The University of Iowa
School of Library and Information Sciences
Fall 2017

Course	SLIS 6330: Archives and Media
Course Schedule	Mondays 9:30-12:15, 3092 Main Library
Instructor	Dr. Lindsay Mattock
Office Location	3072 Main Library
E-mail	lindsay-mattock@uiowa.edu
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 affect the message?; How are archives constructed?; What decisions must be made in building and representing collections?; and How are these decisions reflected in the final product – the archives or the DH project?.

Required Textbooks

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

Semester at a Glance

Week 1 | August 21	Introduction to Archives & Media
Week 2 | August 28	Metadata and Controlled Vocabularies
September 4	Labor Day
Week 3 | September 11	Databases
Week 4 | September 18	Data Model Development
Week 5 | September 25	The Archives
Week 6 | October 2	Text-Based Media
Week 7 | October 9	Non-Textual Media
Week 8 | October 16	Time-Based Media
Week 9 | October 23	Digital Media
Week 10 | October 30	The Archives Revisited
Week 11 | November 6	Representing Collections
Week 12 | November 13	Building an Audience
November 20	Thanksgiving
Week 13 | November 27	Sustainability and Preservation
Week 14 | December 4	Project Evaluation

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. Late assignments will NOT be accepted.

Assignments at a Glance

Assignment	Due Date
Data Model	September 25
Data Entry	October 9
Project Proposal	October 30
Project Documentation and Evaluation	December 11
Weekly Attendance	Throughout term

Data Model

Group Assignment
20% of final grade
Due Monday, September 25

Over the course of the term we will work with representatives from Mason City to create a digital version of *Mason City Architectural Heritage*. The first step in this process is to create a data model for the information contained within the publication. Working in small groups you will create an Entity-Relationship diagram demonstrating how you propose to describe the information contained within this publication. An Entity-Relationship (ER) diagram describes the structure of the database tables and will inform the design of the final database in the Heurist platform.

Each group will create an ER diagram using the free software Draw.IO. The model will include each record type that you wish to describe along with the fields required for each record and the relationships between records. We will discuss ER diagrams and review the Draw.IO tool during the September 11th class meeting. In addition to the ER diagram, each group will create a metadata dictionary providing definitions for each of the fields represented in the ER diagram along with a brief (min. 2 page) narrative describing how the data model and metadata definitions were defined and generated from the original text. The September 18th class meeting will be used as an open lab session for this assignment.

Each group will submit a single .pdf document containing the ER diagram, metadata dictionary, and narrative by 9:30 am, Monday, September 25. The Data Models will be evaluated according to the following rubric:

Requirement	Percentage	Letter Grade		
		A	B	C
ER Diagram	30%	The ER diagram represents each element of your proposed database structure including record types, all elements, and the relationships between records. The ER diagram represents all of the data within the *Mason City Architectural Heritage* publication and proposes additional record types and/or data fields that can enhance this data.	The ER diagram represents each element of your proposed database structure including record types, all elements, and the relationships between records. The ER diagram represents all of the data within the *Mason City Architectural Heritage* publication.	The ER diagram is missing some of the key elements (record types, data fields, and relationships) that would accurately represent the data from the *Mason City Architectural Heritage* publication.
Metadata Dictionary	30%	The metadata dictionary contains clear and concise definitions for each of the record types, data fields, and relationships represented in the ER diagram. The definitions refer to appropriate data standards such as	The metadata dictionary contains clear and concise definitions for each of the record types, data fields, and relationships represented in the ER diagram. The dictionary also references specific sections of the text,	The metadata dictionary fails to define all of the elements of your data model and/or the dictionary does not contain enough detail for someone to translate the

		controlled vocabularies and other data standards for normalization of the data. The dictionary also references specific sections of the text, providing examples for your reader. Someone reading your dictionary should be able to translate the publication text into the data model without question.	providing examples for your reader. Someone reading your dictionary should be able to translate the publication text into the data model without question.	publication text into the data model.
Narrative	30%	The narrative should describe the process of translating the text and provide a rationale for the model, including a justification for each of the record types and data fields. The narrative should further describe the group's decision making process including a discussion of any debates that arose among the group. The narrative should also justify any additional data included in the data model, but not represented in the	The narrative should describe the process of translating the text and provide a rationale for the model, including a justification for each of the record types and data fields.	The narrative fails to describe the group's rationale for the data model and/or does not address each of the individual record types and fields described in the model.

		original text.		
Clarity	10%	The Data Model and documentation demonstrates evidence of proofreading and proper use of grammar and punctuation. Any citations are properly formatted according to your preferred citation style.	The Data Model and documentation contains a few minor proofing errors.	The Data Model and documentation contains significant errors in grammar, punctuation, and citation that effect the clarity of the document.

