

Bucknell University

Bucknell Digital Commons

Faculty Contributions to Books

Faculty Scholarship

1-2023

Bridging Communities of Practice: Cross-Institutional Collaboration for Undergraduate Digital Scholars

Carrie M. Pirmann

Bucknell University, cmp016@bucknell.edu

R.C. Miessler

Gettysburg College

Clinton Baugess

Gettysburg College

Kevin Moore

Gettysburg College

Courtney Paddick

Bloomsburg University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.bucknell.edu/fac_books



Part of the [Digital Humanities Commons](#), and the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Pirmann, Carrie M.; Miessler, R.C.; Baugess, Clinton; Moore, Kevin; and Paddick, Courtney, "Bridging Communities of Practice: Cross-Institutional Collaboration for Undergraduate Digital Scholars" (2023). *Faculty Contributions to Books*. 268.

https://digitalcommons.bucknell.edu/fac_books/268

This Contribution to Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Scholarship at Bucknell Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Contributions to Books by an authorized administrator of Bucknell Digital Commons. For more information, please contact dcadmin@bucknell.edu.

CHAPTER 7

Bridging Communities of Practice: Cross-Institutional Collaboration for Undergraduate Digital Scholars

*R. C. Miessler, Clinton Baugess, Kevin Moore,
Courtney Paddick, and Carrie Pirmann*

Introduction

At Bucknell University and Gettysburg College, an increasing focus on supporting creative undergraduate research as intensive, high-impact experiences has resulted in both institutions implementing library-led digital scholarship fellowships for their students. Gettysburg's Digital Scholarship Summer Fellowship began in 2016, and Bucknell's Digital Scholarship Summer Research Fellowship in 2017.¹ While academic libraries have emerged as leaders on college campuses for digital humanities (DH) services, the programs at Gettysburg and Bucknell are distinctive in their structured curricula, a focus on independent student research, and the development of a local community of practice. Each program situates undergraduate research in the field of digital humanities, providing methodological and technological support as students explore their own topics of humanistic inquiry and develop public-facing digital projects during the summer.

In addition to sharing digital tools that help students interpret, analyze, and present their original scholarship, the programs are equally invested in giving



each summer's cohort a broad introduction to digital humanities, which includes introducing them to the larger DH community. Building bridges to similar DH communities of practice at other institutions allows students and librarians to share their work, learn from their peers, and develop a network of like-minded practitioners. Constructing these connections requires close collaboration to ensure alignment of not only logistics, such as scheduling, but also shared approaches to teaching and doing digital humanities.

The Bucknell and Gettysburg programs are grounded in forming “communities of practice,” defined by Étienne and Beverly Wenger-Trayner as “groups of people who share a concern or a passion for something they do and learn how to do it better as they interact regularly.”² By default, digital humanists often see themselves as part of a “big tent” community, but working together requires intention; as Lynne Siemens describes it, “... humanists do not necessarily come to DH with the necessary skills and mindset for collaboration.”³ Developing cross-institutional communities of practice grounded in the digital humanities requires learning how to collaborate in a local environment and outreach to reach librarians and undergraduates outside the silo of the residential liberal arts institution.

The application of the community of practice model to academic libraries and digital humanities (and the intersections thereof) is well-established,⁴ but practical applications of modeling communities of practice when working with undergraduate DH scholars are less well-defined and virtually unexplored when exploring how these communities can work across institutional boundaries.

Partnership

In the first year of Gettysburg's Digital Scholarship Summer Fellowship (DSSF) program, the librarian facilitators were new to working with student DH researchers, and there was uncertainty about how to best build cross-institutional communities of practice among undergraduates. Several institutions in Gettysburg's peer group developed summer DH research programs, including Lafayette College library's Digital Humanities Summer Scholars (DHSS) program; librarians at both institutions arranged for Gettysburg's students to travel to Lafayette to meet.⁵

The day-long encounter was unstructured and intended to be a time for the students to discuss their projects and identify intersecting methods and interests as well as provide an opportunity for the librarian facilitators to share their approaches to mentorship and pedagogy. This approach aligned with Lafayette's philosophy of encouraging “resourcefulness” among its students, with the idea that they would create their own networks to build community.⁶ Demonstrating this resourcefulness, the students in each program corresponded informally using a group chat throughout the rest of the summer of 2016. Additionally, the

students and librarians from both institutions presented at the 2016 Bucknell University Digital Scholarship Conference and the 2017 Pennsylvania Library Association, College and Research Division spring conference.⁷

When planning began for the second summer of the Gettysburg DSSF program, the Gettysburg librarians reflected on how to best introduce students to their community of undergraduate peers at neighboring institutions. It became clear that future cross-institutional collaborations would be best accomplished if peer programs had similar programmatic goals and students would be at similar stages in their projects. At the time of the 2016 meet-up with Lafayette, the Gettysburg fellows were in the second week of a ten-week program and still working through the scope of their digital projects and determining their research methodology. The Lafayette scholars were reaching the mid-point of their six-week program, with their program scaffolded in such a way that the research components were front-loaded, meaning students tended to be further along in their work.⁸

