Stakeholder #1: Content Creator, Subject Matter Expert (6-25-15)

SME: A scholar who is an authority in the subject matter. He is concerned that the new writing format may not give users the right amount of information about the audio and video material and the illustrations. He would like the content to be both interesting and pedagogical. He also wants his role in the project to be wrapped up in 1 year.

History:

SME first thought of the idea when he learned about the relationship of audio and video materials between one archive and another. Previously, archival material such as letters, photographs, ephemera, and other objects, could be photographed and then published in a book.

The archives in the Getty Research Institute themselves, such as the David Tudor papers, are underpublished, so SME would like more people to learn and talk about them. This includes scholars and students from all visual arts disciplines, including history, musicology, literature, theatre/performance studies.

As someone with teaching experience, SME thought about how easy an epub/app could be for teaching. It would take the revolution from image slides to Powerpoint presentations to the next level--a “further stop along the chain!”

Challenges:

--no current project workflow in place

--roles of subject matter expects not defined

--still not sure about what is possible re: technology

-this could turn out to be a really bad navigation/IA system where you:

-can’t identify what something is

-can’t find other things

-can’t go back and forth

-can’t use image callouts in multiple places across the book

--interesting users who are not part of our usual audience and target of our mission (ie, musicologists are not necessarily art history professionals).

-overpromising the digital publication as something it is not

-do we want to deliver more content or technology?

-what parts of the app can really be tested

-If we find out that users can’t understand the text that highlights the content, can we really have other SMEs rewrite content? If so, it would be better to cut than add more text

Stakeholder #2: Editorial Manager (7-2-15)

EM: A seasoned editor and managing editor who has experience acquiring and editing manuscripts. His expertise is in print publications. While he is excited about the possibilities of an epublication, he is always thinking about resources (budgets, staff and consultants’ time, delivery dates, copyright issues). He would like to keep the table of contents for the project flexible and treat the project as an experiment. He doesn’t even have an ideal timeline--he would like the content to be good, and the other stakeholders to be happy and content.

I see this as “an experiment, and a collaboration between digital design and technical experts and scholars. As we work together to develop the presentation of the content, we will learn how, and how easy or hard it will be, to create such a complex electronic publication. The number of cases to be treated, and the complexity will necessarily depend upon the experience of developing each "chapter." We will definitely take on board as many as possible of the the excellent suggestions of the peer reviewer as we go forward with the project.

The other variable, of course, are rights, because all material is in copyright. Our working idea for the budget would be that for each "chapter" or object, we would allot up to $ X in permissions fees for all material in that chapter, whether it be primary or secondary, photos or video, etc., and that we stick with that budget in our planning phase. If costs for including a particular artist's work or secondary materials becomes too expensive, we would find a different, less expensive work to feature. We do have existing relationships with many artists and estates represented here, and are hoping that we will be able to use that goodwill in our favor.”

--also likes the material, and is familiar with it from working on a print publication of a related topic (Allan Kaprow)

--Kaprow’s happenings and stories around performances are rich content for social sharing; this material maximizes form

--worked with stakeholders of the Kaprow estate

--perhaps other artists might be interested?

--material is good match for format, imprint, mission of the GRI; also wants to please senior executive, who is excited about the project

--still archive-based but a different way of presenting material

--thinks we really need to talk to students and professors. Is this what they really want?

--in print, we make too many assumptions

--this needs to be genuinely useful vs. just authoritative

--shareable with other art history professionals would be good, because right now, the GRI’s Facebook does not always have the most shareworthy posts

--also shys away from building anything, including databases, that people won’t actually look at again and use later on

--impressed with the design thinking sprint for the publications repository

--Greg and Ahree can get to the gist of what people want and understands politics at the Getty as a result of this project

--trusts that the subject matter expert has the experience to pull together the content from other volume editors

--will not exhert much control in the project

Stakeholder #3: Reviewer

Reviewer’s Report

Thanks very much for sending me this proposal. I think this is a wonderful idea – in part because it joins the very best promise of e-publication/ distribution and will both profile strong existing work and inspire new scholarship. Moreover, it also highlights several strengths of the Getty’s Special Collections and the GRI and I feel sure it will bring new attention to the value of this still somewhat under-the-radar extraordinary collection of objects, ideas, and people.

