

Transcript | Adventures in Digital Publishing

Episode 4. Secret Feminist Agenda

Recorded October 26, 2023

00:00:07.000 -->00:00:19

Ana Jimenez-Moreno: So hello everyone, and welcome to the fourth episode of Adventures in Digital Publishing: Collaborations and Conversations--a web series exploring the creation of enhanced and interactive digital publications.

00:00:19-->00:00:31

So Adventures in Digital Publishing is co-produced by Allison Levy, the director of Brown University Digital Publications, and Sarah McKee, who is project manager

00:00:32.000 --> 00:00:45.000

at the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS). It is also sponsored the collaboration of AUPresses, and we thank all our colleagues for all their support in helping to plan the series.

00:00:45.000 --> 00:00:50.000

So the series showcases and explores enhanced and interactive digital books that have been published by or forthcoming from member presses,

00:00:50.000 --> 00:01:11.000

members of AUPresses, often in collaboration with stakeholders at the author's home institutions. Each 75-minute episode highlights the workflows and collaborations behind the making of a digital book or an interactive work by bringing together members of one project team,

00:01:11.000 --> 00:01:19.000

typically including the author, acquisitions editor, and key development, production, and marketing professionals to share their stories

00:01:19.000 --> 00:01:23.000

and answer your questions. Episodes are recorded and available on the series website. I'll share those links to you soon,

00:01:23.000 --> 00:01:33.000

with you soon, and you'll find the link to the website in the chat. We encourage you to visit and explore further.

00:01:33.000 --> 00:01:45.000

Today's episode features the team behind the Secret Feminist Agenda, a peer-reviewed podcast hosted by Hannah McGregor and published by Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

00:01:45.000 --> 00:01:50.000

I'll be moderating today's episode with Sara Cohen, editorial director at University of Michigan Press, where she handles acquisitions in music and media studies among other areas.

00:01:50.000 --> 00:02:00.000

So take it away, Sara.

00:02:00.000 --> 00:02:10.000

Sara Cohen: Thanks so much, Ana. I'm so excited to be here today to talk to the folks in this room about Secret Feminist Agenda and also about the Amplify Podcast Network, which spun out of that.

00:02:10.000 --> 00:02:22.000

So we'll be talking about both. I'm going to quickly introduce everybody. We're here with Hannah McGregor, who is Director and Associate Professor of Publishing at Simon Fraser University.

00:02:22.000 --> 00:02:27.000

Siobhan McMenemy, Interim Director at Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

00:02:27.000 --> 00:02:34.000

Stacey Copeland, Assistant Professor of Media Studies at University of Groningen and co-director of the Amplify Podcast Network.

00:02:34.000 --> 00:02:45.000

Maia Desjardins, a digital projects coordinator with a shared position between Wilfrid Laurier University Library and Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

00:02:45.000 --> 00:02:52.000

And last but not least, Lindsey Hunnewell, who is the production coordinator at Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

00:02:52.000 --> 00:02:56.000

So Hannah is going to get us started with a bit of an overview of Secret Feminist Agenda.

00:02:56.000 --> 00:03:14.000

Hannah McGregor: I am. Thanks so much, Sara. So I'm gonna start off by talking a little bit about Secret Feminist Agenda as a project and how it got started, and then I'm going to throw things over to Stacey to talk about how Secret Feminist Agenda turned into the Amplify Podcast Network.

00:03:14.000 --> 00:03:28.000

So, Secret Feminist Agenda as a project started essentially with Siobhan and I having a conversation in the book fair at the Congress of the Humanities and Social Sciences, I think in Calgary,

00:03:28.000 --> 00:03:43.000

about the possibilities of scholarly podcasting. I had just gotten a job at Simon Fraser University in the publishing program where they had explicitly said that they were interested in the fact that I was making a podcast.

00:03:43.000 --> 00:03:50.000

At the time I was making what I considered to be not at all a scholarly podcast. It was called Witch, Please.

00:03:50.000 --> 00:04:02.000

It was a friend and I rereading the Harry Potter series together. And talking about them kind of through a scholarly lens but only incidentally because we were both literature scholars and that's just how we talked about books.

00:04:02.000 --> 00:04:09.000

But making Witch, Please had really convinced both of us that there was an appetite out there for feminist podcasts informed by scholarly methods and scholarly conversations.

00:04:09.000 --> 00:04:29.000

And I suspect that Siobhan had come to a similar conclusion from listening to Witch, Please. And said that as the new incoming--is it managing editor?--I can never remember what

00:04:29.000 --> 00:04:33.000

your job title was, supervising editor, lead editor.

00:04:33.000 --> 00:04:34.000

Siobhan McMenemy: Sure. Yeah.

00:04:34.000 --> 00:04:44.000

Hannah McGregor: Sure, as editor, at Wilfrid Laurier University Press, was really excited in the possibility of sort of seeding some more experimental projects there.

00:04:44.000 --> 00:04:51.000

And so said, you know, what do you think about the possibility of making a podcast with or for the press?

00:04:51.000 --> 00:05:06.000

And so as Canadian researchers do when we've got kind of an idea and want some money, we went to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, which is a big funding body here, and pitched a project purely as a proof of concept.

00:05:06.000 --> 00:05:16.000

We said we think that maybe you can make scholarly podcasts, and we think that maybe you can peer review them, and we really don't know what that will look like, but

00:05:16.000 --> 00:05:20.000

you know, I know how to make podcasts, and Siobhan knows how to peer review, and so we're gonna try to figure it out.

00:05:20.000 --> 00:05:30.000

It was a little more formal than that, but but not much, and we certainly didn't have a specific podcast idea at the time.

00:05:30.000 --> 00:05:40.000

We sort of vaguely said like maybe something about fandom, we don't really know. And then in the meantime, I arrived in Vancouver.

00:05:40.000 --> 00:05:45.000

And I got really lonely because moving for academic jobs is really lonely, and I didn't know anybody.

00:05:45.000 --> 00:05:52.000

And so I started Secret Feminist Agenda because I already owned the URL because I thought it was funny.

00:05:52.000 --> 00:06:04.000

And I made it an interview podcast because that was my sneaky plan to make friends in Vancouver was I'll start a podcast where the idea is I talk to really interesting feminists about stuff they're doing.

00:06:04.000 --> 00:06:11.000

And then that was their way of luring interesting feminists into my home. And you know what?

00:06:11.000 --> 00:06:20.000

It worked really, really well. That's my hot tip for making friends in a new place. But a little way into the project,

00:06:20.000 --> 00:06:28.000

you know, we'd gotten the funding. I sent Siobhan a pitch saying, "Okay, here's, you know, what I think maybe our scholarly podcast should be about."

00:06:28.000 --> 00:06:35.000

And Siobhan said, "No, Secret Feminist Agenda is your scholarly podcast." And I was like, "Don't be absurd."

00:06:35.000 --> 00:06:41.000

It's not scholarly. It's just me, a scholar, talking to feminists about feminism."

00:06:41.000 --> 00:06:51.000

And Siobhan, as Siobhan has so many times had to do, you know, gently pointed out to me that my thinking about what constituted the scholarly was perhaps a bit narrow.

00:06:51.000 --> 00:06:59.000

And that in fact Secret Feminist Agenda would make a perfect sort of test case, a perfect pilot project for this grant.

00:06:59.000 --> 00:07:06.000

But that's then left us in kind of an interesting situation because I was already making the podcast.

00:07:06.000 --> 00:07:15.000

It was actively in production, and it was a weekly podcast. So I didn't have time to re-listen to the episodes before they went out.

00:07:15.000 --> 00:07:26.000

Siobhan sure didn't have time to listen to the episodes before they went out. So we had to come up with a way to incorporate this into our research project that made sense as a way to test

00:07:26.000 --> 00:07:41.000

collaboration between podcasters and university presses to develop a possible model for peer review, and what we came up with was essentially peer reviewing the podcast by season.

00:07:41.000 --> 00:07:48.000

So I would complete a season. We kind of chose an arbitrary, I think, fifteen interviews as our season model.

00:07:48.000 --> 00:08:00.000

I would complete a season, and then Siobhan would essentially treat that season as a single text that would be packaged and shared with peer reviewers who would respond to that season as a whole.

00:08:00.000 --> 00:08:07.000

And then I would use the feedback from the peer review of that season in my development of the subsequent season.

