Communicating the Value and Impact of Digital Humanities in Teaching, Research, and Infrastructure Development

Second Discussion Paper of the UK-Ireland DH Network

Author(s)	Sarah Gambell (University of Glasgow) Paul Gooding (University of Glasgow) Lorna Hughes (University of Glasgow) Michelle Doran (Trinity College Dublin) Órla Murphy (University College Cork) Charlotte Tupman (University of Exeter) Jane Winters (School of Advanced Study) Jennifer Edmond (Trinity College Dublin) Arianna Ciula (King's College London) Justin Tonra (NUI Galway) Neil Jakeman (King's College London) Patricia Murrieta-Flores (Lancaster University) Natasha Romanova (King's College London) James Smithies (King's College London)
Corresponding author	Paul Gooding (paul.gooding@glasgow.ac.uk)
Reviewer(s)	Samya Roy (IIT Jodhpur)
Version History	2.0 (This version): 2nd November 2021 (DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.5643727) 1.0 (https://osf.io/z8v9c/): 23rd July 2021
Project title	UK/Ireland Digital Humanities Network: A Network for Research Capacity Enhancement
Funder & Scheme	AHRC/IRC

Table of Contents

I. Introduction

Description

This is the second discussion paper produced by the UK-Ireland Digital Humanities Network in consultation with the wider Digital Humanities (DH) Community in the two countries and beyond. It summarises the findings of the second workshop organised by the network, and offers recommendations based on these findings.

The UK-Ireland DH Network

The UK-Ireland Digital Humanities Network is an AHRC/IRC-funded project (2020-21) to undertake research and consultation towards the implementation of a permanent DH association for the UK and Ireland. The project is led by the UK PI Professor Jane Winters (School of Advanced Study, University of London, UK), and Irish PI Dr. Michelle Doran (Trinity Centre of Digital Humanities, Trinity College Dublin, Ireland); the full list of project members and participating institutions can be found on the Network's website (https://dhnetwork.org/team).

As part of the Network project a series of workshops, discussions, surveys, and consultations are being conducted in order to formulate recommendations that will inform the future of the UK-Ireland DH Network. The planned impact of the Network project is described at https://dhnetwork.org/about/.

The aim of this document is to present the findings and recommendations of the second Network workshop, organised by the University of Glasgow on the topic of advocacy for Digital Humanities in the UK and Ireland.

The Workshop and Discussions

The second event of the AHRC-funded UK-Ireland DH Network was entitled *Digital Humanities and Advocacy: Communicating the Value and Impact of DH in Teaching, Research, and Infrastructure Development*. The event was organised by the University of Glasgow and was held online via Zoom on the 16[th of] March 2021.

191 people registered for the event on Eventbrite. The number of participants on the Zoom call varied throughout the day but peaked at over 100 simultaneous attendees.

The programme of the workshop can be found in "Workshop Overview" (part III, below) and on the project website (https://dhnetwork.org/events/event-2/). The workshop's main themes will be discussed in "Workshop and Survey Highlights" (part IV, below).

The Discussion Paper

The draft of this discussion paper was open for comments to the wider community via the Open Science Framework (https://osf.io/) tool until Friday 29th October 2021. The draft report, and associated review comments, are available at the following link: https://osf.io/z8v9c/.

Methodology

In the analysis leading to the present report, the authors drew upon ideas and opinions expressed in the contents of the workshop's presentations, presenters' slides (to be deposited in Open Research Exeter Repository at the end of the project), participants' notes and transcripts of live chat discussions during the workshop.

II. Issues

The objective of the event was to contribute to the development of a UK-Ireland DH Network by discussing the policy areas in which DH interests need to be heard, and to discuss shared, strategic challenges where a united voice for those working in DH is required. The workshop explored several key issues for DH development in the UK and Ireland that have policy implications, areas where expert opinions and guidance may be needed, and the audiences for those views. The workshop was structured around three topical strands where advocacy is needed in DH, as follows:

- **Research**: the ways that DH tools, methods, and outputs are assessed for national research assessment exercises and peer review of digital content, tools, methods and research outputs, and the impact of open access publishing on DH research outputs.
- **Teaching:** central issues have emerged around shared curricula and teaching assessment, especially the lessons learned from both longstanding online DH programs in the UK, Ireland and beyond, and recent experiments with online course delivery.
- **Infrastructure:** what are the areas for investment that will impact the development and uptake of DH? Post-Brexit, how can the UK and Ireland, in the context of the network, we stay connected and involved in pan-European infrastructural programmes? And what can we do to engage with those shaping policy regarding key infrastructure development?