Data Entry

Individual Assignment
10% of final grade
Due Monday, October 9

We will work together as a class to take the combine the proposed Data Models from the previous assignment to build a database in the Heurist platform for the *Mason City Architectural Heritage* publication. The responsibility for data entry will be divided among each student individually. You will be responsible for entering data for an assigned section of the book, following the prescribed data model. The text and images from the book have been provided as separate files and are available on the ICON site.

Your assigned entries must be completed by 9:30 am, Monday, October 9th in the Mason City Architecture Heurist database. This individual contribution to the database will allow you to gain experience following a metadata model, as well as entering and normalizing data in a database. Your Data Entry will be evaluated according to the following rubric:

Requirement	Percentage	Letter Grade		
		A	B	C
Completeness	40%	You have completed the all of the data points assigned to	You have completed most of the data points assigned to	You have failed to create entries for all

		you.	you, but several of the entries are missing elements.	of your assigned data points.
Accuracy	50%	You have accurately parsed the data from the Mason City publication and entered the information into the individual data fields as described in the data model.	Your entries contain a number of minor errors in interpreting the data model. All of the data from the publication has been represented, but has not been placed into the correct data fields according to the data model.	Your entries fail to conform to the data model containing significant errors that prevent the correct linkage between records in the database.
Clarity	10%	Your entries demonstrate evidence of proofreading and proper use of grammar and punctuation.	Your entries contain a few minor proofing errors.	Your entries contain significant errors in grammar and punctuation that effect the clarity of the document.

Project Proposal

Group Assignment
20% of final grade
Due Monday, October 30

Each group will develop their own version of the Mason City application using a clone of the Heurist database developed from the class Data Model and WordPress. Each web application will include a search interface with faceted searches, content pages, and visualizations using either the mapping and networking tools within Heurist or another visualization tool of the group's choice. The project proposal will describe the proposed search interface, the content to be highlighted, the visualizations that will be generated, as well as a description of each group member's role and responsibilities in completing the project.

Each proposal will be submitted as a .pdf document and will be assessed according to the following rubric:

Requirement	Percentage	Letter Grade		
		A	B	C
Introduction	10%	The proposal provides a detailed introduction to the group's proposed web application describing the group's overall rationale and approach to developing the application. The introduction clearly articulates the theoretical or historical framework informing the group's perspective on the project.	The proposal provides an introduction to the group's proposed web application describing the group's overall rationale and approach to developing the application.	The proposal provides a brief introduction to the goals and aims for the project.
Search Description	20%	The proposal describes the proposed searches that will be included in the database search interface. The description includes the key records that will serve as the basis for the search and identifies an imagined audience for the project that will use the search.	The proposal describes the proposed searches that will be included in the database search interface. The description includes the key records that will serve as the basis for the search.	The proposal describes the proposed searches to be included in the search interface.

Static Content	20%	The proposal thoroughly describes the static pages that will serve as the historical background for the project informing the searches and other visualizations included in the project. The proposal describes the content and clearly articulates the theoretical or historical framework informing this informational resource.	The proposal thoroughly describes the static pages that will serve as the historical background for the project informing the searches and other visualizations included in the project.	The proposal briefly describes the static content for the application.
Visualizations	20%	The project proposes at least one additional visualization of the data using either the tools included in the Heurist platform or another visualization tool. The proposal clearly articulates what data will be used to generate the visualizations, the imagined uses of the visualizations, and how the visualization enhance the static and search interfaces for the web application.	The project proposes at least one additional visualization of the data using either the tools included in the Heurist platform or another visualization tool. The proposal clearly articulates what data will be used to generate the visualizations.	The project proposes at least one additional visualization of the data using either the tools included in the Heurist platform or another visualization tool.

Roles and Responsibilities	20%	The proposal clearly articulates the roles for each of the group members, outlining the specific tasks that each group member will be responsible for completing. A timeline for the project tasks is also proposed referencing the key deliverables required in the proposal (visualization, search, static content) as well as the final project deliverables articulated in the final assignment (project documentation, software evaluation, prototype evaluation, group evaluation).	The proposal clearly articulates the roles for each of the group members, outlining the specific tasks that each group member will be responsible for completing. A timeline for the project tasks is also proposed referencing the key deliverables required in the proposal.	The proposal provides a list of group members and a brief description of their roles and responsibilities.
Clarity	10%	The Project Proposal demonstrates evidence of proofreading and proper use of grammar and punctuation. Any citations are properly formatted according to your preferred citation style.	The Project Proposal contains a few minor proofing errors.	The Project Proposal contains significant errors in grammar, punctuation, and citation that effect the clarity of the document.