In addition to the argument for the importance of the score articulated in the Synopsis, I call your attention to four other important reasons why the time is good to undertake this project:

1) Claire Bishop edited a vital collection of primary documents for MIT, entitled, Participation in 2006. The first section of the book is devoted to the concept of the open score and these documents, many of them from the 1950s and early 1960s, have helped inspire recent political actions, such as Occupy Wall Street and Black Lives Matter. Thus, the (open) score introduced by avant-garde artists (and theorists) has found new political life in the last decade.

2) San Francisco’s Museum of Modern Art’s 2008 show, The Art of Participation: 1950 to Now, and its strong catalog, made important connections between the art history of the performance score and the larger recent interest in (re)-enactments of such scores. (Tino Seghal and Marina Abramovic are probably the two most prominent beneficiaries of this interest).

3) While I do not see much attention to this possibility in the proposal, I nonetheless encourage the Getty to publish this “study of the score” as itself a new form of scholarly (open) score. That is, I think it would be fairly easy to allow scholars and artists to add links to other works concerned with scores. For example, Liz Kotz’s important work on Mac Low, for example, can supplement John Hicks’ introduction and so on. I imagine that many contributors on this list know huge amounts of fascinating things about several artists. One huge advantage of electronic publication is that it is possible to be looser with the scholarly form. I would love it, for example, if Perloff’s perhaps shorter or less formal thoughts on Tudor, can be part of the scholarly score, even though her main contribution is elsewhere.

4) Faculty are being encouraged to add more e-resources to their teaching and I think this topic in this e-format will be very appealing to scholars and students in a range of disciplines (art history, music, dance, and performance).

Suggestions to Strengthen:

1) I encourage Hicks and Gallope to add a few artists to this project. Right now, there are only three women included, and one, Yoko Ono, will be featured in collaboration with her more famous partner, John Lennon. I would encourage the authors to look at artists such as Senga Nengundi and Maren Hassinger, both of whom are represented in Special Collections I believe. (I am sure Hassinger’s work is represented). They did a work called Highway Frets in the 1970s that had an important score for dance, music, and improv. Bruce Nauman and Suzanne Lacy also did significant work with performance scores and both are represented in the collection. In brief, this important initiative should include the work of more artists, especially the work by artists of color and women.

2) I very much like the implicit thread of correspondence throughout the proposal and I think this should be foregrounded. The correspondence often serves as a kind of rehearsal for the score, or in some cases, a meditation on it. One aspect of the score that distinguishes it from other art forms is that it is at once anticipatory and a recollection. I think this double temporality might be conveyed a bit not only “in” the content of the correspondence, but also by the formal structure of correspondence as a mode of address.

3) I am very glad to see that Yvonne Rainer will be included. I simply note that her first book, called simply Work, originally published by the Nova Scotia School of Design in 1974, is out of print. There are several (graphic) scores in that volume that would be very useful to include here.

4) I would also encourage all participants to embrace, more fully, the more creative possibilities of the e-format. Right now the proposal seems to be aligning closely with the format of a scholarly print book with the addition of “e-samples” and sound tracks. But the format actually allows for much more cross-talking, uneven approaches, and creative design.

5) Since the interdisciplinary nature of the project calls for a wide range of expertise, I think it would be helpful to invite short “comments and responses” from some interesting scholars. I really like the range of performers selected to be included for the musical compositions, and I think this same kind of eclectic “sampling” could be extended to the scholarly community as well. For example, it would be rich to have Carrie Lambert-Beatty and Marcia Siegel respond to the Rainer section. Their approach to Rainer’s work could not be more different and I think their contrary views could enrich our grasp of Rainer’s score/s.

This is truly a wonderful idea and exactly the kind of approach the Getty should be taking. It will be among the first of its kind and I know it will be done beautifully. Should you go forward with this, I will use it in my teaching, at both the graduate and undergraduate level. I am sure MANY others will as well. Great project.