Digital Humanities Studio – Archaeology in a Digital Age (DGHM 150)
Professor Lieberman – Spring 2019

Studio Assignment 1: Digital Project Review (Part 2)

Deadline for Choosing a Project: E-mail Prof. Lieberman by Friday, 2/1, 11:59pm.
Check In: by Wednesday, 2/6, 2:45pm – e-mail Prof. Lieberman a draft of your review for feedback before the final deadline
Final Deadline: Submitted to Sakai by Sunday, 2/10, 11:59pm.

The Overview: Now that you've explored a variety of different digital projects, you're ready to write your own review. Your review should consist of both <u>Metadata</u>, information that describes the project, and <u>Content</u>, a narrative account of your critique.

Metadata
Please provide the following information about the site, to the extent possible. Below is example of what this information looks like for the Digital Augustan Rome project.

- **Title**: Digital Augustan Rome
- **Description**: Online map, with textual commentary, of Augustan Rome
- **URL**: http://digitalaugustanrome.org/
- **Author(s)**: David Gilman Romano (Director), Nicholas L. Stapp, and Mark Davidson
- **Place**: University of Arizona, Archaeological Mapping Lab
- **Date Created**: 2009 – 2013
- **Date Accessed**: April 2017 (Providing your reader with the date that you accessed the site gives context to your review.)
- **Availability**: Free *(All of the projects you'll be reviewing are free, but it's important to note that not all digital resources are free.)*

Content
The narrative of your review should include:
- A brief summary of the project's content and purpose, indicating its major sections
- An assessment of the scholarly research involved in the work. **Remember the questions you asked yourself when prepping for the first part of this assignment.** What is the scholarly argument? What is the project's audience? What source materials were used? How was the data organized, and why? What scholarly decisions, including platform design, were made? How does the project and the way it is presented advance the state of knowledge in the field? What methodology was used? To what extent does the site take full advantage of the potential of the digital medium?
- Notice of factual errors and their severity
- Identification of the main contributors and their roles (if this is not clear, point that fact out)
- An estimate of the current status of the project with regard to its "life cycle," as the nature of digital work can change significantly over time
- An assessment of the project's interface design and navigation

Reviews may also include:
- Representative screenshots
- Results of tests in various browsers (Safari, Internet Explorer, Firefox), operating systems (Mac, PC, Linux), and devices (computer, smartphone, tablet)

Reviews should not *include:*
- Long-windedness or excessive detail
- Excessive quotation
- Attacks for not being the project *you* would have created

The Fine Print: Effective writing requires extensive revision and rewriting. The worst thing you can do for yourself is wait until the last minute to begin planning and writing. My suggestion: start early, giving yourself plenty of time and mental space to reflect on what you've written and revise before the deadline.

The purpose of this review is not just to summarize the project you're considering, but rather to offer a reasoned critique of the project — to demonstrate to the reader, that is, of the strengths and weaknesses of the project that you have chosen to review. While there is no single way to compose your review, the organization is critically important, so carefully plan before you begin to write.

Remember that spelling and grammar do count. Your review should be typed, double-spaced, and in 12-point font (Times New Roman or similar); while there is no specific length requirement, reviews should be somewhere between 1000-1500 words, and no more than 2000. Make sure you cite any sources you refer to, including course readings and other digital projects. If you have any questions about what should or should not be cited, please ask. The Claremont Colleges have a variety of useful guidelines and resources about when and how to cite properly. You are highly encouraged to make an appointment with the Center for Writing and Public Discourse at CMC when working on this assignment.

Review Models:
Gellar-Goad, Review: The Latin Library
Arcenas, Review: Digital Augustan Rome
Others available upon request.

The Outcome:
These reviews will be posted on the DGHM 150: Digital Humanities Studio course web site that is presently under development.