The Public Historian
Podcast and Blog Review Guidelines
All questions regarding review proposals, submissions, editing, and publication should be
directed to the Assistant Reviews Editor at
hist-publichistory@ucsb.edu

BACKGROUND:

Podcasts and blogs are increasingly important forms of digital publication. Our goal is to recognize excellence in this important new format for scholarship and public engagement and create critical dialogue among public historians about the uses of technology in our work. Podcasts are often episodic series, while blogs provide periodic short essays in an online environment and generally offer the opportunity for comment. Both often allow listeners/readers to subscribe or follow. Podcasts and blogs can be produced by a single individual, a group, or an organization. We encourage our reviewers and other interested historians to suggest podcasts and blogs for review. Review essays compare two or more projects, treating the relevant subject matter in more depth than would be possible in a short review. Reviews will be assigned to reviewers by *TPH* staff.

REVIEWING PODCASTS AND BLOGS:

In reviewing podcasts and blogs, it is especially important that reviewers understand the intended purposes and audience of the work and the context in which it was produced (e.g., large or limited budget, time constraints) and seek to communicate these parameters to *TPH* readers. Podcasts and blogs are quite diverse, and projects should be evaluated on their own terms.

As with reviews of history in other forms, podcast and blog reviewers should briefly report on the subject matter and main themes presented before evaluating the work itself. Since podcast series and blogs are continually offering new content, reviewers may be asked to review a particular season, topic area, or a representative sample. Evaluation should take into consideration accuracy of content and effectiveness of presentation (tone, navigation, etc.). Reviewers should evaluate both the content and form of a project.

Content: Reviewers should emphasize the podcast's or blog's significance to public historians. Please consider such questions as:

- Who is the intended audience of the work (the general public, professionals in the same field, in other fields)?
- How does it engage its intended audience?
- What is the purpose of the work?
- Is the work produced under special conditions (under contract, in the course of public agency employment, as part of an educational program)?
- Does it fit within a body of scholarship? If so, how?
- In what ways are the developer's sources, methods, analysis, and interpretations remarkable and especially instructive for public historians?

Form: Blogs ought to be organized in an intuitive, easy-to-navigate manner. Podcasts may have accompanying websites that also should be easy to navigate. Individual podcasts should have an organizational structure that works well for the topic discussed. Reviewers should ask the following questions:

- Is the digital resource easy to navigate?
- Does it function effectively, or are aspects cumbersome or confusing?
- Does it have a clear, effective, and/or original design or approach?

- Does the blog or podcast make effective use of the digital form? What does it provide that traditional media, such as print/exhibition, cannot?

Please avoid passive-voice constructions, overly complex sentences, jargon, and redundancies. We may return for revision any review in need of severe editing, and we reserve the right to reject any review submitted for publication.

All reviews are edited to conform to *TPH* house style and standard literary usage to achieve greater economy of space and clarity of meaning. Please consult *The Chicago Manual of Style* for guidance.

FORMAT OF REVIEWS:

1. Please submit your review as a Microsoft Word document, and please use 12-pt. font and double-space the review.

2. Unless otherwise agreed upon, reviews should be about 1000 words long. We will shorten, or return for revision, any review of excessive length. Length restrictions vary in the case of review essays, but are generally 2000 words.

3. Provide the following information in your introductory heading: title of podcast or blog; name of creator/s; sponsor/publisher; URL; season or selection; access date, and any further information that would help to identify or credit responsible parties. Please limit the heading to three full lines of text.

   Heading examples:

   Made by History. Blog of the *Washington Post*. http://www.washingtonpost.com/news/made-by-history/. Accessed XXX.

   Process: A Blog for American History. Blog of the Organization of American Historians. http://www.processhistory.org/. "Public History" posts; Accessed XXX.

   Uncivil podcast. Gimlet Media. *Jack Hitt* and *Chenjerai Kumanyika*, Hosts. http://uncivil.show/. Season 1, fall 2017; Accessed XXX.

1. Illustrations, such as screenshots, are strongly encouraged, and will be included whenever possible. Please supply images as electronic jpg or tiff files sized at 4" wide, with a minimum 300 dpi. Please do not place them directly in the text; instead, label your images by your last name (Smith image 1, etc.) and indicate image placement within the text. Use brackets: [Insert Smith image here]. Please provide image captions in a separate Word document.

   Place files too large to e-mail in a Dropbox folder and invite the assistant reviews editor to share. All images must be accompanied by captions, credits, and a statement (letter or e-mail message) of permission from the holder of the copyright.

2. Your name and institutional affiliation should appear on a separate line at the end of your review.

3. *The Public Historian* uses the footnote style, spelling, and punctuation format of *The Chicago Manual of Style* and *The American Heritage Dictionary*.

4. E-mail your completed manuscript to hist-publichistory@ucsb.edu.

5. Once your manuscript has been submitted, you will receive an acknowledgement, then later a copy-edited version of the review. Please promptly approve or request changes in the

typescript. Approximately one month before publication you will receive proofs e-mailed directly from UC Press. Please review and make any further changes within three days of receiving proofs, then return to the managing editor, shcase@ucsb.edu.

NOTE: Please keep *TPH* up-to-date with your e-mail and affiliation.

Thank you for your contribution to *The Public Historian*.