Course	SLIS 6330: Archives and Media
Course Schedule	Mondays 9:30-12:15
On Campus	3092 Main Library
EXE Section	https://uiowa.zoom.us/j/304733352
Instructor	Dr. Lindsay Mattock
Office Location	3072 Main Library
E-mail	lindsay-mattock@uiowa.edu
Office Hours	Tuesdays and Thursdays by appointment schedule at lindsaymattock.net/officehours.html

Course Overview

Collecting is a core activity for libraries, archives, museums, and galleries (GLAMs). Such collecting institutions are charged with the care of various types of media, from print to audiovisual to born digital. Through constructing databases and building digital projects, Digital Humanities scholars are also responsible for collecting, describing, representing, and creating access points for collections, whether culled from the archives or personally curated.

This course will introduce collection building from an archival perspective, exploring conceptualizations of the archive, how archives are formed, the methods by which records are selected and described, and the ways in which these records are used to construct histories.

Required Textbooks

There are no required textbooks for this course. The required readings for each week are available through the University Libraries or on the course ICON site.

Week 1 | August 20	Introduction to Archives & Media
Week 2 | August 27	Archives as Evidence
September 4	Labor Day
Week 3 | September 10	Archives and Memory
Week 4 | September 17	Archives and Identity
Week 5 | September 24	Community Archives
Week 6 | October 1	Open Lab
Week 7 | October 8	Textual Records
Week 8 | October 15	Non-Textual Records
Week 9 | October 22	Ephemera
Week 10 | October 29	Archival Representation
Week 11 | November 5	Databases & Content Management Systems
Week 12 | November 12	Metadata & Data Standards
November 19	Thanksgiving
Week 13 | November 26	Data Visualization
Week 14 | December 3	Data Curation

Course Requirements and Grading

All assignments are to be submitted electronically through the designated space in ICON, unless otherwise noted. Assignments are due by 9:30am on the due date stated in the syllabus. <u>Late assignments will NOT be accepted.</u>

Assignments at a Glance

Assignment	Due Date
Project Proposal	September 24
Mid-Term Report	October 29
Final Report and Documentation	December 10
Individual Evaluation	December 14

Project Proposal
Team Project
20% of final grade
Monday, September 24
This term the class will be collaborating with two different community partners. Students will be divided into two project teams, one for each of the community-based projects. Each team will build a database and public interface that meets the needs of the community project. This work will serve as the basis for each of the assignments that you complete this term.

As the first step, each project team will develop a proposal that will outline the work that you will accomplish over the course of the term. The proposal will describe the collection that your team will be working with, define the role of each team member, and propose a data model that will be used to describe the collection items in the database. The proposal will be considered a working-document, that is, it will provide a means of guiding the work to be completed but may be modified as the project develops over the course of the term.

Each team is responsible for submitting one proposal as a single .pdf to the appropriate ICON assignment link. All members of the team will receive the same grade. The Project Proposals will be evaluated according to the following criteria:

Requirement	Percentage	Expectations
Collection Description	15%	The project proposal should open with a short summary (2-3 paragraphs) describing the collection that you will be working with. The description should describe the materials that you will be digitizing and what you have learned about the collection from your own research and the community partners.

Project Summary	20%	The project summary outlines the work to be done. The summary should include a discussion of how you will select the materials that the group will digitize, the standards for digitization, how the digitized materials will be described in the database, and the end-product for the project.
Data Model	30%	The data model will define each of the data fields in the database, that is how the group will describe each of the objects in the collection and the collection as a whole. The data model will include an entity-relationship diagram that describes the relationship between metadata fields and a data dictionary that clearly defines how each metadata field in your model will be used.
Team Roles	15%	This section will outline how you will divide the work among the team members. The team may elect to break into smaller working groups or set individual roles. Each role should clearly define the work that the working group or team member is responsible for with reference to the end-products to be produced.
Proposed Timeline	10%	The timeline will outline when each of the steps defined in the project summary will be completed. This section will propose dates for the completion of each step.
Clarity	10%	The project proposal demonstrates evidence of proofreading and proper use of grammar and punctuation. Any citations are properly formatted according to Chicago Manual of Style.
Organization	5%	The project proposal is well organized and easy to read, making use of appropriate headings where necessary to guide the reader. You have included the names of all of the group members and a title for your proposal.

Mid-Term Report
Team Project
25% of final grade
Monday, October 29
Each team will prepare a short presentation (15-20 minutes), reporting on the progress that the group has made. The report should include a discussion of the project proposal and how the work has followed or deviated from that plan.

