PressForward is a free plugin that provides an editorial workflow for content aggregation and curation within the WordPress dashboard.

Collect materials by RSS-Atom feed or using the “Nominate This” bookmarklet

Discuss and nominate content

Share and contextualize

Attribute and auto-direct to original source

PressForward enables scholarly communities to collectively identify and distribute materials they value.

http://pressforward.org

PressForward

Collects dispersed English language

DH content

Invites participants with a wide range of experiences and expertise to nominate materials for distribution

Highlights work from practitioners with diverse scholarly interests as Editors’ Choice

Publicizes opportunities to participate in conferences, to apply for funding or jobs, and to try new resources

Grows community engagement by returning readers to the original site of publication

http://digitalhumanitiesnow.org

DHNow serves the growing digital humanities community by surfacing, selecting, and circulating recent, high-quality scholarship and salient news items informally published on the web.

How can someone interested in digital humanities keep up with the expanding quantity and diversity of multidisciplinary scholarship available on the open web?

1)翔

2) legitimacy

3) relatively easy way for individuals to contribute and help define conversation.

DHNow offers a new model for scholarly communication

DHNow expedites scholarly communication by broadcasting open access, scholarly content and raising the profile of open access informally published gray literature. Through a streamlined process for managing large numbers of novice and seasoned community volunteers, DHNow nurtures and expands DH communities of practice.

http://digitalhumanitiesnow.org

dh+lib

where the digital humanities and librarianship meet

http://acrl.ala.org/dh

dh+lib provides a communal space where librarians, archivists, graduate students, and information specialists of all stripes can engage in conversations about digital humanities and libraries.

How can a growing, diverse community identify, validate, and contextualize publications and announcements around relevant projects, resources, posts, calls for papers, opportunities, and job announcements?

1)翔

2)翔

3) relatively easy way for individuals to contribute and help define conversation.

dh+lib enhances scholarly communication

A survey conducted by the dh+lib editors in 2012 revealed the content our audience is most interested isn’t represented in existing library publications. Thus, the dh+lib Review was born.

Editors-at-Large: Volunteer editors-at-large power the Review. Each week, 6-10 reviewers evaluate the output of the 188 feeds and nominate the best pieces.

Writing: At the end of the week, the Review editor selects the most relevant pieces and writes short contextual paragraphs. Once drafted, the other 3 dh+lib editors review the contextual paragraphs.

Publish: When ready, these posts (4-10 per week) are published on the website and also distributed via email and Twitter.
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Figure 1 illustrates the presence of an increasing interest in DH within the library community, but a relatively low output of formal scholarly pieces (in particular, for the years prior to dh+lib, 2005-2011). There was an unmet need for information about DH that was sensitive to the perspective of librarians. Modification of Figure 1 from Suka, Chris Alan. “Digital Humanities and Librarianship: A Conceptual Model.” Journal of Library Administration 53(1) (2013): 10-26.

Figure 2 reveals the content our audience most interested in, which isn’t represented in existing library publications. Thus, the dh+lib Review was born. Since we are surfacing a variety of content from the open web, there are three things that grant our content validity: 1)翔; readers get the most relevant content; 2)翔; content is selected by professional peers; 3)翔; relatively easy way for individuals to contribute and help define conversation.

http://digitalhumanitiesnow.org

http://acrl.ala.org/dh

http://digitalhumanitiesnow.org

http://acrl.ala.org/dh

Digital humanities on the web

Over 450 feeds

Editors-in-Chief

Editors-at-Large

Digital Humanities Now

Aggregation, Nomination, and Publication

Published to site

25-30

Editors’ Choice per month

Up to 50 news items per month
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