

The University of Iowa
School of Library and Information Science
Fall 2016

Course	SLIS 6330: Archives and Media
Course Schedule	Mondays 9:30-12:15, 3092 Main Library
Instructor	Lindsay Mattock
Office Location	3072 Main Library
E-mail	lindsay-mattock@uiowa.edu
Course Websites	uiarchivesandmedia.slack.com medium.com/archives-and-media-2016
Office Hours	by appointment

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 media to audiovisual media and media created by digital technologies. However, 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, with a focus on the various media formats preserved by collecting institutions. Media will be explored from a cross-disciplinary perspective, interrogating the histories, technologies, preservation practices, use, and curation of media across disciplines. Over the course of the term, we will explore the material nature of records, their social and historical context, as well as the considerations for using these materials in research, and begin to answer questions such as:

- ◆ How do we “read” these various forms of media?
- ◆ How does the medium influence the message?
- ◆ How are archives constructed?
- ◆ What decisions must be made in building and representing collections?
- ◆ How are these decisions reflected in the final product – the archives or the DH project?

Course Website and Technology

We will be using Slack as our learning management system (LMS). As we will work independently and collaboratively to complete a digital project this term, Slack provides a single space to share documents, post messages and questions, host video conversations, and share general information of interest. Each assignment will be posted to a dedicated channel in Slack to provide an opportunity for peer review throughout the development of our projects.

In addition to Slack, we will use the Medium web-publishing platform for our final assignment. Medium provides a means for publishing our scholarship on the web with embedded images of the visualizations from our projects.

All students are expected to use these tools respectfully. Meaningful and constructive dialogue is encouraged in this course and requires a degree of mutual respect, willingness to listen, and tolerance of opposing points of view. Respect for individual differences and alternative viewpoints will be maintained at all times.

Semester at a Glance

Week 1 Aug. 22	Introduction to Archives & Media
Week 2 Aug. 29	Text-based Media
September 5	Labor Day
Week 3 Sept. 12	Non-Textual Media
Week 4 Sept. 19	Time-Based Media
Week 5 Sept. 26	Born-Digital Media
Week 6 Oct. 3	Archives & Databases
Week 7 Oct. 10	Metadata, Ontologies, and Description I
Week 8 Oct. 17	Metadata, Ontologies, and Description II
Week 9 Oct. 24	Data Visualization and Palladio
Week 10 Oct. 31	Open Lab
Week 11 Nov. 7	Open Lab
Week 12 Nov. 14	Open Lab
November 21	Thanksgiving
Week 13 Nov. 28	Sustainability and Preservation
Week 14 Dec. 5	Peer Review

Course Requirements and Grading

Notes on Grades

Your work will be assessed on a three-point scale: $\sqrt{+}$, $\sqrt{}$, $\sqrt{-}$. Detailed rubrics have been provided for each of the assignments, outlining the specific requirements.

$\sqrt{+}$	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{-}$
Exceeds expectations	Meets requirements	Fails to meet expectations

At the end of the term the totality of your work will be assessed according to the Final Grade Rubric.

Course Work at a Glance

Grade Point	Due Date
Weekly Attendance	Throughout term
Collection Proposal	September 26
Description Proposal	October 24
Data Model	November 7
Digital Publication	December 5
Final Reflection	December 12

1. Weekly Attendance

Recorded weekly and evaluated at the end of term

Digital Humanities projects are inherently multi/inter-disciplinary and collaborative. We will share our work throughout the term as an interdisciplinary cohort of scholars and work together to assist each other with the development of our projects. As such, regular and punctual attendance in class is expected. Your attendance will be recorded each week and a mark will be assessed at the end of the term according to the following rubric:

$\sqrt{+}$	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{-}$
You have attended all of the required class sessions; have arrived on-time and participated in the course until dismissed	You have missed no more than 2 of the required class sessions; or have arrived late/left early a few times during the term	You have missed more than 2 of the required class sessions; and/or have frequently arrived late or left class sessions early

2. Collection Proposal

Due Monday, September 26

Over the course of the term you will develop a prototype digital humanities collection using a dataset of your choice. You may work individually or in small groups of 2-3 students. For this first part of the assignment you will identify and describe the data source for your project. This brief proposal (3-5 double-spaced pages) will identify the data source(s), the evidence contained within the source(s), and the research question(s) that are driving your interrogation. In this proposal you will also identify the number of items/data-points that you will include, how you will collect this data, and finally describe how this dataset is a collection.

Keep in mind that you may have to scale back your project to complete the work this semester. For example, if you propose an analysis of a decade of a monthly publication, I do not expect that you will complete the analysis of the entire corpus this term. Instead, you should identify a manageable subset of the materials to work with this term.

Each proposal will be submitted to the #collection_proposals Slack channel by the stated due date. I will provide individualized feedback on each proposal through direct message. You are also expected to review the proposals of your classmates and provide critical feedback via Slack. This should be done publically through the #collection_proposals channel.

