the way forward will be harmonious or easy. Nevertheless, the clash of assumptions between the traditional and digital humanities presents an opportunity to rethink humanistic practices and values at the time when the Age of Print, so important in forming the explicit and preconscious assumptions of the humanities, is passing.

N. Katherine Hayles. "How We Think." *Understanding Digital Humanities.* Edited by David M. Berry (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012) 61.

[91] The amount of scholarship moving to the Internet is impressive. One interesting example is *Open Book Publishers*. On page for the Digital Humanities, the website states,

---

> *Digital Humanities Series: Knowledge, Thought and Practice*
>
> Invention and application of digital methods, tools and media have had significant effects on scholarly research and are raising new questions about how we conceive knowledge, think about scholarship and develop new epistemic practices. Especially since the development of the Web new opportunities for scholarly communications, including Open Access publication, have begun to change disciplines by altering the scope and availability of sources for study, articles and monographs, and have created space for hybrid forms. Large-scale digitization projects and hyperactive social media have brought into focus kinds of social and historical texts, images and other data formerly difficult or impossible to reach. The changes are not merely to volume and mechanisms of access and analysis but also to the history, sociology, psychology and philosophy of knowledge. Culturally significant data made mutable and manipulable raise fundamental questions we are just beginning to notice. *Digital Humanities Series: Knowledge, Thought and Practice* is dedicated to the exploration of all the above by scholars across disciplines and offers them a venue for high-quality, Open Access publication. We encourage submissions of original research that investigate the links and, increasingly, co-evolutionary interrelations between the digital and these disciplines. We are particularly interested in publishing monographs and collected works that don't naturally conform to traditional print formats and that utilise digital technologies. The series is overseen by an international board of experts and its publications subjected to rigorous peer review. Proposals in any area of the Digital Humanities are invited. Please do not hesitate to contact us (digitalhumanities@openbookpublishers.com) if you would like to discuss a publishing proposal or concept and ways we might work together to best realise it.

Compared to print publication, the tone is welcoming and encouraging.

Open Book Publishers

Bibliography

Books

Bernhardt, Beth R., Leah H. Hinds, and Katrina P. Strauch, Editors. *Too Much is not Enough!* Charleston Conference Proceedings 2013 (Against the Grain Press, LLC, 2014)

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Homo Academicus* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1984)

Cohen, Patricia. "Scholars Test Web Alternative to Peer Review." *The New York Times* (August 23, 2010)

Dufresne, Todd. "Preface." *The Economy as Cultural System: Theory, Capitalism, Crisis.* Edited by Todd Dufresne and Clara Sacchetti (2012)

Eells, Linda L.. "For Better or for Worse: The Joys and Woes of E-Journals." *Emerging Issues in the Electronic Environment. Challenges for Librarians and Researchers in the Sciences*. Edited by Jeannie P. Miller (Routledge, 2013)

Eve, Martin Paul. "The Future of Peer Review." (2013)
Open Access and the Humanities (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014)

Fitzpatrick, Kathleen. "Scholarly Publishing in the Digital Age." *Between Humanities and the Digital*. Edited by Patrik Svensson and David Theo Goldberg (Cambridge, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2015)

Planned Obsolescence: Publishing, Technology and the Future of the Academy (New York: New York University Press, 2011)

Dr. Morgan Giddings. *The Passive Voice. A Lawyer's Thoughts on Authors, Self-Publishing and Traditional Publishing.* "Peer Review, Self-Publishing, and Blowhards." (July 19, 2014)

Gold, Matthew K. *Debates in the Digital Humanities* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2012)

Goldberg, David Theo. "Deprovincializing Digital Humanities." *Between Humanities and the Digital*. Edited by Patrik Svensson and David Theo Goldberg (Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2015)

Gould, Thomas H. P. *Do we still need Peer Review?: An Argument for Change* (Lanham, Maryland: Scarecrow Press, 2013)

Hayles, N. Katherine. "How We Think." *Understanding Digital Humanities.* Edited by David M. Berry (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012)

Hunt, Lynn. "Democratization and Decline? The Consequences of Demographic Change in the Humanities." *What Happened to the Humanities?* Edited by Alvin Kerman (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997)

Kaufmann, Walter. *The Future of the Humanities. Teaching, Art, Religion, Philosophy, Literature, and History* (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1977)

Lessig, Lawrence. *The Future of Ideas. The Fate of the Commons in a Connected World* (New York: Random House in 2001, now licensed by Creative Commons) See also his TED talk, "Laws that Choke Creativity" and "Prof. Lawrence Lessig Explains Creative Commons Licensing."

Lyotard, Jean-François. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge.* Translation for the French by Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi (Paris: Les Editions de Minuit, 1979 and Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1984).

