### 501AO Information Organization and Access

### Spring 2019

### Wednesdays 6:30-8:30 pm

### COURSE INSTRUCTOR

### Instructor Linda C. Smith lcsmith@illinois.edu (217) 333-7742

### Teaching assistant E.E. Lawrence elawrnc2@illinois.edu

### CATALOG DESCRIPTION

### Emphasizes information organization and access in settings and systems of different kinds. Traces the information transfer process from the generation of knowledge through its storage and use in both print and non-print formats. Consideration will be given to the creation of information systems: the principles and practice of selection and preservation, methods of organizing information for retrieval and display, the operation of organizations that provide information services, and the information service needs of various user communities.

### COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course provides an intensive and thorough introduction to fundamentals of information organization and access from the point of view of the field of library and information science. The course is not an introduction to LIS as a whole or to the profession of librarianship--the focus is squarely on information organization and access. IS 501 aims to acquaint you with the principal problems of information organization and access, the main streams of thought, and the key thinkers and contributors. The material covered is broad in scope and applicable to a wide variety of settings and systems. The course emphasizes the central position of information users in problems of information organization and access.

**COURSE OVERVIEW**

The central themes of the course are:  
1) who uses information, how they use it, and what constraints shape their use of information;   
2) how recorded knowledge can be organized and structured;   
3) ways of providing access to the world's knowledge.

Through lectures, readings, writing exercises, and discussion, students will engage with concepts, theories, principles, and research on user communities, collections, retrieval and display of information, preservation, and general issues of access.

### IS 501 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

1. To provide a foundation for further study in library and information science, including an appreciation for forms of systematic research in LIS.

2. To introduce central concepts, theories, principles, research issues, and people associated with the practice and study of information organization and access.

3. To advance a common set of ideas that help to define the profession's orientation toward problems of information organization and access.

### MS/LIS PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES

Upon completion of the MS/LIS program, students will be able to:

* Apply foundational concepts, theories, and principles to problems of information organization and access.
* Communicate capably with diverse stakeholders, promoting not just access to but also effective use of information services and systems in specific contexts.
* Use evidence to help address information problems, meet information needs, and create relationships in their institutions, communities, profession, and the world.
* Compare and critique contemporary information practices, structures, and standards in relation to historical and global alternatives.
* Apply core ethical principles to professional practice.

### COURSE MATERIALS

There is no required textbook for this course; required articles and book chapters are available electronically, through the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Library's online journals and databases search tool (<https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>), the journal and article locator (<http://search.grainger.illinois.edu/linker/>), the online catalog (<https://vufind.carli.illinois.edu/vf-uiu/>), or the open Web (as indicated).

This course will introduce you to many terms and concepts that may be new to you. Remember that the Library provides access to some reference sources online that may be helpful in providing additional background and explanations. These titles are linked from: http://www.library.illinois.edu/infosci/research/#encyclopedias and <http://www.library.illinois.edu/infosci/research/#dictionaries>. They include: *ODLIS: Online Dictionary for Library and Information Science* and the *Encyclopedia of Library and Information Sciences.*

**LIBRARY RESOURCES**

Website: <http://www.library.illinois.edu/infosci/>   
Email: [lislib@library.illinois.edu](mailto:lislib@library.illinois.edu)  
Phone: 217-300-8365  
Librarian: Chris Bailey [cbailey3@illinois.edu](mailto:cbailey3@illinois.edu)  
 **WRITING RESOURCES**There is a Writing Resources website (https://publish.illinois.edu/ischoolwritingresources/) that includes contact information for writing consultants available to work with iSchool students.

### ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

Please review and reflect on the academic integrity policy of the University of Illinois, <http://studentcode.illinois.edu/article1/part4/1-401/> to which we subscribe. By turning in materials for review in IS501AO, you certify that all work presented is your own and has been done by you independently or as a member of a designated group for group assignments. If, in the course of your writing, you use the words or ideas of another writer, proper acknowledgement must be given (using the style manual of your choice). Not to do so is to commit plagiarism, a form of academic dishonesty. If you are not clear on what constitutes plagiarism and how to cite sources appropriately, please consult with the instructor or the TA.

**STATEMENT OF INCLUSION**

As the state’s premier public university, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign’s core mission is to serve the interests of the diverse people of the state of Illinois and beyond. The institution thus values inclusion and a pluralistic learning and research environment, one in which we respect the varied perspectives and lived experiences of a diverse community and global workforce. We support diversity of worldviews, histories, and cultural knowledge across a range of social groups including race, ethnicity, gender identity, sexual orientation, abilities, economic class, religion, and their intersections. [http://diversity.illinois.edu/supportingdocs/diversity%20values%20statement.pdf]

**ACCESSIBILITY STATEMENT**  
To obtain accessibility-related academic adjustments and/or auxiliary aids, students with disabilities must contact the course instructor and the Disability Resources and Educational Services (DRES) as soon as possible. To contact DRES, you may visit 1207 S. Oak St., Champaign, call (217)333-1970, e-mail [disability@illinois.edu](mailto:disability@illinois.edu) or go to the DRES website (<http://www.disability.illinois.edu/>).

