Public Philosophy Journal
2018 New Engaged Scholars Digital Pilot Program

All meetings will be held on **Wednesdays, 2:00-3:30pm EST** via Zoom:
https://msu.zoom.us/j/2119723828

Participants

Jacqueline Alvarez: jalvar18@mail.sfsu.edu
Suzania Brahmacharimayum: suzania.sharma@gmail.com
Katina Fontes: katinafontes@gmail.com
Claire Skea: 1508084@leedstrinity.ac.uk
Heather Stewart: hstewa27@uwo.ca

Program Coordinator: Andrea Walsh: walshan5@msu.edu

Program Agenda

Pre-Meeting Tasks

Welcome! To prepare for the program, we invite you to take these steps:

1. Create a *PPJ* profile and explore the site:
    http://publicphilosophyjournal.org

2. Become familiar with the functionality of the *PPJ* Current and the kind
    of content curated by the *PPJ* community.
    a. Upload your project proposal as an original submission.
    b. Share 2-3 links that are publicly accessible and relevant to your
        project.

3. Create a profile on Humanities Commons (HC): https://hcommons.org
    a. Join the HC PPJ group: https://hcommons.org/groups/public-
        philosophy-journal/
    b. Message Andrea Walsh (@awalsh) on HC for an invitation to join
        the separate (hidden) group "Public Philosophy Journal New

Engaged Scholars." This is a place for us to share resources related to program projects, topics and activities, to engage in discussions between meetings, and to post project updates. Assessment surveys will also be available here.

4. *Encouraged reading:*
    a. "Practicing Public Scholarship" by Christopher P. Long (available in the "files" section of our HC group, and in the *PPJ*).
    b. "Power Mapping A framework for problem solving through relationship building," a handout from the American Association of University Women. You will be encouraged to develop your peer mentoring network throughout the program. This handout provides a brief overview of strategies to help you along (available on HC).

Optional/encouraged activities to engage in at any time throughout the program

1. Develop your digital scholarly presence by
    a. identifying and attending live tweet chats of interest to your project;
    b. tweeting project updates and reflections;
    c. sharing small parts of your project on social media (this may involve building a "content pillar" to determine how your project would best be broken into smaller parts, as well as considering which venues would be best for sharing which parts).
2. Compose short blog pieces that reflect on one or more aspects of your project and/or your experiences with forming your project. You might share these pieces on the Current, your personal blog (if you have one), and/or other venues. Consider drawing attention to and welcoming engagement with them on social media. (Note: though you are invited to compose more than one piece, on the session agenda for May 2nd this activity is listed as a "to-do.")
3. Continue mapping and developing your peer mentoring network even when this is not formally recommended as a "to-do," perhaps sharing them with the group in our HC group folder "Peer Mentoring Networks."
4. Using our HC group discussion board, take conversations with your cohort beyond scheduled meetings, and share links and documents of interest to your project, the projects of others, or any topics discussed in meetings.
5. Record any issues with the *PPJ* site that interfere with your experience (broken links or buttons, missing features, etc.). You are also welcome to share suggestions for refining site language and content. Though

opportunities to do so will be available via the assessment surveys, we would be most grateful for any feedback provided in the interims.

February 7th: Meeting 1
Topics: Welcome and introductions; Overview of the *PPJ*

- Welcome remarks and introductions

- Review of program purpose and agenda

- Icebreaker activity

- Overview of the *PPJ*

- Developing a peer mentoring network

- To-dos:

    1. Read your cohort's project proposals (on the Current). You may also use the comment forums to offer initial feedback.
    2. Work on developing your peer mentoring network by identifying at least 2-3 individuals working, whether within or beyond academe, in areas that are relevant to your project with whom you would like to connect and potentially ask for project feedback. Please create your list as a document in our HC group folder "Peer mentoring networks." (https://hcommons.org/groups/ppj-2018-new-engaged-scholars/docs/). You are also encouraged to indicate in your document the strategies you are or plan on using to develop your network.
    3. Complete assessment survey 1.

February 14th: Meeting 2
Topic: Writing for relevance and accessibility

- Speaker: Christopher Long (*PPJ* Editor-in-Chief; Dean of the College of Arts & Letters at Michigan State University)

- Discussion: provide collective feedback regarding the relevance and accessibility of project proposals

- To-dos:

1. Formative peer "mini-review":

   The purpose of this "mini-review" is to gain familiarity with the *PPJ* Formative Peer Review process and platform and to receive initial peer feedback on your project proposals. Andrea will act as coordinator for the reviews, inviting each of you to the role of reviewer to provide feedback on your review partner's proposal via the review platform. You should expect to spend approximately 30 minutes providing feedback that focuses on the criterion of relevance and accessibility. Reviewer feedback should appear on the platform by February 23rd. You are encouraged to make use of platform features for engaging in post-review discussion.

   <u>Pairs</u>
   Claire and Katina
   Suzania and Jacqueline
   Heather and Andrea

2. Focusing particularly on relevance and accessibility, draft your paper introduction. Please share it in our HC group folder "Paper introductions."

February 28th: Meeting 3
Topic: Writing for intellectual coherence and scholarly dialogue

- Speaker: Christopher Long

- Discussion:
  o Questions to bear in mind as you work to improve your paper for intellectual coherence and scholarly dialogue.
  o Updates and reflections on drafting your paper introductions.

