# Researcher Bi-Weekly Reporting Template

The purpose of this document is to help prompt reflection and capture the progress, barriers, and needs you have as you undertake your project. We’ve included some preferred and suggested prompts in each section below. This document is to be completed every two weeks and submitted according to the reporting schedule.

Please append the filename with the date of submission and your initials (ex: CCHC-Biweekly-Reporting-Template-**2021-06-01**-**od**.docx). Once completed, please submit to [**LC-Labs@loc.gov**](mailto:LC-Labs@loc.gov)and CC Jaime Mears ([jame@loc.gov](mailto:jame@loc.gov)).

**Name:**

**Reporting Period: 13: 11/15/2021-11/26/2021**

### No Work Completed

We anticipate that there may be periods in your project during which you make little progress. In this situation, we ask you to check the “Nothing to report” box. After the “Reason” prompt below, please briefly indicate why there was nothing to report. Where possible, we’d still like to learn more about the reasons behind any unexpected events or barriers you encounter. You can share additional details in the “Obstacles/Needs” section before submitting this report.

Nothing to report

Reason:

### Activity and Progress

*We’d like to hear about your progress over the last couple of weeks. Please feel free to expand on the questions below.*

1. **What did you and your team work on over the last two weeks? Why?**

*We’d love to hear about your decision-making, the technologies (ie. cloud services, hardware, and software) you’ve been using, why you’ve adopted them, modifications or hacks you’ve had to create, prototyping and testing, and anything you’d like to share about your current in-progress deliverables.*

These two weeks have been insane between the end of the semester and with moving, so I haven’t had a lot of time to work on this project. With that said, I’ve been carving out some time to do some reading because I wanted to ground sound of the work in best practices and/or theory. In particular, I’ve been making my way through *Data Feminism* over the last several weeks and spent some time this week on it. Chapter 7: Show Your Work led to ideas for this project.

I am continually awed by the amount of labor and the scale of the work at LOC. *Data Feminism* made me think about how to credit this labor with ADDI. In particular, I was thinking about their conversation about invisible labor. This is labor that is out of sight. I was particularly thinking about digitization. The entire reason this project is possible is because of the expansive work to collect, digitize and provide metadata for the collections. Yet, it is way too common for people, including myself, to underestimate and undervalue the amount of work that is involved to create “the data”. This is in part because digital material is online and “free”, which just means free for the user but not to the institution that built the digital collection/data set. I would like to include a section that makes visible the labor of this project. It led to several questions that I’m thinking through:

* + Who should be included in this section?
  + How should people be acknowledged/credited?
  + Are there other ways to make this labor visible?

I’ve been thinking about this also in terms of this concept of “screening techniques” from Sarah Ahmed, which D’Ignazio and Klein discuss. As they write, “When those other people are screened out, they become invisible, and their contributions go unrecognized. The *screening techniques* that lead to their erasure, as Ahmed terms them, are not always intentional, but they are, unfortunately, self-perpetuating” (D’Ignazio and Klein, Data Feminim, Ch. 7, online). I’m hoping not to participate in this, and appreciate any and all feedback! As they write, “When designing data products from a feminist perspective, we must similarly aspire to show the work involved in the entire lifecycle of the project” (D’Ignazio and Klein, Data Feminim, Ch. 7, online).

I also return to our discussions over the course of last several months about documenting changes in the data. I’ve been really interested in this so that I can understand and account for changes in the data. This has been particularly acute for metadata. For example, it is my understanding that data was added to FSA photos based on new information that came from comments on Flickr. LOC did a cool experiment where they put the color FSA photos on Flickr for people to comment on. If I recall correctly, curators then used the information to update the records. However, this isn’t recoded in the metadata (at least to my knowledge). As a result, this can be a challenge for a few reasons. One is that it is now harder to know the difference between the metadata data generated in the 1940s and more recently. Let’s say one wanted to study the difference in the metadata over time, they would have to be careful. They’d have to know that the color set may include augmented metadata by other means such as curators or having engaged with the collection for years. Another reason to document it is to indicate the labor behind the metadata: staff in the 1930s, archivists in the 1940s, interested online communities in the 2010s, etc. The labor could be embedded in the metadata. The power of this is demonstrated in Chapter 7 where they turn to Ben Schmidt’s work visualizing the LOC catalogue, which revealed a history of labor among cataloguers.

1. **What are your plans for the next two weeks? What excites you about those plans?**

I’m excited to finalize our decisions for the visualizer and build that version!

### Obstacles/Needs

1. **What barriers, if any, have you encountered over the past two weeks? Were these barriers expected?**

*Examples: unexpected costs; API limitations; organizational barriers; data issues; technical gaps or challenges; collections knowledge.*

In this case, it has been time!

1. **What would resolve these barriers (or would have resolved them, in retrospect)?**

*We’d love to know what you need help with! This is an opportunity for LC staff to learn from you about how to best support this work going forward.*

I appreciated moving to the optional 1:1 meetings at this point in the project.

1. **What changes, if any, do you anticipate to your proposed timeline? Why?**

*Do you expect any significant blockers to your progress?*

The “final” visualizer will be closer to mid-December.

### Reflection

1. **What happened over the last two weeks that was particularly thought-provoking?**

*Examples: surprises; places where help from Library staff was critical; incorrect assumptions; things you learned; things that, in retrospect, you wish you’d known.*

I’ve been thinking a lot about labor.

1. **Anything else you’d like to add?**

As always, thank you to everyone for all their work!