The assignment will be evaluated according to the following rubric:

Requirement	√+	√	√-
Description of Dataset	A robust description of the data to be collected is provided. The proposal identifies the data source(s), clearly describes the evidence contained within the source(s), and the number of data points/sources that will be used for this project. The proposal provides a clear introduction and background information to demonstrate the relevance/significance of the data source(s).	A description of the data to be collected is provided. The proposal identifies the data source(s), clearly describes the evidence contained within the source(s), and the number of data points/sources that will be used for this project.	The proposal fails to provide sufficient details regarding the source of the data, the evidence it contains, and the number of data points/source(s) that will be utilized.

Identification of Research Question	Uses prior knowledge to identify the question to be studied. There is a clear statement of the thesis and/or objectives of the investigation. The research questions are grounded in the academic literature related to the topic.	Uses prior knowledge to identify the question to be studied. There is a clear statement of the thesis and/or objectives of the investigation.	The proposal fails to identify a clear research question or the research question is out of scope for the identified dataset. The proposal fails to identify a clear thesis or objectives.
Description of the Data Collection Method	The proposal contains a clear description of how the data will be collected. This includes both the technical methods (scanning, data-scraping, etc.) and any theoretical frameworks that will be used to guide data collection. The proposed method is clearly grounded in the literature and best practices for the field.	The proposal contains a clear description of how the data will be collected for this project, including any technical methods (scanning, data-scraping, etc.) that will be used. The method is appropriately scaled and scoped for the proposed project.	The proposal fails to identify a clear method for data collection and/or the methodology is inappropriate or out of scope for the proposed project.
Identification of the Boundaries of the Dataset	The proposal includes a clear identification of the boundaries of the dataset, both the larger dataset and any limitations imposed by the time constraints of the semester.	The proposal defines clear boundaries of the project, scaling the dataset to the limitations of the semester.	The proposal fails to identify clear boundaries for the dataset.
Clarity of Writing	The proposal demonstrates evidence of proofreading and proper use of grammar and punctuation. Any citations are properly formatted according to <i>Chicago Manual of Style</i> with footnotes and bibliography.	The proposal and citations contain a few minor proofing errors.	The proposal contains significant errors in grammar and punctuation that affect the clarity of the document. Citations are not formatted according to <i>Chicago Manual of Style</i> .

Peer Review	You have provided critical feedback to 5-6 peers, identifying opportunities for collaboration.	You have provided critical feedback to 3-4 of your peers. The suggestions and questions that you propose may be used to improve you peers' projects.	The provided feedback does not contain enough information or is not clear enough to be of use to your peers. Or, you have failed to provide feedback to at least 3 peers.
-------------	--	--	---

3. Description Proposal

Due Monday, October 24

Building on the Collection Proposal, each student or small group will propose a method for describing the dataset. At this point, you only need be concerned with the description that best suits your data and your research questions/objectives. In the next step, the data model, we will take this descriptive information and format it according to the standards for the Palladio platform.

This proposal (3-5 double-spaced pages) should include a discussion of the significant aspects of the data that you will choose to represent in your data model. For example, will you include a birth date and death date for each of the persons described in your data? Will you include the geographic place of their birth? Will you geocode this data (add latitude and longitudinal data)? Further, the proposal should address the connections between data points. For example, if you are representing publication title and the publisher, what are the key aspects of this relationship are significant to your project? The proposal should also address how these selected aspects of your data will support your analysis and research objectives. If your research objectives have changed after the peer review of your Collection Proposal, these changes should be reflected in the proposal.

In addition, the proposal should suggest a few methods for the visualization or representation of the data. That is what is the most affective means of representing your data to make your arguments. Will you create a timeline, a map, a chart,? The description of the data does not need to be comprehensive at this point, but your description will be informed by your method of analysis.

Each proposal will be submitted to the #description_proposals Slack channel by the stated due date. I will provide individualized feedback on each proposal through direct message. You are also expected to review the proposals of your classmates and provide critical feedback via Slack. This should be done publically through the #description_proposals channel.

The assignment will be evaluated according to the following rubric:

Requirement	√+	√	√-
Identification of Significant Data Points	The proposal provides a robust description of the specific data points that will be used to support your research questions/objectives. A robust description will include a discussion of metadata standards/ontologies that will be adopted or adapted for the project.	The proposal provides a clear description of the specific data points that will be used in your project, and reflects on the significance of these specific data points.	The proposal fails to provide a clear description of the significant data points for the project, and instead provides a more general description of the data sources.
Discussion of the Relationships Represented	The proposal contains a robust description of the connections and relationships between specific data points and how they will be represented. This description is further supported by research questions/objectives.	The proposal contains a clear description of the connections and relationships between specific data points and how they will be represented.	The proposal fails to address the relationships between specific data points.
Proposed Visualizations	The proposal contains a clear description of how the data will be visualized. The proposed visualizations are clearly grounded in the literature and best practices for the field. The proposed analysis of the datasets is appropriate for the research objectives/questions.	The proposal contains a clear description of how the data will be visualized. The proposed visualizations are clearly grounded in the literature and best practices for the field. The visualizations are appropriate for the dataset.	The proposal fails to identify a clear method for data visualization and/or the proposed visualizations are inappropriate or out of scope for the proposed project.