Inspired by the presentations done by Lafayette and Gettysburg at BUDSC 2016, Bucknell University librarians decided to create their own summer digital humanities program, the Digital Scholarship Summer Research Fellowship (DSSRF), based in part on the Gettysburg DSSF curriculum and leveraging the various resources and expertise Bucknell Library and IT staff had to offer.⁹ Bucknell librarians consulted with Gettysburg colleagues as they developed DSSRF in spring 2017, and a partnership between the two programs emerged out of several converging factors. The two institutions are in close geographic proximity (approximately a two-hour drive) and librarians frequently saw each other at regional conferences and consortium meetings. The increased familiarity between librarians at both institutions further benefited from an Associated College Libraries of Central Pennsylvania grant program that supports peer-to-peer library site visits as a means of learning and sharing expertise across schools.¹⁰

The DSSRF program adopted several elements of the Gettysburg program, such as student-driven independent research projects and a curriculum designed to introduce students to DH tools and methods. With both programs including a goal of developing cross-institutional communities of practice between students, the Bucknell and Gettysburg facilitators experimented with different approaches to accomplish this. Each year, we have brought the two programs together for either session focused on talking about students' research or a tool-based workshop as well as time for students to share and receive feedback on their projects. Both programs run on similar schedules, with the facilitators keeping in close contact with each other during the planning stages of their program each year.¹¹ This has enabled us to plan our meetups intentionally to occur when our students are at similar stages of their respective programs, which is especially critical for the students to be able to give and receive authentic feedback about their projects-in-progress.

In both 2017 and 2019, the meetups between the Gettysburg and Bucknell students focused on two objectives: (1) learning how to present to a public audi-

ence and (2) working in small groups to critique each other's projects-in-progress. With students in both programs expected to deliver public presentations of their projects at the conclusion of the summer, we decided to work on developing public speaking skills. Librarians from the two schools worked together to design an activity in which students crafted and delivered an "elevator pitch" to a targeted audience.¹² We asked students to run through the exercise multiple times, imagining a different audience (e.g., academic administrator, faculty member, family member) for each pitch, which enabled them to build confidence in talking about their research in different contexts. In bringing students together from two different institutions, they instantly had a new audience to discuss their research with, making the exercise more authentic and allowing them to begin building connections with their peers.

At the time of the 2017 and 2019 meetups, students in each cohort had been working together closely and were intimately familiar with each other's projects. As with any situation in which people work closely together, there is value in receiving feedback from those who are less familiar with a project. Given that our meetups occurred only a couple of weeks prior to the deadline for completed projects, this was an ideal time for the students to have fresh sets of eyes on their work. Students were put into small groups, mixing those from Gettysburg and Bucknell, and rotated through a series of round-robin sessions in which they demonstrated their projects-in-progress and gave each other feedback. On the whole, students found these critique and feedback sessions to be extremely helpful and talked enthusiastically about how meeting with their peers gave them new insights into their own projects.

In 2018, we experimented with bringing the students together for an introductory workshop on the digital exhibits and collections platform, Omeka. The workshop was timed at about the mid-point of both programs and scheduled so that students could learn the tool with enough time to incorporate it into their projects if they so chose. We leveraged the expertise of Bucknell's digital scholarship coordinator in offering this workshop and opened it up to students in other library-based summer research programs. Although this was designed as a field trip with the intent of having students engage in a community of practice, for some it was simply another day learning another DH tool, which students shared afterward could have just as easily been accomplished at our respective institutions. Our assessments and conversations with students indicated that they preferred our approaches in 2017 and 2019, which will inform our plans for broadening the cross-institutional community of practice in future summers.

Assessment

As with any new program or initiative that evolves from year to year, the assessment plans for Gettysburg and Bucknell's programs have also evolved as

we have clarified our program goals and learned what our students want and need from us to be successful. While both programs have developed aspects of their designs that are unique to their respective campus and library cultures, local expertise, library staffing, and students' areas of study, they continue to share a common emphasis on developing a community of practice within the program cohorts, with other undergraduate DH programs, and with the larger DH community.

The specific nature of the collaboration between the Gettysburg and Bucknell programs has been adjusted annually to find a balance between structured time to introduce new content or skills that are beneficial to both cohorts and unstructured time in which students can connect with each other in a student-controlled space as peer undergraduate digital scholars. Knowing how to redesign the nature of our collaboration has relied not only on our informal observations each year but also on detailed and honest feedback from our students.

Both programs share formative and summative assessment components that have been helpful to learn from students about our efforts around developing a community of practice. At Gettysburg, librarians have been able to draw upon summative assessment data received in weekly meetings between students and their assigned librarian mentors, within weekly reflective blog posts, and in group sharing/planning sessions at the end of each week. For a summative assessment, students are also asked questions on the community of practice in mid-point and final program evaluations.