00:08:07.000 --> 00:08:15.000

And we went through that process three times and produced a total of four seasons of Secret Feminist Agenda before

00:08:15.000 --> 00:08:19.000

I decided that that was too much podcast to make while also being a professor and decided to stop the project.

00:08:19.000 --> 00:08:32.000

I still say like for now because I'm still holding on to the possibility that maybe I'll just come back and keep making it again at some point.

00:08:32.000 --> 00:08:46.000

But what we came up with was with Secret Feminist Agenda was one, one particular model of how peer review could happen, a kind of summit of peer review that happened

00:08:46.000 --> 00:08:52.000

at the end of the season and that iteratively responded to work that was continuing to go forward.

00:08:52.000 --> 00:09:09.000

And sort of one possible editorial model. But more generally what it really demonstrated to us was that our proof of concept was sound, that it was possible to make a podcast that was engaging to a wider listenership while still grounded in the principles of scholarship.

00:09:09.000 --> 00:09:34.000

That we could find peer reviewers, like Siobhan could find peer reviewers who were willing to experiment and go with us on a really nonconventional project, that that peer review would be substantive and generative and interesting and helpful and push the project forward.

00:09:34.000 --> 00:09:48.000

And that, you know, there was something here. There was something to be done with the premise of peer-reviewed podcasts being created in collaboration with university presses.

00:09:48.000 --> 00:10:02.000

And that is the point when we said okay, well that was a proof of concept. It worked. But in some ways, all we're demonstrating really is that I can make a scholarly podcast.

00:10:02.000 --> 00:10:09.000

And we kind of already knew that. And what we weren't interested in doing was creating essentially a project that was about me and things that I could do.

00:10:09.000 --> 00:10:26.000

We wanted to actually demonstrate the possibilities of the medium as a way to transform and and rethink about how scholarly communication happens and how scholarly knowledge is created.

00:10:26.000 --> 00:10:49.000

And that is why we decided to move from Secret Feminist Agenda as our pilot project into the Amplify Podcast Network as a sort of larger and more infrastructure-focused project that said cool, we know that Siobhan and I together can make something like this work.

00:10:49.000 --> 00:10:56.000

Can we build out the capacity so that scholarly podcasting becomes something that more people can participate in?

00:10:56.000 --> 00:11:09.000

And are there other approaches to the peer review that might be a little less stressful for Siobhan than just finding out what I'm going to say on Friday mornings, the same time every other listener also found out what I was gonna say.

00:11:09.000 --> 00:11:17.000

You know what? Sometimes what I was going to say was potentially libelous, so it might have been a slightly stressful project.

00:11:17.000 --> 00:11:26.000

So the Amplify Podcast Network was a chance to continue this collaboration with Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

00:11:26.000 --> 00:11:37.000

And to expand the reach, but also to bring in a lot of other really vital questions that had emerged while we were making Secret Feminist Agenda. Questions about

00:11:37.000 --> 00:11:42.000

discoverability and citability and sustainability and that is right around the time when Stacey got involved in the project.

00:11:42.000 --> 00:11:50.000

So Stacey, do you want to take over?

00:11:50.000 --> 00:11:55.000

Stacey Copeland: Yeah, I'll grab that baton. So as Hannah mentioned, this is when I came into the picture.

00:11:55.000 --> 00:12:01.000

Hannah and I were already working together on another scholarly podcast, the SpokenWeb podcast, out of SpokenWeb Canada, which is a literature sound archive project.

00:12:01.000 --> 00:12:13.000

And I was working on my PhD at the time, and Hannah and I worked together, I think pretty well.

00:12:13.000 --> 00:12:29.000

So she tapped me on the shoulder and said, "Look, I have this interesting new scholarly podcast project in the works. Would you be interested in coming on?" And so that was about 2019, which of course then we all know the pandemic happened.

00:12:29.000 --> 00:12:42.000

So we are in our third year, technically fourth year from the pandemic, of what was an Insight Partnership Development Grant from Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council.

00:12:42.000 --> 00:12:53.000

So kind of the next level after the Secret Feminist Agenda project. And originally this was led by Hannah and Siobhan along with a group of awesome collaborators.

00:12:53.000 --> 00:13:04.000

So Brenna Clarke Gray, Daniel Heath Justice, Bart Vautour, and some amazing master's students at the time who are now full-time workers in their industry as well.

00:13:04.000 --> 00:13:29.000

And this project essentially was pitched to dig further into this experimentation of scholarly podcasting and thinking about what challenges could be unearthed if we pushed these questions further--of what would peer review look like, for instance, if it started right from the get-go, from proposal stage, podcasters working with Siobhan from that first outline all the way through production and peer review.

00:13:29.000 --> 00:13:42.000

And of course, as Hannah mentioned, also thinking about these questions of discoverability, of sustainability, and as we'll get into I'm sure later on, because we have Maia and Lindsey, accessibility as well.

00:13:42.000 --> 00:13:55.000

So the Amplify Podcast Network we envision as being on a mission to revolutionize scholarship and create communities of support for academic podcasters who really are invested in this form as scholarship.

00:13:55.000 --> 00:14:15.000

So Amplify has become home over these years to a creative group of podcasters and researchers thinking about how sound work can be really rooted in and as serious scholarship where accessibility, rights, sustainability, preservation, and publication are really central to the work we're doing.

00:14:15.000 --> 00:14:24.000

And so When we're thinking about what Amplify is structured like, we think about four key areas of focus

00:14:24.000 --> 00:14:27.000

for Amplify Podcast Network, and number one, maybe not surprising, is production of peer-reviewed podcasts.

00:14:27.000 --> 00:14:44.000

So that's really central to what we're thinking through with Amplify. And so grown out of Hannah and Siobhan's work and of course press team's work with Secret Feminist Agenda,

00:14:44.000 --> 00:15:01.000

the Amplify Podcast Network became a project more interested in the questions of what peer review could look like from that proposal stage and as well thinking about as Hannah mentioned what that would look like if other scholars brought their own ideas, their own themes and topics to this question.

00:15:01.000 --> 00:15:10.000

And so from our first year we had three podcasts we were going to put through peer review. We've hit lots of really interesting challenges along the way.

00:15:10.000 --> 00:15:32.000

And learned a lot in the process. And so over the three-and-a-half years together, we've learned some interesting ideas and challenges including thinking about timeline, thinking about production capacity of scholars and whether their topics are suited to this particular form, what do they need to be thinking about if they are interested in this form for their research?

00:15:32.000 --> 00:15:42.000

And of course, what does it mean to be putting a podcast through peer review approach if the idea is creating peer review as part of the production process.

00:15:42.000 --> 00:15:54.000

What does it mean to take that feedback on a podcast and revise, edit, or add to based on the comments that you receive, which was a little bit different than what happened with Secret Feminist Agenda.

00:15:54.000 --> 00:15:58.000

So thinking about how do we create this model through Amplify. So for example, as I mentioned, we started with three podcast projects.

00:15:58.000 --> 00:16:09.000

We now have one that's been postponed, one that's been reduced in size and scope, and one that's kind of stayed on the original course.

00:16:09.000 --> 00:16:26.000

So that gives you a good idea of, you know, going through this experimentation, how this brings up really interesting challenges, what this tells us about and what we've learned about this process and how to create this structure for scholarly podcasting going through peer review.

00:16:26.000 --> 00:16:29.000

Of course, as I mentioned, Covid-19 was certainly a factor, but I think also just this was brand new.

00:16:29.000 --> 00:16:49.000

Like you were all just experimenting with and learning how to do this. So this brought forward really interesting conversations between Hannah, Siobhan, and I, for instance, around what are the differences in book manuscript publication timelines versus podcast timelines?

00:16:49.000 --> 00:16:57.000

I was coming from podcast industry, Hannah from more DIY scholar podcasting, and Siobhan from the book industry.

00:16:57.000 --> 00:17:03.000

So how can we kind of blend those worlds together into what would be the best suited structure for this particular format?

00:17:03.000 --> 00:17:24.000

And so Siobhan and I worked really closely with our podcasters, providing feedback on their series outlines, for instance, and met regularly with them over the initial production and development stages to answer issues, questions they had along the way, and of course provide feedback and proposed revisions on those initial drafts.

00:17:24.000 --> 00:17:34.000

You can probably see some similarities with, for instance, book editing in this way, except we were also providing feedback on the actual sound content.