Regazzi, John J. *Scholarly Communications. A History of Content as King to Content as Kingmaker* (Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015)

Seife, Charles. Science's Big Scandal. Even Legitimate Publishers are Faking Peer Review." Slate.com (April 2015)

Shatz, David. *Peer Review: A Critical Inquiry* (Latham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2004)

Weller, Ann C. *Editorial Peer Review: Its Strengths and Weaknesses* (Medford, New Jersey: American Society for Information Sciences and Technology, 2001)

Articles

---"The Cost of Salami Slicing." *Nature Materials* (Volume 4, Number 1, 2005)

---"Mellon Foundation Awards Grant to CAA to partner with SAH on Digital Scholarship Guidelines." *CAA News,* October 29, 2014.

--- "Unreliable research. Trouble at the Lab. Scientists like to think of science as self-correcting. To an alarming degree, it is not" *The Economist*. (Oct 19th 2013).

Alexie, Sherman. "Sherman Alexie Speaks Out on The Best American Poetry 2015" (September 7, 2015).

Armstrong, Jan. "Political Economy of Writing Practices." *Journal of Thought* (Spring Summer 2010)

Barbash, Fred. "Major Publisher Retracts 43 Scientific Papers Amid Fake Peer-Review Scandals." *The Washington Post* (March 27, 2015)

Barker, Stephen. "The Weight of Writing: Lyotard's Anti-Aesthetic in À l'écrite bâté." *Rereading Jean-François Lyotard: Essays on his Later Works.* Edited by Heidi Bickis and Rob Schields (Surry, England: Ashgate Press, 2013)

Bartaen, Kristine M. "Digital Scholarship and the Tenure and Promotion Process." *The Academic Commons For the Liberal Education Community* (July 24, 2014)

Bérubé, Michael. "The Humanities Unraveled." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (February 28, 2013)

Biagioli, Mario. "From Book Censorship to Academic Peer Review." *Emergences: Journal for the Study of Media & Composite Cultures.* Volume 12, Number 1 (2002)

Brügger, Niels. "What About the Postmodern? The Concept of the Postmodern in Lyotard." Robert Harvey and Lawrence R. Schehr. Editors. *Jean-François Lyotard: Time and Judgment* (2001)

Cavanagh, Shelia. Living in a Digital World: Rethinking Peer Review, Collaboration, and Open Access. *Journal of Digital Humanities.* Volume 1, Number 4 (Fall 2012)

Chong, Philippa. "Legitimate judgment in art, the scientific world reversed? Maintaining critical distance in evaluation." *Social Studies of Science* 43(2)

Coggburn, Jerrell D. and Stephen Neely. "Publish or Perish? Examining Academic Tenure Standards in Public Affairs and Administration Programs." *The Journal of Public Affairs Education* (Volume 21, No. 2 Spring 2015)

Cassuto, Leonard. "How Graduate Schools are a Complete Disaster—how we can Fix That." *The Washington Post* (September 15, 2015) This article was also reprinted in *The Los Angeles Times*, November 30, 2015.

Doyle, Joanne and Michael Cuthill. "Does 'get visible or vanish' Herald the End of 'publish or perish?'" *Higher Education Research & Development*. (2015 Vol. 34, No. 3)

Esposito, Joseph. "The Market for Social Sciences and Humanities Publications." *The Scholarly Kitchen. The Market for Social Sciences and* Humanities (January 28, 2014)

Etchells, Pete and Chris Chambers. "The Games we Play: A Troubling Dark Side in Academic Publishing." *The Guardian* (March 12, 2015)

Fisher, Gabriel. "Monopoly on Truth. Five For-Profit Companies Control More than 50% of Academic Publishing." *Quartz* (July 2, 2015)

Fountain, Kathleen Carlisle. "To Web or Not to Web? The Evaluation of World Wide Web Publishing in the Academy." Deborah Lines Andersen. *Digital Scholarship in the Tenure, Promotion, and Review Process.* Edited by Deborah Lines Andersen. (Routledge, 2004)

Galarza, Alex, Jason Heppler, and Douglas Seefeldt. "A Call to Redefine Historical Scholarship in the Digital Turn." *Journal of Digital Humanities.* Volume 1, Number 4 (Fall 2012)

Giddings, Dr. Morgan. *The Passive Voice. A Lawyer's Thoughts on Authors, Self-Publishing and Traditional Publishing.* "Peer Review, Self-Publishing, and Blowhards." (July 19, 2014)

Haustein, Stefanie and Philippe Mongeon. "The Oligopoly of Academic Publishers in the Digital Era." *PLOS One* (June 10, 2015)

Holley, Dr. Robert P.. "Self Publishing and Academic Libraries."

Jaschik, Scott. "Tenure in a Digital Era." *Inside Higher Ed*. (May 26, 2009)

Kennison, Rebecca and Lisa Norberg."A Scalable and Sustainable Approach to Open Access Publishing and Archiving for Humanities and Social Sciences. A White Paper."

