

The University of Iowa  
School of Library and Information Sciences  
Spring 2016

Course	SLIS 6145: Digital Preservation and Stewardship
Course Schedule	Wednesdays 10:00-12:30, 3092 Main Library
Instructor	Dr. Lindsay Mattock
Office Location	3072 Main Library
E-mail	lindsay-mattock@uiowa.edu
Office Hours	by appointment

### **Scheduling Notes**

The Spring 2016 academic term runs from January 18 – May 6. Our first class meeting will be held, Wednesday, January 20. The last day of class is May 4<sup>th</sup>. The course will not meet during the week of Spring Break, March 13 – March 20.

### **Course Overview**

---

This course will provide an introduction to the concepts, theories, and practices related to the preservation and continued stewardship of born-digital and digitized materials. Taught from an archival perspective this course will focus on the current methods of collection, maintenance, and access to digital collections in libraries, archives, and museums.

Through assignments and in-class activities, students will become familiar with the tools, workflows, and processes currently utilized by LIS professionals to manage digital records, including: BitCurator digital forensic software, BagIt file packaging, and the Internet Archive's web archiving service Archive-It.

Upon successful completion of this course, students will be able to:

- Develop a familiarity with the history of digital preservation and curation and the development of methods and theories related to these practices
- Become conversant with the key concepts and terminology of digital preservation, curation, stewardship, and management of digital collections

- Identify, assess, and apply standards for the preservation and continued management of digital objects
- Identify and apply descriptive and preservation metadata to digital and digitized objects
- Identify and make informed decisions regarding the software and hardware available for creating and maintaining digital collections

## **Textbooks**

---

### Required Texts

Edward M. Corrado and Heather Lea Moulaison, *Digital Preservation for Libraries, Archives and Museums* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2014).

Dan Farmer and Wietse Venema, *Forensic Discovery* (New York: Addison-Wesley, 2005).  
Available at <http://www.porcupine.org/forensics/forensic-discovery/>

Anne J. Gilliland, *Conceptualizing 21<sup>st</sup>-Century Archives* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2014).

### *Recommended Texts*

Charles Petzold, *Code: The Hidden Language of Computer Hardware and Software* (Redmond, WA: Microsoft Press, 2000).

Ron White, *How Computers Work* (Indianapolis: Que, 2014).

The required and recommended textbooks have been placed on reserve in the Main Library. Additional required readings for each week will be available through the URL provided in the syllabus or through the University Libraries' ejournal collections.

## Semester at a Glance

---

Week 1   Jan. 20	Introduction – What Is Digital Preservation?
Week 2   Jan. 27	Digital Preservation: A Brief History
Week 3   Feb. 3	Digital Materiality 1
Week 4   Feb. 10	Digital Materiality 2
Week 5   Feb. 17	Preservation Metadata
Week 6   Feb. 24	Digital Repositories
Week 7   Mar. 2	Collection Development <i>BitCurator Reports and Reflection Due</i>
Week 8   Mar. 9	Descriptive Metadata
<i>March 16</i>	<i>Spring Break</i>
Week 9   Mar. 23	Preserving Research Data
Week 10   Mar. 30	<i>Archive-It Collection and Presentation Due</i>
Week 11   Apr. 6	Collection Assessment
Week 12   Apr. 13	Record Keeping Models
Week 13   Apr. 20	Preservation Strategies
Week 14   Apr. 27	Sustainability & Project Management
Week 15   May 4	Peer Review
<i>May 11</i>	<i>Access to Historical Records Grant Project Due</i>

## Course Requirements and Grading

---

### Assignment Deadlines

All assignments are to be submitted electronically through the designated space in ICON. Assignments are due by 10:00am on the due date listed in the syllabus. Late assignments will NOT be accepted.

### Style Guide and Formatting Requirements

Use of The Chicago Manual of Style, 16th edition (Notes and Bibliography Style) is mandatory for footnotes and bibliographies. While you are strongly urged to purchase a copy of this work, an online version is available at <http://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/home.html>. Line spacing can be line-and-a-half or double-spaced. Fonts used should be no smaller than 10 point and no larger than 12 point. Margins should be set to 1". Footnotes should be used rather than endnotes. The use of *Ibid* and parenthetical inline references will not be accepted.

All assignments are to be submitted as a .pdf to the appropriate dropbox on ICON unless otherwise instructed. All submissions must include your name, a title, page numbers, and bibliography/works-cited page.

### Grading Scale

A	93-98%	C+	77-79%
A-	90-92%	C	73-76%
B+	87-89%	C-	70-72%
B	83-86%	D	60-69%
B-	80-82%	F	<60%

### Assignments at a Glance

Assignment	Points	Due Date
Discussion Leadership	25	As Scheduled
BitCurator Reports and Reflection	25	Week 7, March 2
Archive-It Collection and Presentation	25	Week 10, March 30
Access to Historical Records Grant	25	Finals Week, May 11

**1. Discussion Leadership – 25 points**  
**As Scheduled, Weeks 3-6, 8-9, 11-14**

Most class sessions will begin with a discussion of the weekly topic and assigned reading. The discussion sessions will be led by a different pair of students each week. Each student will identify a theme or question in the weekly assigned reading to draw out an interesting conversation with the class. Discussion leaders should complete the assigned reading along with at least one additional self-selected article or chapter to inform the discussion.

Each discussion leader will have 8-10 minutes to introduce their selected theme/question before discussion begins. Discussion leaders should then be prepared to facilitate discussion together for an additional 25-30 minutes.

In order to give your colleagues a chance to prepare, discussion leaders will be required to post their question or theme along with the selected reading to the appropriate ICON discussion board by 7 PM on the Monday before Wednesday's class. No two discussion leaders may select the same additional reading, although they may choose to address the same theme. Discussion leaders may work together, if they wish, to prepare for the week, but each student will be graded individually.

A sign-up sheet will be posted following the first class session on Wednesday, January 20<sup>th</sup>. Students will have until Noon, Monday, January 25<sup>th</sup> to select a week or they will be assigned to a date by the professor.

The assignment will be graded according to the following rubric:

Requirement	Point Value	Guidelines
Preparation	5 points	The selected theme or question is clear and focused. The discussion leader is well prepared with discussion points and questions for the class. The discussion leader's theme and self-selected reading have been posted to the appropriate discussion board by 7PM the Monday before the assigned class session.
Introduction	5 points	The theme/question is clearly introduced, referencing the required and self-selected reading. Key concepts and theories are defined and explained.
Argumentation	6 points	The discussion leader has carefully read and understood the readings as evidenced by oral contributions by demonstrating familiarity with the main ideas, supporting evidence, and secondary arguments. Arguments or positions are reasonable and supported with evidence from the readings.