00:17:34.000 --> 00:17:52.000

So how are they making good use of the podcast form? So thinking about the sound quality, what kind of atmosphere, sound effects, etc., and of course recording quality is being used to make it the best podcast that they can put forward to represent their work.

00:17:52.000 --> 00:17:57.000

So at present, our brilliant collaborator, Brenna Clarke Gray, is nearing the end of their peer review process.

00:17:57.000 --> 00:18:11.000

So I'm looking forward to the next steps with that, of course. And then moving on to--I mentioned there was four moving through things--second area focus of Amplify is creating resources.

00:18:11.000 --> 00:18:26.000

So creating resources specifically for scholarly podcasters. So our inaugural open access resource was our guide to academic podcasting, and it was published in 2021 as an open resource for really anyone interested in academic podcasting.

00:18:26.000 --> 00:18:43.000

We noticed there was a lot of generic resources out there for, you know, how to create a podcast; what are the best tips and tricks, right, but nothing that was specifically suited for scholars and researchers who are interested in the form as part of their scholarship.

00:18:43.000 --> 00:18:56.000

So the creating this guide also really helped us think through these questions of what is scholarly podcasting, what are the particular best practices, questions, and tools that scholars need to create their own work.

00:18:56.000 --> 00:19:12.000

And then the second resource that we've developed is our *Why Podcast?* series. It's a peer-reviewed series, three-part series with *Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy*.

00:19:12.000 --> 00:19:20.000

And that was really, Hannah and I thinking about, how can we take these big questions from Amplify and apply them to a smaller case study like a journal submission.

00:19:20.000 --> 00:19:37.000

And the team with Kairos was absolutely amazing. They were very much game to experiment with what peer review would look like for a three-part audio series and web text, and so excited they even created a roundtable version of the peer review which became part of the appendix of that submission.

00:19:37.000 --> 00:19:46.000

So it's the three-part audio series as well as the appendix roundtable. So you can kind of get full transparency of what that peer review process looked like.

00:19:46.000 --> 00:19:55.000

And then finally, a third resource, resource output. And maybe my personal favorite from Amplify was our Manifesto.

00:19:55.000 --> 00:20:09.000

So it's available as an audio collage and a digital zine on our website, and it's a collaboratively voiced sound work articulating core values of the Amplify Podcast Network in the voices of all of our network collaborators.

00:20:09.000 --> 00:20:16.000

So it's kind of a wonderful love letter to the community that's formed around the network and really claims some big claims about what scholarly podcasting is doing in the publishing industry,

00:20:16.000 --> 00:20:35.000

and in scholarship and the academy at large. And then our third and fourth are really looking at, so third preservation, which we are working on right now, our Amplify Metadata Packaging tool.

00:20:35.000 --> 00:20:45.000

So thinking about this critical need for academic podcast preservation, a big question in digital publishing, but in podcasting in particular, because RSS feeds can come and go as quickly as hosting platform subscriptions.

00:20:45.000 --> 00:21:01.000

So if podcasters want to keep their work in their library institutions, for instance, we were trying to create this tool that would help facilitate that process.

00:21:01.000 --> 00:21:25.000

So AMP for short, the Amplify Metadata Podcast or Packaging tool is in collaboration with Simon Fraser University's digital humanities innovation lab, DHIL, and it's hosted by them and allows scholars to ingest their podcast RSS feed, tweak that metadata, and export it back out as library repository friendly digital packaging.

00:21:25.000 --> 00:21:30.000

So thinking about Islandora, MODS, and bepress for instance that we're working with, and we're currently in beta testing right now.

00:21:30.000 --> 00:21:38.000

I think our meeting's next week from where this is being recorded right now. And so we're looking forward to hopefully being able to open that up more broadly to more community members

00:21:38.000 --> 00:21:51.000

in the near future. And then finally, our fourth and final focus for Amplify is really just community, which I think all three of these focuses speak to already.

00:21:51.000 --> 00:22:05.000

And in thinking about this creating a community, we decided to create a second stream for Amplify Podcast Network.

00:22:05.000 --> 00:22:17.000

So our first one being that peer-reviewed stream of podcasts with Wilfrid Laurier University Press and now a second stream for non-peer-reviewed podcasts, and that's the Sustained stream.

00:22:17.000 --> 00:22:43.000

So the Sustained stream is created out of conversations we've had with other podcast scholars over the years that maybe are really interested in podcasting for its rapid release, the way to get ahead and stay current with ideas within their research, for instance, and put out like Hannah was with Secret Feminist Agenda maybe a weekly podcast or a biweekly podcast and not have to wait for that peer review process

00:22:43.000 --> 00:22:54.000

to go through. And so we've got, we put out our first CFP just earlier this year for Sustain and got an amazing cohort of four brand-new podcasts as part of the network.

00:22:54.000 --> 00:22:59.000

You can check them all out on our website, and we're looking forward to putting out another call in the near future as well.

00:22:59.000 --> 00:23:12.000

And so now that we're almost at our end of our initial grant funding for this project, we're starting to, and I'm sure you can tell from my description so far, thinking about the future of the network and where we want to go next with it.

00:23:12.000 --> 00:23:27.000

And I think the development of these two streams really gives us that support to look to the future. So Resonate as peer review with Wilfred Laurier University Press, and Sustain stream as an ongoing community of practice.

00:23:27.000 --> 00:23:40.000

So hopefully that gives you a good overview of Amplify. Trying to cram in as much as I could in the timeline so we can get more to the chat and hear from everyone here.

00:23:40.000 --> 00:23:51.000

Sara Cohen: Thank you so much, Hannah and Stacey. That was fabulous. And one of the things that I loved like hearing about the Amplify Podcast Network as you were speaking is the way that feminist practice is sort of embedded in the way that the network works.

00:23:51.000 --> 00:24:03.000

And I don't know if that's just a function of the amazing feminists who are at the heart of it, or if it's a conscious effort, but maybe we can talk more about that as we get into the Q&A.

00:24:03.000 --> 00:24:09.000

So thank you both for all that you've done and for sharing with us. So as we normally do about this time over at Adventures in Digital Publishing, I'm going to transition into questions

00:24:09.000 --> 00:24:15.000

for the folks in the room. We have at least one question for everybody. So everybody should get a turn.

00:24:15.000 --> 00:24:30.000

And the first person that I have a question for is Siobhan. Siobhan, could you talk to us a little bit about what happens when someone wants to create a podcast for the Amplify Network?

00:24:30.000 --> 00:24:40.000

Siobhan McMenemy: Hello, yes, I certainly can. Though I will preface everything I am saying with the fact that it is all a work in progress.

00:24:40.000 --> 00:24:46.000

So we continue to, tinker if you will, with the way in which we are operating at the press.

00:24:46.000 --> 00:25:01.000

And in in collaboration with Amplify. So you've already heard about the fact that there are the two streams, and I think I'd just like to take a moment to echo what Stacey was saying about

00:25:01.000 --> 00:25:29.000

the capacity of Amplify, you know, being that much more considerable and more impressive for the two streams. Because as you can gather from the comments from both Hannah and Stacey, the peer review process, and this won't come as a surprise to people in scholarly publishing, but it can it can become onerous, and it can get bogged down, and as Stacey was suggesting there are some very

00:25:29.000 --> 00:25:45.000

unique challenges in undertaking a peer review of audio and, and even the editorial work and the production work that Stacey and I were doing in advance necessitated a slower process.

00:25:45.000 --> 00:25:50.000

So over the course of time what I'm anticipating, and what Stacey and I have understood will likely happen and and it's already in evidence,

00:25:50.000 --> 00:26:08.000

is that the Resonate stream, the peer-reviewed stream, will put out calls with the same frequency as the Sustained stream, which is a, is twice a year.

00:26:08.000 --> 00:26:21.000

But at the moment, because we are still wrapping up work on prospectively two new series, but certainly one that is that much closer to actual release,

00:26:21.000 --> 00:26:37.000

I want to complete those because of the the labor that is involved in in doing that work, and it would also behoove us at the press, as my colleagues will later attest, to having seen a scholarly podcast through that peer review process

00:26:37.000 --> 00:26:45.000

in a way that as Hannah elaborated is considerably different from the process we undertook with Secret Feminist Agenda and is therefore seen from the beginning,

00:26:45.000 --> 00:26:52.000

through the early production and editing, to the in-house work, to its publication. And then we'll have a model.

