Review of: "Project-Based Learning for Graduate Students in Digital Humanities"

Ana Jofre[1]

1 SUNY Polytechnic Institute

Potential competing interests: The author(s) declared that no potential competing interests exist.

This work is both of high relevance and high interest for educators in the digital humanities. It provides a well-written overview of the structure and outcomes of a five-year internship that gave humanities students the opportunity to learn digital skills and to develop collaborations with researchers in STEM.

While the narrative structure is very readable and engaging, it doesn't seem like the most effective way to convey the tremendous amount of rich information to come out of this case study. It would be helpful if there were more charts and tables to provide context for the narrative.   I would like to see the quantitative data that underpins the narrative. For example, the two pie charts showing the students' disciplines and their learnings goals were helpful. The narrative mentions that many students started out doing one thing then moved toward another, which got me wondering how many changed their direction throughout the internship. So, it would be helpful to see a chart of the breakdown of final projects by category (web publication, text analysis, GIS/mapping, database development, code preservation, etc). I was also curious about how many, on average, different tools did students engage with throughout their internship (this seems important as the narrative suggests that experimentation was an important part of the learning process).

One thing that would be very helpful for people at other institutions thinking about developing a similar internship would be a clearer and more quantitative accounting of the resources. How many faculty members per student, on average? Was it one humanities supervisor and one STEM faculty? Or more? How many support staff? How many external institutions participated? It seems like a big part of the success of this program was the relevant experience that students acquired, as well as the strong support and mentorship from faculty. It made me wonder how much of that could effectively be reproduced at smaller institutions.

I was also curious if the authors had any information on student success rate after the internship. It seems anecdotally that most were very successful after the internship - but what are the numbers?

Finally, there were many interesting quotes from students in the narrative, but no clear summary of student comments. What was the overall sentiment of the students? It appears that they had a good experience, that they learned a great deal, and that the program provided the professional experience they needed to succeed. But, was this the case for the majority of the students or for the few whose quotes were chosen? There is no clear methodology on how the interviews

with the students were analyzed and interpreted. As such, student quotations seem to be used anecdotally to support points that the authors were making, rather than as data.

Overall, this is very interesting work, and it is a valuable contribution for educators in the digital humanities. However, a little more quantitative analysis of this case-study would have been fruitful.