These issues were intended to inform discussion around the structure of a UK-Ireland DH association that could underpin an advocacy agenda, and to address membership models that would support an organisation that has a resonant and authoritative 'voice' for our field.

III. Workshop Overview

Link to workshop page: https://dhnetwork.org/events/event-2/

The workshop was structured around four panels: "Reshaping Research," "Transforming Teaching," "Innovating Infrastructure", and a final respondent panel and open discussion. Each panel had five speakers who were each given five to eight minutes to present their position on the topic. These presentations were followed by an open discussion facilitated by the panel chair and supported by questions delivered via Mentimeter.[1]

Programme

10.00 – 10.30 Welcome to participants

---

[1] As we did not request permission to use the responses to Mentimeter beyond the confines of the workshop, we decided not to include results in this report. Please see the Appendix for a list of the questions that were asked via Mentimeter.

Lorna Hughes (Information Studies, University of Glasgow, UK).

The introduction outlined the aims of the workshop, placing it within the context of a series of key questions:

- How could a DH Association exert pressure, gather evidence, and speak on behalf of the DH community?
- What are the specific national contexts, such as research assessment frameworks, that need to be addressed by a cross-national association?
- How might an association address concerns around grant funding, promotions and credit for DH work, and methods for promoting DH more broadly?

Reference was made to previous work that informs this context, including: exercises to address the scope and nature of the field in the United Kingdom[2]; and initiatives such as the EU-funded DESIR project that set out to strengthen the sustainability of DARIAH, and establish it as a long-term leader and partner within arts and humanities communities (see Szprot *et al.*, 2019).

10.30 – 11.30 Panel: "Reshaping Research"

Chaired by Jane Winters (School of Advanced Study, University of London).

Panellists:

- Marc Alexander (University of Glasgow)
- Tao-Tao Chang (AHRC, UKRI)
- Simon Hettrick (University of Southampton/Software Sustainability Institute)
- Erik Ketzan (University of Cologne)
- Tom O'Connor (Maynooth University)

This session addressed the following questions:

- What support is needed for researchers using digital tools and methods, and how might a professional association help articulate their needs?
- What do those responsible for reviewing DH research need to understand about the field?
- How do we evaluate and value research with digital outputs including but not limited to digital publications?

11.45 – 12.45 Panel: "Transforming Teaching"

Chaired by Justin Tonra (National University of Ireland Galway)

Panellists:

- Francesca Benatti (Open University)
- Catherine Cronin (National Forum for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education)
- Paul Gooding (University of Glasgow)

---

[2] Several reports have emerged in recent years, with topics including: the scope of the field in the UK (Marketwise Strategies Limited, 2017) and Ireland (O'Sullivan, 2020); opportunities and challenges in collaboration between the humanities and the data sciences (McGillivray *et al.*, 2020); and prospects for the long-term sustainability of DH (Bergel *et al.*, 2020).

- Julianne Nyhan (University College London)

This session addressed the following questions:

- What is the role of a DH association in relation to national teaching assessment exercises and shared teaching infrastructure?
- What teaching infrastructures and initiatives exist, and to what extent are the community's needs being served by their existence?
- With which issues around teaching advocacy should a DH association engage?

13.45 – 14.45 Panel – "Innovating Infrastructure"

Chaired by Órla Murphy (University College Cork)

Panellists:

- Kathryn Cassidy (Digital Repository of Ireland)
- Jennifer Edmond (Trinity College, Dublin)
- Stuart Lewis (National Library of Scotland)
- Paola Marchionni (JISC)

This session addressed the following questions:

- What are the key areas of infrastructure that are required for DH research?
- How should the DH community make the case for investment in required infrastructures?
- What role might a DH association take in these issues?

15.00 – 15.45 Respondent panel and open discussion

Chaired by Mike Pidd (University of Sheffield)

Panellists:

- Alan Bowman (Brasenose College, University of Oxford)
- Peter Brown (Irish Research Council)
- Jane Ohlmeyer (Trinity College, Dublin)
- Andrew Prescott (University of Glasgow)

This session provided an opportunity for panellists and attendees to respond to the previous panels, with debate focused on the following questions:

- How might a DH association influence funders, and help identify priorities for investment?
- How can good practice in the field be better embedded in policy, and where can a subject association play a role?
- In a world of limited funding, how can we ensure that what is funded both has value and is representative of the field?