For Bucknell, similar weekly reflective blog posts with developed prompts have provided valuable insight into students' experiences throughout the program. Similarly informative, in 2019, an assessment was added to the end of the program to survey students on their overall summer experience. In 2020, the Bucknell program facilitators also conducted a survey of all past DSSRF participants as a means of examining the lasting impacts of the program on students.¹³

For both programs, the weekly blog posts in which students are prompted to discuss what they have been reading, working on, their successes, and their project challenges have been particularly effective as a formative assessment to inform program adjustments. Since collaborating on these cross-campus visits since 2017, students have noted the value in meeting students from another school and expanding their knowledge of what other undergraduate digital scholarship projects could be, the value of being able to discuss projects with other peers, receiving feedback that helped shape their projects, and have a sense of being part of a digital scholarship community:

“It’s always nice to have another pair of eyes glance through the same words I have been staring at for the past 7 weeks, and to receive feedback from someone who has not been involved with the entire process of my project.” (Bucknell DSSRF, 2017)¹⁴

“While most of our time was spent learning a new tool, I most enjoyed the time we had to discuss our projects.” (Gettysburg DSSF, 2018)¹⁵

“In the afternoon we did peer-editing, or rather more like peer-suggesting, and I got a good suggestion of something I could include.” (Bucknell DSSRF, 2019)¹⁶

“I’m not going to lie, I thought the morning session would be super boring, but I actually really enjoyed it. We talked about elevator speeches and the ‘say it in 6-ish’ method. Writing out a speech, after receiving a vague outline, really helped me realize what parts of my research were the most important and what people would want to know the most about.” (Bucknell DSSRF, 2019)¹⁷

Students have made it clear that the tool-based workshops are less interesting and valuable to them than the time to learn how to talk about their research, to see what other undergraduates are working on, or to have space to receive constructive feedback on their own developing projects. In the final program evaluations conducted at Gettysburg in 2019, librarians added a question specific to the collaboration with Bucknell. At the program’s end, Gettysburg students shared feedback similar to the earlier immediate impressions seen in Bucknell students’ blog post reflections:

“Interacting with other students outside of Gettysburg who were also creating projects within DH really made me feel like I was part of the community as a whole. It was also good for getting a general idea of the type of projects people worked on outside of our Gettysburg bubble.”

“[M]eeting with the Bucknell students [was a] really beneficial experience for me. I think it was important to interact with students who were working on similar projects with a vast array of topics.”

“As scary as they were, I feel like the elevator pitches with Bucknell helped me a lot when it came to preparing for the final presentation.”¹⁸

Thoughtful and detailed responses like the ones above from our students have been central to how we have thought about structuring the ongoing collaboration between the two programs. When you are running an undergraduate re-

search program with many moving parts, all compressed into eight to ten weeks, it can be tempting to skip the time necessary for assessment. Taking that time, however, has meant that we have been able to adjust as needed for our students and have made sure that we are really supporting our shared program goals.

Reflection

Thinking back to the summer meeting between Lafayette and Gettysburg, we were hoping for something more along the lines of “collaboration” rather than merely “collegiality and connectedness,” using the framework of digital humanities values proposed by Lisa Spiro.¹⁹ Spiro writes of collaboration, “Indeed, the digital humanities community promotes an ethos that embraces collaboration as essential to its work and mission.... In part, that emphasis on collaboration reflects the need for people with a range of skills to contribute to digital scholarship.” Complementing collaboration is the idea of connectedness and collegiality—that is, “welcoming contributions and offering help to those who need it.”²⁰ This “niceness” of DH, as described by Tom Scheinfeldt, was demonstrated in the Lafayette-Gettysburg encounter as it was a space for the students to interact but did not invite critical review.²¹

Our hope was that the students would connect on an organic level and a natural bond would emerge as student practitioners of DH, but the missing element in the encounter was a guided and intentional emphasis on collaboration that would result in meaningful contributions to the individual student projects. Miriam Posner notes, “For me, community happens when people are genuinely invested in seeing each other succeed. This does not happen by being nice to each other—although there is nothing wrong with that, *per se*. It happens by recognizing and rewarding other people’s work.”²²

The experience of offering a joint Omeka workshop in 2018 taught us two major lessons about getting our respective groups of students invested in seeing each other succeed. First, students had reached a saturation point when trying to learn new tools in their programs’ midpoints, and the tool-based workshop became a siloed, individual experience instead of an opportunity to practice using a new platform together. Second, the workshop structure did not allow for the same initial period of learning about each other’s projects as the elevator pitch workshop.