		The discussion leader deepens the conversation by going beyond the text, recognizing implications and extensions of the text. The student provides an analysis of complex ideas that help deepen the inquiry and further the conversation.
Facilitation	5 points	The flow and quality of discussion was maintained. The student helped to redirect or refocus discussion when it becomes sidetracked or unproductive. An effort was made to engage reluctant participants. Constructive feedback and support was provided. The leader actively attended to what others were saying, by building on, clarifying, or responding to comments.
Leadership and Speaking Skills	4 points	The student speaks clearly and can be understood by the class. The discussion leader shows respect for all of the members of the class, both in speech and manner, and for the method of shared inquiry and peer discussion. The student challenges ideas respectfully, encourages and supports others to do the same.

**2. BitCurator Reports and Reflection – 25 points**  
**Due Fridays, Weeks 3-6 and Wednesday, March 2**

Using the suite of BitCurator tools, students will image, analyze, process, and prepare born-digital objects for ingest into an archival collection. The in-class activities during weeks 3-6 will be dedicated to working through the various tools built into the BitCurator suite for imaging, performing forensic analysis, and accessioning digital objects.

This project will have three deliverables:

(1) BitCurator Reports

Each student will submit the output reports from the disk analysis:

- a. .info file from the disk imaging process
- b. md5 hash value for the imaged file
- c. fiwalk XML report
- d. bulk extractor reports
- e. premis.xml event metadata
- f. list of exported files with extensions

(2) Weekly Lab Reports

Following the weekly BitCurator in-class activity, each student will compose a Lab Report reflecting on the activity for the week. Each report should address any problems or issues encountered, questions and observations, and reflect on the class discussion and reading. Lab Reports are due by 10:00am the Monday following class. Reports will be posted to the appropriate discussion board on ICON.

(3) Final Reflection and Analysis

Each student will submit a final 6-8 page paper reflecting on and analyzing their experience using BitCurator to process born-digital materials. While students may draw from the Weekly Lab Reports, the final paper should provide an analysis of your use of the tool, the generated reports, and how the processes connect to the theory and practice of digital preservation.

The BitCurator Reports and Final Reflection are to be submitted as a single .pdf file to the appropriate Dropbox on Wednesday, March 2nd.

The assignment will be graded according to the following rubric:

Requirement	Point Value	Guidelines
BitCurator Reports	5 points	The final reflection is accompanied by a portfolio of the required reports generated during the weekly in-class activities.
Weekly Lab Reports	5 points	A report has been submitted for all required weeks. The report reflects on the success and challenges encountered during the exercises and reflects on the class discussion and readings.
Final Reflection and Analysis	10 points	The BitCurator Reports are accompanied by a 6-8 page paper reflecting on the experience using the BitCurator suite. The paper provides an analysis, reflecting on relevant aspects of the student's experience as evidence. The reflection also draws connections to the theory and practice of digital preservation and the relevance of digital forensics tools to this practice.
Organization	2 points	The Reflection and BitCurator reports are presented in a single, well-organized document including a table of contents and headings and sub-headings where appropriate.

Clarity of Writing	3 points	The assignment have been carefully proofread to ensure proper spelling and grammar. References to the outside literature are properly cited with footnotes and bibliography.
--------------------	----------	--

### **3. Archive-It Collection and Presentation – 25 points<sup>1</sup>** **Due Wednesday, March 30**

Archive-It is a subscription-based web archiving service provided by the Internet Archive. For this assignment, students will work in small groups to harvest websites and build a small thematic collection. A representative from the Internet Archive will lead a training session during the March 2<sup>nd</sup> class session.

For this group project you will design, execute and critique a web crawl on a topic of your choice using Archive-It to harvest and preserve a web-based collection. Your group will scope the collection, troubleshoot media file format issues, create metadata, and deal with robot.txt files and copyright issues, and learn about the architecture of the web. Each group will then report on the overall result of their project during the March 30<sup>th</sup> class session.

Each presentation will address the following topics:

- Description of and rationale for your web archive collection. What is the theme or topic of your collection, and how did you arrive at it?
- What are the 7-10 seeds that make up your collection?
- How did you scope or filter your collection? Did you have to make any scoping or filtering adjustments along the way? What filters did you create to define the types of files you wanted to copy?
- What did you choose to capture for each site or seed: the entire site, one or more directories, or one ore more subdomains? (Be sure to attend to the syntax of your seed URLs to make sure your are capturing what you intend.)
- How did you make these decisions? Before making your final selections, please read the "appraisal and selection" section of Jinfang Niu's "And Overview of Web Archiving" in *D-Lib Magazine* < <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/march12/niu/03niu1.print.html>>. Take note of the various approaches to appraisal he identifies: selection by domain (such as .gov or .edu), topic or event, or media type and genre. Niu also distinguishes between value-based sampling and random or statistical sampling.
- What type of content was archived in the course of your crawls? Images? Video? Form- and database-driven content? PDFs? Study your post-crawl reports to get a quantitative sense of the types and numbers of files that were captured.

---

<sup>1</sup> Based on "Assignment 4: Web Archiving" accessed January 16, 2016, [https://webarchive.jira.com/wiki/download/attachments/91717708/DigCur\\_Assignment04.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1421548050591&api=v2](https://webarchive.jira.com/wiki/download/attachments/91717708/DigCur_Assignment04.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1421548050591&api=v2)



- What major rendering problems did you encounter, and how did you troubleshoot them? What other technical issues did you run into (e.g., crawl traps, robots.txt files, etc.)?
- What are some of the major takeaways from this project? What did you learn, and what surprised you?

Your group will be in charge of deciding how you will present your group project. You may record a presentation ahead of time (the One-Button studio is available on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor of the Main Library) or present in class. The entire group may participate in the delivery or the group can designate a representative(s) to deliver the content. The presentation must last 15-18 minutes and address the topics outlined in the assignment description.

The assignment will be graded according to the following rubric:

Requirement	Point Value	Guidelines
Organization & Delivery	5 points	The presentation is well organized and easy to follow. The group utilizes appropriate visuals (screenshots and charts) to accompany the presentation. The presenter(s) speaks clearly and can be understood.
Project Summary	8 points	The presentation provides a summary of the development of your thematic collection, the project workflow, and your experience using the Archive-It service.
Analysis & Evaluation	8 points	The presentation moves beyond summary to provide an analysis of the experience using the tool and developing a collection, connecting the group's experience to the larger themes of the course.
Q & A	4 points	The group is prepared to lead discussion and respond to questions from peers.

#### **4. Access to Historical Records Grant – 25 points** **Due Wednesday, May 11**

Using the National Historical Publications & Records Commission (NHPRC) Access to Historical Records Grant as a framework, students will work in small groups to develop a mock grant proposal for a digital preservation project. The details of this funding opportunity can be accessed at <http://www.archives.gov/nhprc/announcement/access.html>.

