Transliteracies RoSE Design Charrette

log in | help

🖉 **Wiki**   📄 **Pages & Files**

Search this workspace

VIEW   EDIT

"What Next" Meeting

last edited by 👤 Alan Liu   2 mins ago   ▶ Page history

Contents of this Page:

1. Congratulations and Thanks
2. Tasks & Resources for Spring Quarter 2010
3. Strategizing the Future of RoSE
4. Technical or Data Issues Bearing on Future of RoSE
5. Suggestions relevant to meeting

Congratulations and Thanks

Tasks & Resources for Spring Quarter 2010

Tasks	**Thinking Through Grant-Writing and Article Writing**
	• Grant proposals
	○ Google Digital Humanities grant competition (deadline April 15th)
	○ MacArthur Digital Media & learning grant competition
	○ NEH grant competitions
	■ NEH Office of Digital Humanities Start-up grant competition
	■ NEH soon-to-be-announced teaching with technology competition
	○ NEH / SSHRC / JISC Digging into Data competition (2nd round next year)
	• Possible publications & co-publications
	• Preparation for Transliteracies Project summary report
Resources	**Projected remaining funds for Transliteracies: $12,000**
	• Project Coordinators: $3,000
	• Programmers & Research Assistants: $9,000

Strategizing the Future of RoSE:

(For background, see resullts of the charrette breakout sessions and Roundup Session. Also see suggestions that have come in since the charrette.)

RoSE target audience ("who is RoSE for?")	**Tier 1:**
	• K-12 students (and instructors)
	○ Example of high-school student assigned to research a bibliography preparatory to an end-of-year extended research paper but not knowing how to start, how to research libraries, how to reseach online resources, how old or new articles should be, what the difference in research value is between (for example) *Reader's Digest, Time, Nature, PMLA*.
	• Undergraduate researchers (and instructors)
	• The "public"
	Possible Development Priorities:
	• User Interface
	○ Also: inclusion of some conventional commenting and social-network featrures
	• Visualizations
	○ Informational
	○ "Poetic"
	• Links to full-text data
	• High-quality starter sets of metadata

Navigator

📬 Unfiled Items ›

SideBar

FrontPage
RoSE at the Transliteracies Project
Participants
Reflections on RoSE
Breakout Session Pages
- Breakout Ia: Expertise and Networked Public Knowedge
- Breakout Ib: Data-mining and Visualization of Social Networks
- Breakout IIa: Information Credibility
- Breakout IIb: Fluid Ontologies for Social and Historial Research
- Breakout IIc: Online Reading and Research Environments
Roundup Session
Event Photos

RoSE Future Development
"What Next" Meeting (March 15, 2010, 11:00-12:30)

Recent Activity

🖉 **"What Next" Meeting**
edited by Alan Liu

🖉 **"What Next" Meeting**
edited by Alan Liu

🖉 **"What Next" Meeting**
edited by Alan Liu

🖉 **"What Next" Meeting**
edited by Alan Liu

🖉 **"What Next" Meeting**
edited by Alan Liu

🖉 **"What Next" Meeting**
edited by Alan Liu

🖉 **"What Next" Meeting**

1. Automated harvesting of metadata from WorldCat, etc.
2. "Context"-situated instructor and student addition of metadata
   - Assisted by algorithmic methods of discovering and correlating metatdata across contexts
   - Assisted by algorithmic methods of channeling free-tagging into controlled vocabularies
- "Time-slider" (ability to move back and forward in a knowledge-scape of people and documents)
  - Ability to track the intervention and moves of a single author or document
- Algorithmic means of creating "living" historical author and document pages
  - Also: algorithmic means of clustering authors and documents into "movements"
- "Narrative engine" (metadata encoding for machine discovery of narrative/argument paths)

Tier 2:
- Scholars or professional-level researchers
  - Cf., ConceptVista in the geoscience field, whose value for high-level researchers does not emerge until the scale of the system increases to allow for network effects
  - Examples of kinds of questions RoSE might answer that could not easily be answered otherwise: [TBD]

Possible Development Priorities: (in addition to above under Tier 1)
- Sufficient scale to allow for emergent network effects
- Bibliometrics and social-network metrics (centrality, betweeness, etc.)
- Annotation tools
- "What if" analysis tools (e.g., what if we looked at two apparently unrelated fields--say, string theory and contemporary quilt art--as if they were a single field? What connections might be suggested?)