Discussion of Research Question	As with the previous proposal, there is a clear statement of the thesis and/or objectives of the investigation. This proposal includes a clarification and refinement of the research objectives based on the peer review of the Collections Proposal and reflects new understandings of the data set.	There is a clear statement of the thesis and/or objectives of the investigation, but does not reflect on how thesis or objectives have changed as the project develops.	The proposal fails to identify a clear research question or the research question is out of scope for the identified dataset. The proposal fails to identify a clear thesis or objectives.
Clarity of Writing	The proposal demonstrates evidence of proofreading and proper use of grammar and punctuation. Any citations are properly formatted according to <i>Chicago Manual of Style</i> with footnotes and bibliography.	The proposal and citations contain a few minor proofing errors.	The proposal contains significant errors in grammar and punctuation that affect the clarity of the document. Citations are not formatted according to <i>Chicago Manual of Style</i> .
Peer Review	You have provided critical feedback to 5-6 peers, identifying opportunities for collaboration.	You have provided critical feedback to 3-4 of your peers. The suggestions and questions that you propose may be used to improve you peers' projects.	The provided feedback does not contain enough information or is not clear enough to be of use to your peers. Or, you have failed to provide feedback to at least 3 peers.

4. Data Model

Due Monday, November 7

Building from the feedback from your previous proposal, you will now submit a complete data model for your project. This data model will take the description proposed in the previous proposal and adapt the descriptive model to Palladio (or the software that you have selected for your project). The data model should include a document containing your proposed metadata schema and definitions, along with an entity relationship diagram demonstrating the relationship between specific data points. In addition, the model should indicate where controlled vocabulary or data standards (e.g. ISO date standards) will be used.

Each data model will be submitted to the #data_models Slack channel by the stated due date. I will provide individualized feedback on each proposal through direct message. You are also expected to review the proposals of your classmates and provide critical feedback via Slack. This should be done publically through the #data_models channel.

The assignment will be evaluated according to the following rubric:

Requirement	√+	√	√-
Metadata and Definitions	All of the metadata fields to be utilized are accompanied by a clear definition. The definition should articulate how the metadata field will be used and how the data will be formatted. Each definition is accompanied by an example from your dataset. The document also provides a discussion of how Palladio has influenced the data model.	All of the metadata fields to be utilized are accompanied by a clear definition. The definition should articulate how the metadata field will be used and how the data will be formatted. Each definition is accompanied by an example from your dataset.	Not all of the metadata fields have been clearly defined. The metadata and the definitions fail to conform to the requirements of Palladio. Someone unfamiliar with your dataset would have difficulties conforming your data to this standard.

Use of Controlled Vocabulary and Standards	The model has been informed by current best practices, utilizing appropriate controlled vocabularies and other data standards. A rationale for the standards is provided and justified by the project parameters.	The model has been informed by current best practices, utilizing appropriate controlled vocabularies and other data standards.	Appropriate data standards and controlled vocabularies have not been utilized in the data model.
Entity Relationship Diagram	The entity relationship diagram represents all of the metadata from your model and the relationship between individual data points. The diagram makes use of clear symbols and shapes to articulate different relationships.	The entity relationship diagram represents all of the metadata from your model and the relationship between individual data points.	The entity relationship diagram fails to represent all of the metadata from your model and the relationship between individual data points.
Conformance to Palladio Model	The data model conforms perfectly to the requirements of the Palladio model (or the model for your selected software) with no errors.	The data model conforms to the Palladio model (or selected software) with a few minor errors.	The data model fails to conform to the specifics of the Palladio model (or your selected software).
Clarity of Writing	The documentation demonstrates evidence of proofreading and proper use of grammar and punctuation. Any citations are properly formatted according to <i>Chicago Manual of Style</i> with footnotes and bibliography.	The documentation and citations contain a few minor proofing errors.	The documentation contains significant errors in grammar and punctuation that affect the clarity of the document. Citations are not formatted according to <i>Chicago Manual of Style</i> .

Peer Review	You have provided critical feedback to 5-6 peers, identifying opportunities for collaboration.	You have provided critical feedback to 3-4 of your peers. The suggestions and questions that you propose may be used to improve you peers' projects.	The provided feedback does not contain enough information or is not clear enough to be of use to your peers. Or, you have failed to provide feedback to at least 3 peers.
-------------	--	--	---

5. Digital Publication

Due Monday, December 5

At the end of the term you will write an article that will be posted to the course Medium site medium.com/archives-and-media-2016. Medium is an open publishing site, providing an opportunity to share your scholarship with your peers and the public audience outside of the academy. Each article must include an introduction to your project and its significance, a discussion of the development of the project, your analysis of the data, examples of the visualizations that you have created, and your conclusions. As with our project proposals, you will also be required to provide feedback to your peers, this time using the commenting functions through Medium.