While we did set aside afternoon time in 2018 for students to discuss their projects, we had not set the stage for sharing authentic feedback. Compared to joint session timing in 2017, students were not as far along in their project development in 2018 and thus had less to show and share with their peers. More importantly, the elevator pitch session naturally helped students develop an initial sense of trust and an understanding of each person’s project. Without this understanding, the 2018 cohorts were more reluctant to engage with each other and talk about their works-in-progress. As facilitators, we considered this a learning

experience, and in 2019 we pivoted back to the model of a meetup timed later in the summer, focusing on public presentation skills and peer feedback.

Beyond these summer workshop days, it also helped to have multiple touch-points when cross-institutional cohort members might interact. When students saw each other again later in the year as presenters at regional events showcasing undergraduate digital humanities work, it reinforced the sense of community originally introduced during the summer workshops. Organizing cross-institutional workshops has also benefited our community of practice as program facilitators. When the two student cohorts have time for informal conversations without us present, we are also able to talk in person about our work designing and overseeing our respective summer fellowships. These opportunities to share notes, swap ideas, and ask questions work just as well for us as they do for the students.

Looking ahead to future summers, we hope to continue trading travel responsibilities from year to year and bringing our fellows together for an in-person workshop. With the wide adoption of video conferencing in the 2020–21 academic year, earlier and more frequent interactions between the two programs are also possible. Cross-institutional remote workshops that leverage local digital humanities expertise could introduce specific tools or concepts early in the programs. Online office hours could create a space where facilitators from both programs help students troubleshoot issues. There is even the possibility of encouraging the cohorts to create a space for cross-program backchannel communication using a tool like Slack, Teams, or Discord. Knowing from our assessment data that students value the opportunity to provide and receive peer feedback later in the programs, we are excited to explore ways we can align our schedules more effectively and bring students together throughout the summer so they develop familiarity and trust before meeting in person to share their work.

Recommendations and Best Practices

From our experience, a successful collaboration starts from a place of commonality. Since the Bucknell program was initially modeled after Gettysburg's, there are built-in similarities between the structure, programmatic goals, and timing of our programs that naturally lend themselves to this type of collaboration. Students from each program have similar expectations of the project they will complete by the end of the program and are also working within a similar timeline. In other iterations, the discrepancies in timelines have proved to be an obstacle. Students who are not as far along may be intimidated by the level of completeness of a student's project who is further along in their program. At the opposite end of the spectrum, students who are close to the end of their program may not be as interested in hearing feedback that they may not have time to incorpo-

rate into their projects. When scheduling our meetups, we are intentional in our timing and make sure students are far enough along to have part of their project completed but also still have plenty of time to reflect on the feedback they receive and make changes as needed.

In our experience, a highly interactive workshop, like the elevator pitch session, works well to serve as a natural ice-breaker for the group and sets the tone for the rest of the day. This structured but interactive workshop is an opportunity for students to introduce their projects (and themselves) in a low-pressure environment. By providing students with a common elevator speech script to personalize, it serves as a safety net during the initial round of sharing and places students on even footing.²³ As the workshop progresses, students are given the flexibility to go off script as they feel comfortable. The initial sharing of projects through the elevator pitch workshop helps students build connections early in the day and proves extremely valuable as we move into the peer feedback sessions during the latter part of the day. In one iteration of the meetup, we held a fairly technical tool workshop in the morning session. While useful, it did not provide the students with an opportunity to engage with each other from the start of the day. This set the tone for the day and impacted the level of trust and comfort students felt while providing and receiving feedback later in the day. Where possible, build in both structured and unstructured time into the day for students to interact across programs.

Bringing together students from separate institutions is a daunting task, especially when the overarching goal is to create a lasting community of practice that extends beyond the day. When possible, it is helpful to think about developing additional opportunities for the students to interact and engage with one another. Our students are fortunate and typically have the opportunity to meet up with one another again during a meetup with students from several other Pennsylvania schools during the summer and again in the fall at the Bucknell University Digital Scholarship Conference. The fall conference is a particularly positive experience for the students as it gives them an opportunity to share their completed projects and perhaps see how their peer feedback from our meetup has been incorporated into their respective projects. In the field of digital humanities, many practitioners and scholars use Twitter to engage in conversation. Depending on the Twitter use of students in each cohort, some have chosen to follow each other on the platform. While time is certainly constrained during a summer program, it is helpful to consider how students will continue growing and developing their community of practice after the initial meetup.

Conclusion

Undergraduate students in the summer DH programs at Gettysburg and Bucknell have found value in collaborative, conversational encounters about their

research that span institutional boundaries. Ideally, the structure of a day that combines elevator pitch workshopping and individual project feedback will continue for both programs. Unfortunately, the COVID-19 pandemic made collaboration across institutions more difficult, even with the adoption of remote conferencing tools such as Zoom. Bucknell's program did not convene in the summer of 2021, and Gettysburg's was held entirely remotely. However, the affordances of synchronous video and screen sharing can be utilized when both programs reconvene, with the potential of adding multiple sessions to allow for more iterative feedback beyond a single day. Remote sessions may also allow us to revisit the idea of collaborative tool-based workshops that leverage expertise in data visualization and other DH tools that exist in both programs and are timed in such a way that the tools are taught in a sequence that supports the students' projects. Despite the challenges we have faced since March 2020, developing a deep community of practice that bridges undergraduate DH practitioners across our institutions remains our intent, and will ultimately help our students become better researchers and creators of new knowledge.