00:26:52.000 --> 00:26:56.000

And we'll have a better, we'll be better equipped to begin the process of fine-tuning that

00:26:56.000 --> 00:27:06.000

that set of best practices. So I'm even hesitant to call it best practices. Because at the moment I think it's some practices that are working.

00:27:06.000 --> 00:27:15.000

And we will continue to, we will continue to polish them until they become closer to best. And I know none of that answers your question.

00:27:15.000 --> 00:27:24.000

So I'll turn to the question to say that what will happen is that we will have calls.

00:27:24.000 --> 00:27:41.000

And, as with any decision-making process at the at the front end at a university press the editor will be responsible for looking for proposals that really do--I'm trying to avoid

00:27:41.000 --> 00:27:54.000

using the word "resonate" here--that will really, speak to the the publishing program and its lists so that there is a compatibility with the vision overall

00:27:54.000 --> 00:28:13.000

at Wilfrid Laurier University Press. But we will have the benefit of the Amplify Network editorial board who will look at the proposals too and will work with the senior editor at the press to to advise.

00:28:13.000 --> 00:28:25.000

Unlike the editorial board's work with the Sustained stream, where they are actively involved in making the selections, they will advise the press on the peer-reviewed podcasts.

00:28:25.000 --> 00:28:33.000

But the decision to go forward toward peer review with a particular podcaster will be a decision made internally at the press.

00:28:33.000 --> 00:28:37.000

And then it really is a system and a process that as Stacey and I have been honing over the last number of years

00:28:37.000 --> 00:29:08.000

that is very similar to the way in which we handle proposals for book manuscripts. But of course, there is a level of--I'm also trying to avoid using the word "polish"--but there is a there is a level of readiness that the the podcaster has to demonstrate in the proposal itself, and then very early on in conversation with the editor, in order to assure us that they are well equipped to produce

00:29:08.000 --> 00:29:24.000

a podcast. We will be working alongside producers like Stacey, not necessarily Stacey, but people with Stacey's skills to ensure the quality of the podcasts.

00:29:24.000 --> 00:29:27.000

And, but we are not, we are not podcast producers per se, and it may be down the road.

00:29:27.000 --> 00:29:49.000

We, we can, we can dream that we have, you know, additional staff to take on that work, but at the moment we are really going to rely on the podcasters to demonstrate their ability to produce and to, if not do the editorial work necessary on the audio files, then at least work with somebody to do so.

00:29:49.000 --> 00:30:15.000

So needless to say funding then becomes an absolute necessity and and something that needs to be discussed upfront, which you know most editors I suspect do when there's an obvious need for discussion of funding, but it's it's absolutely crucial in this regard. And I have to say that so far it's

been fairly obvious that scholars who are interested in podcasting are either already well versed with the tech and can do it, or

00:30:15.000 --> 00:30:20.000

they understand that they don't have that skill and will have to pay for it. So that that's less of a concern.

00:30:20.000 --> 00:30:35.000

But from the acceptance of a proposal, then we move into the same kind of process that Stacey and I have been developing over the last while with our SSHRC-funded collaborators.

00:30:35.000 --> 00:30:44.000

And that was an interesting process because Stacey and I came to know each other better and the ways in which we worked as an audio producer editor and as a book editor.

00:30:44.000 --> 00:31:00.000

So I of course was concerned that listening to the audio I wouldn't know how to articulate my thoughts about where strengths and weaknesses in fact existed.

00:31:00.000 --> 00:31:08.000

But I was very relieved to discover that our opinions on the the drafts we were hearing over the course of time were fairly similar, and of course we do have different perspectives

00:31:08.000 --> 00:31:27.000

and we do have a different language to describe strengths and weaknesses. And then of course we have a different array of of ideas about how one might respond to to revise strengths and weaknesses to make the work even better.

00:31:27.000 --> 00:31:32.000

But there's a lot of back and forth. And in that regard, the the sort of peer review process,

00:31:32.000 --> 00:31:48.000

and the the pre-peer-review developmental process was was really building on the work and and the education of having worked with Hannah on Secret Feminist Agenda.

00:31:48.000 --> 00:32:00.000

So the the notion of iterative versions, drafts, it is became very important even as that didn't necessarily translate to formal peer review becoming itself iterative.

00:32:00.000 --> 00:32:19.000

So unlike the Sustained stream, which Stacey described as an opportunity for rapid release, the Resonate stream is going to have to be more reflective and and and incorporate opportunities for multiple revisions.

00:32:19.000 --> 00:32:24.000

In fact, Stacey and I listened in most cases to two drafts of every episode and offered concrete feedback.

00:32:24.000 --> 00:32:32.000

And then, and then we determined that everyone was content that it could go, that the series could go to peer review.

00:32:32.000 --> 00:32:47.000

But it, I'm gonna save save these comments for later, but that but it did that that decision like when when do you decide it's ready to go to peer review, and when do you decide decide that it's ready for publication remains,

00:32:47.000 --> 00:33:01.000

you know, not quite elusive, but it's going to be, it's going to be a shifting, it's a question with shifting answers, which I think having worked with book manuscripts, I feel much more, I feel much better equipped applying a timeline to.

00:33:01.000 --> 00:33:17.000

So I'm anticipating that podcasters may grow frustrated. And I think it's safe to say we've seen a bit of that already with the three sets of podcasters we were working with with the length of time that this process takes.

00:33:17.000 --> 00:33:31.000

And so that is something that I have to be continually aware of and look for ways to accommodate you know the need for that scholars have for forward momentum and ultimately for a publication that doesn't take ten years.

00:33:31.000 --> 00:33:52.000

We have, as with our book manuscripts, an editorial board that considers the the podcasts in more or less the same way. They are given the audio in advance, they are given a review dossier, they are given the comments that I have to make about the project, and a bit of the history.

00:33:52.000 --> 00:34:00.000

And then we meet, and they tell us that, they tell me principally, you know, what they think needs to be done if anything, and we continue to work on the work

00:34:00.000 --> 00:34:27.000

for with publication in mind. So, that, that extends the, the answer extends the, the question into sort of workflow, but I thought that might be useful because it's it's the the the challenge really in in inviting and then accepting proposals to into the Resonate stream for Amplify

00:34:27.000 --> 00:34:39.000

is going to be impressing upon people the the need to be prepared for these fairly time-consuming and in-depth back-and-forth exchanges all along.

00:34:39.000 --> 00:34:45.000

And it and it equally necessitates thinking and discussing with them regularly the the entirety of the process

00:34:45.000 --> 00:34:50.000

because it is largely unfamiliar to them.

00:34:50.000 --> 00:35:01.000

Sara Cohen: Thanks so much, Siobhan. I have a follow-up question for you about peer review, but I'm gonna save it for later in case that we, I can make sure that we have enough time.

00:35:01.000 --> 00:35:08.000

Definitely want to talk more about that, and I'm sure that the other folks in in the audience want to hear more about peer review too.

00:35:08.000 --> 00:35:16.000

Stacey, I'm going to move to you and ask you a production question, which is sort of a good place to transition from the end of Siobhan's remarks.

00:35:16.000 --> 00:35:29.000

In terms of production, can you talk to us about what kinds of things the press and the author need to take into consideration when creating an audio project versus a written one?

00:35:29.000 --> 00:35:37.000

Stacey Copeland: Yeah, I mean, Siobhan's definitely spoken a little bit to this as well in the maybe growing pains that we've had along the way and creating what it means to bring these worlds together.

00:35:37.000 --> 00:35:49.000

And when I describe Amplify Podcast Network to scholars who aren't familiar necessarily with the idea of scholarly podcasting,

00:35:49.000 --> 00:36:02.000

it's still, you know, fairly new in the grand scheme of things, I often get asked, "So do people just like monologue about their research, or are they just like reading their article aloud?"

00:36:02.000 --> 00:36:11.000

What is scholarly podcasting?" I'm like, none of that, please. That's not what I want to listen to in a scholarly podcast.

00:36:11.000 --> 00:36:18.000

But it really begs the question of thinking about what it means to think about the form of podcast.

00:36:18.000 --> 00:36:46.000

What does it mean to work with sound and think about sound first when you're developing this project? And so I think one of the biggest things I can suggest to folks, and Siobhan was already talking about this, is that publishers and editors need to be working really early on with their podcasters and making sure they're well equipped to produce a work in sound because scholars are trained throughout graduate school and their career to write a

00:36:46.000 --> 00:36:52.000

manuscript, to write an article, but they aren't trained how to make a scholarly podcast.