Completed proposals are due during finals week, May 11. A Peer Review exercise has been scheduled for the final class session, May 4. Groups will exchange drafts of their proposals and will be given the opportunity to provide feedback to their peers. Each group should incorporate the appropriate suggestions from this exercise into their final narrative.

Grant Description: "The National Historical Publications and Records Commission seeks proposals that promote the preservation and use of historical records collections to broaden understanding of our democracy, history, and culture. This grant program is designed to support archival repositories in preserving and processing primary source materials. The program emphasizes the creation of online tools that facilitate the public discovery of historical records.

The Commission looks to fund projects that undertake one or more of the following activities:

- Preservation, arrangement, and online description of historical records in all formats
- Digital preservation of electronic records and unstable audio or moving image formats

After completing arrangement and description activities, applicants may also propose to digitize materials to provide online access to collections."

Please review the eligibility requirements before developing your project at <http://www.archives.gov/nhprc/apply/eligibility.html>

**The proposal guidelines have been modified for the purposes of this assignment. Each proposal must contain the following sections:**

##### **(1) Project Narrative:**

The project Narrative is a description of the proposal. It should be between 10-15 double-spaced pages in 12-pt type formatted for 8.5 x 11 inch paper with standard margins.

The narrative must be organized in the following sections:

1. Overview: Begin with an overview of the project. Describe the collections and show how the records would broaden public understanding of our democracy, history, and culture. Characterize the project's intended audience.
2. Archives Program Description: Briefly summarize your organization's history, mission, and goals with an emphasis on its archival programs. Describe the nature and scope of your holdings and your access policies for public use of your holdings,

including days and hours of operation. Briefly discuss the repository's environmental and security controls.

3. Description of Collections: Describe the materials that will be processed during this project, including the quantity in cubic or linear feet, topical matters, formats, dates, and their historical significance. For projects with born digital materials, provide the number of files and bytes to be processed. Demonstrate why each collection should be processed at the collection, series, box, folder, or item level. Describe the current demand and the physical condition of the materials. Provide use statistics. Explain how you expect this project to change usage levels.
4. Archival Methodologies: Describe your current processing methodologies and detail the ways in which you plan to describe the materials. Explain what preservation treatments are necessary and the cost estimates to preserve these items. Detail the specific methods used for any preservation reformatting of audio or moving image materials.
  - If you plan to digitize selected series or collections, provide detailed descriptions of your equipment and resources, metadata standards, and professional scanning practices. State clearly how your project will repurpose existing descriptive information to serve as metadata. Outline your institution's long-term preservation plan (or provide a link to it online). Specify cost estimates for digitized items in detailed charts in the supplemental materials.
  - If you plan to process born-digital materials, explain your current electronic records program and methods of preserving and providing access to electronic records. Describe the nature of the electronic records you expect to manage in terms of content, number of files, and bytes. Explain which of these electronic records have permanent value according to records retention policies, legal status, and historical value.
5. Project Products: Describe and quantify the products you plan to produce for the completed project. This includes collections, catalog records, finding aids, digitized items, electronic files, and related publicity materials. Applicants should contribute MARC records to appropriate national bibliographic utilities and use Encoded Archival Description (EAD) to place finding aids on the Internet or explain why other formats may be appropriate.
6. Project Publicity: Describe how you will publicize the results during the project, including websites, press releases, professional newsletters and journals, and the use of Web 2.0 applications. Identify appropriate professional conferences at which to present ideas and findings about their projects. Applicants are encouraged to consider how to broaden the project's reach through appropriate citizen engagement techniques like crowdsourcing, tagging, geo-location, wiki sites, direct user feedback, and mobile applications. Outline the methods your institution will use to evaluate the project (e.g., researchers' surveys, website usage, or other methods).

7. Plan of Work: Provide evidence of planning and a realistic scope of work for the project. Describe each stage of the work plan and provide a time chart identifying the personnel required for each activity (in the supplemental materials).
8. Qualifications of Staff: Provide a narrative explanation of the skills and qualifications of project staff. For those yet to be hired, provide a job description or announcement. Explain any planned professional development for project staff. In your supplementary materials, provide brief résumés of not more than two pages per person for all staff named in the project budget and job descriptions for people to be hired.
9. Performance Objectives: List six to eight quantifiable performance objectives that will allow you and the Commission to evaluate the project as you submit interim and final reports. Performance objectives might include the number or volume of collections processed or described, the number of items digitized, or types of new procedures put in place to expedite access to collections.

## **(2) Supplementary Materials:**

Prepare up to 10 pages of Supplementary Materials to your Narrative, where applicable:

- Position descriptions for staff to be hired with grant funds
- Detailed work plan charts that supplement the Narrative
- Institution's preservation plan for digital materials
- Samples from existing finding aid(s) or indexes for selected materials

## **(3) Project Summary:**

The Project Summary should be no more than 3 double-spaced pages in 12-pt type with standard margins, and it must include these sections:

- Purposes and Goals of the Project
- Plan of Work for the Grant Period
- Products and Publications to be completed during the Grant Period
- Names, Titles, and Institutions, of the Project Director and Key Personnel
- Performance Objectives

## **(4) Project Budget:**

You must submit a budget on the NHPRC Budget Form available at <http://www.archives.gov/nhprc/apply/budget.pdf>. Instructions for completing this form can be found at <http://www.archives.gov/nhprc/apply/>.

In preparing the budget, please follow the suggestions below in each of the categories:

- Salaries: List each staff position and compensation that will be charged to the project and show the percentage of time each staff member will devote to the project. Indicate which positions are to be filled for the proposed project and which personnel are already on the staff of the applicant institution. Grant funds

may be used to pay the salaries of only those individuals actually working on the project. You may count the time provided to the project by advisory board members.

- Fringe Benefits: Include employee benefits using your organization's standard rates. No separate benefits should be included for positions that are computed at a daily rate or using honoraria.
- Consultant Fees: Include payments for consultant services and honoraria. Provide justification for large or unusual consultant fees. List consultant travel expenses in the "Travel" category.
- Travel: Include transportation, lodging, and per diem expenses. The NHPRC does not fund staff travel to professional meetings unless the travel is essential to accomplish the goals of the project.
- Supplies and Materials: Include routine office supplies and supplies ordinarily used in professional practices. Justify the cost of specialized materials and supplies in a supplemental budget narrative.
- Services: Include the cost of duplication and printing, long-distance telephone, equipment leasing, postage, contracts with third parties, and other services that you are not including under other budget categories or as indirect-cost expenses. The costs of project activities to be undertaken by each third-party contractor should be included in this category as a single line item charge. Include a complete itemization of the costs in a supplemental budget narrative.
- Other costs: Include costs for necessary equipment above \$5,000, stipends for participants in projects, and other items not included in previous grant categories. The NHPRC does not provide grant funds for the acquisition of routine equipment such as office furnishings, shelving, and file cabinets, but we may provide grant support for the purchase of technical equipment, such as software, computers and peripherals, essential for a project.
- Indirect costs: As indicated in 2 CFR 2600.101, NHPRC grant recipients are not permitted to use grant funds for indirect costs; however, a grant recipient may use indirect costs for cost sharing.