IV. Workshop Highlights

This section outlines the common themes that emerged in the workshop presentations and discussion. These themes inform our thinking and the recommendations that follow about the role of an association in advocacy for the UK and Irish DH communities.

1. Research

1.1 "Looking outwards": developing a coherent identity and voice
1.11 The panel members identified coherence as a key challenge for advocacy. O'Connor noted that internal advocacy remained key; looking inward to "win" likeminded colleagues over. The question of what constitutes a "Digital Human" was not yet resolved, with O'Connor noting that it continues to have implications for how DH is represented within universities. O'Connor emphasised the need to view advocacy as both an internal and external prerogative.

1.12 Rather than a soft option, interdisciplinarity was raised as a key challenge for DH research; the panel members felt that although some wrongly saw it as a soft option, interdisciplinary research in DH presented significant challenges relating to shared language, co-operation and understanding across disciplines. O'Connor phrased this as a "methodological deficit," identifying the methodological discontinuities that are evident at each stage of the conception and development of research projects. It was argued that more work needs to be done to provide "bridging from the digital humanities to colleagues in faculty, to the libraries, to research management teams." Relationships with other groups within universities were viewed as essential, such as computer science, research software engineers (RSE), researchers across the arts and humanities, and libraries and archives.

1.13 The key role of cultural heritage organisations was noted, with libraries in Ireland undertaking work that falls clearly under the banner of DH. Speakers noted the need for an organisation to develop a coherent voice that could form the basis of relationship building with other sectors and communities. Chang, for instance, argued that "the nature of data and the needs of arts and humanities research present opportunities for collaboration between the arts and humanities community and the RSE community." Speakers generally agreed that not enough had been done to facilitate these conversations, with one describing this as a "missed opportunity."

1.2 Relationships with funders and external bodies
1.21 This coherent voice was noted to have a role in building relationships with external bodies such as funders. Chang noted that the biggest challenge for funders is knowing whether a research call has reached your entire audience, knowledge which is essential to developing meaningful calls and programmes. Furthermore, Chang noted that the existence of defined communities that can work with funders to inform the development of calls is vital, arguing that a "coherent and collective voice between the wider community and to the funder is a good thing". There was general agreement on this point; Hettrick spoke of his involvement with the Software Sustainability Institute, emphasising the importance of a society focused specifically on supporting researchers to use software better.

1.22 Speakers noted the importance of securing long-term resource investment and funding for DH, and that this funding needed to support both large-scale centralised infrastructure and small specialist resources. Alexander proposed a need to advocate for "unsexy" things, noting that those creating complex, rich infrastructures for research faced a "problematic model": "you need infrastructure upgrade X, so you tie it to sexy research question Y." Alexander

proposed that we should advocate for those who create research infrastructures, and "nurture" those resources that already exist.

1.23 It was also argued that existing assessment and reward structures can be poorly aligned with the outputs of many DH scholars. For instance, Hettrick noted the problems of the UK Research Excellence Framework (REF), commenting that "each successive REF focuses more and more on publications." Hettrick cited that in the last REF in 2014, 91,000 outputs were registered across the various publication categories, while just 38 software outputs were submitted. The newly founded "Hidden REF"[3] was praised for its efforts to recognise a wider range of research outputs, and an example of the need to address what should be included in the REF.

1.3 Legal and regulatory advocacy
1.31 Speakers drew attention to the importance of legal and regulatory environments to the work of DH in the UK and Ireland. While this is an issue for both nations, the need for the United Kingdom to consider its laws in light of Brexit is evident. Ketzan drew attention to the example of text and data mining: the UK was the first EU country to introduce an exception to copyright for non-commercial text and data mining in 2014, subsequently incorporated into the 2019 Copyright Directive. Ketzan suggested that the network might want to consider legal advocacy "to articulate the positions of DH researchers to law-making bodies."

2. Teaching

2.1 Distinctive Teaching Identities
2.11 A key point from the discussion was the difficulty inherent in developing a single, coherent identity for DH teaching. DH teaching and research are both highly contingent on local, regional, and national contexts. For instance, the United Kingdom and Ireland were noted to have different mechanisms for assessing teaching quality: something like the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) in the United Kingdom does not have an equivalent in Ireland. However, Tonra argued that a DH association could allow Irish colleagues to learn from the experiences of UK colleagues in the event that such a framework was to be introduced in Ireland.