Appendix A

DSSF/DSSRF 2019 – Elevator Speeches and Talking about Your Work

Monday, July 15, 2019 – 10am–Noon

Goals:

1. Compose and deliver an elevator speech on their project in order to adapt to/inform a variety of audiences
2. Evaluate and provide constructive feedback to others on their elevator speeches

Part 1: The Elevator Speech

An elevator speech is a **clear, brief message about you**. It communicates who you are, what you do/have done, and how you can benefit your audience. **It's typically about 30 seconds long**, the time it takes for people to ride from the top of a building to the bottom in an elevator.

The idea is that you should be **prepared to share this information with anyone, at any point, even in an elevator**. You often hear them mentioned in the professional/business context, such as what you'd be able to say at a career fair to a potential employer – or, in our case, in a presentation on campus or at a conference.

We're going to **twist that a bit and think about how you can talk about your project to a variety of audiences** using that same model – short, clear, and precise. It's something we will **practice out loud**. It needs to sound natural, so that you'll be able to say it easily when needed.

The Model – Say it in Six

Based on Ron Hoff's *Say It in Six: How to Say Exactly What You Mean in Six Minutes or Less* (1996)

(Outline these on the whiteboard. Give examples and discuss)

1. **What's the main point?** Hoff says that if you have more than two people in a meeting and you're not clear on what the main point is, you might as well just go back to work.

The main point is the real reason that there is a meeting or that the group has asked you to speak or report on something. This is essentially a direct statement.

Tell who you are, what you have done (be open, show enthusiasm), what you've been doing

2. **Overview.** After you say the main point, the voice inside the audience's head will instantly say «What? How can you say that?» And this is where the overview comes in.

Tell what research question you have explored/contributions you have made.

3. **Idea Made Tangible.** At this point, the audience is thinking «What does that look like? What does it mean?» This is where you tell them what your idea, proposal or solution is. Keep it clear, simple and if you can at all use some kind of physical example or prop to demonstrate this idea – all the better. You'll immediately see a relieved look on their face- because you've already done the thinking and processing.

Offer a vivid example.

4. **The Payoff – Why this is good for you.** Right after the relieved look, will come instant distrust – «But wait, that's a good idea, but what's in it for me?» So, just at they think this, you launch into the benefits (from the audience perspective) of why this plan or idea is the ideal solution. How will their life be better, easier? How will they save money, time effort, etc.?

Tell why you're interested in your listener. What can you offer? What are the advantages to working with you? In what way do you differ from others? Give a concrete example.

5. **What you want them to do.** By this time, the audience can see that you've done all the work; you've identified a problem, researched the cause, come up with a solution, identified the benefits and now all that's left, is to feed them the final bite – here's all you have to do to make it all happen. Tell them what to do and be prepared to have them do it.

What is the most wanted response after your elevator speech?
 For them to look at your project and give you feedback? For
 them to consider it as a model for other student projects?
 Identify students who would continue your work?

Delivery Tips

Courtney will introduce some basic tips for speaking to an audience and demonstrate what not to do.

Delivery is incredibly important for helping people connect to your message.

1. Audience

How you deliver your message should be based on the audience members. Word choice and approach need to be considered.

2. Eye Contact

Making eye contact with all audience members is key. Make sure to address the space. If the audience is just one person, speak directly to them. If more than one, make sure to look around the room.

3. Pace

Nerves makes us speak quickly. Rehearsing your speech can help combat this. Being aware that it is something you tend to do is also helpful.

4. Vocal Static vs. Silence

People aren't comfortable with silence. What is only a few seconds of silence in a speech can feel like an eternity to the speaker. It's okay to pause and embrace the silence. What you want to avoid is vocal static – the “ums,” “uhs,” and the occasional “you know what I mean” can distract from your message. This can be a difficult habit to break but just getting comfortable with the silence helps.

5. Physicality

Your posture and gestures can convey a lot. A big part of communication is the things we don't say. You need to make sure you are standing or sitting in a way that shows your interest in the topic. Gestures can be tricky to balance, but you need to remember that they are used to punctuate what you are saying; they draw attention to key points. You want to avoid falling into using the same gesture repeatedly. Ask yourself, does this add to my message. Rehearsing in front of a mirror is incredibly helpful.

6. Facial Expression

Just like posture and gestures, your face helps communicate your message. You want to avoid looking bored or angry. It sounds cheesy, but a pleasant smile should be your default expression. If talking about something sad or disturbing, you should adjust your expressions accordingly. Again, rehearsal in front of a mirror is helpful.

After covering those best practices, she'll provide a model elevator speech and debrief how she chose to structure and present it.