The assignment will be evaluated according to the following rubric:

Requirement	√+	√	√-
Introduction	The article begins with a robust introduction to your project, including discussion of your dataset and its significance, as well as your research questions and objectives. The introduction argues for the relevance of the project by grounding the project in the significant work in the field.	The article begins with a clear introduction to your project, including discussion of your dataset and its significance, as well as your research questions and objectives.	The aims, objectives, and significance of the project are not clearly articulated in the introduction to your article.

Project Development	Your article provides a thoughtful outline of the development of your project, including a critique of the tools that you used, a discussion of the limitations of the dataset, as well as a critical analysis of the descriptive standards and data-model.	Your article provides a summary of the development of the project, outlining the major decisions that were made throughout the term, including the dataset, descriptive standards, and data model.	Your article fails to summarize the key aspects of the development of the project, including your choices regarding the dataset, descriptive standards, and data model.
Analysis	The article extends beyond a mere report of the development of your project and provides a clear analysis of your data. The analysis is supported by evidence from your data and is appropriately matched to your research questions. The analysis is grounded in the current literature, methodologies, and theoretical frameworks.	The article extends beyond a mere report of the development of your project and provides a clear analysis of your data. The analysis is supported by evidence from your data and is appropriate matched to your research questions/objectives.	The article summarizes the project and fails to provide an analysis of your work.
Visual Representations	Your article is accompanied by an appropriate number of visualizations of your data. The visualizations are used to support your major arguments and conclusions. Each visual representation also critiqued, suggesting the limitations or biases of the technique.	Your article is accompanied by an appropriate number of visualizations of your data. The visualizations illustrate your major arguments.	Your article does not include enough illustrations to support your argument and major conclusions.

Conclusions	Your major conclusions are clearly articulated, drawing on your analysis of the data and the development of the project. The conclusion also addresses the scalability of the project and any future directions for development.	Your major conclusions are clearly articulated, drawing on your analysis of the data and the development of the project.	The article fails to summarize the major conclusions and/or your conclusions are not supported by evidence.
Clarity of Writing	The publication demonstrates evidence of proofreading and proper use of grammar and punctuation. Any citations are properly formatted according to <i>Chicago Manual of Style</i> with footnotes and bibliography.	The publication and citations contain a few minor proofing errors.	The publication contains significant errors in grammar and punctuation that affect the clarity of the document. Citations are not formatted according to <i>Chicago Manual of Style</i> .
Peer Review	You have provided critical feedback to 5-6 peers, identifying opportunities for collaboration.	You have provided critical feedback to 3-4 of your peers. The suggestions and questions that you propose may be used to improve you peers' projects.	The provided feedback does not contain enough information or is not clear enough to be of use to your peers. Or, you have failed to provide feedback to your peers entirely.

6. Final Reflection – Letter to a Future Student
Due Monday, December 12

While each of you will have an opportunity to provide feedback via the course evaluation at the end of the term, this final reflection is intended to give you an opportunity to reflect on the course and its impact on your progression towards the Public Digital Humanities Certificate and/or the MILS degree and your career goals. Each of you will write a 2-3 page letter addressed to a future student evaluating and critiquing the course and your performance over the course of the term. Each letter should reflect on your personal experience by selecting key

experiences to support your critique. Each reflection must be formatted as formal letter (see owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/653/01/ for guidance).

The assignment will be evaluated according to the following rubric:

Requirement	√+	√	√-
Self-Reflection	The letter openly examines your personal experience and observations as a participant in the course, carefully selecting key observations and experiences as evidence to support your analysis and critique.	The letter provides an overview of your experiences, but fails to pinpoint the key observations that support your argument(s) and critique.	The letter summarizes the course activities, but fails to reflect on your personal experience.
Analysis	The letter moves beyond simple description of your experience to an analysis of the key strengths and weakness of the course as well as an evaluation of your performance as a student. The letter synthesizes, analyzes, and thoughtfully evaluates issues and ideas introduced in the course, the course projects, reading materials, and the technologies that we used. Further, the letter connects this course to your academic and career goals.	The letter examines the course and makes an argument about the strengths and weaknesses of the course. The letter addresses a future student course, but fails to engage the larger conversation of digital humanities/LIS education.	The letter fails to provide an analysis or evaluation of your experience and simply reports on the course activities.

Clarity of Writing	The letter demonstrates evidence of proofreading and proper use of grammar and punctuation. Any citations are properly formatted according to <i>Chicago Manual of Style</i> with footnotes and bibliography.	The letter and citations contain a few minor proofing errors.	The letter contains significant errors in grammar and punctuation that affect the clarity of the document. Citations are not formatted according to <i>Chicago Manual of Style</i> .
--------------------	---	---	--

7. Final Grade

Evaluated at the end of term

Your work throughout the term will be evaluated at the end of the semester after all of your work has been submitted. At this point, a letter grade will be determined according to the following rubric:

Letter Grade	Description of Work
A	Exceptional work: Demonstrates an outstanding understanding – both theoretical and factual – of the course materials. This is work that consistently exceeds expectations, that is, your work has been consistently evaluated with a $\checkmark+$ throughout the term. Your marks include no more than 3 \checkmark and no $\checkmark-$'s.
A-	Outstanding work: Demonstrates comprehensive knowledge of the course materials. Greatly surpasses course expectations. Your record contains no more than 6 \checkmark marks. There are no $\checkmark-$'s in your record.
B+	Very good work: Demonstrates a better-than-average command of the course materials. This grade is awarded to work that exceeds course expectations Your record contains more $\checkmark+$ than \checkmark marks. A record earning this grade will demonstrate improvement over the term.
B	Solid work: Demonstrates expected command of the course materials. This grade is awarded to work that meets course expectations. Your work has consistently earned \checkmark marks throughout the term, that is, the number of \checkmark marks is greater and more consistent than $\checkmark+$ or $\checkmark-$ marks.
B-	Marginal work: Demonstrates an incomplete understanding of the course materials. This work does not meet course expectations. Your work has consistently earned $\checkmark-$ marks, demonstrating little or no improvement over the course of the term.
C	Unacceptable work in a graduate program: This work fails to meet course expectations. Students earning below a B- have failed to submit assignments or otherwise received no credit on assignments and consistently earned $\checkmark-$ marks.

F	Failing grades are reserved for extreme circumstances when work has not been submitted or in cases of plagiarism. Please refer to the course "Academic Integrity" policy below.
---	---

Class Policies

Office Hours

With the variances in everyone's work and class schedules, it is difficult to agree upon one particular time that suits everyone's needs. Therefore, formal office hours will not be scheduled. If you would like to schedule an appointment, please email me <lindsay-mattock@uiowa.edu> or speak with me after class to arrange a time and date.

Assignment Deadlines

All assignments will be submitted to the appropriate channel in Slack. Assignments are due by 9:30am on the due date stated in the syllabus. **Late assignments will not be accepted.** This policy protects both your time and mine. Timely submission allows me to fairly evaluate everyone's 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

Life happens – I realize that all of you are balancing other courses along with work, families, pets, etc., etc., etc., while completing your degree. 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 in the course. It is your responsibility to contact me as soon as possible if such a circumstance will prevent you from completing the coursework according to the set schedule or attending a class session. 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. 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 source²

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

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>

Reading Schedule

The required reading is to be completed before class each week. Required readings are available electronically through the course website or the University of Iowa Libraries. Please note that the reading schedule may be modified to suit the needs of the class. We will discuss any changes as a group before they are made.

Week 1 | Aug. 22 – Introduction to Archives & Media

REQUIRED READING

Marilyn Deegan and Simon Tanner, "Conversion of Primary Sources," in *A Companion to Digital Humanities* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2004): 488-504.

Julia Flanders, "Rethinking Collections," in *Advancing Digital Humanities: Research, Methods, Theories* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014): 163-174.

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>.

RECOMMENDED READING

Sheila Corrall and Angharad Roberts, "Information Resource Development and 'Collection' in the Digital Age: Conceptual Frameworks and New Definitions for the Network World," *Libraries in the Digital Age Proceedings* 12 (2012):
<http://ozk.unizd.hr/proceedings/index.php/lida/article/view/62/33>.

James Currall, Michael Moss, and Susan Stuart, "What is a Collection?" *Archivaria* 58 (Fall 2004): 131-146.

John Elsner and Roger Cardinal, eds., *The Cultures of Collecting* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994).

Hur-Li Lee, "What is a Collection?" *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* 51, no. 12 (October 2000): 1106-1113.

Carole L. Palmer, "Thematic Research Collections," in *A Companion to Digital Humanities* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2004): 348-365.

REQUIRED READING

- Lisa Gitelman, "Near Print and Beyond Paper: Knowing by *.pdf," in *Paper Knowledge: Toward a Media History of Documents* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2014): 111-135.
- N. Katherine Hayles, "Translating Media: Why We Should Rethink Textuality," *The Yale Journal of Criticism* 16, no. 2 (Fall 2003): 263-290.
- Alan Rekrut, "Material Literacy: Reading Records as Material Culture," *Archivaria* 60, (Fall 2005): 11-37.
- JoAnne Yates, "Communication Technology and the Growth of Internal Communication," *Control Through Communication: The Rise of System in American Management* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989): 21-64.
<<http://quod.lib.umich.edu.proxy.lib.uiowa.edu/cgi/t/text/pageviewer-idx?c=acls;cc=acls;rgn=full%20text;idno=heb01161.0001.001;didno=heb01161.0001.001;view=image;seq=00000043;node=heb01161.0001.001%3A7>>

RECOMMENDED READING

- Robert Darton, *The Case For Books: Past, Present, and Future* (New York: Public Affairs, 2009).
- Johanna Drucker, *What Is?: Nine Epistemological Essays* (Berkeley: Cuneiform Press, 2013).
- Elizabeth L. Eisenstein, *The Printing Revolution in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).
- Susan Hockey, *Electronic Texts in the Humanities* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000).
- Friedrich A. Kittler, *Gramophone, Film, Typewriter* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999).
- George P. Landow, ed., *Hyper/Text/Theory* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994).
- David M. Levy, *Scrolling Forward: Making Sense of Documents in the Digital Age* (New York: Arcade Publishing, 2001).
- Alan Liu, "The Big Bang of Online Reading," in *Advancing Digital Humanities: Research, Methods, Theories* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014): 274-290.
- D.F. McKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
- Henry Petroski, *The Book on the Bookshelf* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1999).
- Thomas Rommel, "Literary Studies," in *A Companion to Digital Humanities* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2004).