**GENERAL COURSE EXPECTATIONS**

Enrollment in 501 includes expectation of regular attendance. If you find you must miss class, contact the instructor as soon as possible. Synchronous sessions will be archived, but it is important to participate in order to contribute questions and comments and to join in small group discussions and activities that will be part of class sessions. Students are expected to demonstrate respect for the ideas and opinions of all other members of the class at all times.

**GRADING SCALE**

94-100 = A   
90-93 = A-  
87-89 = B+  
83-86 = B  
80-82 = B-  
77-79 = C+  
73-76 = C

70-72 = C-  
67-69 = D+  
63-66 = D  
60-62 = D-

59 and below = F

**CLASS FORMAT**

The class will have weekly live sessions in the scheduled 2-hour time slot. In addition you are expected to contribute to discussion in the forums set up for this purpose in Moodle.

**CALENDAR OF READINGS/ASSIGNMENTS**

1. **January 16 - What is data? information? knowledge? Information organization?**

**Readings:**Sweeney, M. (2014). How to read for grad school. <http://miriamsweeney.net/2012/06/20/readforgradschool/>.

Bates, M. J. (2015). The information professions: knowledge, memory, heritage. *Information Research* 20(1), paper 655. http://www.informationr.net/ir/20-1/paper655.html#.XCzpkjBKhaQ

Buckland, M. K. (2017). Introduction. In *Information and Society*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1-19. <https://vufind.carli.illinois.edu/vf-uiu/Record/uiu_8275269> or <https://vufind.carli.illinois.edu/vf-uiu/Record/uiu_8286111>

Buckland, M. K. (1997). What is a “document”? *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* 48(9): 804-809. <http://people.ischool.berkeley.edu/~buckland/whatdoc.html>

Bush, V. (1945). As we may think. *Atlantic Monthly.*http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/1945/07/as-we-may-think/303881/

Peekhaus, W. (2018). Seed libraries: Sowing the seeds for community and public library resilience. *Library Quarterly* 88(3): 271-285. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

*Additional resources:*Video: Memex animation <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c539cK58ees>

Video: The Man Who Wanted to Classify the World <http://search.alexanderstreet.com/view/work/1641522>  
  
**Assignment:**On the introduction forum, post a brief introduction including: your experience in Leep and/or the iSchool and your motivation for pursuing this degree.

**(2) January 23 – Information needs and information seeking (research methods)**

**Readings:**Bawden, D.; Robinson, L. (2009). The dark side of information: Overload, anxiety and other paradoxes and pathologies. *Journal of Information Science* 35(2): 180-191. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

Blair, A. (2003). Reading strategies for coping with information overload ca. 1550-1700. *Journal of the History of Ideas* 64(1): 11-28. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

Connaway, L. S.; Faniel, I. M. (2014). *Reordering Ranganathan: Shifting User Behaviors, Shifting Priorities.* Dublin, OH: OCLC Research, 1-5, 103-108.<http://oclc.org/research/publications/library/2014/oclcresearch-reordering-ranganathan-2014-overview.html>

Johnson, J. D. (2014). Health-related information seeking: is it worth it? *Information Processing & Management* 50(5): 708-717. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

Rhee, H. L. (2015). Reflections on archival user studies. *Reference and User Services Quarterly* 54(4): 29-42. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

*Using research methods:*Connaway, L. S.; Powell, R. R. (2010). Chapter 3. Selecting the research method. In *Basic Research Methods for Librarians*. 5th ed. Santa Barbara, CA: Libraries Unlimited, 71-106.<https://vufind.carli.illinois.edu/vf-uiu/Record/uiu_7262157>

*Additional resources:*Benselin, J. C.; Ragsdell, G. (2016). Information overload: the differences that age makes. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science* 48(3): 284-297. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

Weiss, A. (2018). Chapter 7: The shock of information overload and big data. In *Big Data Shocks: An Introduction to Big Data for Librarians and Information Professionals.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 53-59. <https://vufind.carli.illinois.edu/vf-uiu/Record/uiu_8587766>

Savolainen, R. (2016). Elaborating the conceptual space of information-seeking phenomena. *Information Research* 21(3), paper 720. <http://www.informationr.net/ir/21-3/paper720.html#.XCzrdzBKhaQ>

**Assignment:**Complete sign up for final project topics on the forum set up for this purpose.

**(3) January 30 - Collections**

**Readings:***Open access*  
Björk, B.-C. (2017) Gold, green, and black open access. *Learned Publishing* 30: 173-175.[e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

Herther, N. K. (2017). Open access repositories: Revealing the mother lode of research to the world. *Online Searcher* 41(6): 34-39. e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

*Users and collections*  
Barbakoff, A. (2017). Balancing connections and collections. *Library Journal.* September 15. https://www.libraryjournal.com/?detailStory=balancing-connections-collections-library-design.