BREAK

Practice! Round 1

Let's actually try this out. It's only by actually scripting and reading these that you notice what doesn't work –and you'll sound more natural as you keep practicing.

To try this out, we're going to develop elevator speeches for two different audiences.

Ask: What audiences do you anticipate talk to about your projects? (*record on whiteboard*)
(Anticipate they'll say upper admin. Offer if they don't.)

For the first elevator speech, let's try an upper administrator.

Ask: What do you think this audience would be interested in knowing?

Give them the handout. Explain what the handout outlines. You can use as a model or write your own -- Surprise! For this first one, we want to make sure you have a speech ready for upper administrators, like the provost or deans. You can choose the next one.

Let's also revisit the delivery tips we talked about earlier and consider how we might approach communicating information to someone in upper administration.

Write for one audience:

- Each person writes their elevator speech. All will take turns reading their speech.
- Debrief after each:
 - What are the strengths you noticed in the others' speeches that you will try to emulate in future revisions of your own speech?
 - What were some common weaknesses that you noticed during the speeches? What effects might these have on how your message is received? What do you think will help?

BREAK

Practice! Round 2

You've just done your speech once. Now we're going to have you practice delivering that content to a different audience.

Looking back at the whiteboard, what is another audience you might end up speaking to about your particular project? Try to think of someone outside the library or even outside the college/university if possible.

Ask: Compared to your previous speech to upper administration, what do you think this second audience would be most interested in knowing?

You still have the outline from your first speech, and the structure of it should still be good. It might help to consider which parts could be condensed or expanded upon in this new situation.

Let's also use this opportunity to revisit the delivery tips and think about how we plan to adapt and communicate with a new audience. In what ways should we adjust our presentation style?

- Write for a different audience (gauge their energy – either then just read to a partner or do as a group)

Closing: Review Goals + Check for Questions

Appendix B

Elevator Speeches about Your Project

1. What's the Main Point?
Tell them who you are/what you've been doing
2. Overview
Tell what research question you've explored using digital tools
3. Idea Made Tangible
Offer a vivid example
4. The Payoff – Why This is Good for You
Tell why you're interested in your listener. What can you offer? What are the advantages for working with you? In what way do you differ from others? Give a concrete example.
5. What You Want Them to Do
What is it you want from them? For them to look at your project and give you feedback? For them to consider it as a model for other student projects? Identify students who would continue your work?

Example sentences for each element for an **upper college administrator**. Speak it. Is it clear and concise? Concentrate on what your audience wants to know, not on what you want to talk about.

1. I am _____, and I have been _____ this summer as a _____ at _____ University/College.
2. Based on what I've learned about _____, I have _____.

By using digital tools, we can _____.
3. Specifically, my project _____
_____. Now that I've done this part, my next step is to _____.
4. You have been a supporter of undergraduate research, and I thank you for _____. I would like to _____ to build upon my project.

Acknowledgment

Special thanks to Melissa Forbes, Gettysburg College Writing Center Coordinator, for providing feedback on our chapter.

Notes

1. For a detailed overview of the beginnings of both the Gettysburg and Bucknell programs as well as their local applications of digital humanities methods, see Janelle Wertzberger and R. C. Miessler, “Dreaming Big: Library-led Digital Scholarship for Undergraduates at a Small Institution,” in *Undergraduate Research and the Academic Librarian: Case Studies & Best Practices*, eds. Stephanie Davis-Kahl and Merinda K. Hensley (Chicago: Association of College & Research Libraries, 2017); Courtney M. Paddick and Carrie M. Pirmann, “Librarian Mentorship of Undergraduate Research,” in *The Engaged Library: High-Impact Educational Practices & Academic Libraries*, ed. Joan Ruelle (Chicago: Association of College & Research Libraries, 2020).
2. Étienne Wenger-Trayner and Beverly Wenger Trayner, “Introduction to Communities of Practice,” Wenger-Trayner, 2015, <https://wenger-trayner.com/introduction-to-communities-of-practice/>.
3. Lynne Siemens, “Project Management and the Digital Humanist,” in *Doing Digital Humanities: Practice, Training, Research*, eds. Constance Crompton, Richard J. Lane, and Ray Siemens (London: Routledge, 2016), 344.
4. For an overview of intersections between DH, academic librarians, and faculty/students, see Harriett E. Green, “Facilitating Communities of Practice in Digital Humanities: Librarian Collaborations for Research and Training in Text Encoding,” *Library Quarterly* 84, no. 2 (2014), <https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.1086/675332>; Christina Bell, “In Practice and Pedagogy Digital Humanities in a Small College Environment,” in *Digital Humanities in the Library: Challenges and Opportunities for Subject Specialists*, eds. Arianne Hartsell-Gundy, Laura Braunstein, and Liorah Golomb (Chicago: The Association of College & Research Libraries, 2015).
5. For information about the Lafayette DHSS program, see “About our Program & FAQ,” Digital Humanities Summer Scholars, Lafayette College, 2021, <https://sites.lafayette.edu/dhss/about-our-program/>.
6. Sarah Morris, “The Digital Humanities Summer Scholarship: A Model for Library-Led Undergraduate Digital Scholarship,” *College & Undergraduate Libraries* 24, no. 2-4 (2017), <https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10691316.2017.1338978>.
7. R. C. Miessler, Lauren White, Keira Koch, and Julia Wall, “#dssf16: Library-led Digital Scholarship for Undergraduates at a Small Institution” (presentation, Bucknell University Digital Scholarship Conference, Lewisburg, PA, October 29, 2016); Sarah Morris, Tawfiq Alhmaedi, Caroline Nawrocki, and Mila Temnyalova, “Digital Humanities Summer Scholars: A Model for Undergraduate Engagement with DH” (presentation, Bucknell University Digital Scholarship Conference, Lewisburg, PA, October 29, 2016); R. C. Miessler, Keira Koch, Julia Wall, Lauren White, “#dssf16+1: Library-Led Digital Scholarship for Undergraduates at a Small Institution” (presentation, Pennsylvania Library Association, College and Research Division Spring Conference, Lewisburg, PA, May 25, 2017), <https://cupola.gettysburg.edu/librarypubs/70/>.
8. Sarah Morris, R. C. Miessler, Courtney Paddick, and Carrie Pirmann, “Digital Scholarship, with Undergraduates, in the Library” (presentation, DLF Forum 2017, Pittsburgh, PA, October 25–26, 2017), <https://osf.io/4ugbx/>.