00:36:52.000 --> 00:37:17.000

And so it's really critical to have the conversation early on about whether they have the capacity to produce in sound or they need to put a team together to produce in sound, and whether that's going to be on the publisher or whether it's going to be on the podcaster who's pitching the work and having those clear conversations and making sure that the podcaster is thinking about gathering sound along the way so that we

00:37:17.000 --> 00:37:26.000

can hear their process. We can hear what sounds are actually a part of their research. For instance, are they talking about a particular place?

00:37:26.000 --> 00:37:41.000

Could they go there? Did they go there? Could they collect sounds while they're on location that they could use to help bring us into their research more and take advantage of this form in ways that we can't necessarily be embedded in place through a manuscript in the same way?

00:37:41.000 --> 00:37:54.000

You can add description, but you can't add those sound bites. So what can we do to really take advantage of audio specifically and also then thinking about writing for the ear.

00:37:54.000 --> 00:38:02.000

So this was interesting working with Siobhan, for instance, because we would often have similar notes on the writing, but different ways of approaching or tweaking it.

00:38:02.000 --> 00:38:19.000

So I'd be interested in, you know, how can we get the intro down to two minutes versus Shiobhan would be interested in the amount of sentences, or the way that they flow, and so having a good blend of these conversations about what it means to write for the ear, but also write clearly and in a scholarly manner and blending those two worlds together.

00:38:19.000 --> 00:38:35.000

So thinking about, I think on the publisher side, are your editors and is your team equipped and feeling confident in their ability to think about writing for the ear, to think about considering sound.

00:38:35.000 --> 00:38:48.000

And if they're not, make sure that they have the tools and time to think about these questions and put together a structure ahead of taking on these particular exciting scholarly podcast initiatives.

00:38:48.000 --> 00:38:51.000

So maybe I'll leave it there as a little bit of a, please think about sound.

00:38:51.000 --> 00:39:02.000

Sara Cohen: Thank you so much, Stacey. And sort of transitioning from like the sound production to the press production process,

00:39:02.000 --> 00:39:19.000

I want to ask Lindsey a question now. As the production coordinator at the press, can you talk about how some of the accessibility considerations came into play, or can you talk about, pardon me, some of the accessibility considerations that came into play with the Amplify Podcasting Network?

00:39:19.000 --> 00:39:27.000

What do you think about differently for content that is digital first versus print content when it comes to accessibility issues?

00:39:27.000 --> 00:39:33.000

Lindsey Hunnewell: Certainly. So I came into this project after the initial podcast with Hannah was done.

00:39:33.000 --> 00:39:46.000

So we, I came in at the beginning of more of the like the resources section. Like the podcasting network, the podcasting guide, and the manifesto, and the website.

00:39:46.000 --> 00:39:53.000

So. For accessibility, as a press, we are really focused on accessibility.

00:39:53.000 --> 00:40:21.000

Roughly one in ten Canadians has a print disability. So that is anything from having a visual disability where you have low vision or blindness or colorblindness to a disability that affects you being able to hold and physically work with printed materials or a disability like dyslexia, which affects cognitive and abilities to take in the information

00:40:21.000 --> 00:40:37.000

from a print book. So with that, one in ten Canadians, it's roughly the same with Americans, less than 10 percent of material is actually published in a format that is accessible to them.

00:40:37.000 --> 00:40:51.000

So it's crucial that we start making more content in formats like audio, like podcasting and e-books and fully web-based materials as publishers.

00:40:51.000 --> 00:41:03.000

So we are a Benetech Global Certified Publisher, which means our aim is to make all of our materials as accessible as possible.

00:41:03.000 --> 00:41:09.000

But things get a little bit tricky when we're working with newer formats like podcasting.

00:41:09.000 --> 00:41:18.000

For e-books and websites, there's standards that we follow. So we have the WCAG standards, which is the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines.

00:41:18.000 --> 00:41:28.000

We have e-book, EPUB accessibility specifications and Daisy's ACE checker to help with our work with content with those types of formats.

00:41:28.000 --> 00:41:40.000

But there really isn't yet some like guidelines and set organ-, like set specifications for podcasting and audio books.

00:41:40.000 --> 00:41:49.000

There are guidelines that some organizations are following, but nothing that's a global standard. So what happened with the Amplify Network,

00:41:49.000 --> 00:42:13.000

it was one of our first truly born-digital projects that we took on after becoming Benetech certified. And it was important for us that we make this as a born-accessible project and not something that we were retrofitting, which happens a lot with print books to e-books, especially in years gone by.

00:42:13.000 --> 00:42:26.000

We needed to make it a project that from the get-go we were thinking about accessibility and how people and users were going to interact with our content and materials.

00:42:26.000 --> 00:42:38.000

It was a little bit of a challenge. We wanted to bring, obviously, our accessibility knowledge from print and EPUBs into this.

00:42:38.000 --> 00:42:43.000

But what was nice about it is that there's some core principles that follow through for accessibility

00:42:43.000 --> 00:42:56.000

considerations, no matter what format we're working in. And so the things that we thought about when we were working with this was making sure that we included, we had a robust

00:42:56.000 --> 00:43:10.000

design that would adapt to a variety of technologies so that it could be opened on a variety of different softwares, that we have good navigation so it's easy for e-readers to understand how

00:43:10.000 --> 00:43:23.000

it jumps from different sections and different elements within the podcast within the website within the EPUB that we've created.

00:43:23.000 --> 00:43:37.000

That we had proper markup. And tagging like accessibility tagging with headings and things like that, and that we had clear descriptions for alt text for all of our audio and visual components.

00:43:37.000 --> 00:43:53.000

From the beginning of this project we took the WCAG standards into consideration. So, and that meant even starting from the beginning with color palettes and designs and logos.

00:43:53.000 --> 00:44:05.000

So with the logo and the color scheme for branding, we had ah--Hannah and her team had originally come up with a palette that they really liked, but it wouldn't pass the AIM color contrast specifications for WCAG.

00:44:05.000 --> 00:44:17.000

So it was not passing for contrast and for colorblindness. So we then had to take that into consideration and change gears and shift into a different color palette.

00:44:17.000 --> 00:44:29.000

And then after that, we had to settle on a layout for production for the podcasting guidebook.

00:44:29.000 --> 00:44:37.000

And it was going to be a web-based document first before it was going to be a printed resource.

00:44:37.000 --> 00:44:44.000

And we wanted to make it also a fully accessible EPUB. And what was nice about this is it gave us the freedom

00:44:44.000 --> 00:44:56.000

to like create the work for a web for web standards and simplify our design so that we had crisp and clean designs throughout from the beginning,

00:44:56.000 --> 00:45:08.000

that we could very easily incorporate proper HTML coding and semantic markup with accessible tagging for the e-readers.

00:45:08.000 --> 00:45:26.000

It also meant when we were thinking about layouts that we didn't have overlapping images with text boxes because that is an accessibility nightmare for for e-readers and that are, you know, that it was divided properly so that it would translate very like nicely

00:45:26.000 --> 00:45:37.000

for someone who's using it as a visual component. But also work really well with e-readers and for those who needed to take the information in a different way.

00:45:37.000 --> 00:45:55.000

So that was the biggest consideration for that. We also made sure that all of our alt text was, we created alt text for any visual and audio elements, and that we had proper transcriptions that were linked to linked to

00:45:55.000 --> 00:46:06.000

the audio podcast and that they were provided. On a whole, the biggest shift, I'm thinking towards this production,

00:46:06.000 --> 00:46:26.000

was the audio files. So for web and e-book content we have those recognized standards. But it's a little bit like the Wild West for audio and podcasting. There are specs and levels and bit rates and sound quality

00:46:26.000 --> 00:46:28.000

things, elements that we need to take into consideration.

00:46:28.000 --> 00:46:40.000

But even for podcasting, those are different from audio books. So what I learned with this is that you really need to be clear about your intention of how you're going to use your audio content.

00:46:40.000 --> 00:46:49.000

And, if you plan on repurposing it, how you're going to record it in a method that you can package it both for audio,

00:46:49.000 --> 00:46:58.000

for podcasts, but also that will work for audio in other, and for other vendors.

00:46:58.000 --> 00:47:04.000

And I think that's pretty much what I've got to say for right now. So I will pass it back.

