

## Project 2: Proposal Peer Review

Instructions: One group member should post your project proposal as a Word Doc attachment. Individually, you'll provide a review to the **two project proposals that follow your own**: For instance, if the list below shows the order of proposals posted on the forum, I'd review Mandie's and Lindsey's group proposals:

Desiree's Group  
Mandie's Group  
Lindsey's Group  
Thomas's Group

The rest of my group would review the same group proposals, but since we're doing this individually rather than as a group, you should get different feedback.

Make sure to use your peers' proposals and your understanding of the assignment prompt and rubric to guide your responses. When you're finished, post this completed guide as a reply to the group's original post. Your responses should be detailed, specific, constructive, and critical.

Note: If you don't make any specific suggestions for improvement, you won't receive full credit for this review. Likewise, if your tone is not supportive while being critical, you won't receive full credit.

### Content

1. Just by reading the **title**, is it clear that this is a digital humanities project? What words are used or should be used to make the title more concrete and appropriate for the subject and design of the project?
2. After reading the proposal, what do you picture as this group's project? How could the project **purpose** be more concretely connected to the project as a whole, including its design, purpose, audience, content, and significance?
3. In your own words, describe how has the group has situated the project in research and critical thinking within the background section. What revisions do you recommend to situate the group's project in a body of research and digital projects?
4. How might the group better justify the need and/or significance of the project? How could this **justification** be more persuasive? In other words, do you suggest more attention to research and/or some elements of the rhetorical situation to make a better case for this project's significance and effectiveness?
5. According to the proposal (not your own insights), what additional details are needed to understand and visualize how the project looks and/or works?
6. In the **project goals**, who is the audience for this project and how will they use the site?

7. What additional detail do you need to understand what this project will accomplish for a specific audience/need-case scenario? What more do you need to be fully convinced of the project's connection to a defined rhetorical situation, genre, and audience?
8. What are the tools and data specified in the **tools** section? Is the data and tool details articulated concretely enough that you could explain them to someone else and maybe even locate them yourselves? What other suggestions or feedback on tool and data selection?
9. How has the group connected issues of **ethics and data collection** to the specific way in which they've gathered and worked with data? How could this section improve?
10. Do any elements of remaining 2-3 weeks that comprise the **plan of work** need to be further addressed or revised to meet the remaining deadlines and goals of the assignment? You might address areas that need to be further developed and also when/if the project seems to be taking on too much and may need to scale back:
  - a. Further collecting, editing, and documenting sources/data
  - b. Conducting, collecting, archiving qualitative data like interviews, texts, tweets
  - c. Getting feedback
  - d. Revising/retooling the project
  - e. Delivering your project
11. Since this is a group project, what suggestions do you have to improve the clarity and organization of the **plan of work**? Comment on the overall cohesiveness of the group project vision.

## Organization & Clarity

12. Provide suggestions to make the proposal more cohesive. How could each element of the proposal be better connected to create a cohesive, concrete vision?
13. Provide suggestions to make the proposal look more professional and aesthetically pleasing: consider layout, text, headings, bullets, etc.
14. Describe the tone of the proposal and provide suggestions on making the tone more engaging and appropriate to the proposal genre.

## Takeaways

15. What is the greatest strength of this proposal?
16. What should be the biggest priority for revision?
17. What have you learned from this proposal that you'll apply to your own proposal revision?