Applications must be submitted by a designated group member as a single .pdf to the appropriate ICON dropbox.

The assignment will be graded according to the following rubric:

Requirement	Point Value	Guidelines
Project Narrative	10 points	The proposed project fits the grant description. The narrative provides a thorough description of the proposed project, including each of the 9 sections outlined in the assignment description. The project goals and objectives are clearly stated.

Supplementary Materials	3 points	The proposal includes the appropriate supplementary materials to support the project narrative and summary.
Project Summary	4 points	The project summary includes all 5 sections from the assignment description, concisely summarizing the key points of the project narrative.
Project Budget	3 points	The proposal includes the completed NHPRC Budget Form and any additional required budget information. The form has been completed with informed estimates of costs.
Formatting, Clarity, and Organization	2 points	The document has been submitted to the appropriate ICON dropbox as a single .pdf. The submission is well organized and easy to read. The proposal shows evidence of proofreading and the proper use of grammar and punctuation.
Peer Review	3 points	The grant application demonstrates that the group has considered the constructive criticism provided during the peer review exercise and has addressed any questions or concerns raised by reviewers.

## Course Policies

---

### Office Hours

Prof. Mattock will be available to meet with students by appointment. Students are encouraged to schedule individual appointments with the professor via email (lindsay-mattock@uiowa.edu). Office hours are optional for students.

### Extenuating Circumstances and Incomplete Grades

Extenuating circumstances (illness, bereavement, etc.) will be considered by the instructor on a case-by-case basis. The student is required to provide evidence of the severity of the situation and must notify the instructor as soon as possible in the event that circumstances prevent a student from completing a class assignment or attending class. No incomplete grades will be given for this course, unless such circumstances affect a student's ability to meet the requirements for the course.

## **Class Attendance**

Regular and punctual attendance in class is required. Regular attendance is defined as attendance at not less than 13 of the classes for the semester. Tardiness and leaving class prior to dismissal in excess of 30 minutes will be counted as absenteeism.

## **Plagiarism and Academic Integrity**

All students are expected to adhere to the standards of academic honesty. Any student engaged in plagiarism, cheating, or other acts of academic dishonesty, will be subject to disciplinary action.

The *Chicago Manual of Style 16<sup>th</sup> Edition* stresses the importance of providing proper attribution when reusing the materials of others, arguing that this practice “not only bolsters the claim of fair use but also helps avoid the accusation of plagiarism.”<sup>2</sup>

Plagiarism is a serious offence that includes:

- stealing or passing off the ideas or words of another as one’s own
- using another’s work without crediting the source
- committing literary theft
- presenting as new and original a product or idea derived from an already existing source<sup>3</sup>

Plagiarism can be avoided by following the guidelines for proper citation and paraphrasing.

Sections 13.1-13.6 of the *Chicago Manual of Style 16<sup>th</sup> Edition*

<[http://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/16/ch13/ch13\\_toc.html](http://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/16/ch13/ch13_toc.html)> may be referenced for guidance.

Acts of plagiarism will be evaluated by the professor on a case-by-case basis and will be reported to the department. No credit will be given for plagiarized assignments, regardless of the severity of the offence. Minor transgressions will be documented in the student’s departmental file. If the case is deemed to be sufficiently egregious, the offence will be reported to the Graduate College and may result in expulsion from the program.

Any student suspected of academic misconduct for any reason during the semester will be required to participate in the procedural process, initiated at the instructor level, as outlined in the *Graduate College Rules and Regulations* <http://www.grad.uiowa.edu/manual-part-1-section-iv-academic-standing-probation-and-dismissal>.

## **Students with Disabilities**

If you have a disability for which you are or may be requesting an accommodation, you are encouraged to contact both your instructor and Student Disability Services, 3015 Burge Hall,

---

<sup>2</sup> *The Chicago Manual of Style, 16<sup>th</sup> Edition* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2010): 190.

<sup>3</sup> *Merriam-Webster Online*, s.v. “plagiarize,” accessed January 6, 2016, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/plagiarize>

319-335-1462/319-335-1498 (TTY), as early as possible in the term. A comprehensive description of the services of that office can be obtained at <http://sds.studentlife.uiowa.edu>.

## **Reading Schedule**

---

The reading schedule is subject to modification. Required readings are listed in **BOLD**. Recommended readings are *italicized*. The reading is to be completed BEFORE class each week.

- 📖 Available through Ulowa Libraries Digital Journals
- 🌐 Available online through the provided URL
- 📖 Assigned textbook, also available through Course Reserve

### Week 1 | January 20 – What is Digital Preservation?

📖 Chapter 1, "What is Digital Preservation?" *Digital Preservation for Libraries, Archives, & Museums*: 3-16.

📖 Chapter 2, "Getting Started with the Digital Preservation Triad," *Digital Preservation for Libraries, Archives, & Museums*: 17-40.

🌐 Ricky Erway, "Defining 'Born Digital,'" (OCLC, 2010):  
<http://www.oclc.org/research/activities/hiddencollections/borndigital.pdfsw>

📖 Elizabeth Diamond, "The Archivist as a Forensic Scientist. Seeing Ourselves in a Different Way," *Archivaria* 38 (Fall 1994), pp. 139–54.

*Chapter 1, "Introduction," Conceptualizing 21<sup>st</sup> Century Archives: 1-36.*

*Chapter 2, "Reframing the Archive in a Digital Age: Balancing Continuity with Innovation and Responsibility with Responsibilities," Conceptualizing 21<sup>st</sup> Century Archives: 37-54.*

### Week 2 | January 27 – Digital Preservation: A Brief History

📖 Chapter 6, "Early Analog Computing, Machine-Readable Records, and the transition to Digital Recordkeeping," *Conceptualizing 21st Century Archives*: 131-147.

📖 Chapter 7, "Research in Electronic Records Management," *Conceptualizing 21st Century Archives*: 148-200.

📖 Chapter 8, "Emergent and Related Areas of Research," *Conceptualizing 21st Century Archives*: 201-214.

🌐 Jackie Dooley, *The Archival Advantage: Integrating Archival Expertise into Management of Born-Digital Library Materials* (Dublin, OH: OCLC Research, 2015):  
<http://www.oclc.org/content/dam/research/publications/2015/oclcresearch-archival-advantage-2015.pdf>.