SEPTEMBER 5 – LABOR DAY

Week 3 | August 29 – Non-Textual Media

REQUIRED READING

- André Bazin, "The Ontology of the Photographic Image," in *What is Cinema? Volume 1* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005): 9-16.
- William J. Mitchell, "Electronic Tools" and "How To Do Things With Pictures," *The Reconfigured Eye: Visual Truth in the Post-Photographic Era* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1994): 59-86 & 191-223.
- Hugh A. Taylor, "Documentary Art and the Role of the Archivist," *American Archivist* 42, No. 4 (1979): 417-428.
- Alan Trachtenberg, "Photographs as Symbolic History," in *Lincoln's Smile and Other Enigmas* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2007): 86-122.

RECOMMENDED READING

- Walter Benjamin, "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction" in *Illuminations: Essays and Reflections*, ed. Hannah Arendt (New York: Schocken Books, 2007).
- Peter Burke, *Eyewitnessing: The Use of Images as Historical Evidence* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008).
- Vilém Flusser, *Towards a Philosophy of Photography* (London: Reaktion Books, 2000).
- Image Permanence Institute, *Graphics Atlas*, <http://www.graphicsatlas.org>
- Christopher Moore, "Screenshots as Virtual Photography: Cybernetics, Remediation, and Affect," *Advancing Digital Humanities: Research, Methods, Theories* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014): 141-160.
- Mary Lynn Ritzenthaler and Diane Vogt-O'Connor, eds, *Photographs: Archival Care and Management* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2006).
- Joan M. Schwartz and James R. Ryan, eds., *Picturing Place: Photography and the Geographic Imagination* (New York: I.B.Tauris, 2003).
- Susan Sontag, *On Photography* (New York: Picador, 1977).
- Marita Sturken and Lisa Cartwright, *Practices of Looking: An Introduction to Visual Culture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009).
- John Tagg, *The Burden of Representation: Essays on Photographies and Histories* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1988).
- Alan Trachtenberg, *Reading American Photographs: Images as History Mathew Brady to Walker Evans* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1989).

Week 4 | September 19 – Time-Based Media

REQUIRED READING

Leo Enticknap, "Film" in *Moving Image Technology: From Zoetrope to Digital* (New York: Wallflower Press, 2005): 4-28.

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," in *New Media 1740-1915*, eds. Lisa Gitelman and Geoffrey B. Pingree (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2003): 157-173.

Jonathan Sterne, "Format Theory," in *MP3: The Meaning of a Format* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2012): 1-31.

RECOMMENDED READING

Mike Casey and Bruce Gordon, *Sound Directions: Best Practices for Audio Preservation* (Bloomington: University of Indiana, 2007)
http://www.dlib.indiana.edu/projects/sounddirections/papersPresent/sd_bp_07.pdf

Ichiro Fuginaga and Susan Forscher Weiss, "Music," in *A Companion to Digital Humanities* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2004).

Lisa Gitelman, *Scripts, Grooves, and Writing Machines: Representing Technology in the Edison Era* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999).

Doug Hall and Sally Jo Fifer, eds.. *Illuminating Video: An Essential Guide to Video Art* (New York: Aperture, 2005).

Film Forever: The Home Film Preservation Guide. "Film Specifics: Stocks and Soundtracks."
<http://www.filmforever.org>.

Mona Jimenez, Liss Platt, and Materia Media. *Videotape Identification and Assessment Guide*. Texas Commission on the Arts, 2004. <http://www.arts.texas.gov/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/video.pdf>.

Janna Jones, *The Past is a Moving Picture: Preserving the Twentieth Century on Film* (Miami: University Press of Florida, 2012).

Robert Kolker, "Digital Media and the Analysis of Film," in *A Companion to Digital Humanities* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2004).

Colin McGuire, "The Concrete and the Ephemeral of Electronic Music Production," *DanceCult* 6, No. 1 (2014).

David L. Morton, Jr., *Sound Recording: The Life Story of a Technology* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004).

National Film Preservation Foundation. *The Film Preservation Guide: The Basics for Archives, Libraries, and Museums*. San Francisco: National Film Preservation Foundation, 2004. Available for download at: <http://www.filmpreservation.org/preservation-basics/the-film-preservation-guide>

Geoffrey Rockwell and Andrew Mactavish, "Multimedia," in *A Companion to Digital Humanities* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2004).

D. N. Rodowick, *The Virtual Life of Film* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007).

Jonathan Sterne, ed., *The Sound Studies Reader* (New York: Routledge, 2012).

Jonathan Sterne, *The Audible Past: Cultural Origins of Sound Reproduction* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003).

Paolo Cherchi Usai, *The Death of Cinema: History, Cultural Memory and the Digital Dark Age* (London: BFI, 2001).