2.12 Different institutions, and scholars, also bring very different perspectives to their teaching. Gooding noted that the fragmented, unstable nature of DH in many institutions made the development of "stable, robust teaching programmes problematic in some institutions." Nyhan argued that the presence of research-led teaching, and the way projects and research feed into individual teaching practices, meant that "while we do have digital humanities in common… for many of us there are also distinctive and unique aspects to our offering." As a result, it was noted that the success of shared teaching endeavours rested upon "accommodating this wonderful variation and richness and situatedness."

2.2 Alternative Learning Models – PGR Training, Online Courses
2.21 Cronin described the work of the National Forum for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education[4] in Ireland. She noted that conversations in the year since the start of the pandemic have been about teaching online. A key priority for advocacy and collaboration is therefore online education. Cronin described Digital Humanities as "placed very strongly" in the context of open multi-modal learning and was excited by the importance

---

[3] Further information about the "Hidden REF" can be found at the following website: https://hidden-ref.org.
[4] Further information about the aim and scope of the National Forum can be found on their website: https://www.teachingandlearning.ie.

of the community's work and how it related to the National Forum approach. The DH community is therefore well placed to provide leadership on issues relating to open online education, with the benefit of existing leaders in remote learning programs such as the Open University.

2.22 Examples of good practice in open online teaching were shared. Nyhan discussed the Programming Historian,[5] a not-for-profit platform for teaching interdisciplinary DH skills for free, which represents an obvious success, with academic leads representing ten countries across the Americas and Europe. Nyhan argued that the Programming Historian, and similar successful resources, "could very usefully and profitably be championed through such a network."

One commenter expanded on this, sharing that some of their colleagues in English had wrongly assumed the Programming Historian did not apply to them, and educating colleagues about the broad applicability of DH methods might be a fruitful area for a DH Network.

2.23 Benatti also outlined the process and rationale for creating the Open Online Course, *Digital Humanities: Humanities Research in the Digital Age*, which was developed by the Open-Oxford-Cambridge AHRC Doctoral Training Partnership with funding from the Arts and Humanities Research Council.[6] Similarly, opportunities are growing in cognate careers, with a growth in training opportunities for DH Research Software Engineers.[7] However, Benatti also warned that the fast-moving nature of DH means that there is a problem with obsolescence of teaching materials, and that a DH Network might help to open up new teaching opportunities to a wider range of educators.

2.3 Supporting individuals at various career stages?
2.31 The open educational resources described in section 2.2 demonstrated the potential of DH to provide learning opportunities for individuals of different backgrounds, and at different career phases. Panellists noted other relevant resources, including Library Carpentry, that provide relevant training to other cohorts. The panel raised questions about how best to support individuals to develop their skills in teaching and learning DH. Gooding argued that there was a need to consider the "sort of structural and formal routes by which career development for teaching happened in the UK." Despite most Early Career academics in the UK now completing some form of postgraduate certificate in teaching practice, it was felt that more specialised training was necessary in DH, and that alternative or complementary routes to the academic path were needed. While the topic of links beyond the UK and Ireland was not raised, it is important to note that conversations around career development in both countries are in fact a global issue, requiring wide interaction to understand and address barriers for citizens of other countries: indeed, such themes will be the focus of Event 4 of the UK/Ireland DH Network.

2.32 Furthermore, the fragmented and isolated nature of teaching at some institutions was raised. While there are a growing number of large centres of teaching in DH, and allied subjects, there remain many scholars teaching in institutions where the field is not strongly

---

[5] Full details relating to Programming Historian are available on the public website: https://programminghistorian.org.

[6] The *Digital Humanities: Humanities Research in the Digital Age* OOC is available online at the following link: https://www.open.edu/openlearn/history-the-arts/digital-humanities-humanities-research-the-digital-age/.

[7] RSE training resources include the 'MaDiH: Research Software Engineering Training' resources available via DARIAH-CAMPUS (https://campus.dariah.eu/resource/rse2019) and the Digital Humanities and Research Software Engineering Summer School run by the Alan Turing Institute (https://www.eventsforce.net/turingevents/frontend/reg/thome.csp?pageID=23222&eventID=72).

represented. Some panellists argued that collaboration and knowledge exchange could help address this problem, with Benatti proposing that a DH Network could play an important role in "finding partners and collaborators for teaching DH together." Similarly, Cronin felt that DH educators had an important role in facilitating knowledge flow between policymakers and teachers.