00:47:04.000 --> 00:47:14.000

Sara Cohen. Alright, thank you, Lindsey. And Stacey gave you a shout-out in the chat if you didn't get a chance to see it.

00:47:14.000 --> 00:47:16.000

If we have time, I want to come back and ask you later about what parts of the accessibility process you handle and what parts authors handle.

00:47:16.000 --> 00:47:29.000

But for now I'm gonna switch over and ask a question of Maia. So Maia, you work at both the library and the press.

00:47:29.000 --> 00:47:34.000

And I wanted to ask if it was challenging to combine the needs of each setting and apply those to academic podcasting?

00:47:34.000 --> 00:47:46.000

Maia Desjardins: For sure. In a way, they share a lot of goals. So the idea of discoverability and sustainability.

00:47:46.000 --> 00:47:56.000

I find things that carry across podcasts, publishing, and libraries. But once you go within those goals, they have very different sections.

00:47:56.000 --> 00:48:07.000

So a lot of the work that I did with the podcast network was looking at metadata and what formats they wanted to export into and where we wanted to see these podcasts end up.

00:48:07.000 --> 00:48:24.000

And originally we were looking at RSS feeds, of course. But we also looked at ONIX, which is publishing metadata, and MARC, our library metadata, and it was really fascinating to see the way that those overlap.

00:48:24.000 --> 00:48:33.000

And the kind of fields that we could bring in to using in the AMP tool. But there's also so many differences.

00:48:33.000 --> 00:48:45.000

You have publishing focused on like distribution and sales, libraries focused on discoverability, and that sort of thing, and then the RSS feeds that are created for audio, and a serial at that.

00:48:45.000 --> 00:48:48.000

Especially when it comes to publishing monographs, there's not that much metadata around serials.

00:48:48.000 --> 00:49:02.000

So we were really adapting things to work with both that audio format. And something that's going to have seasons as well as individual episodes within them.

00:49:02.000 --> 00:49:12.000

And then of course we also had to have the RSS feeds translate into a Dublin-core-based metadata for all of our repositories.

00:49:12.000 --> 00:49:19.000

Which is where sustainability comes in as well. So I also work on our library's repository.

00:49:19.000 --> 00:49:28.000

And so we really wanted to make sure that that metadata could be exported and held in a place long-term where people could go back and find it.

00:49:28.000 --> 00:49:37.000

And it be retrievable and not quite as flexible and all over the place as an RSS feed is, as wonderful as those traits are.

00:49:37.000 --> 00:49:47.000

Those are not what repositories focus on. Yeah, so they they do have a lot of overlap in their overall goals, but when it came down

00:49:47.000 --> 00:50:03.000

to the inside that it was really key to find the areas that actually overlap such as creators, titles, an order of sorts; copyright metadata is also super important to all those groups as well.

00:50:03.000 --> 00:50:08.000

So I definitely learned a lot about podcasts, but it was really great to be able to look at it through both a publishing lens

00:50:08.000 --> 00:50:10.000

and a library lens.

00:50:10.000 --> 00:50:21.000

Sara Cohen: Thank you so much, Maia. That was super helpful. I appreciate your talking us through some of those considerations.

00:50:21.000 --> 00:50:33.000

My sort of last big question before we transition into a Q&A is a really big question, and it's for you Hannah, and the question is should all scholarly podcasts be peer reviewed?

00:50:33.000 --> 00:50:39.000

Hannah McGregor: Hmm, it's such a good question. I know because I suggested that we put it in the script.

00:50:39.000 --> 00:50:57.000

That's how I know it's a good question. And you know what? It's one that has, has been like kind of plaguing me since the very first time I stood up at an academic conference and said, "Hey, maybe we can make podcasts and take those seriously."

00:50:57.000 --> 00:51:03.000

And almost immediately somebody in the audience was like, "I make a podcast. I absolutely don't want it peer reviewed.

00:51:03.000 --> 00:51:09.000

I absolutely don't want it looked at by my tenure and promotion committee. I do not want my dean to know that it exists.

00:51:09.000 --> 00:51:23.000

My podcast is the space where I am free to say the things I actually want to say and think things through in the way I want to outside of the sort of overwhelming force of like institutional interpolation.

00:51:23.000 --> 00:51:46.000

So like please don't take the freedom of my podcasting away from me." And the more time I have spent working on scholarly podcasting and working with other, other scholarly podcasters, the more convinced I've become that peer review does not have to be the end goal of every podcasting project.

00:51:46.000 --> 00:51:58.000

And the more convinced I've become that, in fact, peer review in a more expansive sense is actually at the heart of all scholarly knowledge creation.

00:51:58.000 --> 00:52:11.000

So I have a book coming out in February that I co-authored with Lori Beckstead at Toronto Metropolitan University and Ian M.

00:52:11.000 --> 00:52:17.000

Cook, who is in Budapest, works for the Open Learning Initiative there,

00:52:17.000 --> 00:52:24.000

who are both scholarly podcasters, come from really different sorts of disciplinary backgrounds.

00:52:24.000 --> 00:52:29.000

And we we have a book coming out called Podcast or Perish. Do you get the joke? Yeah, it's good.

00:52:29.000 --> 00:52:35.000

It's funny. And one question we had to work through was, what's the definition of scholarly podcasting?

00:52:35.000 --> 00:52:49.000

Like what, is it different from other podcasting? What do we mean by scholarly? And it was really important to us that we didn't mean like somebody who was employed full-time by a university.

00:52:49.000 --> 00:53:06.000

That there must be some actual quality to scholarlyness that we wanted to arrive at, and after hours and hours of conversation, the conclusion we came to was that scholarly podcasts are defined are defined by their reviewability.

00:53:06.000 --> 00:53:26.000

Which is to say that scholarly knowledge is, what characterizes it as scholarly, is its openness to the possibility of review, which is to say that it is, it is accountable to a larger community of other scholars working in the same field but also other experts in that field.

00:53:26.000 --> 00:53:38.000

You know, in some disciplines, it's the reproducibility of a particular experiment. Or a particular dataset. In other fields, it's transparent engagement with established research.

00:53:38.000 --> 00:53:51.000

And citing your sources so that people can follow your sources back and check. That you, you know, are citing things correctly and can respond to you by engaging with the same body of research.

00:53:51.000 --> 00:54:15.000

And based on my experience making Witch, Please and on the experience of a lot of other scholars making non-peer-reviewed podcasts, you nonetheless are engaging in conversations with other experts in the field all the time about what you're saying on your podcast, and they are you know challenging you and pushing you, and you come back and continue the conversation in subsequent episodes.

00:54:15.000 --> 00:54:26.000

So that you are, in fact, engaged in a kind of ongoing iterative review process, by virtue of having a scholarly conversation.

00:54:26.000 --> 00:54:38.000

And so for me, the question becomes not "Do you want to peer review this podcast?" but "What particular kind of review are you interested in and why?"

00:54:38.000 --> 00:54:52.000

So the non-peer-reviewed podcast that I make now, Material Girls, we we are not formally reviewing it in any way. And, you know, we make sure to cite all of our sources.

00:54:52.000 --> 00:55:00.000

We make sure that we have open lines of communication with our listeners so that they can push us and challenge us on things.

00:55:00.000 --> 00:55:11.000

We have accountability measures built into how we make the work so that we are constantly engaging in a kind of open conversational

00:55:11.000 --> 00:55:19.000

process that is itself a kind of iterative review. And in other cases, there's a huge amount of value to be had from a more formal review process.

00:55:19.000 --> 00:55:42.000

Particularly from how there's nothing quite like some experts in your field sitting down and carefully listening to your work and then, you know, thoughtfully writing out some notes for you. That's actually incredibly useful and I think I, peeked at the Q&A,

00:55:42.000 --> 00:56:08.000

and I think we can't put aside the really important role that formal review plays in rendering scholarly podcasting legible to our institutions, so that for people who do want to incorporate it into, you know, into their formal CVs, into their tenure and review process, who were trying to get hired on the basis of this work.

00:56:08.000 --> 00:56:27.000

You know, the the legitimization that comes with a peer review process is also really essential. But I've increasingly come to understand review as less of a sort of binary on/off switch and more as a spectrum of forms of engagement.

00:56:27.000 --> 00:56:35.000

That in fact when you are producing scholarly knowledge, you're always, you're always engaging in some kind of review.