- Philip C. Bantin, "Developing a Strategy for Managing Electronic Records: The Findings of the Indiana University Electronic Records Project," *American Archivist* 61, no. 2 (1998): 328-364.
- Philip C. Bantin, "The Indiana University Electronic Records Project Revisited," *American Archivist* 62, no. 1 (1999): 153-163.
- Philip C. Bantin and Gerald Bernbom, "The Indiana University Electronic Records Project: Analyzing Functions, Identifying Transactions, and Evaluating Recordkeeping Systems—A Report on Methodology," *Archives and Museum Informatics* 10, no. 3 (1996): 246-266.
- David Bearman, "Automated Access to Archival Information: Assessing Systems," *American Archivist* 42, no. 2 (April 1979): 179-190.
- David Bearman, "The Implications of *Armstrong v. Executive of the President* for Archival Management of Electronic Records," *American Archivist* 56, no. 4 (Fall 1993): 674-689.
- Neil Beagrie, "Digital Curation for Science, Digital Libraries, and Individuals." *International Journal of Digital Curation* 1, no. 1 (2006): 3-16.
- Michael Cook, "The Role of Computers in Archives," *Information Development* 5, no. 4 (October 1989): 217-220.
- Richard J. Cox, "Re-discovering the Archival Mission: The Recordkeeping Functional Requirements Project at the University of Pittsburgh, A Progress Report," *Archives and Museum Informatics* 8, no. 4 (1994): 279-300.
- Richard J. Cox and Wendy Duff, "Warrant and the Definition of Electronic Records: Questions Arising from the Pittsburgh Project." *Archives and Museum Informatics* 11, nos. 3-4 (1997): 223-231.
- Wendy Duff, "Ensuring the Preservation of Reliable Evidence: A Research Project Funded by the NHPRC," *Archivaria* 42 (Fall 1996): 28-45.
- Luciana Duranti and Heather MacNeil. "The Protection of the Integrity of Electronic Records: An Overview of the UBC-MAS Research Project," *Archivaria* 42 (Fall 1996): 46-67.
- Luciana Duranti, "The Long-Term Preservation of Accurate and Authentic Digital Data: The INTERPARES Project," *Data Science Journal* 4 (2005):  
[https://www.jstage.jst.go.jp/article/dsj/4/0/4\\_0\\_106/\\_article](https://www.jstage.jst.go.jp/article/dsj/4/0/4_0_106/_article).
- Luciana Duranti, "Reflections on InterPARES The InterPARES 2 Project (2002-2007): An Overview," *Archivaria* 64 (Fall 2007): 113-121.
- Everett Ellin, "An International Survey of Museum Computer Activity," *Computers and the Humanities* 3 (November 1968): 65-86.
- Carolyn L. Geda, "Social Science Data Archives" *American Archivist* 42, no. 2 (April 1979): 158-166.
- Heather MacNeil, "Providing Grounds for Trust II: The Findings of the Authenticity Task Force of InterPARES," *Archivaria* 54 (Fall 2002): 24-58.

Heather MacNeil, "Providing Grounds for Trust: Developing Conceptual Requirements for the Long-Term Preservation of Authentic Electronic Records," *Archivaria* 50 (Fall 2000): 52-78.

Paul Marsden, "When is the Future? Comparative Notes on the Electronic Record-Keeping Projects of the University of Pittsburgh and the University of British Columbia," *Archivaria* 43 (Spring 1997): 158-173.

Jeffrey D. Morelli, "Defining Electronic Records: Problems of Terminology," in *History and Electronic Artefacts*, ed. Edward Higgs (Oxford: Clarendon Press: 1998): 169-183.

Joseph Raben, "Computer Applications in the Humanities." *Science* 228, no. 4698 (April 26, 1985): 434-438.

Sorensen, Peter. "Movies, Computers and the Future." *American Cinematographer* 64 (January 1983): 69-78.

Bernard Wishy, "New Hardware for the Humanities," *Computers and the Humanities* 2 (September 1967): 1-11.

### Week 3 | February 3 – Digital Materiality 1

📖 Chapter 1, "The Spirit of Forensic Discovery" *Forensic Discovery*: 3-15.

📖 Chapter 3, "File System Basics" *Forensic Discovery*: 39-58.

📖 Chapter 4, "File System Analysis" *Forensic Discovery*: 59-85.

📖 Julianna Barrera-Gomez and Ricky Erway, *Walk This Way: Detailed Steps for Transferring Born-Digital Content from Media You Can Read In-House* (Dublin, OH: OCLC Research, 2013): <http://www.oclc.org/content/dam/research/publications/library/2013/2013-02.pdf>.

📖 Jean-François Blanchette, "A Material History of Bits," *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 62, no. 6 (2011): 1042–1057.

📖 Kenneth Thibodeau, "Overview of Technological Approaches to Digital Preservation and Challenges in Coming Years," in *The State of Digital Preservation: An International Perspective* (CLIR, 2002): 4-31 <http://www.clir.org/pubs/reports/pub107/pub107.pdf>

Brian Carrier and Eugene H. Spafford, "Getting Physical with the Digital Investigation Process," *International Journal of Digital Evidence* 2, no. 2 (Fall 2003): 1-20.

Jeremy Leighton John, *Digital Forensics and Preservation* (Digital Preservation Coalition: 2012): <http://www.dpconline.org/newsroom/not-so-new/935-digital-forensics-and-preservation-jeremy-leighton-john-new-report-released-for-member-preview>

Christopher A. Lee, Matthew Kirschenbaum, Alexandra Chassanoff, Porter Olsen, and Kam Woods, "BitCurator: Tools and Techniques for Digital Forensics in Collecting Institutions" *D-Lib Magazine* 18, no. 5/6 (May/June 2012): <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/may12/lee/05lee.html>.

Ciaran B. Trace, "Beyond the Magic Mechanism: Computers, Materiality, and What It Means for Records to Be 'Born Digital,'" *Archivaria* 72 (Fall 2011): 5-27.

## Week 4 | February 10 – Digital Materiality 2

- 📖 Chapter 8, "File Formats and Software for Digital Preservation" *Digital Preservation for Libraries, Archives, & Museums*: 143-168.
- 📖 Matthew Kirschenbaum, Erika L. Farr, Kari M. Kraus, Naomi Nelson, Catherine Stollar Peters, Gabriela Redwine & Doug Reside, "Digital Materiality: Preserving Access to Computers as Complete Environments," *The Sixth International Conference on the Preservation of Digital Objects Proceedings: Mission Bay Conference Center* (San Francisco: 2009): 105-112 <https://drive.google.com/open?id=0B0eEUEjVPT0YUNEWVZoczUxVGM>.
- 📖 Christopher A. Lee, Kam Woods, Matthew Kirschenbaum, and Alexandra Chassanoff, *From Bitstreams to Heritage: Putting Digital Forensics into Practice in Collecting Institutions* (Bitcurator Project, 2013): <http://www.bitcurator.net/docs/bitstreams-to-heritage.pdf>.
- 📖 Christopher A. Lee, "Digital Curation as Communication Mediation," in *Handbook of Technical Communication*, Volume 8 (Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 2012): 507-530.
- Matthew G. Kirschenbaum, Richard Ovenden, and Gabriela Redwine, *Digital Forensics and Born-Digital Content in Cultural Heritage Collections* (Washington, DC: CLIR, 2010): <http://www.clir.org/pubs/reports/reports/pub149/pub149.pdf>
- Simson L. Garfinkel and Abhi Shelat, "Remembrance of Data Passed: A Study of Disk Sanitation Practices," *IEEE Security & Privacy* (January/February 2003): 17-27.
- Kam Woods, Christopher A. Lee, and Sunitha Misra, "Automated Analysis and Visualization of Disk Images and File Systems for Preservation," *Proceedings of Archiving 2013* (Washington, DC: 2013): <http://ils.unc.edu/callee/p239-woods.pdf>.
- Seamus Ross and Ann Gow, *Digital Archaeology: Rescuing Neglected and Damaged Data Resources* (London: British Library, 1999).