Each team is responsible for presenting in-class during the October 29th class session. The team does NOT need to submit presentation materials. The Mid-Term Report will be graded according to the following criteria:

Requirement	Percentage	Expectations
Project Summary	15%	The project summary introduces your project proposal and the collection materials, outlining the work that the team aims to accomplish over the course of the term.
Team Roles	15%	The presentation clearly defines each of the team roles as they were outlined in the project proposal and how each of those roles have or have not changed.
Data Model	15%	The presentation includes a discussion of the data model, the rationale for the model, and a discussion of any modifications made as the collection has been input into the database.
Timeline	10%	The presentation includes a discussion of the proposed timeline, any revisions, and the timeline moving forward.
Work Completed	15%	The presentation details the work that has been completed to date.
Next Steps	15%	The presentation includes a discussion of the next steps in the project and the work to be completed.
Clarity	10%	The presentation slides/visuals demonstrate evidence of proofreading and proper use of grammar and punctuation. Any citations are properly formatted according to the Chicago Manual of Style.
Organization	5%	The team has made use of the visuals appropriate for your presentation and has presented the information in an organized manner.

Final Report and Project Documentation
Team Project
35% of final grade
Monday, December 10

Each team will submit a Final Report outlining the details of the work that has been completed over the course of the term. The report will include the documentation to be passed on to the community partners so that the project may be continued into the future.

Each team is responsible for submitting the Final Report and Project Documentation as a single .pdf to the appropriate ICON assignment link. All members of the team will receive the same grade. The assignment will be evaluated according to the following criteria:

Requirement	Percentage	Expectations
Executive Summary	10%	The executive summary briefly summarizes the report to follow. The executive summary should be no longer than ½ page in length. The summary should acquaint the reader with the materials to follow, concisely describing the details of the report.
Final Timeline	15%	The final timeline describes the progression of the work that was completed over the course of the term and includes the specific dates that each step was completed.
Final Roles	15%	The final roles are described in the document, including any discussion of how work was re-distributed over the course of the project, if appropriate.
Next Steps	20%	The final report includes a discussion of the next steps to be taken. This section should reflect on the completed steps and suggest ways in which the community partners may continue to build on the project in the immediate and in the long-term.
Project Documentation	25%	The project documentation should provide a full set of instructions for the community partners, outlining how each step in your timeline was completed. The documentation should include a discussion of the standards for digitization, the digitization workflow, the metadata model and definitions, and data entry instructions. The documentation should point to documentation for any of the tools used, where appropriate. This section should include screenshots, code snippets, and other visual elements to guide the user, where appropriate. The documentation should consider the audience, providing an appropriate level of guidance and consider the longevity of the project.

Clarity	10%	The final report demonstrates evidence of proofreading and proper use of grammar and punctuation. Any citations are properly formatted according to Chicago Manual of Style.
Organization	5%	The final report is well organized and easy to read, making use of appropriate headings where necessary to guide the reader. You have included the names of all of the group members and a title for your proposal.

Project Evaluation
Individual Assignment
20% of final grade
Friday, December 14

At the end of term, you will have an opportunity to evaluate the work that has been completed. Each student will submit an individual evaluation that will consider your contributions to the project team and the contributions of each of the team members, along with the success of the project. Each statement should use professional and collegial prose to evaluate the end-product, the tools and methods used to create the project, and the performance of the team throughout the term.

Each student will submit their Evaluation as .pdf to the appropriate ICON assignment link. The assignment will be evaluated according to the following criteria:

Requirement	Percentage	Expectations
Personal Evaluation	30%	The evaluation considers your individual contributions to the project, noting where you feel that you performed well and where you see room for improvement.
Team Evaluation	30%	Using professional and collegial prose, the document considers the group dynamic and evaluates each of the individual members of your team noting where team members performed well and where there was room for improvement.
Project Evaluation	25%	The document also evaluates the tools, technologies, and methods employed in completing the project. The evaluation considers the utility and appropriateness of the tools and methods for competing the project aims and makes suggestions for improving upon the process and methods, if appropriate.
Clarity	10%	The project evaluation demonstrates evidence of proofreading and proper use of grammar and punctuation. Any citations are properly formatted according to Chicago Manual of Style.

Organization	5%	The project evaluation is well organized and easy to read, making use of appropriate headings where necessary to guide the reader. Your name and a title at the top of the proposal.