King, Brad. "Why I Won't Try to Publish as I Move Towards Tenure." *Brad King: The Appalachian Tech* (Sunday, September 1, 2013)

Kolowich, Steve. "Fight Over Academic Publisher is Stoked by Fear of Corporate Values." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (December 11, 2015)

Lambert, Craig. "The Wild West of Academic Publishing. The Trouble Present and Promising Future of Scholarly Communication." *Harvard Magazine* (January-February 2015)

Lewin, Tamar. "As Interest Fades in the Humanities, Colleges Worry." *The New York Times* (October 30, 2013)

Manning, Colin. "Humanities in the Digital Age." *Harvard Gazette* (April 3, 2013)

McCabe, Bret. "Publish or Perish: Academic Publishing Confronts its Digital Future." *Johns Hopkins Magazine* (Fall 2013)

Nichols, Catherine. "*Homme de Plume*: What I Learned Sending My Novel Out Under a Male Name." *Jezebel* (August 4, 2015)

Poe, Marshall. "E=Publish or Perish." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (May 3, 2002)

Presner, Todd. "How to Evaluate Digital Scholarship." UCLA's Digital Humanities program (September 2011)

Prior, Andrew. "Glitching Paralogy." *APRJA Journals/Newspapers* (November 20,

Raben, Joseph. "Tenure, Promotion and Digital Publication." *Digital Humanities Quarterly* (Volume 1, Number 1, 2007)

Rehman, Jalees. "Cancer Research in Crisis: Are the Drugs we count on based on Bad Science?" *Salon* (September 1, 2013)

Richter, Arne K. "Open Access—A Never Ending Story." *Academic Publishing in Europe, Quality and Publishing* (Volume 28, Number 2, 2008)

Risam, Roopika. "Rethinking Peer Review in the Age of Digital Humanities." *Ada. A Journal of Gender, New Media & Technology*. Number 4. "Publication and its Discontents." (2014)

Rond, Mark de and Alan N. Miller. "Publish or Perish. Bane or Boon of Academic Life?" *CiteSeer*

Roscorla, Tanya. "Open Access to Scholarly Work Gains Steam in California Universities." *Center for Digital Education* (August 8, 2013)

Smith, Richard. "Peer review: a flawed process at the heart of science and journals." Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine (2006 Apr; 99(4): 178–182.)

Singal, Jesse. "The Case of the Amazing Gay-Marriage Data: How a Graduate Student Reluctantly Uncovered a Huge Scientific Fraud." *The Science of Us* (May 29, 2015)

Suber, Peter. "Knowledge as a Public Good." *SPARC* (November 2009)

Sweeney, Aldrin E. "Tenure and Promotion: Should You Publish in Electronic Journals?" *The Journal of Electronic Publishing* (Volume 6, Issue 2, December 2000)

Paul Voosen. "Journal Publishers Rethink a Research Mainstay: Peer Review." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (October 15, 2015)

Wacquant, Loïc J. D. "For a Socio-Analysis of Intellectuals: On "Homo Academicus." Berkeley Journal of Sociology (Volume 34, Symposium on the Foundations of Social Science, 1989)

Waldman, Katy . "The White Poet Who Used an Asian Pseudonym to Get Published Is a Cheater, Not a Crusader" *Slate.com* (July 30, 2015)

Wexler, Ellen. "What a Mass Exodus at a Linguistics Journal Means for Scholarly Publication." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (November 5, 2015)

Yang, Zheng and Yu Li. "University Faculty Awareness and Attitudes Towards Open Access Publishing and the Institutional Repository: A Case Study." *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication* (Volume 3, Issue 1, May 26, 2015)

Guidelines

Tenure Guidelines." In "Guidelines for Evaluating Digital Media Activities in Tenure, Review, and Promotion." The American Association for History and Computing (2006)

Central Connecticut State University Department of Art. "Promotion and Tenure and Guidelines."

College Art Association. *Standards and Guidelines.* "Standards for Retention and Tenure of Art Historians:" http://www.collegeart.org/guidelines/tenure

College of Design, Architecture, Art and Planning of the University of Cincinnati. *DAAP Faculty Handbook*.

"Department of Art & Art History Tenure Policies, Regulations and Procedures." University of North Carolina at Charlotte.

MLA. “Tenure’s 2005 Survey of Tenure and Promotion.” *Modern Language Association, Report of the Task Force on Evaluating Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion.* (2007)

Marshall University, College of Liberal Arts. “Promotion and Tenure.”

“Overview of the Faculty Evaluation Process: Department of Humanities.” Clayton State University

Oregon State University Academic Affairs. *Faculty Handbook*: “Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.”

Pomona College Faculty Handbook. *2015-2016.*

Liberal Arts. Texas A&M University. *Faculty Review, Tenure and Promotion Procedures* (for 2015-2016)

University of Nebraska-Lincoln. College of Art and Sciences. “Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.”

The University of the Arts Faculty Handbook.

The University of Nebraska at Omaha. College of Communication, Fine Arts and Media. “Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure.”

University of North Alabama. Department of Arts and Sciences. “Tenure and Promotion Guidelines Applicable to all College of Arts and Sciences Faculty.”