## Week 5 | February 17 – Preservation Metadata

- 📖 Chapter 7, "Metadata and Metadata for Digital Preservation," *Digital Preservation for Libraries, Archives, & Museums*: 111-142.
- 📖 Angela Dappert and Markus Enders, "Digital Preservation Metadata Standards" *Information Standards Quarterly (ISQ)* 22 (2010): 4-13  
[https://www.loc.gov/standards/premis/FE\\_Dappert\\_Enders\\_MetadataStds\\_isqv22no2.pdf](https://www.loc.gov/standards/premis/FE_Dappert_Enders_MetadataStds_isqv22no2.pdf)
- 📖 Devan Ray Donaldson and Paul Conway, "Implementing PREMIS: A Case Study of the Florida Digital Archive," *Library Hi Tech* 28, no. 2 (2010): 273-289.

Rebecca Guenther and Leslie Myrick, "Archiving Web Sites for Preservation and Access: MODS, METS and MINERVA," *Journal of Archival Organization* 4, no. 1/2 (2006): 141-166.

Murtha Baca, ed., *Introduction to Metadata 3.0* (Los Angeles: Getty, 2008): [http://www.getty.edu/research/publications/electronic\\_publications/intrometadata/](http://www.getty.edu/research/publications/electronic_publications/intrometadata/).

Michael Dulock and Christopher Cronin, "Providing Metadata for Compound Digital Objects: Strategic Planning for an Institution's First Use of METS, MODS, and MIX," *Journal of Library Metadata* 9 (2009): 289-304.

Rebecca Guenther and Sally McCallum, "New Metadata Standards for Digital Resources: MODS and METS," *Bulletin of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 29 no. 2 (January/December 2005): 12-15.

Christopher A. Lee and Kam Woods, "Automated Redaction of Private and Personal Data in Collection: Towards Responsible Stewardship of Digital Heritage," *Proceedings of the Memory of the World in the Digital Age: Digitization and Preservation* (UNESCO, 2013): <http://ils.unc.edu/callee/p298-lee.pdf>.

David A. Wallace, "Metadata and the Archival Management of Electronic Records: A Review." *Archivaria* 36 (Autumn 1993): 87-110.

## Week 6 | February 24 – Digital Repositories

Chapter 6, "The Digital Preservation Repository and Trust," *Digital Preservation for Libraries, Archives, & Museums*: 95-110.

Chapter 7, "The Persistence of Deleted File Information," *Forensic Discovery*: 145-160.

Andrew Treloar, David Groenewegen, and Catharine Harboe-Ree, "The Data Curation Continuum: Managing Data Objects in Institutional Repositories," *D-Lib Magazine* 13, no. 9/10 (2007). <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/september07/treloar/09treloar.html>

Kam Woods, Christopher A. Lee, Simson Garfinkel, "Extending Digital Repository Architectures to Support Disk Image Preservation and Access," *Proceedings of the 11th Annual International ACM/IEEE Joint Conference on Digital Libraries (JCDL '11)* (New York: ACM, 2011): 57–66.

Mackenzie Smith, Mary Barton, Mick Bass, et. al, "DSpace: An Open Source Dynamic Digital Repository." *D-Lib Magazine* 9, no. 1 (January 2003). <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/january03/smith/01smith.html>

Steve Hitchcock and David Tarrant. "Characterising and Preserving Digital Repositories: File Format Profiles." *Ariadne*, no. 66 (2011). <http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue66/hitchcock-tarrant>

Robert Tansley, Mick Bass, and MacKenzie Smith. "DSpace as an Open Archival Information System: Current Status and Future Directions," *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* 2769 (January 2003): 446-460.

Thorton Staples, Ross Wayland, and Sandra Payette, "The Fedora Project: An Open-source Digital Object Repository Management System," *D-Lib Magazine* 9, no. 4 (April 2003).  
<http://www.dlib.org/dlib/april03/staples/04staples.html>

## Week 7 | March 2 – Collection Development

📖 Chapter 9, "Collection Development," *Digital Preservation for Libraries, Archives, & Museums*: 171-177.

📖 Euan Cochrane, *Practical Options for Archiving Social Media* (Archives New Zealand, 2011):  
<http://www.algim.org.nz/globalassets/symposium-web/2011-web-symposium/presentations/euan-cochrane-practical-options-for-archiving-social-media.pdf>

📖 Brewster Kahle, "Preserving the Internet," *Scientific American* 276, no. 3 (1997): 82-83.

📖 Courtney C. Mumma, Glenn Dingwall, and Sue Bigelow, "A First Look at the Acquisition and Appraisal of the 2010 Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games Fonds: or, SELECT \* FROM VANOC\_Records AS Archives WHERE Value="true";" *Archivaria* 72 (Fall 2011): 93-122.

📖 Gabriela Redwine, et al., *Born Digital: Guidance for Donors, Dealers, and Archival Repositories* (Washington DC: CLIR, 2013):  
<http://www.clir.org/pubs/reports/pub159/pub159.pdf>

Adrian Cunningham, "Waiting for the Ghost Train: Strategies for Managing Electronic Personal Records Before it is Too Late," *Archival Issues* 24, no. 1 (1999): 55-64.

Jean Dryden, "Copyfraud or Legitimate Concerns? Controlling Further Uses of Online Archival Holdings." *American Archivist* 74 ,no 2 (Fall/Winter 2012): 522-543.

Michael Forstrom, "Managing Electronic Records in Manuscript Collections: A Case Study from Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library," *American Archivist* 72 (Fall/Winter 2009): 460-477.

Paul Groth, Yolanda Gil, James Cheney, and Simon Miles. "Requirements for Provenance on the Web," *International Journal of Digital Curation* 7, no. 1 (2012): 39-56.

Kimberly Christen, "Opening Archives: Respectful Repatriation." *American Archivist* 74, no. 1 (Spring/Summer 2012): 185-210.