Possible RoSE Plan	**Staged development:**
	1. K-12 and undergraduate audience
	2. Scholarly and professional audience
	
	"Chunking" of Development Priorities According to Grant Possibilities:
	- Google Digital Humanities Research Awards (deadline April 15)
	  Google_Digital_Humanities_Request_for_Proposals.pdf
	- MacArthur Foundation and HASTAC Digital Media and Learning grants (subcategory: "Learning Lab Designer Awards") (deadline for 3rd annual competition passed on Jan. 7th; possible 4th annual competition?)
	- NEH grant competitions
	  - NEH Office of Digital Humanities Start-Up grant competition (Levels 1 & 2) (deadline March 23)
	  - NEH soon-to-be-announced teaching with technology competition
	- NEH / SSHRC / JISC Digging into Data competition (1st round deadline for letter of intent, March 14, 2009) (2nd round next year)

Achievable RoSE development goals in spring 2010 (with remaining funding)	?

Collaborative or individual research publications we can generate from RoSE	- Research reports that might be worked up into articles
	- Collaborative articles?
	- Possible target journals:
	  - Digital Humanities journals
	    - *Digital Humanities Quarterly* (DHQ)
	    - *Electronic Book Review* (EBR)
	    - *Vectors: Journal of Culture and Technology in a Dynamic Vernacular*
	    - *Postmodern Culture* (PMC)

- ?
    - Mainstream Humanities journals
    - Information Science journals?
    - Computer Science journals?
- Possible target edited books of essays:
    - ?

Technical or Data Issues Bearing on Future of RoSE: (in progress)

Narrativity	- Bearman, Peter S. and Katherine Stovel. "Becoming Nazi: A Model for Narrative Networks," *Poetics* 27 (2000): 69-90. Available online from ScienceDirect <<http://www.sciencedirect.com/>> [Search on "Bearman" and "Nazi," and access through a UC library proxy server for the pdf file] - Franzosi, Roberto, *Quantitative Narrative Analysis* (Los Angeles: Sage, 2010)

Suggestions relevant to meeting
(also see results of the charrette breakout sessions and roundup session)(Click column headers to sort)

Suggested by:	Date:	Suggestion:
Krapp, Peter (& Catherine Liu)	02/27/2010	Dear Alan, Thanks for having Catherine and me up to the RoSE charrette. It was great to join in the conversations about where this can take people's research, and to meet old and new friends. - Catherine just now on the train pointed out that instead of printing a program book, one could have entered each participant into RoSE, with cross-references (contacts such as collaborations, mutual or shared citations, affiliations) to see how it might look for all those in the room. To riff on that, we might have taken half an hour to refine such connections, e.g. between former colleagues at another institution outside UC, or people who wrote on closely related topics, or else assigned each person a historical avatar, as it were, to animate in the system. - Thanks for the hospitality, great food and conversations!
Bulger, Monica	02/27/2010	See Monica's blog post on RoSE and "Affinity Browsing"
Snow, Jeremy	02/27/2010	Alan, I'd just like to thank you again for bringing me on board for this project and inviting me to the charette, which I found to be a very interesting and engaging discussion among a lot of really intelligent folks. One thing that I would like to discuss with the other graduate students when we get the chance to recap is really trying to tackle those questions of who this research environment is being aimed towards and how we can make it most effective and engaging for that particular audience. During the lunch hour most of the RA's had a very engaged discourse about who RoSE is for and how to mold and direct the project as it moves forward. What we don't want to have happen is for this tool to become so distanced from what I felt was the original audience (and arguably the audience most in need of this sort of tool-set): K-12 students. While many of the Professors and other distinguished faculty presented us with a number of very challenging and good points during the feedback session,

I think in re-examining what should be done moving forward we shouldn't lose sight of this demographic. Graduate students and faculty have been endowed with, after a great many years of experience, inherent skills and abilities that allow them to pursue research projects, even those subjects to which they are completely foreign, with a certain degree of confidence and authority. K-12 students have not. I do not think that RoSE is just another fun online playground for academics and intellectuals to run around in. There is plenty of that to go around. Instead RoSE should be imagined as the kind of research environment that is conducive to learning for students of all ages.

I also think that we should have a brief discussion on the nature of "privacy" in the Web 2.0 universe, as that seemed to be of great concern to many of your peers, while I feel as though the definition of privacy is rapidly changing in the eyes of the graduates students that are helping develop this project.

In any case, that's all I have to say at the moment. I do hope that we get the chance to debrief soon while all of this is still fresh in my mind.

Feel free to forward this to the rest of the group if you wish for some additional feedback.

Template Table

Template Topic	

💬 **Comments (0)**

You don't have permission to comment on this page.

🖨 Printable version