00:56:35.000 --> 00:56:43.000

And I hope Siobhan is at least mentally patting herself on the back because when we started this project I was like not convinced peer review has any value at all.

00:56:43.000 --> 00:56:48.000

And now I'm like, actually I think the very nature of scholarship might be its openness to peer review.

00:56:48.000 --> 00:56:48.000

So. Sorry, Siobhan, I was wrong.

00:56:48.000 --> 00:56:53.000

Sara Cohen: Thank you so much, Hannah. And I'm really looking forward to Podcast or Perish.

00:56:53.000 --> 00:56:57.000

I mean, to bring things somewhat full circle, I got to be part of the open peer review process for that,

00:56:57.000 --> 00:57:07.000

which was super fun, and I'm looking forward to seeing it out in the world. So I see Ana's back on screen, Ana are you gonna moderate the Q&A?

00:57:07.000 --> 00:57:20.000

Ana Jimenez-Moreno: Yes, yes----Alright, thanks for coming back!----thank you so much, yes, thank you. So if everyone who's with us right now, if you want to ask a question, please ask it in the Q&A.

00:57:20.000 --> 00:57:29.000

We will, like I said in the beginning, we'll be, we'll have another kind of fifteen minutes to, to engage with you all.

00:57:29.000 --> 00:57:49.000

There already are questions on the Q&A, and I think Hannah already sort of talked, started addressing this quite, you know, already in that, you know, do, do is there a sense of maybe it's too early because it's, you know, it's part you're still part of the movement and there's there's so much to figure out, but if there are

00:57:49.000 --> 00:57:59.000

Hannah or anybody else on this panel, if they know if, how academic podcasts are being considered by promotion and tenure committees at universities.

00:57:59.000 --> 00:58:10.000

If there's any other sense of that, I know you already spoke to that already, Hannah, but if you have or anybody else on the panel knows if that has been received or conversations,

00:58:10.000 --> 00:58:12.000

potential conversations, that have been had.

00:58:12.000 --> 00:58:16.000

Hannah McGregor: Yeah. Oh yeah, yeah, yeah, that's been, I mean, it's been conversation from

00:58:16.000 --> 00:58:27.000

not just from the beginning of this work, but really sort of emerging out of ongoing conversations in the digital humanities and in sort of the world of multimodal publishing.

00:58:27.000 --> 00:58:35.000

You know, Cheryl Ball, who was one of our, our peer reviewers for Season One of Secret Feminist Agenda,

00:58:35.000 --> 00:58:51.000

really was like, I have been doing this work for years. I've been advocating for nontraditional forms of scholarly communication for years, and the landscape has changed in some ways, and in other ways it's still a really up,

00:58:51.000 --> 00:59:00.000

really uphill battle. I will say it's really different from discipline to discipline, institution to institution, and country to country.

00:59:00.000 --> 00:59:22.000

The the cultures of tenure and promotion committees really vary across all of those different things. And, and sometimes very, at like really simple structural levels, you know, in my, in my faculty, the individual departments create our own tenure and promotion guidelines.

00:59:22.000 --> 00:59:44.000

So we can say what our values are as a department. And how we are going to evaluate work. You know, in other institutions, they come from the faculty level and so are much more top-down, have much less room for, you know, shifting or changing things depending on on the discipline or or what kind of work

00:59:44.000 --> 00:59:51.000

people are doing that. My colleague Juan Pablo Alperin, who directs the Scholarly Communications Lab here at SFU,

00:59:51.000 --> 01:00:11.000

a couple of years ago published an article where he, they basically like looked at tenure and promotion documents across North America to see if there was any evidence that TPCs were taking public scholarship seriously, and his conclusion was absolutely not, like nobody specifies it.

01:00:11.000 --> 01:00:36.000

Nobody actually says we're gonna reward you for this. And yet we see at high levels in universities a lot of emphasis on publicly engaged scholarship, a lot of emphasis on knowledge mobilization. In Canada, our SSHRC, like our Tri-Council funder, is really emphasizing accessibility, knowledge mobilization, public engagement, impact metrics

01:00:36.000 --> 01:00:46.000

in ways that that really support the work of podcasting, but you might get a grant from your national funder supporting you making podcasts,

01:00:46.000 --> 01:00:51.000

successfully make a podcast, peer review it, and then turn around and have your TPC be like,

01:00:51.000 --> 01:01:01.000

"That's not real. We don't we don't see that as real." It's a culture shift, and culture shifts really slow in academia.

01:01:01.000 --> 01:01:05.000

And I really believe that it is

01:01:05.000 --> 01:01:29.000

really important right now that those of us who are doing this work advocate for the podcasts themselves to be counted, and shift away from the model of always doubling, of always saying like okay I'll make the podcast, but I'll also publish the article that justifies the podcast, and then I'll get tenure based on the article, and then the podcast will be the nice side thing.

01:01:29.000 --> 01:01:42.000

Like I really think we need to, again, Siobhan pushed me on this when I was like, should we make a book that's just like kind of the transcripts edited, and Siobhan was like no, that undermines our argument that the podcast is the thing.

01:01:42.000 --> 01:01:58.000

Like the podcast itself counts as the scholarship. We need to really hold on to that argument. And the other thing I will say is that I think that collaborating with university presses is a really effective way to push

01:01:58.000 --> 01:02:14.000

for the legitimacy. Both because the presses have the infrastructure, the expertise, and the knowledge to render scholarship more legible to the larger scholarly community,

01:02:14.000 --> 01:02:25.000

as opposed to something that like I have just put up on my website. And also because for a lot of people, like a university press peer review is the checkmark.

01:02:25.000 --> 01:02:35.000

And so understanding that like you can put your work through a peer review process that's going to be generative and actually meaningful and also bonus

01:02:35.000 --> 01:02:45.000

this was published and peer reviewed from this university press makes people who might otherwise be really skeptical of this work look at it and say, okay, well they're not allowed to make things up.

01:02:45.000 --> 01:02:49.000

They are. Don't tell anyone.

01:02:49.000 --> 01:02:59.000

Yeah. Complex, right? It's complex. Thank you.

01:02:59.000 --> 01:03:01.000

Ana Jimenez-Moreno: Thank you so much. There's a question for Lindsey. Are recommended resources for creating or improving accessibility workflows?

01:03:01.000 --> 01:03:06.000

So I guess I'm-- are there any recommended resources?

01:03:06.000 --> 01:03:16.000

Lindsey Hunnewell: So I will just give you based on what I like. I've been working in accessibility for a number of years.

01:03:16.000 --> 01:03:23.000

So this is just coming from like what I've picked up along the way. But the resources that I use a lot are AccessiblePublishing.ca.

01:03:23.000 --> 01:03:37.000

It is a website and platform built by NNELS, which is our network of, oh gosh, network, National Network of Equitable Library Service.

01:03:37.000 --> 01:03:55.000

Sorry. Take it's a bit of a mouthful. They are, function in Canada, and they are really leading the way here with building accessibility and talking about accessibility in new formats, not just EPUB,

01:03:55.000 --> 01:03:58.000

though EPUB still has a long way to go.

01:03:58.000 --> 01:04:14.000

But they are also developing specs and standards that they're trying to get, together with Benetech, to be like adopted more globally, for audio and web,

01:04:14.000 --> 01:04:27.000

web-based projects. So they're really a really good resource to look through. LIA in Italy is doing amazing things with accessibility.

01:04:27.000 --> 01:04:34.000

Check out LIA. I believe it's LIA. It's so they have a nationwide accessibility mandate,

01:04:34.000 --> 01:04:42.000

so everything that gets converted for accessible resources goes through them and they're doing really cool things.

01:04:42.000 --> 01:04:58.000

Benetech is a great resource, and Daisy is a great resource. I find sometimes they can be a little daunting to approach and to enter if you're new and you don't have a good coding background.

01:04:58.000 --> 01:05:07.000

So I tend to stick more toward the NNELS website and the AccessiblePublishing.ca.

01:05:07.000 --> 01:05:30.000

But also we have an organization up here called eBOUND that has created a new platform that's a learning network, so there's videos and elements about not just not just accessibility but like any digital production and accessibility is in there, and that's a that's the APLN, the Accessible Publishing Learning Network.

01:05:30.000 --> 01:05:37.000

And there's just videos and like lots of content that's free to help you help you along your way.