Week 5 | September 26 – Born Digital Media

REQUIRED READING

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

Matthew G. Kirschenbaum, "'An Old House with Many Rooms': The Textual Forensics of Mystery_House.dsk," in *Mechanisms: New Media and the Forensic Imagination* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2008): 111-158.

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

RECOMMENDED READING

Andrea Laue, "How the Computer Works," in *A Companion to Digital Humanities* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2004): 145-160.

Vannevar Bush, "As We May Think," *ACM SIGPC Notes* 1, No. 4 (Spring 1979): 36-44.

Mark Coté, "iResearch: What Do Smartphones Tell Us about the Digital Human?" in *Advancing Digital Humanities: Research, Methods, Theories* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014): 130-140.

Anne Friedberg, *The Virtual Window: From Alberti to Microsoft* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2006).

Lisa Gitelman, *Always Already New: Media, History, and the Data Culture* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2006).

Henry Jenkins, *Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide* (New York: New York University Press: 2006).

- Matthew G. Kirschenbaum, *Track Changes: A Literary History of Word Processing* (Cambridge: Belknap Press, 2016).
- Christopher A. Lee, "Digital Curation as Communication Mediation," in *Handbook of Technical Communication*, Volume 8 (Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 2012): 507-530.
- Christopher A. Lee, ed., I, *Digital: Personal Collections in the Digital Age* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2011).
- Peter Lunenfeld, ed., *The Digital Dialectic: New Essays on New Media* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1999).
- Paul D. Miller and Svitlana Matviyenko, *The Imaginary App* (Cambridge: MIT press, 2014).
- Daniel Punday, *Computing as Writing* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2015).
- Ned Rossiter, "Materialities of Software: Logistics, Labour, Infrastructure," in *Advancing Digital Humanities: Research, Methods, Theories* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014): 221-240.
- 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 6 | October 3 – Archives & Databases

REQUIRED READING

- Lisa Gitelman and Virginia Jackson, "Introduction" in *"Raw Data" is an Oxymoron*, Lisa Gitelman, ed. (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2013): 1-14.
- Daniel Rosenberg, "Data Before the Fact," in *"Raw Data" is an Oxymoron*, Lisa Gitelman, ed. (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2013): 15-40.
- Terry Cook, "Evidence, Memory, Identity, and Community: Four Shifting Archival Paradigms," *Archival Science* 13, nos. 2-3 (June 2013): 95-120.
- Stephen Ramsay, "Databases," in *A Companion to Digital Humanities* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2004): 177-197.

RECOMMENDED READING

- Geoffrey C. Bowker, *Memory Practices in the Sciences* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2005).
- N. Katherine Hayles, "How We Think: Transforming Power and Digital Technologies" (p.42-66), in *Understanding Digital Humanities* (New York: Plagrove Macmillan, 2012).
- John Ridener, *From Polders to Postmodernism: A Concise History of Archival Theory* (Duluth, MN: Litwin Books, 2008).

Peter Revesz, *Introduction to Databases: From Biological to Spatio-Temporal* (New York: Springer, 2010).

Helen Willa Samuels, "Who Controls the Past?" *American Archivist* 49, no. 2 (Spring 1986): 109-124.

Week 7 | October 10 – Metadata, Ontologies, and Description I

REQUIRED READING

Geoffrey C. Bowker and Susan Leigh Star, "Introduction: To Classify is Human," in *Sorting Things Out: Classification and Its Consequences* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2000): 1-33.

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

Anne J. Gilliland, "Setting the Stage" in *Introduction to Metadata: Online Edition, Version 3.0*: http://www.getty.edu/research/publications/electronic_publications/intrometadata/setting.html

Manuel Portela, "Multimodal editing and Archival Performance: A Diagrammatic Essay on Transcoding Experimental Literature," *DHQ: Digital Humanities Quarterly* 8, No. 1 (2014): <http://digitalhumanities.org/dhq/vol/8/1/000175/000175.html>

RECOMMENDED READING

C. M. Sperberg-McQueen, "Classification and its Structures," *A New Companion to Digital Humanities*, Susan Schreibman, Ray Seimens, and Johns Unsworth, eds. (Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell, 2016): 377-393.

David Bawden and Lyn Robinson, *Introduction to Information Science* (Chicago: Neal-Shcuman, 2013).

frLois Mai Chan, *Cataloging and Classification: An Introduction*, 3rd Edition (Lanham MD: Scarecrow Press, 2007).

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

Philip Hider, *Information Resource Description: Creating and Managing Metadata* (London: Facet Publishing, 2012).

Martha Lampland and Susan Leigh Star, *Standards and Their Stories: How Quantifying, Classifying, and Formalizing Practices Shape Everyday Life* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2009).

Andrea Leigh, "Context! Context! Context!: Describing Moving Images at the Collection Level," *Moving Image* 6, no. 1 (Spring 2006): 33-65.

Joan M. Schwartz, "Coming to Terms with Photographs: Descriptive Standards, Linguistic 'Othering,' and the Margins of Archivry." *Archivaria* 54 (Fall 2002): 142-171.