- To-dos:
  1. Attending equally to the four criterion, compose 3+ pages of your draft.
  2. Identify at least 3 recent scholarly sources that are of substantial relevance to and you would like to engage with in your project (that you haven't engaged with already). If you find this helpful, you might post your results as a document in our HC group folder "Project engagement sources" and use this space as you continue to develop your list.

3. Encouraged reading: "Back to the future: (Re)turning from Peer Review to Peer Engagement," Rebecca Kennison (available on HC).

March 14th: Meeting 4
Topic: Formative peer engagement and review

- Speaker: Rebecca Kennison (R|N Consultants)

- Group activity: engaging in Formative Peer Review the *PPJ* way

- To-dos:
  1. Compose 2-3+ pages of your draft. By March 23rd, please gather and upload to the Current all pages drafted thus far.
  2. **Formative Peer Review round 1:** Each project will be assigned two formative peer reviewers from the cohort. Please conduct reviews on the *PPJ* platform by March 26th. Feedback should attend equally to the four *PPJ* style criterion. Using the comment forum, you are encouraged to engage in post-review discussion with your review team prior to our next meeting.

     Review teams
     Claire and Heather review Katina
     Jacqueline and Katina review Heather
     Katina and Suzania review Claire
     Suzania and Claire review Jacqueline
     Heather and Jacqueline review Suzania

  3. After you have finished the review processes, please complete assessment survey 2.

March 28th: Meeting 5
Topic: Preparing works for publication in scholarly venues: best practices

- Speaker: Kurt Milberger (Coordinating Editor, College of Arts & Letters at Michigan State University)

- Group reflection on the first round of Formative Peer Review

- To dos:

1. Identify 2-3 scholarly venues to which final manuscripts could potentially be submitted, become familiar with their submission guidelines and the writing style of the articles they publish, and draft a cover letter for the venue of your preference. Please post your findings and cover letter as a document in our HC group folder "Scholarly venues."
2. Work on revising existing pages of your draft in specific consideration of feedback received in the first round of Formative Peer Review.
3. Compose 2+ new pages of your draft.

April 11th: Meeting 6
Topic: Fundamentals of Academic Writing (a Refresher)

- Speaker: William Hart-Davidson (Associate Dean of Graduate Education, Michigan State University)

- Group reflection: which 2-3 aspects covered during today's discussion do you think you should prioritize while writing your next few pages?

- Progress updates on preparatory research of scholarly journals

- To-dos:
    1. Compose 3+ pages of your paper draft.
    2. Identify 2-3 individuals you might nominate as peer reviewers for the final round of Formative Peer Review. On your mentoring network document in our HC group, please add their names and any notes you wish to share.
    3. Reach out to at least one individual you have identified as a potential peer mentor to ask for feedback on your draft or specific areas of your draft. Remembering that genuine peer engagement is a reciprocal practice, consider some ways you might help to enrich the other's scholarly work or development in return.

April 25th: Meeting 7
Topic: The Ins and Outs of Revising

- Speaker: Christopher Long

- Discussion: strategies for revising in response to peer reviewer feedback

- To-dos:
  1. Compose 2-3+ pages of your paper draft.
  2. **Formative peer review round 2:**

  Each project will be assigned two formative peer reviewers: one from your cohort, and one from the *PPJ* editorial team. Reviews should be conducted on the platform and completed by <u>March 26th</u>. They should attend equally to the four *PPJ* style criterion. You are encouraged to engage in post-review platform discussion with your review team prior to our next meeting.

  <u>Review teams</u>
  Claire and Chris Long review Katina
  Jacqueline and Kurt Milberger review Heather
  Heather and Sophia Pavlos review Suzania
  Katina and Andrea review Claire
  Suzania and Andrea review Jacqueline

May 2nd: Meeting 8
Topic: Maximizing Scholarship for Public Impact; Digital Technologies

- Speakers: Kathleen Fitzpatrick (Director of Digital Humanities in Michigan State University's College of Arts & Letters) and Dean Rehberger (Director of the Matrix Digital Lab, Michigan State University).

- Group reflection on the second round of Formative Peer Review

- Discussion: progress on developing your peer mentoring networks (e.g., what strategies have you found effective/ineffective?)

- To-dos:
  1. Compose a short blog piece reflecting on a specific area of your project and/or your experience with developing the project. Please post or compose the piece on the Current. You are encouraged to read the pieces of your cohort and use the comment forum to engage.
  2. Reach out to at least two individuals you have identified as potential peer mentors to ask for project feedback (one may be the same individual to whom you reached out before), and consider/offer ways you might help in exchange. Revise existing pages as you are able.

3. Compose 2+ new pages of paper draft.

May 23rd: Meeting 9
Topic: Preparing for the final round of Formative Peer Review

- Closing remarks and group reflections

- Preparing for the final round of Formative Peer Review

- To-dos:
    1. Schedule an individual meeting with Andrea to discuss where you are in the writing process and to create your Formative Peer Review plan.
    2. Continue formative peer engagement with your review partner and other peer mentors who have agreed to provide feedback. Please use our HC group documents feature to collaborate. (Partners: Suzania and Jacqueline, Claire and Katina, Heather and Andrea)
    3. And of course, keep writing, revising, and connecting!

Follow-ups

- After your final round of Formative Peer Review has been completed, please contact Andrea to schedule an individual meeting to discuss your next steps.
- Complete assessment survey 3. The survey will be emailed to each participant upon completion of their final round of review.