9. Paddick and Pirmann, "Librarian Mentorship of Undergraduate Research," 97.
10. "Grants," Associated College Libraries of Central Pennsylvania, ACLCP, 2021, <https://www.aclcp.org/index.php/grant-opportunities/>.
11. For examples of past years' schedules for DSSRF, see the schedule sections on <http://dssrf.blogs.bucknell.edu/>, <https://dssrf2018.blogs.bucknell.edu/>, and <http://dssrf2019.blogs.bucknell.edu/>. For examples of past years' schedules for DSSF, see <https://dssf.musselmanlibrary.org/2017/syllabus/>, <https://dssf.musselmanlibrary.org/2018/syllabus/>, and <https://dssf.musselmanlibrary.org/2019/syllabus/>.
12. For an example lesson plan, see appendix 1.
13. Courtney Paddick and Carrie Pirmann, "Assessing the Impact of an Undergraduate Digital Humanities Summer Research Program" (poster presented at Digital Humanities 2020 [virtual], July 22-24, 2020), <https://hcommons.org/deposits/item/hc:32073/>.
14. Minglu Xu, "Week 7," *Digital Scholarship Summer Research Fellows 2017* (blog), Bucknell University, July 17, 2017, <http://dssrf.blogs.bucknell.edu/2017/07/17/week-7/>.
15. Madison Cramer, "Making and Expanding DH Communities," *Digital Scholarship Summer Fellows 2018* (blog), Musselman Library, Gettysburg College, June 25, 2018, <https://dssf.musselmanlibrary.org/2018/week-3/making-and-expanding-dh-communities/>.
16. Aung Pyae Phyo, "Week 8," *Digital Scholarship Summer Research Fellows 2019* (blog), Bucknell University, July 25, 2019, <http://dssrf2019.blogs.bucknell.edu/2019/07/25/week-8-blog/>.
17. Morgan McMullen, "Week 8," *Digital Scholarship Summer Research Fellows 2019* (blog), Bucknell University, July 25, 2019, <http://dssrf2019.blogs.bucknell.edu/2019/07/25/week-8/>.
18. Gettysburg has developed both mid-point and final, or exit, evaluations during the program to receive student feedback related to specific program goals and new additions in that year's program. Students discuss their responses individually with their supervisor and as a group. This feedback has been essential to the small improvements and adjustments made during the program and for the next year, such as how to structure collaborations with other undergraduates.
19. Lisa Spiro, "This Is Why We Fight: Defining the Values of the Digital Humanities," in *Debates in the Digital Humanities*, ed. Matthew K. Gold (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012), <https://dhdebates.gc.cuny.edu/read/untitled-88c11800-9446-469b-a3be-3fdb36bfd1e/section/9e014167-c688-43ab-8b12-0f6746095335>.
20. Spiro, "This Is Why We Fight."
21. Tom Scheinfeldt, "Why Digital Humanities is 'Nice,'" in *Debates in the Digital Humanities*, ed. Matthew K. Gold (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012), <https://dhdebates.gc.cuny.edu/read/untitled-88c11800-9446-469b-a3be-3fdb36bfd1e/section/ffbe0616-a8d6-44ac-8f8e-1e4d4359d4f8>.
22. Miriam Posner, "Here and There: Creating DH Community," in *Debates in the Digital Humanities 2016*, eds. Matthew K. Gold and Lauren F. Klein (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2016), <https://dhdebates.gc.cuny.edu/read/untitled/section/c6b8f952-acfd-48b6-82bb-71580c54cad2#ch22>.
23. For a possible elevator speech script, see appendix 2.

