Podcast and Blog Reviews and Review Essays

All questions regarding review proposals, submissions, editing, and publication should be directed to the Assistant Reviews Editor at publichistory@history.ucsb.edu.

BACKGROUND

The digital history project review section of *The Public Historian* was established to report on and evaluate current digital history projects with the goal of recognizing excellence in this important new format for scholarship and public engagement and creating critical dialogue among public historians about the uses of technology in our work. Podcasts and blogs are a special category of digital projects and are increasingly important forms on digital publication. 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 blog 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 can 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.

CONTENT

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). 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 in addition to evaluating the work itself. Since podcast series and blogs are continuing offering new content, reviewers may be asked to review a particular season, topic area, or to review a representative sample. Evaluation should take into consideration accuracy of content and effectiveness of presentation (tone, navigation, etc.). Reviewers should evaluate both a project's content and its form.

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:

As with the organizational logics of monographs and journal articles, 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 of cumbersome or confusing?

- Does it have a clear, effective, and/or original design or approach?

- Does the blog or podcast make effective use 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.

NUTS AND BOLTS

1. Please submit your review as an MS WORD document, and please use 12-pt. font and double space the review.

2. Unless otherwise agreed upon between reviewer and editor, reviews should be 750–900 words long. We will shorten, or return for revision, any review of excessive length. Length restrictions vary in the case of review essays, to which we apply the standards of articles.

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.

Heading examples:

Made by History. Blog of the *Washington Post*. Purdue University Department of History, Oregon State Center for the Humanities, Lepage Center for History in the Public Interest, Cambridge University Press, American Political History Institute, and University of North Carolina Press, Sponsors. 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.

BackStory podcast. Program of the Virginia Foundation for the Humanities. *Ed Ayers*, *Brian Balogh*, *Nathan Connolly*, and *Joanne Freeman*, Hosts; *Peter Onuf*, Host Emeritus, Guest Host; *Nina Earnest*, *Emily Gadek*, and *Ramona Martinez*, Associate Producers; *Melissa Gismondi*, Assistant Digital Editor/Marketing and Development Associate; *Brigid McCarthy*, Senior Editor; *Jamal Millner*, Technical Director; *Joseph Thompson*, Researcher; *Diana Williams*, Digital Editor and Strategist. http://backstoryradio.org/. Accessed XXX

4. Illustrations, such as screenshots, are strongly encouraged, and will be included whenever possible. Please supply images as electronic tiff files sized at 4" wide, with a minimum 300 dpi. Place large files in a Dropbox folder and invite the assistant reviews editor to share. All images must be accompanied by captions, credits, and a letter (or e-mail message) of permission from the holder of the copyright.

5. Your name and institutional affiliation should appear on separate lines at the end of your review.

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

7. Email your completed manuscript as an MS WORD document to publichistory@history.ucsb.edu.

8. Once your manuscript has been submitted, you will receive an acknowledgement, then later a copy-edited version of the review and/or galley proofs. Please promptly approve or request changes in the typescript and/or galleys. You will receive one copy of the journal issue containing the review; authors of review essays will also receive 25 free offprints.

NOTE: Please keep *TPH* informed of any changes of address so that edited reviews and future requests may reach you promptly.

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