Project Documentation and Evaluation

Group Assignment

30% of final grade

Due Monday, December 11

Each group will develop their own version of the Mason City web application using a clone of the Heurist database and WordPress. At the end of the term, the web application prototype and project documentation will be assessed. Along with the prototype, each group will also submit documentation for their prototype that will serve as a step-by-step guide for the Mason City partners so that they can continue to maintain the database and web application. Each group will also evaluate the success of the final prototype in a narrative assessing the tools and platforms used to generate the prototype (i.e. Heurist and WordPress) and the group's ability to successfully develop and implement their ideas from the proposal.

The Project Documentation and Evaluation will be submitted as a single .pdf and will be evaluated according to the following rubric:

Requirement	Percentage	Letter Grade		
		A	B	C
Web Application Prototype	20%	The web application prototype contains each of the elements outlined in the proposal (faceted search, visualizations, static content). All elements of the prototype are fully-functional as described in the project documentation.	The web application prototype contains each of the elements outlined in the proposal (faceted search, visualizations, static content). While all of the elements are represented, there may still be a few bugs in the prototype, but each of these elements is functional, however flawed.	The web application prototype is missing key required elements.

Project Documentation	25%	The prototype is accompanied by full documentation that describes how to use, update, and modify the Heurist database and the other elements of the web application. The documentation includes screenshots, code snippets, and other visual elements where appropriate. The documentation is written for the Mason City collaborators, providing an appropriate level of guidance and considers the longevity of the project, suggesting places where the documentation too can be updated over-time.	The prototype is accompanied by full documentation that describes how to use, update, and modify the Heurist database and the other elements of the web application. The documentation includes screenshots, code snippets, and other visual elements where appropriate. The documentation is written for the Mason City collaborators, providing an appropriate level of guidance.	The prototype is accompanied by full documentation that describes how to use, update, and modify the Heurist database and the other elements of the web application. The documentation is lacking key details and/or has not been customized for the intended audience.
Evaluation of Tools/Software	15%	The project evaluation includes a critical analysis of the Heurist tool and other software used in the creation of the prototype. The critique includes a consideration of the use of the Heurist platform (and/or other employed technologies) for this application and also considers the broader intended uses for the	The project evaluation includes a critical analysis of the Heurist tool and other software used in the creation of the prototype. The critique includes a consideration of the use of the Heurist platform (and/or other employed technologies) for	The project evaluation includes a description of how the software was used, but does not analyze or critique the successes or failures of the tool in development of the web application.

		tool, referencing the documentation from the software developers.	this application.	
Evaluation of Prototype	15%	The project evaluation includes a critical analysis of the prototype developed by your group. The critique includes a consideration of the requirements outlined by the Mason City collaborators, the successes and failures of the prototype itself (independent of the technologies used), and the limitations of the dataset that we were provided (*Mason City Architectural Heritage).* The critique includes a discussion of related or exemplar projects and/or the DH and archival literature that could inform changes/modifications/ improvements to the project moving forward.	The project evaluation includes a critical analysis of the prototype developed by your group. The critique includes a consideration of the requirements outlined by the Mason City collaborators, the successes and failures of the prototype itself, and the limitations of the dataset that we were provided.	The project evaluation includes a description of the prototype and the requirements outlined by the project collaborators, but does not analyze or critique the successes or failures of the prototype.
Evaluation of Group	15%	The project evaluation includes a critical analysis of the efforts of the group. I am not concerned with individual performance, but	The project evaluation includes a critical analysis of the efforts of the group. I am not concerned with individual	The project describes each of the roles of the group members, but fails to analyze or critique the

		rather would like a critical reflection on the skill set of the group and the skills necessary to successfully implement a project like the Mason City project. What skills did you develop during the course of the term?, what skills did you bring to the project from past/other experiences?, what skills are LIS specific?, what skills are Humanities specific?. The evaluation also considers the role of the community collaborators in the project and the expertise that they contributed to the development of the tool.	performance, but rather would like a critical reflection on the skill set of the group and the skills necessary to successfully implement a project like the Mason City project. What skills did you develop during the term?, what skills did you bring to the project from past/other experiences?, what skills are LIS specific?, what skills are Humanities specific?.	ultimate successes or failures of the group.
Clarity	10%	The assignment demonstrates evidence of proofreading and proper use of grammar and punctuation. Any citations are properly formatted according to your preferred citation style.	The assignment contains a few minor proofing errors.	The assignment contains significant errors in grammar, punctuation, and citation that effect the clarity of the document.

Weekly Attendance

Individual grade

10% of final grade

Assessed throughout term

This is a project and discussion-based course. Contributions to your group and to our class discussion are expected and valued. 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:

A	B	C
You have attended all of the required class sessions; have arrived on-time and participated in the weekly session 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 3 of the required class sessions; and/or have frequently arrived late or left class sessions early

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

Due to the differences 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. The course discussion board will serve as a forum for general questions about the course, the projects, and assignments over the course of the term. Otherwise, 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 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

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 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*

---

[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

<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 http://sds.studentlife.uiowa.edu.