Seamus Ross, "Digital Preservation, Archival Science, and Methodological Foundations for Digital Libraries," *New Review of Information Networking* 17, no. 1 (2012): 43-68.

## Week 8 | March 9 – Descriptive Metadata

- 📖 Chapter 4, "Standardizing and Automating American Archival Description and Access," *Conceptualizing 21st Century Archives*: 83-109.
- 📖 Chapter 5, "Archival Description and Descriptive Metadata in a Networked World," *Conceptualizing 21st Century Archives*: 110-130.
- 📖 Joan E. Beudoin, "Context and Its Role in the Digital Preservation of Cultural Objects," *D-Lib Magazine* 18, no. 11/12 (November/December 2012).  
<http://www.dlib.org/dlib/november12/beudoin/11beudoin1.html>
- 📖 Ricardo Eito-Brun, "Context-based Aggregation of Archival Data: The Role of Authority Records in the Semantic Landscape," *Archival Science* 15, no. 3 (September 2015): 217-238.
- 📖 Barbara Tillett, What is FRBR: A conceptual Model For the Bibliographic Universe (LOC, 2003): <https://www.loc.gov/cds/downloads/FRBR.PDF>.
- Wendy M. Duff, "Evaluating Metadata on a Metalevel," *Archival Science* 1, no. 3 (September 2001): 285-294.
- Joanne Evans, Sue McKemmish, Karuna Bhoday, "Create Once, Use Many Times: The Clever Use of Recordkeeping Metadata for Multiple Archival Purposes," *Archival Science* 5, no. 1 (March 2005): 17-42.
- Kathleen Fear, "User Understanding of Metadata in Digital Image Collections: Or, What Exactly Do You Mean by 'Coverage'?" *American Archivist* 73, no. 1 (Spring/Summer 2010): 26-60.
- Pat Franks and Nancy Kunde. "Why Metadata Matters," *Information Management Journal* 40, no. 5 (September/October 2006): 55-61.
- Anne Gilliland, Nadav Rouche, Lori Lindberg, Joanne Evans, "Towards a 21<sup>st</sup> Century Metadata Infrastructure Supporting the Creation, Preservation, and Use of Trustworthy Records: Developing the InterPARES2 Metadata Schema Registry," *Archival Science* 5, no. 1 (March 2005): 43-78.
- Mark Philips and Hannah Tarver, "Enhancing Descriptive Metadata Records with Freely-Available APIs," *Code4lib* 24 (April 2014): <http://journal.code4lib.org/articles/9415>.
- Jenn Riley and Kelcy Shepherd, "A Brave New World: Archivists and Shareable Descriptive Metadata," *American Archivist* 72, no. 1 (Spring/Summer 2009): 91-112.
- David A. Wallace, "Managing the Present: Metadata as Archival Description" *Archivaria* 39 (Spring 1995): 11-21.
- Geoffrey Yeo, "'Nothing is the Same as Something Else': Significant Properties and Notions of Identity and Originality," *Archival Science* 10, no. 2 (2010): 85-116.

**MARCH 16 – SPRING BREAK**

## Week 9 | March 23 – Preserving Research Data

📖 Chapter 10, "Preserving Research Data," *Digital Preservation for Libraries, Archives, & Museums*: 179-196.

📖 Chapter 11, "Preserving Humanities Content," *Digital Preservation for Libraries, Archives, & Museums*: 197-210.

📖 Alex H. Poole, "Now is the Future Now? The Urgency of Digital Curation in the Digital Humanities," *DHQ: Digital Humanities Quarterly* 7, no. 2 (2013): <http://www.digitalhumanities.org/dhq/vol/7/2/000163/000163.html>.

📖 Frank Upward, Sue McKemmish, and Barbara Reed, "Archivists and Changing Social and Information Spaces: A Continuum Approach to Recordkeeping and Archiving Online Cultures." *Archivaria* 72 (Fall 2011): 197-237.

Michelle Caswell, "Instant Documentation: Cell-Phone Generated Records in the Archives." *American Archivist* 72, no. 1 (Spring/Summer 2009): 133-145.

Golnessa Galyani Moghaddam, "Archiving Challenges of Scholarly Electronic Journals: How Do Publishers Manage Them?" *Serials Review* 33, no. 2 (2007): 81-90.

Paul Gooding and Melissa Terras, "'Grand Theft Archive': A Quantitative Analysis of the State of Computer Game Preservation," *International Journal of Digital Curation* 3, no. 2 (2008): 19-41.

Kelly Hamilton, "Structured Data Elements: Are They Records?" *Information Management Journal* 45, no. 2 (March/April 2011): 27-30.

Paul Lambert, Vernon Gayle, Larry Tan, Ken Turner, Richard Sinnott, and Ken Prandy, "Data Curation Standards and Social Science Occupational Information Resources," *International Journal of Digital Curation* 2, no. 1 (2008): 73-91.

Randal Luckow, and James M. Turner, "All Singing, All Talking, All Digital: Media Windows and Archiving Practice in the Motion Picture Studios," *Archivaria* 65 (Spring 2008): 165-186.

National Research Council Committee on Archiving and Accessing Environmental and Geospatial Data at NOAA, *Environmental Data Management at NOAA: Archiving, Stewardship, and Access* (Washington, DC: National Academies Press, 2007).

Steven Ovadia, "The Need to Archive Blog Content." *The Serials Librarian* 51, no. 1 (2006): 95-102.

Chad Owen, "'Three Little Words': Is E-Mail Unmanageable?" *Archival Issues* 32, no. 1 (2010): 33-45.

Rhodes, Sarah and Dana Neacsu, "Preserving and Ensuring Long-Term Access to Digitally Born Legal Information," *Information & Communications Technology Law* 18, no. 1 (2009): 39-74.

John Roeder, "Art and Digital Records: Paradoxes and Problems of Preservation," *Archivaria* 65 (Spring 2008): 151- 163.

Julie Sweetkind, Mary Lynette Larsgaard, and Tracey Erwin, "Digital Preservation of Geospatial Data," *Library Trends* 55, no. 2 (2006): 304-314.

Frank Upward, Sue McKemmish, and Barbara Reed, "Archivists and Changing Social and Information Spaces: A Continuum Approach to Recordkeeping and Archiving Online Cultures." *Archivaria* 72 (Fall 2011): 197-237.

## Week 10 | March 30 – Archive-It Collection Presentation

Archive-It Presentations Due

## Week 11 | April 6 – Collection Assessment

📖 OCLC, *Trustworthy Repositories Audit & Certification: Criteria and Checklist*  
[http://www.crl.edu/sites/default/files/d6/attachments/pages/trac\\_0.pdf](http://www.crl.edu/sites/default/files/d6/attachments/pages/trac_0.pdf).

