Digital technology in heritage interpretation (evaluation sheet)

This document was prepared by the heritage interpretation experts of the Association of Cultural Heritage Managers – KÖME within the framework of the MUSE.ar (musear.eu) project (co-funded by the Creative Europe programme of the European Union). The basic purpose of the sheet is to evaluate the practical works of future participants of potential Digital Interpretation Planning courses. The structure was built on the evaluation sheets of the existing Certified Trainings of Interpret Europe (https://interpret-europe.net/training/). Please indicate the resourse with the name of the project and the association if you further use the content.

contact: info@heritagemanager.hu

December 2022

1. Is the digital device properly selected to suit the intended audience(s)?	0	+	+ +	+ + +	Comments
Is the digital tool (hardware) handy and familiar for the target audience?					
Is the display/interface/experience user friendly? (skeuomorphs and anti-patterns, aesthetics, etc.)					
Is it inclusive – developed with sensitivity to all users and abilities (incl. multi-user experiences)?					
Has the digital interpretive product weaknesses/deficiencies which could have been avoided with proper research before and/or testing during its development?					

2. Is the digital technology properly selected to suit the site and site management?	0	+	+ +	+ + +	Comments
Is digital technology opted for after careful consideration and with a management purpose? (focus on real needs)					
Can the needs of staff assistance that the tool requires be met?					
Does it address changes in digital technology to ensure that your digital interpretation does not become outdated and obsolete within 5 years?					
Are maintenance and continuous operation safeguarded on the "long run"?					
Does the device or the trigger fit seamlessly in the setting? (If it is mounted.)					
Has the digital interpretive product weaknesses/deficiencies which could have been avoided with a proper research prior to and/or testing during its development?					

Is monitoring incorporated?					
Are the environmental, physical conditions favourable to include the device (e.g. sufficient space; amount of light; humidity; noise level; conservation issues)?					

3. Does digital interpretation fit in the wider interpretive scene?	0	+	+ +	+ + +	Comments
Does it work in conjunction with other forms of interpretation of the site?					
Does digital interpretation enhance existing interpretation?					
Does it contribute to layering the content?					
Does it include first-hand experiences with the phenomenon?					
Is the image of the design in line with the image of the site or does it differ for purpose?					
Has the digital interpretive product weaknesses/deficiencies which could have been avoided with a proper testing during its development?					

4. What effect does it have on the audience?					
Is the service attractive and make people want to use it? (first impressions)					
What is the holding time of the service?					
Is the image of the design in line with (assumed) expectations of the intended audience?					
Does it use motivational techniques (e.g. raising open-ended questions, offering fun, humour, collecting, status, gaming and other methodological and/or rhetorical 'stepping stones')?					
Does it help the intended audience relate to the phenomena/feature by connecting with the audience's everyday lives, experience, interests and culture?					
Does it evoke emotional connections with the phenomenon?					
Does it involve the user physically (other than punching the screen or scrolling)?					
Does it encourage interaction with others? (staff, other audience members)					
Does it provoke thoughts and further thinking?					
Does it give the opportunity to the users to react or express personal thoughts?					
Does it orient the user well in space, time and activities?					
Has the digital interpretive product weaknesses/deficiencies which could have been avoided with a proper testing during its development?					

5. Do content elements (text, images, films, audio, physical objects, etc.) support each other and work as a whole?	0	+	+ +	+ + +	**Comments**
Do all elements have their clear role in a subsidiary relation?					
Do all components support a central idea?					
Do they add up to a concise content, so the meaning can be grasped easily?					
Has the digital interpretive product weaknesses/deficiencies which could have been avoided with a proper testing during its development?					
6. Is the content clear, simple and appropriate for the intended audience?	0	+	+ +	+ + +	**Comments**
Is the content and the concept appropriate on a historical / scientific level?					
Does it engage the user in a colloquial, personal tone/voice?					
If it uses technical words are they explained?					
Is the language (wording) appropriate for their intended audience?					
Has the digital interpretive product weaknesses/deficiencies which could have been avoided with a proper testing during its development?					
7. Does the content help participants find meaning?	0	+	+ +	+ + +	**Comments**
Does it offer paths to deeper truth and meanings rather than simply conveys information?					
Does it introduce universal concepts?					
Does it include human stories related to the topic?					
Is a clear maim theme evident? If 'yes', what could this be?					
Do the selected focuses, i.e. main theme and sub-themes of the content properly build on facts?					
Does it encourage appreciation of the heritage directly or indirectly?					
Does it emphasize unique qualities of the phenomena?					
Does it irritate general common senses and integrates a complexity of perspectives about reality, history etc. (conceptual and artistic quality)?					
Has the digital interpretive product weaknesses/deficiencies which could have been avoided with a proper testing during its development?					