Reading and Topic 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. Assigned readings are available on ICON or through the University of Iowa Libraries.

Week 1 | August 21 – Introduction to Archives & Media

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.

Week 2 | August 28 – Metadata and Controlled Vocabularies

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.

Anne J. Gilliland, "Setting the Stage," in *Introduction to Metadata*, Third Edition, Murtha Baca, ed. (Los Angeles: Getty, 2016): https://www.getty.edu/publications/intrometadata/setting-the-stage/

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/context.html and http://www.getty.edu/research/publications/electronic_publications/intro_controlled_vocab/what.html

SEPTEMBER 4 – LABOR DAY

Week 3 | September 11 – Databases

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

Ellen Gruber Garvey, "'facts and FACTS': Abolitionists' Database Innovations," in *"Raw Data" is an Oxymoron*, Lisa Gitelman, ed. (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2013): 89-102.

Lisa Gitelman and Virgina Jackson, "Introduction" in "*Raw Data" is an Oxymoron*, Lisa Gitelman, ed. (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2013): 1-14.

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

Week 4 | September 18 – Data Model Development

No required reading

Week 5 | September 25 – The Archives

Antoinette Burton, "Introduction: Archive Fever, Archive Stories," in *Archive Stories: Facts, Fictions, and the Writing of History* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2005): 1-24.

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

Ciaran B. Trace, "On or Off the Record? Notions of Value in the Archive," in *Currents of Archival Thinking*, Terry Eastwood and Heather MacNeil, eds. (Santa Barbara: Libraries Unlimited, 2010): 47-68.

Week 6 | October 2 – Text-Based Media

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

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.

Week 7 | October 9 – Non-Textual Media

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.

Week 8 | October 16 – Time-Based Media

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.

Week 9 | October 23 – Digital Media

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.

Stephen G. Nichols, "An Artifact by Any Other Name: Digital Surrogates of Medieval Manuscripts," in *Archives, Documentation and Institutions of Social Memory: Essays*

from the Sawyer Seminar, Francis X. Blouin Jr. and William G. Rosenberg (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2007): 134-143.

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

Week 10 | October 30 – The Archives Revisited

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

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

Carolyn Steedman, "'Something She Called a Fever' Michelet, Derrida, and Dust (Or, in the Archives with Michelet and Derrida," in *Archives, Documentation and Institutions of Social Memory: Essays from the Sawyer Seminar,"* Francis X. Blouin Jr. and William G. Rosenberg (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2007): 4-19.

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 11 | November 6 – Representing Collections

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

Willard McCarty, "Modeling: A Study in Words and Meanings," in *A Companion to Digital Humanities* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2004): 254-270.

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

Week 12 | November 13 – Building an Audience

Daniel J. Cohen and Roy Rosenzweig, "Building an Audience," in *Digital History: A Guide to Gathering, Preserving, and Presenting the Past on the Web* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006): http://chnm.gmu.edu/digitalhistory/audience/index.php

Geoff Browell, "Navigating Nightingale: Creating an App Out of Archives," in *Outreach: Innovative Practices for Archives and Special Collections*, Kate Theimer, ed. (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2014): 137-151.

Anne Murray and Jared Wiercinski, "A Design Methodology for Web-based Sound Archives," *Digital Humanities Quarterly* 8, no. 2 (2014): http://digitalhumanities.org/dhq/vol/8/2/000173/000173.html

NOVEMBER 20 – THANKSGIVING

Week 13 | November 27 – Sustainability and Preservation

Daniel J. Cohen and Roy Rosenzweig, "Preserving Digital History," in *Digital History: A Guide to Gathering, Preserving, and Presenting the Past on the Web* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006): http://chnm.gmu.edu/digitalhistory/preserving/index.php

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

Miguel Escobar Varela, "The Archive as Repertoire: Transience and Sustainability in Digital Archives," *Digital Humanities Quarterly* 10, no. 4 (2016): http://digitalhumanities.org:8081/dhq/vol/10/4/000269/000269.html

Week 14 | December 4 – Project Evaluation

Jodi Allison-Bunnell, Elizabeth Yakel, & Janet Huck, "Researchers at Work: Assessing Needs for Content and Presentation of Archival Materials," *Journal of Archival Organization* 9, no. 2 (2011): 67-104.

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.

Claire Warwick, "Studying Users in the Digital Humanities" (p.1-21) in *Digital Humanities in Practice*, eds. Claire Warwick, Melissa Terras, and Julianne Hyhan (London: Facet, 2012).