01:05:37.000 --> 01:05:48.000

Ana Jimenez-Moreno: Okay, thank you so much. Hopefully I've captured some of those links in the, in the chat itself and that can hopefully be of use to that.

01:05:48.000 --> 01:06:01.000

We can also have another question. So what kind of usage figures do you have for Secret Feminist Agenda and/or other scholarly podcasts. Who's listening, mainly scholars or broader audience?

01:06:01.000 --> 01:06:17.000

Hannah McGregor: I can start that one and then other folks might have more insights. It really, really depends.

01:06:17.000 --> 01:06:25.000

There's no broad truisms about scholarly podcasting in general. It depends on the podcast in particular, the community of the scholar,

01:06:25.000 --> 01:06:49.000

the topic, and sort of the approach that people take. So some scholarly podcasts really are made by scholars for scholars and are having conversations that are so, you know, institutionally or disciplinarily specific that they're unlikely to gather an audience outside of that particular discipline or field.

01:06:49.000 --> 01:07:05.000

Secret Feminist Agenda has a listenership that is partially scholarly but that extends significantly outside of sort of who you would think of as the the audience for

01:07:05.000 --> 01:07:18.000

scholarship. I know this from having conversations with listeners because there's no other way to know how many of your listeners are scholars.

01:07:18.000 --> 01:07:27.000

But I often joke that the demographic for my audience is like 28-year-olds with green lipstick and an arts degree.

01:07:27.000 --> 01:07:51.000

But, but often who I think of as my demographic are like the the many, many people who went and got a bachelor's degree in university and then left to go do something else, and that in many ways as far as academia is considered were thus immediately dead to us because you're not affiliated with an institution, you're not a graduate student, you're not a professor, I

01:07:51.000 --> 01:08:00.000

don't care about you anymore, which is kind of heartbreaking when you think about the like years that you spend teaching undergraduate students to like

01:08:00.000 --> 01:08:09.000

care about theory and scholarship and then you're like okay well we're done so you never get to think about it again and good-bye forever.

01:08:09.000 --> 01:08:22.000

So and so, so finding out, gradually, that the main audiences for my podcast are like, you know, people who are like, oh, I haven't gotten to think about Bourdieu in a really long time, but

01:08:22.000 --> 01:08:28.000

I kind of missed it. This is fun. That's that's a lot of the people who listen to my podcast.

01:08:28.000 --> 01:08:45.000

You know, other scholars make podcasts that are like really for scholars, some make podcasts that are like really really engaged in a particular community, like like a comic books podcast.

01:08:45.000 --> 01:08:50.000

And it's like, cool, the other people who listen to this podcast are like big comic book fans, which is actually a great way to reach

01:08:50.000 --> 01:09:04.000

the like to like, you know, benefit from the expertise of fandom communities. And I think part of why my audience extends beyond academia is the fact that I started by making a fandom-based podcast, right?

01:09:04.000 --> 01:09:11.000

I started with Witch, Please, which was a Harry Potter podcast. Which meant when I started making Secret Feminist Agenda, I kind of had a built-in listenership

01:09:11.000 --> 01:09:24.000

that wasn't limited to academia, and that working with the press almost then was the thing that then introduced the podcasting work to a more scholarly audience.

01:09:24.000 --> 01:09:37.000

Where my audience originally came out of a little more out of fandom. But it really, really varies, and knowing things like how many of your listeners are scholars is something that you could only find out by polling your listeners.

01:09:37.000 --> 01:09:46.000

And generally the thing you find out most successfully by polling your listeners is how many of your listeners care about your podcast enough to bother answering a poll.

01:09:46.000 --> 01:10:14.000

Sara Cohen: I have a follow-up about what Hannah just said, if I may, and so I wanted to ask Hannah and Stacey, do either of you ever use your own podcasts in your classroom, or do you hear from like other people in your networks were like, oh my gosh, I used that episode of Secret Feminist Agenda like in my class the other day because we're talking about Bourdieu. Has that ever happened?

01:10:14.000 --> 01:10:19.000

Stacey Copeland: I mean, I want to say first of all, I don't usually play my own podcasts.

01:10:19.000 --> 01:10:25.000

I feel like my students hear enough of my own voice that they don't need to hear me talk more but in a different format.

01:10:25.000 --> 01:10:31.000

But I do use podcasts in almost all of my courses as supplementary readings or required readings.

01:10:31.000 --> 01:10:50.000

And most of the time students absolutely love that that's an option as a reading because they can do it on the bus, they can listen to it while they're doing their dishes or making their food, and it helps break up that intensive reading that they're so used to as undergraduates or graduate students.

01:10:50.000 --> 01:10:56.000

But Hannah, I know I'm curious, have you ever played Secret Feminist Agenda for instance? Oh my god, my lights just went off.

01:10:56.000 --> 01:11:02.000

Hannah McGregor / Stacey Copeland: Oh my god. That's incredible.---I'll work on that. You take the mic.----Yeah, okay, you work on that. Absolutely not.

01:11:02.000 --> 01:11:15.000

Hannah McGregor: I would never play an episode of my own podcast. For my class that would be just absolutely agonizing for everybody involved.

01:11:15.000 --> 01:11:18.000

Um very cringey, like assigning your own book as the required course text. It's a bad look.

01:11:18.000 --> 01:11:30.000

Don't do it. It's weird. But I also know, particularly because I went through the tenure process two years ago.

01:11:30.000 --> 01:11:38.000

It's I know that my work is taught a lot. I would say that's probably the primary form of engagement with my work is that it is taught in classrooms.

01:11:38.000 --> 01:11:52.000

I know that both because people reach out to me to tell me. Like, oh, I already listened to your podcast, but my professor just assigned an episode of it. Isn't that exciting? Or they reach out because they are a teacher and they want to let me know they're using my work.

01:11:52.000 --> 01:12:13.000

Or they reach out. We had such a cute request a couple of years ago from two teens who listen to Witch, Please who reached out to us to ask if we would make a special audio thank-you message for their high school English teacher because they were graduating, and they wanted to give her a present, and she was the one who had introduced them to the podcast.

01:12:13.000 --> 01:12:20.000

So we made her a little like audio thank-you card. So it's definitely being used in classrooms.

01:12:20.000 --> 01:12:24.000

I know it's been cited because I've searched it on Google Scholar.

01:12:24.000 --> 01:12:39.000

The untrackability of how our work is assigned in classrooms is its own scholarly problem, but I do look forward to us solving the problem of citations for podcasts actually showing up on Google Scholar and other platforms.

01:12:39.000 --> 01:12:46.000

You know that's a problem we haven't solved yet, but I think that one is solvable.

01:12:46.000 --> 01:12:54.000

Ana Jimenez-Moreno: Thank you.

01:12:54.000 --> 01:12:52.000

Sara Cohen: And I like, Ana, go ahead, cause I like, go ahead.

01:12:52.000 --> 01:13:03.000

Ana Jimenez-Moreno: No, I'm I think we could explore this so much more, I think on a logistics level too.

01:13:03.000 --> 01:13:13.000

I see that it's WordPress and I'm sure the press also has a way to maybe just say how many clicks, although of course engagement and and how it's used in in the field or you know with with some other audiences.

01:13:13.000 --> 01:13:15.000

Hannah McGregor: Yeah, yeah, we can know download numbers for sure. Yeah.

01:13:15.000 --> 01:13:24.000

Ana Jimenez-Moreno: It's something that is yeah, and I think that, you know, certainly to answer both, I guess both both parts of that question about usage.

01:13:24.000 --> 01:13:29.000

We're nearing time, and I want to be respectful of everybody's, I know that we really, there is so much more to talk about.

01:13:29.000 --> 01:13:37.000

And hopefully there'll be other ways in which we could expand this conversation. But thank you to all the panelists.

01:13:37.000 --> 01:13:48.000

Thank you for the participants who are able to join us today. For those of you who will watch this later, thank you so very much for your so much engagement and so much so much knowledge.

01:13:48.000 --> 01:14:11.000

Please check out the the podcast and contribute yourself or start one at your own press. I mean, I think that's part of why we do this is that, you know, these digital-born projects can be something that are accessible to publishers themselves, although yes, there there is a lot of responsibility and and a lot of things to consider but it's something to kind of aid in that

01:14:11.000 --> 01:14:17.000

scholarship, scholarly community. So again, thank you everyone, and I think we're going to all sign off now.