2.33 Panellists expressed a general feeling that more could be done to promote the role of teaching within DH. Tonra questioned whether teaching was still the poor relation of research in DH, and that a professional association could have a role for achieving a more desirable balance. Benatti called for a shift in the perception of DH as only relevant for research and saw a role for a Network in articulating good practice for DH teaching. Gooding, too, noted that UK and Irish voices were relatively underrepresented in the literature on DH pedagogy, and suggested that addressing this imbalance would represent a valuable contribution.

3. Infrastructure

3.1 Sustainability and interoperability

3.11 The issues of sustainability and interoperability permeated the panel session. Panellists agreed that it was necessary to create technical, organisational, and political structures that would sustain infrastructure beyond the lifetime of projects. This need was contextualised by trends from elsewhere, including the need for improved data management by researchers. For instance, Cassidy argued that, while practitioners are working with data, "people are maybe not conscious of what they're working with or that they're producing data." Cassidy emphasised that there is a key advocacy role in ensuring that data is not just shared, but follows the FAIR (Findability, Accessibility, Interoperability, Reusability) guidelines.

3.12 It is also becoming increasingly the case that funders are building data preservation and preservation into funding calls, and panellists called for increased attention not only to mitigating the risks of data loss, but to developing and sustaining infrastructures that make that data more useful to digital humanities researchers. Cassidy mentioned the growth of automated transcription tools as an example of new trends that could affect the community.

3.13 Similarly, Marchionni identified content as a key part of infrastructure, and the risk of loss of investment where there is not the capacity or technology to sustain it beyond a project lifecycle. Marchionni argued that while investment had gone into research and development or proofs of concept, there was a pressing need for mechanisms that help those projects to "become a service to try and scale up." Similarly, linking data and collections was identified as a priority area, both for the purposes of interoperability and for addressing research questions around bias and gaps in large-scale digital collections.

3.2 Advocacy as Infrastructure

3.21 Panellists sought to expand the definition of infrastructure to incorporate the human networks of collaboration that already exist. Edmond, for instance, argued that there was "advocacy in infrastructure, advocacy for infrastructure, [and] advocacy as infrastructure." Attention was drawn to networks such as the pan-European DARIAH Network, which provides an infrastructure to support and sustain ICT-based research practices. The concerns of the panel covered the entire digital content lifecycle, incorporating discoverability, access, preservation, sustainability, and reuse. There was a general sense that advocacy couldn't be easily separated from debates on infrastructure and should in fact be seen as an integral part of infrastructure development and maintenance.

3.22 That said, and echoing conversations earlier in the day, there was a sense that the infrastructures that support DH research are often unrecognised. Lewis mentioned that infrastructure becomes more valuable over time and requires ongoing investment, but that its profile suffers from its invisibility and lack of clear lines of responsibility in some cases. Panellists noted that national-level organisations should be promoting and supporting research as part of their role. This was seen as a way to ensure greater utilisation, and a clearer demonstration of value to argue for further investment. For instance, Edmond referred to the importance of the "efficiency you get by sharing infrastructure, the… value of the return on investment," linking this to the need for advocacy to be embedded in the community's approach to infrastructure development.

3.3 Stakeholders in Infrastructure

3.31 Panellists drew attention to the wide range of stakeholders who contribute to, and benefit from, technical infrastructures for DH. This included representatives from the Galleries, Libraries, Archives and Museums sector, who often create and manage the "invisible infrastructure" that supports the publication and use of large-scale cultural heritage collections as data.

3.32 Some panellists expressed a desire for the DH Network to contribute to advocacy that might improve policies around collections access and reuse. Lewis, for instance, identified both copyright and the UK legal deposit regulations as barriers that libraries face when opening up collections. He argued that a DH Network might be able to contribute to advocacy around those topics. A broad sense of the stakeholders in DH infrastructure, and their requirements, is therefore necessary.

4. Final Panel and synthesis of key issues

4.1 Advocacy for DH, or advocacy for the Arts and Humanities?

4.11 Panellists provided some useful provocations that situated the field of DH in relation to other panels. Pidd, for instance, noted that DH has in recent years been very well supported by research council funding, and that questions of infrastructure, sustainability and training fall upon universities and cognate organisations to sort out. Pidd, among other panellists, argued that "the more compelling reason for DH not needing to lobby research funders is that most DH no longer stands as a domain that needs special consideration by funders." He stated that DH is now embedded to the point that it should just be considered another part of arts and humanities research.