Class Policies

Grading Scale

A	4.0	C+	2.33
A-	3.67	C	2.00
B+	3.33	C-	1.67
B	3.00	D	1.00
B-	2.67	F	0

Your work throughout the term will be evaluated to the rubrics posted under the individual assignment description and graded on this 4.0 scale. Please note that a B- does not count towards your degree progression and the course will have to be retaken (see "Academic Progress" in the *SLIS Student Handbook* https://slis.grad.uiowa.edu/current-students).

Office Hours
Office hours will be held, by appointment on Tuesdays and Thursdays each week. You may schedule an appointment at http://lindsaymattock.net/officehours.html

Assignment Deadlines
All assignments are due by 9:30am on the date listed in the assignment description. Late assignments will not be accepted. This policy protects both your time and mine. Timely submission allows me to fairly evaluate everyone work. It also ensures that you will remain on track to complete all of your work by the end of the term. I will make exceptions for extenuating circumstances, so please reach out to me if you believe that you cannot meet an assignment deadline. See the *Extenuating Circumstances and Incomplete Grades*.

Extenuating Circumstances and Incomplete Grades
While I believe that you must attend class each week to get the most out of this course, I understand that extenuating circumstances (illness, bereavement, etc.) may interfere with your ability to participate fully. It is your responsibility to contact me as soon as possible if such a circumstance will prevent you from attending a class session or completing the coursework according to the set schedule. I will then work with you to determine the best path forward for your particular situation. Incomplete grades will only be granted under these circumstances.

Academic Integrity

All students are expected to adhere to the standards of academic honesty. Citation is one of the key competencies of information literate individuals and as such it is crucial for LIS professionals to learn the standards of and practice proper attribution. It is your responsibility to ensure that you are following these standards. Any student engaged in plagiarism, cheating, or other acts of academic dishonesty, will be subject to disciplinary action.

The *Chicago Manual of Style 16th 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."[1]

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[2]

Plagiarism can be avoided by following the guidelines for proper citation and paraphrasing. Sections 13.1-13.6 of the *Chicago Manual of Style 16th Edition* <chicagomanualofstyle.org/16/ch13/ch13_toc.html> may be referenced for guidance. The University Writing Center <writingcenter.uiowa.edu> is another on-campus resource that is available to all students enrolled in course at the University.

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. 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. Please review the policies in the *School of Library and Information Science Student Handbook*<slis.grad.uiowa.edu/current-students> and the *Graduate College Rules and Regulations* <grad.uiowa.edu/manual-part-1-section-iv-academic-standing-probation-and-dismissal>.

Students with Disabilities

Many students require particular accommodations in the classroom. I am happy to work with you to ensure that you have the best learning experience possible. If you are or may be requesting an accommodation, please speak with me privately and contact Student Disability Services, 3015 Burge Hall, 319-335-1462/319-335-1498 (TTY), as early as possible in the term. This will ensure that we both have all the tools and information that we need to have a

---

[1] *The Chicago Manual of Style, 16th Edition* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2010): 190.
[2] *Merriam-Webster Online,* s.v. "plagiarize," accessed January 6, 2016, http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/plagiarize

successful semester working together. A comprehensive description of the services of that office can be obtained at http://sds.studentlife.uiowa.edu.

Reading and Topic Schedule

The reading schedule is subject to modification. The reading is to be completed before class each week. Assigned readings are available on ICON or through the University of Iowa Libraries.

Week 1 | August 20 – Introduction to Archives & Media

Kate Theimer, "Archives in Context and as Context," *Journal of Digital Humanities*, 1, no. 2 (Spring 2012): http://journalofdigitalhumanities.org/1-2/archives-in-context-and-as-context-by-kate-theimer/

Week 2 | August 27 – Archives as Evidence

Francis X. Blouin Jr. and William G. Rosenberg, "Authoritative History and Authoritative Archives" and "The Turn Away from Historical Authority in the Archives," in *Processing the Past: Contesting Authority in History and the Archives* (Oxford University Press, 2011), 13-49.

Terry Cook, "Evidence, Memory, Identity, and Community: Four Shifting Archival Paradigms," *Archival Science* 13, nos. 2-3 (June 2013): 95-120

Fiorella Foscarini, "Archival Appraisal in Four Paradigms," in *Currents of Archival Thinking, 2nd Edition,* eds. Terry Eastwood and Heather MacNeil (Libraries Unlimited, 2017), 107-133.

Jennifer S. Milligan, "'What Is an Archive?' in the History of Modern France," in *Archive Stories: Facts, Fictions and the Writing of History*, ed. Antoinette Burton (Duke University Press, 2005), 159-183.

