Review Guidelines
Started by Bri on 3/10/21

Audiences

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 memories scholars looking for new digital projects and/or writing environmental scans for grant proposals
- Professors who are interested in having their class create a publication in Manifold

Formatting/Approach

- Title: "[Project Name]: A Review" or "A Review of [Project Name]" or perhaps just "[Project Name]"
- Byline: Include all reviewer names and also the date range the review was worked on
    - Digital projects are subject to change, so I think it's important we keep track of when we began reviewing a project and also when we completed our reviews
- Bullet list of the following items:
    - Site link or links: If a project includes multiple links (e.g., the Trans Oral History Project has its own site page, but the majority of the content lives on an NYPL page), please list them all
    - "Data and Sources": Include all types of data you can identify as relevant to the project
    - "Processes": Identify the different ways these sources were changed during the creation of this project
    - "Presentation": Identify how the project is being presented to the user ○ "Digital Tools Used to Build It": If possible, include what information you can from an About page or elsewhere on what tools were used to create the project (e.g., Omeka, Dédalo, TimelineJS, Mapbox, ArcGIS StoryMap) ○ "Languages": Many of the projects we are reviewing are available in multiple languages; please list all of them. When a project exists in more than one language, please note which language(s) you reviewed the content in.
- The text of the review:
    - Provide a bit of context of the project: How did it come about? Is this a digitization of previous analogue content? Was it created with the help of an institution or some sort of major grant that you think is relevant to note,

what type of intervention it is? What are the project's goals or aims?
- Many of these projects are vast in scope. For such projects, there are a couple of 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 very brief overview of the parts of the project, and 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
    - This is also a helpful approach for large projects with multiple reviewers. I suggest groups write an introduction to the project together, and then review different parts of a project individually, noting who contributed which part of the review.
- How well does the project meet its goals? How well do you think they are reaching potential audiences?
- We can review these projects with a critical eye. If there is something about the user experience that bothers you, address it in your review.

Best Practices
- Avoid using abbreviations/acronyms, unless you think the abbreviation/acronym is widely known to our potential audiences: e.g., National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH)
  - When abbreviations/acronyms are used, always spell out on first mention.
  - If a project prominently uses an abbreviated name, be sure to provide the full name on first mention with the abbreviation parenthetically, and then use the abbreviation for the rest of the review: e.g., "Memories of the Occupation in Greece (MOG)"
    - If the project does not refer to themselves by an abbreviation, do not abbreviate the project name yourself. For short, it would be better to refer to it as "the project" or "the center" or something along those lines instead.
- As our reviews are short, avoid using long quotes pulled from the project pages as much as possible.

Formatting Considerations for Manifold Ingestion

Additions Made by Anthony Wheeler & Allison Elliott
Added on May 4th, 2022

Manifold Scholar is a publishing platform, not a text editor. As a result, when edits need to be made to the project, we need to completely replace the existing versions of items with new ones via re-ingesting them. That being said, when ingesting documents into the platform, it reads the text and formats it based on its assigned style(s).

To properly format your review for ingestion, and decrease the labor put on your editor(s), make it so that the title of the review is styled as "Header 1," and then make every subcategory (Data and Sources, Processes, Presentation, etc.) styled as "Header 2." All bodies of text below section headers should be left styled as "Normal text."

See the screenshot below to see where the text "Styles" can be located in Google Docs.