Bibliography

- Associated College Libraries of Central Pennsylvania. "Grants." ACLCP. Accessed July 15, 2021. <https://www.aclcp.org/index.php/grant-opportunities/>.
- Bucknell University. *Digital Scholarship Summer Research Fellows 2017* (blog). Accessed July 6, 2021. <http://dssrf.blogs.bucknell.edu/>.
- . *Digital Scholarship Summer Research Fellows 2019* (blog). Accessed July 6, 2021. <http://dssrf2019.blogs.bucknell.edu/>.

- Gettysburg College. *Digital Scholarship Summer Fellows 2018* (blog). Musselman Library. Accessed July 6, 2021. <https://dssf.musselmanlibrary.org/2018/>.
- Miessler, R. C., Lauren White, Keira Koch, and Julia Wall. "#dssf16: Library-led Digital Scholarship for Undergraduates at a Small Institution." Presentation at the Bucknell University Digital Scholarship Conference, Lewisburg, PA, October 29, 2016. <https://cupola.gettysburg.edu/librarypubs/63/>.
- Miessler, R. C., Keira Koch, Julia Wall, and Lauren White. "#dssf16+1: Library-Led Digital Scholarship for Undergraduates at a Small Institution." Presentation at the Pennsylvania Library Association, College and Research Division Spring Conference, Lewisburg, PA, May 25, 2017. <https://cupola.gettysburg.edu/librarypubs/70/>.
- Morris, Sarah. "The Digital Humanities Summer Scholarship: A Model for Library-Led Undergraduate Digital Scholarship." *College and Undergraduate Libraries* 24, no. 2–4 (2017): 532–44. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10691316.2017.1338978>.
- Morris, Sarah, Tawfiq Alhmaedi, Caroline Nawrocki, and Mila Temnyalova. "Digital Humanities Summer Scholars: A Model for Undergraduate Engagement with DH." Presentation at the Bucknell University Digital Scholarship Conference, Lewisburg, PA, October 29, 2016.
- Morris, Sarah, R. C. Miessler, Courtney Paddick, and Carrie Pirmann. "Digital Scholarship, with Undergraduates, in the Library." Presentation at the DLF Forum 2017, Pittsburgh, PA, October 25–26, 2017. <https://osf.io/4ugbx/>.
- Paddick, Courtney, and Carrie Pirmann. "Assessing the Impact of an Undergraduate Digital Humanities Summer Research Program." Poster presented at Digital Humanities 2020 (virtual), July 22–24, 2020. <https://hcommons.org/deposits/item/hc:32073/>.
- . "Librarian Mentorship of Undergraduate Research." In *The Engaged Library: High-Impact Educational Practices & Academic Libraries*, edited by Joan Ruelle, 93–106. Chicago: Association of College & Research Libraries, 2020.
- Posner, Miriam. "Here and There: Creating DH Community." In *Debates in the Digital Humanities 2016*, edited by Matthew K. Gold and Lauren F. Klein. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2016. <https://dhdebates.gc.cuny.edu/read/untitled/section/c6b8f952-acfd-48b6-82bb-71580c54cad2#ch22>.
- Scheinfeldt, Tom. "Why Digital Humanities is 'Nice'." In *Debates on the Digital Humanities*, edited by Matthew K. Gold, 59–60. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012. <https://dhdebates.gc.cuny.edu/read/untitled-88c11800-9446-469b-a3be-3fdb36bfd1e/section/ffbe0616-a8d6-44ac-8f8e-1e4d4359d4f8>.
- Siemens, Lynne. "Project Management and the Digital Humanist." In *Doing Digital Humanities: Practice, Training, Research*, edited by Constance Crompton, Richard J. Lane, and Ray Siemens, 343–57. London: Routledge, 2016.
- Spiro, Lisa. "'This Is Why We Fight': Defining the Values of the Digital Humanities." In *Debates on the Digital Humanities*, edited by Matthew K. Gold, 16–35. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012. <https://dhdebates.gc.cuny.edu/read/untitled-88c11800-9446-469b-a3be-3fdb36bfd1e/section/9e014167-c688-43ab-8b12-0f6746095335>.
- Wenger-Trayner, Étienne, and Beverly Wenger-Trayner. "Introduction to Communities of Practice." Wenger-Trayner. 2015. <https://wenger-trayner.com/introduction-to-communities-of-practice/>.
- Wertzberger, Janelle, and R. C. Miessler. "Dreaming Big: Library-Led Digital Scholarship for Undergraduates at a Small Institution." In *Undergraduate Research and the Academic Librarian: Case Studies and Best Practices*, edited by Stephanie Davis-Kahl and Merinda K. Hensley, 83–92. Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries, 2017.