📖 Ricky Erway, *You've Got to Walk Before You Can Run: First Steps for Managing Born-Digital Content Received on Physical Media* (Dublin, OH: OCLC Research, 2012):  
<http://www.oclc.org/content/dam/research/publications/library/2012/2012-06.pdf>

📖 Society of American Archivists, "Jump In Initiative,"  
<http://www2.archivists.org/groups/manuscript-repositories-section/jump-in-initiative>

📖 Laura Carroll, Erika Farr, Peter Hornsby, and Ben Ranker, "A Comprehensive Approach to Born-Digital Archives," *Archivaria* 72 (Fall 2011): 61-92.

Beth Patkus, *Assessing Preservation Needs: A Self-Survey Guide* (Andover, MA: NEDCC, 2003):  
<https://www.nedcc.org/assets/media/documents/apnssg.pdf>.

Sally Vermaaten, "Identifying Threats to Successful Digital Preservation: the SPOT Model for Risk Assessment," *D-Lib Magazine* 18, no. 9/10 (September/October 2012):  
<http://dlib.org/dlib/september12/vermaaten/09vermaaten.html>.

## Week 12 | April 13 – Recordkeeping Models

📖 Chapter 3, "The OAIS Reference Model," *Digital Preservation for Libraries, Archives, & Museums*: 43-54.

📖 Chapter 9, "Recordkeeping Models," *Conceptualizing 21st Century Archives*: 215-229.

📖 Luciana Duranti and Corinne Rogers, "Educating for Trust," *Archival Science* 11 (2011): 373-390.

📖 Henry M. Gladney, "Long-Term Preservation of Digital Records: Trustworthy Digital Objects." *American Archivist* 72, no. 2 (Fall/Winter 2009): 401-435.

AIMS Work Group, *AIMS Born-Digital Collections: An Inter-Institutional Model For Stewardship* (2012): [http://www2.lib.virginia.edu/aims/whitepaper/AIMS\\_final.pdf](http://www2.lib.virginia.edu/aims/whitepaper/AIMS_final.pdf).



Gareth Knight, InSPECT Framework Report (JISC, 2009):  
<http://www.significantproperties.org.uk/inspect-framework.pdf>

Jeremy Leighton John, *Digital Lives: Personal Digital Archives for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* (2010):  
<http://www.bl.uk/digital-lives/index.html>.

Arcot Rajasekar, Reagan Moore, Fran Berman, Brian Schottleander, "Digital Preservation Lifecycle Management for Multi-Media Collections," *Digital Libraries: Implementing Strategies and Sharing Experiences*, 3815 (2005): 380-384.

### Week 13 | April 20 – Preservation Strategies

📖 Library of Congress, *Preserving.exe: Towards a National Strategy for Software Preservation*:  
[http://www.digitalpreservation.gov/multimedia/documents/PreservingEXE\\_report\\_final101813.pdf](http://www.digitalpreservation.gov/multimedia/documents/PreservingEXE_report_final101813.pdf).

📖 Carey Stumm, "Preservation of Electronic Media in Libraries, Museum, and Archives," *The Moving Image* 4, No. 2 (Fall 2004): 38-63.

📖 Paul Conway, "Digital Transformations and the Archival Nature of Surrogates," *Archival Science* 15, no. 1 (March 2015): 51-69.

📖 Hedstrom, Margaret L., Christopher A. Lee, Judith S. Olson, and Clifford A. Lampe, "'The Old Version Flickers More': Digital Preservation from the User's Perspective." *American Archivist* 69, no. 1 (Spring/Summer 2006): 159-187.

Paul Conway, "Preservation in the Age of Google: Digitization, Digital Preservation, and Dilemmas," *Library Quarterly* 80, no. 1 (2010): 61-79.

Alain Depocas, Jon Ippolito, and Caitlin Jones, *The Variable Media Approach: Permanence Through Change* (New York: Guggenheim Museum Publications, 2003).

Brian Matthews, Arif Shaon, Juan Bicarregui, and Catherine Jones, "A Framework for Software Preservation," *International Journal of Digital Curation* 5, no. 1 (2010): 91-105.

### Week 14 | April 27 – Sustainability and Project Management

📖 Chapter 4, "Human Resources and Education," *Digital Preservation for Libraries, Archives, & Museums*: 43-54.

📖 Chapter 5, "Sustainable Digital Preservation," *Digital Preservation for Libraries, Archives, & Museums*: 67-94.

📖 Chapter 10, "From Custody to Stewardship: Digital Repositories, Preservation, and Curation," *Conceptualizing 21st Century Archives*: 230-245.

📖 Richard Wright, "The Significance of Storage in the 'Cost of Risk' of Digital Preservation," *The International Journal of Digital Curation* 3, no. 4: 104-122.

*Blue Ribbon Task Force on Sustainable Digital Preservation and Access, Sustainable Economics for a Digital Planet: Ensuring Long-Term Access to Digital Information (2010):*  
[http://brtf.sdsc.edu/biblio/BRTF\\_Final\\_Report.pdf](http://brtf.sdsc.edu/biblio/BRTF_Final_Report.pdf).

Su-Shing Chen, "Digital Preservation: Organizational Commitment, Archival Stability, and Technological Continuity," *Journal of Organizational Computing and Electronic Commerce* 17, no. 3 (2007): 205-215.

Adrian Cunningham, "Good Digital Records Don't Just 'Happen': Embedding Digital Recordkeeping as an Organic Component of Business Process and Systems," *Archivaria* 71 (Spring 2011): 21-34.

Susan E. Davis, "Electronic Records Planning in 'Collecting' Repositories," *American Archivist* 71, no. 1 (Spring/Summer 2008): 167-189.

Digital Preservation Coalition, *Preservation Management of Digital Materials: The Handbook* (Digital Preservation Coalition, 2008): <http://www.dpconline.org/pages/handbook/>.

Ricky Erway, Ben Goldman, and Matthew McKinley, *Agreement Elements for Outsourcing Transfer of Born Digital Content* (Dublin, OH: OCLC Research, 2014):  
<http://www.oclc.org/content/dam/research/publications/library/2014/oclcresearch-born-digital-content-transfer-2014.pdf>.

Ricky Erway, *Swatting the Long Tail of Digital Media: A Call for Collaboration* (Dublin, OH: OCLC Research, 2012):  
<http://www.oclc.org/content/dam/research/publications/library/2012/2012-08.pdf>.

Brian Lavoie, "The Fifth Blackbird: Some Thoughts on Economically Sustainable Digital Preservation," *D-Lib Magazine* 14, no. 3/4 (2008):  
<http://www.dlib.org/dlib/march08/lavoie/03lavoie.html>

Jonas Palm, "The Digital Black Hole" (2006): [http://www.tape-online.net/docs/Palm\\_Black\\_Hole.pdf](http://www.tape-online.net/docs/Palm_Black_Hole.pdf)

## Week 15 | May 4 – Peer Review

No required reading