



## ACP Individual Project Proposal Guidelines

Please use this document as a guide to writing your proposal. When you are finished, please send us a proposal at [acpress@amherst.edu](mailto:acpress@amherst.edu)

### Tell us about your project

1. Working Title and Subtitle (Title is tentative at this stage, and considered a working title.)
2. Brief description (1-2 paragraphs)
3. Outstanding features (What are the unique and distinctive features of this publication? Try to provide three.)
4. Audience (Describe the audience(s) for this work. Be as specific as possible regarding disciplinary background and types of readers (your peers, professionals in practice, grad students, undergrads, general readers, etc.)
5. Subject areas (Identify the primary disciplines this work will speak to; we welcome secondary disciplines as well. Indicate which of the fields ACP currently acquires in it will fit into; also let us know if you would like us to consider this project for one of our existing series.)

### Tell us where your project fits

Scholarship is traditionally defined by its disciplinary boundaries, although it is more commonly interconnected across and between disciplines. Likewise, scholarly publications are situated alongside or within these intellectual currents. Individual publications extend, refine, revise, or contradict existing works, and every so often redirect the path of scholarship.

How/where does your publication fit within existing scholarship? In a paragraph or two, briefly locate your proposed work within the broader scholarly conversation, moving from general to specific. Start by locating this work within the broader trends and disciplinary structure, and situate it within the current scholarship.

## Tell us about competing and comparable projects

Identify the existing work (author/title/publisher/year/format) covering your proposed subject(s). Briefly describe the strengths and weaknesses (including any gaps you will address). By “competing” we mean works addressing similar content with similar methodologies. By “comparable” we mean works that complete the proposed project. For each competing or comparable work, please tell us the following:

- Title
- Author/Editor
- Date of Publication
- Publisher
- Brief analysis of how this work relates to the proposed project.

## Tell us about the size of your project

1. Briefly describe your publication as you imagine it. Share your vision of this scholarship with us. This description can take whatever form best suits the content. For example, it could be a bricolage of existing titles and digital resources, a description of what the audience will see and use, or a standard statement. Use this space as best suits your needs.

2. Type of publication. What structure and authorship model is best suited to the work? Please choose only one.

1. \_\_\_ Authored / coauthored monograph
2. \_\_\_ Edited volume
3. \_\_\_ Reader / primer
4. \_\_\_ Textbook / core course text
5. \_\_\_ Reference work
6. \_\_\_ Collectively authored work (e.g. a greater number of authors with a hierarchy different from the standard edited volume)
7. \_\_\_ Digital work with less traditional narrative
8. \_\_\_ Other

3. Estimated word count (including notes and references) of title. Answers could range from the standard book-length monograph (~125,000 words) to a range of lengths. We understand that page length will not be precise due to the variations in font, type size, line spacing, etc. While we will certainly publish works of the standard book-length monograph, we are eager to experiment with form and length.

4. Current status of the manuscript (optional). If you have already started to write this manuscript, please let us know how far along it is, what digital tools you have used (if any), when you anticipate completing it, and any other information you'd like to share about it.

## Tell us about the shape of your project

We endeavor to use digital technology to incorporate the full richness and robustness of your scholarship into our publications--within the constraints of our commitments to best practices for accessibility, discoverability, and preservation. In order to work with you to develop a publishing plan for your work, it will help us to know as much as possible about the tools, platforms, and file formats you have used throughout your research process so that we can discuss how the digital elements of your scholarship may best be integrated into the published work.

1. Platforms, software, and digital tools (optional). Please indicate which of the following you are already using or anticipate using as you develop this project. We encourage you to think broadly and inclusively about the tools that are part of your scholarly process. These run the gamut from Microsoft Word, LaTeX, Photoshop, and Zotero to Omeka, Scalar, SecondLife, Tableau, etc.

2. Additional content forms. What other types of content might this work include? Please check all that apply.

1.  Representations of primary sources (as digital images, text, etc.)
2.  Images (grayscale)
3.  Color images
4.  Video
5.  Audio

6.  NonWestern diacritics / texts

7.  Other

3. Other digital affordances. What digital affordances are required to best share your work? Please check all that apply.

1.  Annotation of primary source texts and/or materials

2.  Outlinks to datasets and/or statistical analyses

3.  Data visualization

4.  Mapping (GIS)

5.  3D spatial rendering

6.  Other:

4. If possible, provide some specifics on your selections above to help us understand the scope of these elements within the proposed work. (*E.g.*, This work is a survey of development aid on ebola research. Geolocation functionality will provide a global outlook)

5. How might this publication push the boundaries of scholarship via exploring formats beyond the traditional monograph-length book and/or the integration of digital research tools?

### Tell us why, in particular, you want to publish with the ACP?

1. We're interested in hearing how your proposed work fits with our three commitments: alignment with the mission and ethos of liberal arts colleges, digitally native works, and an orientation toward open access.