SEPTEMBER 4 – LABOR DAY

Week 3 | September 10 – Archives and Memory

Francis X. Blouin Jr. and William G. Rosenberg, "The Social Memory Problem," in *Processing the Past: Contesting Authority in History and the Archives* (Oxford University Press, 2011), 97-115.

Margaret Hedstrom, "Archives and Collective Memory: More than a Metaphor, Less than an Analogy," in *Currents of Archival Thinking,* eds. Terry Eastwood and Heather MacNeil (Libraries Unlimited, 2010), 163-179.

Randall C. Jimerson, "Constructing Memory," in *Archives Power: Memory, Accountability, and Social Justice* (SAA, 2009), 190-236.

Helena Pohlandt-McCormick, "In Good Hands: Researching the 1976 Soweto Uprising in the State Archives of South Africa," in *Archive Stories: Facts, Fictions and the Writing of History*, ed. Antoinette Burton (Duke University Press, 2005), 299-324.

Week 4 | September 17 – Archives and Identity

Francis X. Blouin Jr. and William G. Rosenberg, "Contested Archives, Contested Sources," in *Processing the Past: Contesting Authority in History and the Archives* (Oxford University Press, 2011), 116-139.

Michelle Caswell, "Inventing New Archival Imaginaries: Theoretical Foundations for Identity-Based Community Archives," in *Identity Palimpsests: Archiving Ethnicity in the U.S. and Canada* (Litwin Books, 2013), 35-55.

Elisabeth Kaplan, "We Are What We Collect, We Collect What We Are: Archives and the Construction of Identity," *American Archivist* 63 (Spring/Summer 2000): 126-151.

Laura Mayhall, "Creating the 'Suffragette Spirit' British Feminism and the Historical Imagination," in *Archive Stories: Facts, Fictions and the Writing of History*, ed. Antoinette Burton (Duke University Press, 2005), 232-250.

Week 5 | September 24 – Community Archives

Francis X. Blouin Jr. and William G. Rosenberg, "The Archivist as Activist in the Production of (Historical) Knowledge," in *Processing the Past: Contesting Authority in History and the Archives* (Oxford University Press, 2011), 140-160.

Sue McKemmish and Michael Piggott, "Toward the archival multiverse: Challenging the binary opposition of the personal and corporate archive in modern archival theory and practice," *Archivaria* 76 (Fall 2013): 111-144.

Horacio N. Roque Ramírez, "A Living Archive of Desire: Teresita La capesina and the Embodiment of Queer Latino Community History," in *Archive Stories: Facts, Fictions and the Writing of History*, ed. Antoinette Burton (Duke University Press, 2005), 111-135.

Rebecka Sheffield, "Community Archives," in *Currents of Archival Thinking, 2nd Edition*, eds. Terry Eastwood and Heather MacNeil (Libraries Unlimited, 2017), 351-376.

Week 6 | October 1 – Open Lab

No Required Reading

Week 7 | October 8 – Textual Records

Johanna Drucker, "What is Writing?" in *What Is? Nine Epistemological Essays* (Berkeley: Cuneiform Press, 2013): 16-32.

Lisa Gitelman, "Near Print and Beyond Paper: Knowing by *.pdf" (p. 111-135) *in Paper Knowledge: Toward a Media History of Documents* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2014).

Geoffrey Yeo, "Concepts of Record (1): Evidence, Information, and Persistent Representations," *American Archivist* 70 (Fall/Winter 2007): 315-343.

Geoffrey Yeo, "Concepts of Record (2): Prototypes and Boundary Objects," *American Archivist* 71 (Spring/Summer 2008): 118-143.

Week 8 | October 16 – Non-Textual Records

Anne Friedberg, "The End of Cinema: Multimedia and Technological Change," in *The Film Theory Reader: Debates and Arguments*, ed. Mark Furstenau (New York: Routledge, 2010): 270-281.

Lisa Gitelman, "Souvenir Foils: On the Status of Print at the Origin of Recorded Sound" (p. 157-173), in *New Media 1740-1915*, eds. Lisa Gitelman and Geoffrey B. Pingree (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2003).

William J. Mitchell, "How To Do Things With Pictures," *The Reconfigured Eye: Visual Truth in the Post-Photographic Era* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1994): 191-223.

Alan Trachtenberg, "Photographs as Symbolic History" (p. 86-122), in *Lincoln's Smile and Other Enigmas* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2007).

Week 9 | October 22 – Ephemera

Anna Chen, "Perfume and Vinegar: Olfactory Knowledge, Remembrance, and Recordkeeping," *American Archivist* 79, no. 1 (2016): 103-120.