Jim Suderman, "Defining Electronic Series: A Study," *Archivaria* 53 (Spring 2002): 31-46.

Elizabeth Yakel, "Archival Representation," *Archival Science* 3 (2003): 1-25.

Geoffrey Yeo, "Debates about Description," in *Currents of Archival Thinking*, eds. Terry Eastwood and Heather MacNeil (Santa Barbara: Libraries Unlimited, 2010): 89-114.

Week 8 | October 17 – Metadata, Ontologies, and Description II

REQUIRED READING

Murtha Baca, "Fear of Authority? Authority Control and Thesaurus Building for Art and Material Culture Information," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 38, Nos. 3/4 (2004): 143-151.

Jens-Erik Mai, "Folksonomies and the New Order: Authority in the Digital Disorder," *Knowledge Organization* 38, No. 2 (2011): 114-122.

Jens-Erik Mai, "Contextual Analysis for the Design of Controlled Vocabularies," *Bulletin of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* (October/November 2006): 17-19.

Arlene G. Taylor and Daniel N. Joudrey, "Systems for Vocabulary Control," in *The Organization of Information, 3rd Edition* (Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited, 2009): 333-373.

RECOMMENDED READING

Martin Frické, *Logic and the Organization of Information* (New York: Springer, 2012).

Kuang-Wei (Janet) Lee-Smeltzer, "Finding the Needle: Controlled Vocabularies, Resource Discovery, and Dublin Core," *Library Collections, Acquisitions, & Technical Services* 24 (2000): 205-215.

J. Trant, "Studying Social Tagging and Folksonomy: A Review and Framework," *Journal of Digital Information* (2008): 1-44.

Marcie Zaharee "Building Controlled Vocabularies for Metadata Harmonization," *Bulletin of the American Society for Information Science* 39, no. 2: 39-42.

Week 9 | October 24 – Data Visualization and Palladio

REQUIRED READING

Anne Burdick, Johanna Drucker, Peter Lunenfeld, Todd Presner, Jeffrey Schnapp, eds.
"Emerging Methods and Genres," in *Digital Humanities*, (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2012): 29-60.

Johanna Drucker, "Graphical Approaches to the Digital Humanities," in *A New Companion to Digital Humanities*, Susan Schreibman, Ray Seimens, and Johns Unsworth, eds. (Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell, 2016): 238-249.

Martyn Jessop, "Digital Visualization as a Scholarly Activity," *Literary and Linguistic Computing* 23, no. 3 (2008): 281-293.

Franco Moretti, "Maps," in *Graphs, Maps, and Trees* (London: Verso, 2005): 35-64.

RECOMMENDED READING

Daniel J. Cohen and Roy Rosenzweig, *Digital History* (Philadelphia: Penn, 2006).

Johanna Drucker, *Graphesis: Visual Forms of Knowledge Production* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2014).

Matthew L. Jockers, *Macroanalysis: Digital Methods and Literary History* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2013).

Franco Moretti, *Distant Reading* (London: Verso, 2013).

David J. Staley, *Computers, Visualization, and History* (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 2003).

Edward R. Tufte, *Beautiful Evidence* (Cheshire, CT: Graphics Press, 2006).

Edward R. Tufte, *Visual Explanations: Images and Quantities, Evidence and Narrative* (Cheshire, CT: Graphics Press, 1997).

Week 10 | October 31– Open Lab

NO REQUIRED READING

Week 11 | November 7 – Open Lab

NO REQUIRED READING

Week 12 | November 14 – Open Lab

NO REQUIRED READING

NOVEMBER 21 – THANKSGIVING

Week 13 | November 28 – Sustainability and Preservation

REQUIRED READING

William Kilbride, "Saving the Bits: Digital Humanities Forever?," *A New Companion to Digital Humanities*, Susan Schreibman, Ray Seimens, and Johns Unsworth, eds. (Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell, 2016): 408-419.

Daniel V. Pitti, "Designing Sustainable Projects and Publications," in *A Companion to Digital Humanities* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2004): 471-487.

Ashley Reed, "Managing an Established Digital Humanities Project: Principles and Practices from the Twentieth Year of the William Blake Archive," *Digital Humanities Quarterly* 8, no. 1 (2014) <http://digitalhumanities.org/dhq/vol/8/1/000174/000174.html>.

Abby Smith, "Preservation" in *A Companion to Digital Humanities* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2004): 576-591.

Week 14 | December 5 – Peer Review

REQUIRED READING

Anne Burdick, Johanna Drucker, Peter Lunenfeld, Todd Presner, Jeffrey Schnapp, eds., "How to Evaluate Digital Scholarship" in *Digital Humanities*, (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2012): 128-129.

Kathleen Fitzpatrick, "Peer Review," *A New Companion to Digital Humanities*, Susan Schreibman, Ray Seimens, and Johns Unsworth, eds. (Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell, 2016): 439-448.

William G. Thomas III, "The Promise of the Digital Humanities and the Contested Nature of Digital Scholarship," *A New Companion to Digital Humanities*, Susan Schreibman, Ray Seimens, and Johns Unsworth, eds. (Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell, 2016): 524-537.