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Introduction
Students taking DHUM 78000-1 Digital Memories: Theory and Practice in the Spring 2021 semester with Dr. Antonzou Borrachero are writing reviews of digital memory projects as a way to develop critical evaluation skills of work happening in our field. In learning how other projects are built and reviewing how different presentations inform the audience's experiences of these projects, we are also learning how we can take our own theories and ideas pertaining to digital memories—and the digital humanities more broadly—and create new projects.

In addition to the project reviews, the publication will include introductory text explaining the pedagogical rationale for including such activities in a course syllabus, as well as the rationale behind how the projects were selected—both provided by the professor, Dr. Antonzou Borrachero. The introductory text will also discuss themes and explain how the publication is presented, including a disclaiming about the changing nature of the digital environments our reviews are dependent on. Each of our reviews will be written with Miriam Popper’s “How Did They Make That?” video in mind, listing the sources, processes, and presentation for the project. In a self-reflexive turn, our introduction will also detail how we made this project.

Audience
In publishing our collection of reviews on current digital memory projects, as well as documentation of the process of creating the publication in Manifold, we will serve the following audiences:
- Professors who are looking for digital projects to highlight in their course syllabi
- Students and other people who want to learn how digital projects are created and how they can create their own digital projects
- Digital humanities and digital memory scholars looking for new digital projects and/or writing environmental scans for grant proposals
- Professors who are interested in having their class write project reviews and/or create a publication in Manifold

Data and Sources
Our sources are the digital memory projects suggested in the review sign-up sheet, as well as other projects suggested by the class. In total we are writing 20 reviews, all of which are being initially shared via a separate Google doc.

Digital Memory Project Reviews | Manifold @CUNY
Students taking *DHUM 78000-1 Digital Memories: Theory and Practice* in the Spring 2021 semester have written reviews of digital memory projects as a way to develop critical evaluation skills of work happening in our field. In examining how other projec...

Approaches
- Art
- Feminism
- Gaming
- Oral History and Testimony
- Social Media Studies

Events and Time Periods
- Colonization and Decolonization
- War and Conflict
  - Slavery
  - Civil Wars, Revolutions, and Uprisings
    - American Civil War
    - Spanish Civil War
    - Arab Uprisings
    - World War I
    - World War II
    - Dictatorships
    - State-Sponsored Violence
    - Terrorism

Social Movements, Organizing, and Political Activism
- Arab Uprisings
- Political Conventions
- Sexual Assault and Harrassment

Geographical Areas
- Africa
- AsiaMiddle East
- Australia
- EuropeGreece
- Spain
- United Kingdom
- North America
  - Canada
  - Caribbean
  - United States
    - New York
    - North Carolina

Identities
As expressly named in the project as part of its aims to reclaim, foreground, and amplify lost or underrepresented identities and voices:

- BIPOC
  - Black and African American
  - Indigenous People
  - Asian American
  - Latinx
- LGBTQ+
- Women

Video Games
Introducing a Digital Queering Framework

Allison Elliott & Anthony Wheeler

Digital Memory Project Reviews, Vol. II | Manifold @CUNY

An interdisciplinary group of graduate students taking DHUM 78600-2 Digital Memories: Theory and Practice in the Spring 2022 semester share their professional insights into various digital memory projects as a way to develop critical evaluation skills (…)

APPROACHES
- Remediated Archival Projects
- Oral Histories/Testimonies
- Media Studies
- Feminism

HISTORIES
- Black Histories
- Chattel Slavery/Colonizer/Kidnapper History
- Queer and Tran Histories
- Indigenous Histories
- Feminist Histories

EVENTS/TIME PERIODS
- Colonization and decolonization
- European SEcond-Wave Finimist
- The HOlocaust
- D.C.’s Black Renaissance
- Harlem Renaissance
- Suffrage
- State-Sponsored Violence
- Terrorism

IDENTITIES
- Omaha Tribe
- Native Hawai’ians
- Black and African Americans
- Women
- Trans People
- Lesbian/Queer

Social Movements and Organizing
- LGBTQ+
- Anti-Surveillance
- Affordable Housing
- Police Violence
- Digital Activism

Geographical Locations
- Europe
  - Germany
- Canada
- Jamaica
- Omaha Terroir
- United States
- New York City
"In the feminist approach, the archivist cares about and for and with subjects." — Caswell and Civor

"is not simply a matter of transcribing and digitizing texts, but of producing new knowledge as well." — Roopika Risam

Recent calls within and outside the field of archival science have begun to foreground the need for a feminist ethics of care within archival practice. — Agostinho

Maybe we can connect these ideas: ethics of care and production of new knowledge. Instead of referring to archives, how can we apply these concepts to how we review projects?