4.12 This led panellists to note that, rather than advocacy for DH, what was needed in the UK was advocacy for the arts and humanities more broadly. The arts and humanities are declining in the portfolios of funders and challenged by wider governmental policies. This requires a rethink of DH, to emphasise its innovative aspects, and position itself with funders and policymakers as a field of methodological innovation and application. Brown similarly noted that in Ireland there have been "STEM-focused conversations about the creation of centres at scale." Brown argued that there need to be similar conversations about socially and culturally led research centres which address big issues in the arts and humanities.

4.13 Other panellists expanded upon these provocations: Prescott noted that the real threat to the arts and humanities was evident in the "cuts of staff in humanities in places like the University of Leicester." Casualisation was also identified, which expanded upon Gooding's observations earlier around sustainability of teaching programmes. Others argued that innovative research required broad engagement with other disciplines and the business sector.

Ohlmeyer, for instance argued that the arts and humanities should explore "the opportunities of real, meaningful, interdisciplinary [research] working primarily with computer scientists and engineers, but also working with enterprise."

4.2 Addressing the need for DH representation in national conversations
4.21 The panel were in general agreement that DH needed to view itself in relation to other disciplines, in order to produce cutting edge research. However, the lack of formal representation for DH in national conversations was seen as a threat to DH. Prescott argued that the growth of DH Networks was inverted in comparison to other subjects: whereas subjects like Classics, History, English, French and German first built "vibrant nationally based associations" and then built international bodies based on those associations, DH has developed international associations first. Prescott argued that this was problematic because it means that issues which affect career prospects at a national level have not been addressed. While international connections have nurtured the DH community internationally in recent years, the lack of advocacy at a national level was seen as a serious disadvantage, and one that urgently needed addressing.

4.22 The highly situated nature of issues relating to community representation and career development led to discussion of the extent to which it was desirable to establish a single network or association for the UK and Ireland combine the UK and Ireland in a single Network. Prescott outlined the problems the UK community, where the lack of a strong DH association has made it difficult to secure adequate representation for the field across all REF panels The stark point was made that REF organisers simply expect subject associations to make nominations. Furthermore, it was felt that existing conversations around developing DH infrastructure would have been more transparent and focused had there been a national DH association to provide representation.

4.23 These issues were seen as highly localised, leading Prescott to propose that there should be a DH association for the UK alone, and that each nation needed to focus on neglected areas of its own national provision. Given the assumptions around collaboration between the United Kingdom and Ireland that have to date underpinned the work of this research network, this provocation acts as a call to reflect on the level of integration that a UK-Ireland DH Network should seek to achieve.

V. Recommendations
This section outlines recommendations to the UK-Ireland DH Network to enable effective advocacy on behalf of the DH community in the UK and Ireland, based on the workshop discussions noted above.

There was a general agreement that the Network should conduct advocacy for DH in the United Kingdom and Ireland. In doing so, the Network will need to be cognisant of the differences between the UK and Ireland in terms of politics, research and teaching assessment, and research funding. There has already been significant investment in trans-national infrastructure, which both the UK and Ireland have played a significant role in supporting and developing. However, significant questions arose in relation to several aspects of a potential Network: interdisciplinary collaboration; the extent to which the field has already benefited from research funding; the need to address casualisation and career development; and the precise relationship between the DH communities of the UK and Ireland. The following recommendations therefore focus upon the need to closely define the terms of reference around advocacy for and on behalf of the DH communities.

The first discussion paper of the UK-Ireland DH Network made several relevant recommendations relating to advocacy and community building. The third recommendation in that report is highly relevant:

> The Network should conduct advocacy for DH in the United Kingdom and in Ireland, working to raise issues of and propose contextual solutions for sustainability of funding, people, infrastructure, software, and data. Ensuring collaboration and sustainability will allow researchers in both countries to focus on producing innovative and ground-breaking research (Romanova *et al.*, 2021).

The following recommendations build upon this, and upon the workshop discussions to address the scope and nature of that advocacy work:

1. The Network should, in developing its terms of reference, recognise the different academic, political, and funding contexts of its constituent nations. It should be recognised from an early stage that not all issues are equally relevant to the United Kingdom and Ireland, and that this might have implications for the nature of a joint Network. If a joint Network is agreed to be desirable, then representing both contexts will be fundamental to the Network's success.