Anne J. Gilliland and Michelle Caswell, "Records and their imaginaries: imagining the impossible, making possible the imagined," *Archival Science* 16 (2016): 53-75.

James M. O'Toole, "On the Idea of Permanence," *American Archivist* 52 (Winter 1989): 10-25.

Diana Taylor, "The Archive and The Repertoire "in *The Archive and Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2003): 16-33.

Week 10 | October 29 – Archival Representation

Anne Gilliland, "Standardizing and Automating American Archival Description and Access," "Archival Description and Descriptive Metadata in a Networked World," and "Early Analog Computing, Machine-Readable Records, and the Transition to Digital Recordkeeping," in *Conceptualizing 21-st Century Archives* (SAA, 2014), 83-147.

Geoffrey Yeo, "Continuing Debates About Description," in *Currents of Archival Thinking, 2nd Edition,* eds. Terry Eastwood and Heather MacNeil (Libraries Unlimited, 2017), 163-192.

Week 11 | November 5 – Databases and Content Management Systems

Kimberly Christen, "Opening Archives: Respectful Repatriation," *American Archivist* 74 (Spring/Summer 2011): 185-210.

Johanna Drucker, "Interface and Interpretation," in *Graphesis: Visual Forms of Knowledge Production* (Harvard University Press, 2014), 138-179.

Lev Manovich, "The Database," in *The Language of New Media* (MIT Press, 2001): 218-243.

Stephen Ramsay, "Databases," in *A Companion to Digital Humanities* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2004): 177-197.

Week 12 | November 12 – Metadata and Data Standards

Julia Flanders and Fotis Jannidis, "Data Modeling," in *A New Companion to Digital Humanities,* Susan Schreibman, Ray Simens, and John Unsworth, eds. (Malden, MA: Wiley, 2016): 229-237.

Patricia Harpring, "Controlled Vocabularies in Context" and "What Are Controlled Vocabularies?" in *Introduction to Controlled Vocabularies* (Los Angeles: Getty, 2010): http://www.getty.edu/research/publications/electronic_publications/intro_controlled _vocab/index.html

Dominic Oldman, Martin Doerr, and Stefan Gradmann, "Zen and the Art of Linked Data: New Strategies for a Semantic Web of Humanist Knowledge," in A *New Companion to Digital Humanities*, Susan Schreibman, Ray Simens, and John Unsworth, eds. (Malden, MA: Wiley, 2016): 251-273.

Susan Leigh Star and Martha Lampland, "Reckoning With Standards," in *Standards and Their Stories* (Cornell University Press, 2009), 3-24.

NOVEMBER 20 – THANKSGIVING

Week 13 | November 26 – Data Visualization

Johanna Drucker, "Interpreting Visualization::Visualizing Interpretation," in *Graphesis: Visual Forms of Knowledge Production* (Harvard University Press, 2014), 64-137

Todd Presner and David Shepard, "Mapping the Geospatial Turn," in *A New Companion to Digital Humanities,* Susan Schreibman, Ray Simens, and John Unsworth, eds. (Malden, MA: Wiley, 2016): 201-212.

Stéfan Sinclair and Geoffrey Rockwell, "Text Analysis and Visualization: Making Meaning Count," in *A New Companion to Digital Humanities,* Susan Schreibman, Ray Simens, and John Unsworth, eds. (Malden, MA: Wiley, 2016): 274-290.

Edward R. Tufte, "Aesthetics and Technique in Data Graphical Design," in *The Visual Display of Quantitative Information* (Graphic Press, 2001), 177-190.

Week 14 | December 3 – Data Curation

Michael J. Kramer, "Going Meta on Metadata," *Journal of Digital Humanities* 3, no. 2 (Summer 2014): http://journalofdigitalhumanities.org/3-2/going-meta-on-metadata/

Tervor Muñoz, "Data Curation as Publishing for the Digital Humanities," *Journal of Digital Humanities* 2, no. 3 (Summer 2013): http://journalofdigitalhumanities.org/2-3/data-curation-as-publishing-for-the-digital-humanities/

Thomas Padilla, "On Collections as Data Imperative," http://digitalpreservation.gov/meetings/dcs16/tpadilla_OnaCollectionsasDataImperative_final.pdf

Kenneth M. Price, "Edition, Project, Database, Archive, Thematic Research Collection: What's in a Name?" *Digital Humanities Quarterly* 3, no. 3 (2009) http://www.digitalhumanities.org/dhq/vol/3/3/000053/000053.html