March 14
- Third and final project reviews due.

March 21
- Editors present an approach for Vol. 3, a general timeline and expectations for revised reviews.
- Editors provide a Review Guidance document.

March 21 – April 4
- Reviewers revise project reviews following Review Guidance.

April 4 – 18
- Editors provide feedback to reviewers.
- Editors create metadata and categorization using previous volumes; visually sort projects in Miro; send draft to reviewers for feedback and approval.

April 18
- Positionality statements due.

April 25
- All final reviews and project screenshots due.
- Editors test Manifold functionality and make improvements to UX.

May 2
- Editors translate texts into Markdown and ingest in Manifold, along with project description, introduction on approach and positionality statements.

May 9
- All edits complete and submitted.

I think we can follow this loosely...

Create a guided questionnaire to keep in mind as reviews are made re: care
different locations for interventions
different types

Feminist care: retrieve definition from Cyberfeminism

Proposal
Create metadata
add context to the categorization (lenses, relisting etc.)

ATTACK AREA

PROPOSAL

UPDATE UX

PROJECT SORTING

EDITING

TO DO

- Editing: Majel
- Review Updates: Everyone
- Project Sorting: Patricia
- Positionality Statements: Everyone
- Screengrabs: Everyone
- Manifold, Markdown, UX: Patricia
The Ethics of Care in Collaborative Knowledge Production

- Allowing for rich perspectives and participation
- Awareness that there is no neutrality — Our role and influence — Data
- Not causing harm

PROPOSAL
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1OYj-w-zk0tBL4igJS45V56RxBxE

QUESTIONNAIRE
https://docs.google.com/document/d/139j0gpbiBj6u3XVJMQChyC1P6ot275Vn4yRQgsG0Qg4/edit?usp=sharing

CLASS
1. Positionality Statement
2. Assessing Care in reviews

EDITORS
1. Look for discussion of care in reviews
2. UX updates that facilitate navigation and accessibility of positionality statements
DM2023: The Ethics of Care in Collaborative Knowledge Production

Reviewing projects for evidence of “care”

This document offers questions to guide reviewers as they inspect Digital Memory projects for evidence of “care” in their information sourcing, …
Digital Memory Project Reviews, Vol. III | Manifold @CUNY

Continuing the practice of previous graduate students in *DHUM 78000 Digital Memories: Theory and Practice*, the Spring 2023 cohort brings a critical lens to digital memory projects as a method of engaging with the Digital Humanities field, developing c…
Reviews in DH Publication Process

Project Overview Content

Projects submitted for review must be accompanied by a project overview, which will be 500 words in length and should include, where appropriate:

1. description of the project
2. description of the process of creating the project, both in terms of humanistic claims and content and technical infrastructure
3. description of the team behind the project and expertise contributed to the project
4. description of the audience for the project
5. description of project in relation to professional guidelines for evaluating digital scholarship like those provided by the MLA and AHA, including, where relevant: engagement of new audiences; funding, awards or other recognition; adoption and use of the output by other scholars; and citations of the project in scholarship or press.

Overviews should include at the top of the document the following information:

- Project Name
- Name of Project Director(s) or Team Members:
- Project URLs
- Keywords
- Keywords should be selected from the project registry list and include, if appropriate, Time period, Field of study, and Topic or method.
- A list of suggested reviewers who are free of conflict of interest.

Review Content

Reviews will be 500 words in length and should include, where appropriate:

1. A formal citation to the project using the information provided by the project team
2. A brief summary of the project and its purpose
3. An assessment of the humanistic claims and evidence
4. An assessment of the technology used/developed
5. An analysis of the project and its place within existing scholarship and technological practices
6. An evaluation of the project in relation to professional guidelines for evaluating digital scholarship like those provided by the MLA and AHA, including, where relevant: engagement of new audiences; funding, awards or other recognition; adoption and use of the output by other scholars; and citations of the project in scholarship or press
7. Identification of interesting, outstanding or problematic issues.

Reviews will not have:

- ad hominem arguments
- excessive detail or quotation
- attacks of any kind, including not being the project the reviewer would have developed.