2. It is recommended that the Network develops a clear and transparent policy, in consultation with the community, to define the scope and nature of its advocacy activities. Recommended priority areas include:
   a. Aligning the Network to existing European and international networks and infrastructures and advocating for continued investment in these activities.
   b. Engaging with policymakers on issues that impact upon the DH communities of the UK and Ireland, both individually and jointly.
   c. Acting as a focal point for the DH community to respond to select committees and government consultations, and to provide input into research assessment exercises.
   d. Recognising the vibrancy and importance of DH teaching in the UK and Ireland and giving it a due level of attention within the network.
   e. Promoting the development of clear career pathways in DH and cognate sectors and providing a strong voice for the value of the arts and humanities, not just a narrow interpretation of DH.
   f. Promoting (and potentially providing formal support to) existing DH infrastructures and working with funders to identify and address emerging community needs.

3. It is recommended that the Network integrates representatives of the different sectors that contribute to the field of DH (Higher Education, Cultural Heritage, Independent Research Organisations, Business and the Creative sector). The Network should develop protocols to ensure representation for each sector in advocacy and lobbying activities, to accurately represent the diverse perspectives of the DH community.

4. It is recommended that the Network adopts an outward-facing view of advocacy and works actively with other formal DH organisations to address issues that affect DH on a global basis.

5. It is recommended that the Network addresses the situated and fragmented nature of DH practices, by ensuring an inclusive approach to advocacy via a formal structure that allows all groups to be represented in decision making processes.

VI. Bibliography

Bergel, G. *et al.* (2020) *Sustaining Digital Humanities in the UK*. doi: 10.5281/zenodo.4046267.

Marketwise Strategies Limited (2017) *Digital Humanities Research, Teaching and Practice in the UK - Landscape Report*. School of Advanced Study, University of London. Available at: https://sas-space.sas.ac.uk/9216/ (Accessed: 3 June 2021).

McGillivray, B. *et al.* (2020) *The challenges and prospects of the intersection of humanities and data science: A White Paper from The Alan Turing Institute*. Available at: /articles/online_resource/The_challenges_and_prospects_of_the_intersection_of_humanities_ and_data_science_A_White_Paper_from_The_Alan_Turing_Institute/12732164/5 (Accessed: 3 June 2021).

O'Sullivan, J. (2020) 'The Digital Humanities in Ireland', *Digital Studies/Le champ numérique*, 10(1). doi: 10.16995/dscn.374.

Romanova, N. *et al.* (2021) *Capacity Enhancement in Digital Humanities in the United Kingdom and Ireland: Training and Beyond*. Zenodo. doi: 10.5281/zenodo.5105938.

Szprot, J. *et al.* (2019) *D3.4 Final Report: Regularly monitor country-specific progress in enabling new DARIAH membership*. Available at: https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-02454418 (Accessed: 3 June 2021).

VII. Appendix: Mentimeter Questions at Workshop 2

The following questions were asked at Workshop 2, using the real-time feedback application Mentimeter (https://www.mentimeter.com).

Session (time to open questions)	Question
Welcome/Intro (10.05)	- Where are you based? - England - Northern Ireland - Scotland - Republic of Ireland - Wales - Europe - Further afield! - What type of organisation do you represent? (Multiple choice) - Higher Education Institution - Other Educational Institution - Cultural Heritage Sector - Third Sector - Commercial Sector - Strategic Body or Policymaker - Funding Body - Other (please specify) - What single word or words best define what 'advocacy' means to you? (Word Cloud)
Session 1: Research (10.30)	What is the biggest advocacy issue for DH research in the UK and/or Ireland? (Free text)
Session 2: Teaching (11.45)	What would help you to transform your local DH teaching practices? (Free text)
Session 3: Infrastructure (13.45)	- What do you think of as "infrastructure" for the Digital Humanities? (Free text) - How well do existing infrastructures support DH in the UK and Ireland? (Multiple choice) - Extremely well - Quite well - Generally OK - A bit of a mixed bag - Quite poorly - Extremely poorly - What further investment is needed? (Free text)
Session 4: Panel (Q1 - 14.45; Q2 - after 15.00, when answers are ready!)	What is the key funding priority for DH in the next five years? (Free text, before the break)