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Digital Memory Projects: Composing A Review

An essential objective of this course is to practice the critical appraisal of digital memory projects. To this end, you will evaluate a total of three projects for the semester. You may work alone or with a peer. Here is the [suggested list](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1GXtHriJUkhFN5bRqYsomHfD3utk0ZMwqlz4RBT0jkbE/edit?usp=sharing) for you to choose from.

You will write and edit your project reviews collaboratively in this Google document. At the end of the semester, we will publish all reviews in [Manifold](https://cuny.manifoldapp.org/) as an open guide for anyone interested in digital memory projects.

Resources

* Miriam Posner's video ["How did you make that?"](https://archive.org/details/howdidtheymakethat)
* ["Precepts"](https://web.archive.org/web/20220522111041/http://criticaldh.roopikarisam.com/) to evaluate and develop digital projects, prepared by Roopika Risam, her colleagues and her students.
* *Digital Memory Project Reviews*. A collection of reviews written by Digital Memories students in [Spring 21](https://cuny.manifoldapp.org/projects/digital-memory-project-reviews), [Spring 22](https://cuny.manifoldapp.org/projects/digitalmemory-projectreviews-vol2), [Spring 23](https://cuny.manifoldapp.org/projects/digital-memory-project-reviews-vol-iii) and [Spring 24](https://cuny.manifoldapp.org/projects/digital-memories-project-reviews-vol-iv).
* Style and content [guidelines](https://cuny.manifoldapp.org/system/resource/6124b11d-8b80-4d85-be97-fe755cceffea/attachment/original-106c4533422d6118097bc8fe694e76bb.pdf) prepared by Brianna Caszatt, who curated the collection in Spring 21.

**The Digital Memories Journal Volume V: Collaboration**

# **General Instructions**

**Theme**

The theme of Volume V of *The Digital Memories Journal* is “Collaboration.” A defining characteristic of digital humanities projects are their collaborative efforts. Please consider the theme-based questions in the “Review Text” section of the template below as you examine the projects you have chosen to review and respond at the end of your review.

An optional reading for this focus is the section on Collaboration in “[This Is Why We Fight”: Defining the Values of the Digital Humanities](https://dhdebates.gc.cuny.edu/read/untitled-88c11800-9446-469b-a3be-3fdb36bfbd1e/section/9e014167-c688-43ab-8b12-0f6746095335#ch03)” by Lisa Spiro, 2012, from *Debates in the Digital Humanities*, edited by Matthew K. Gold. University of Minnesota Press.

**Video Reviews (Optional):**

* For your third review, you may opt to submit a narrated video/ podcast style project review instead of a written review.
* Your output review will follow the review template provided below and in the ‘Review Text’ section, you will include a link to your video review and your reviewed transcript.
* Here are [Instructions for Creating a Video Review](https://cuny547-my.sharepoint.com/:w:/g/personal/lradhakrishnan_gradcenter_cuny_edu/ES5eMY_l82pNlwDQe6yTl94BU3iNTZ-3yolgDR1UMqYKMg?e=z1bIST) using the Zoom Recording option. You are free to use any recording software as long as you can provide Manifold-compliant output.
* Please ensure the following:
* Your video review must address the expectations set for the review.
* Keep the video under or around five minutes.
* Express your creative side and submit a finished product that reflects your academic presentation skills.

**Project Review Best Practices:**

* Include hyperlinks that you feel will further engage/inform your readers.
* Avoid using abbreviations/acronyms and contractions.
* When abbreviations/acronyms are used, always spell out on first mention.
* Do not abbreviate the project name yourself.
* Avoid using long quotes pulled from the project pages as much as possible.

**Design a Logo Contest (Optional)**

* Create a logo for The Digital Memories Journal!
* Anyone interested should upload their [design](https://cuny547-my.sharepoint.com/:w:/g/personal/lradhakrishnan_gradcenter_cuny_edu/EfmaKzogjwxGhs3qj20B-0AB4evZ3dR-pk08RXsJKwH0Ig?e=xjYRyd) no later than Friday, March 28.
* An anonymous vote to select the logo will be held in class on April 2.
* The winning logo will be featured on the opening page (hero block) of The Digital Memories Journal’s Manifold site.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Project Review Template**

This template represents the review format for the published journal. Just replace the blue text with your review and related information in black font!

# **Project Name**

**Reviewed by:** Reviewer’s Name(s)

**Review date:** Month DD, CCYY (e.g., February 12, 2025)

**Site Link**: Site URL (single site) OR bulleted list of URLs (multiple links)

**Archive Link:** Go to https://archive.ph, archive the project, and enter the generated link here (it may take a few minutes for the archive.ph link to generate). Choose the pages that best reflect the project’s mission.

**Keywords:** To enable a collaborative approach to categorizing the reviews, please include relevant [field of study](https://reviewsindh.pubpub.org/project-registry-field-of-study) and [topic or method](https://reviewsindh.pubpub.org/project-registry-topic-method) as used by *Reviews in Digital Humanities.* Be selective and choose the categories that best fit the project’s focus.

**Data Sources:**

* Bulleted list: Include all types of data relevant to the project, for example:
* *Published slave-trading voyage*
* *Documentary sources*
* *Court records that include slave names*

**Processes:**

* Bulleted list: Identify the different ways these data sources were changed during the creation of this project, for example:
* *Standardizing existing data into precise variables and organizational format*
* *Collating voyages that appeared in several different sets*
* *Adding new (largely unpublished) information*

**Presentation:** Describe how the project is presented in a short paragraph, for example:

*The project is a web-based video archive that appears to look like a desktop application. Users can view the videos by selecting a category or by browsing the videos once they pass the landing page. The landing page shows a moving image of a large protest with two buttons asking the user to select the language of preference Turkish or English.*

**Digital Tools Used:**

* Bulleted list: List the tools used to create the project (e.g., *Omeka, Dédalo, TimelineJS, Mapbox, ArcGIS StoryMap*), if available. For projects that do not disclose the tools used, [Wappalyzer](https://www.wappalyzer.com/) might help.

**Languages:**

* Bulleted list: List all languages in which the project exists. When the project exists in more than one language, please note the language(s) in which you reviewed its content.

**Review**

* Introduction: Provide context for the project: How did it come about? What are the project’s goals or aims? What type of intervention is it? Is this a digitization of previous analog content? Was it created with the help of an institution or some sort of major grant that you think is relevant to note?

* Body: Possible approaches:

* Provide a complete overview of the many different parts of the project and how they fit together within the larger scope of the project.
* For projects with multiple reviewers, an overview-type review would be best written collaboratively rather than submitting multiple overviews

* Provide a brief overview of the parts of the project, then focus the review on one specific part/subproject that is of most interest to you and relate how it is representative of the project as a whole.
* For large projects with multiple reviewers, write an introduction to the project together, and then review different parts of a project individually, noting who contributed which part of the review.

* Criticism(s): If there is something about the user experience that bothers you, address it in your review.

* Conclusion: How well does the project meet its goal(s)? How successfully do you think it is reaching its potential audiences?

**How are the collaborative aspects reflected in the project and are there elements that work particularly well? Consider interdisciplinary scholarly/technical collaborations, collaborative knowledge production, crowdfunding, community participation, and so on.**

**Write your response here.**

**Do you see an opportunity for collaboration that would be helpful to the project?**

**Write your response here.**

# 