Dempsey, L. (2016). Library collections in the life of the user: Two directions. *LIBER Quarterly* 26(4). <https://www.liberquarterly.eu/articles/10.18352/lq.10170/>

*Self-publishing*  
DiGirolomo, K. (2016). *LJ*’s self-publishing survey. *Library Journal.* June 1. <http://reviews.libraryjournal.com/2016/06/in-the-bookroom/self-esteem/ljs-self-publishing-survey-self-publishing-libraries/>

Conrad, K. M. (2017). Public libraries as publishers: critical opportunity. *Journal of Electronic Publishing* 20(1). <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/j/jep/3336451.0020.106/--public-libraries-as-publishers-critical-opportunity?rgn=main;view=fulltext>

*Accessibility*  
Junus, R. (2014). Digital collections and accessibility. *DSC Sandbox blog.* http://spartanideas.msu.edu/2014/12/13/digital-collections-and-accessibility/  
  
Big Ten Academic Alliance. (2017). Library e-resource accessibility. <http://www.btaa.org/library/accessibility/reports>

*Collecting social media*  
McGill, A. (2016). Can Twitter fit inside the Library of Congress? *The Atlantic.* August 4. <https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2016/08/can-twitter-fit-inside-the-library-of-congress/494339/>  
  
Library of Congress. (2017). Update on the Twitter archive at the Library of Congress. December. <https://blogs.loc.gov/loc/files/2017/12/2017dec_twitter_white-paper.pdf>

*Digital collections*Punzalan, R. L. (2014). Understanding virtual reunification. *Library Quarterly* 84(3): 294-323. [e-journal] ] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

Roberts, A. (2016). Chapter 10. Conceptualising the library collection for the digital world. In: *Digital Information Strategies: From Applications and Content to Libraries and People.* Waltham, MA: Chandos Publishing, 143-156. <https://vufind.carli.illinois.edu/vf-uiu/Record/uiu_7980039>

*Additional resources:*NISO. (2007). A Framework of Guidance for Building Good Digital Collections.   
3rd edition. <https://www.niso.org/publications/framework-guidance-building-good-digital-collections>

Pritchard, S. M. (2009). Special collections surge to the fore. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy* 9(2): 177-180. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

Walters, W. H. (2018). The death and migration of book collections in academic libraries. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy* 18(3): 415-422. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

**Assignment:**Information needs/information seeking behavior (Individual Assignment 1)

**(4) February 6 - Approaches to organizing information/ Introduction to metadata**

**Readings:***Introduction*  
Swoger, B. (2012). What is metadata? A Christmas-themed exploration. *Info Culture.* <https://blogs.scientificamerican.com/information-culture/what-is-metadata-a-christmas-themed-exploration/>

Pomerantz, J. (2015). Chapter 1. Introduction. In: *Metadata.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1-18. <http://vufind.carli.illinois.edu/vf-uiu/Record/uiu_7937922>

*Choosing a metadata scheme*Kennedy, M. R. (2008). Nine questions to guide you in choosing a metadata schema. *Journal of Digital Information* 9(1). <https://journals.tdl.org/jodi/index.php/jodi/article/view/226/205>

Smith-Yoshimura, K. (2017). How much metadata is practical? *Hangingtogether.org blog.* November 14. <http://hangingtogether.org/?p=6328>

*Metadata standards for different purposes*Elings, M. W.; Waibel, G. (2007). Metadata for all: Descriptive standards and metadata sharing across libraries, archives, and museums. *First Monday* 12(3).   
<http://www.uic.edu/htbin/cgiwrap/bin/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/1628/1543>

Gartner, R. (2016). Chapter 3. Metadata becomes digital. In: *Metadata: Shaping knowledge from antiquity to the semantic web.* Switzerland: Springer, 27-39. <https://vufind.carli.illinois.edu/vf-uiu/Record/uiu_8128614>

Warren, J. W. (2015). Zen and the art of metadata maintenance. *Journal of Electronic Publishing* 18(3). <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/j/jep/3336451.0018.305?view=text;rgn=main>

**(5) February 13 - Structures and standards in organizing and representing information**

**Readings:***Historical context*  
Coyle, K. (2016). The evolving catalog: cataloging tech from scrolls to computers. *American Libraries* 47(1/2): 48-53. <https://americanlibrariesmagazine.org/2016/01/04/cataloging-evolves/>

Blei, D. (2017). How the index card cataloged the world. *The Atlantic.* December 1. <https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2017/12/how-the-index-card-catalogued-the-world/547271/>

*Introducing terminology*  
Banerjee, K. (2017). Translating technobabble: All you really need to know about URIs, linked data, and FRBR. *Computers in Libraries* 37(10): 21-24. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

Video: Ray, K. (2010). Web 3.0: a documentary. <https://vimeo.com/11529540>.

*FRBR*Tillett, B. (2003). *What is FRBR? A conceptual model for the bibliographic universe*. <http://www.loc.gov/cds/downloads/FRBR.PDF>

Video: Bram Stoker’s Dracula in FRBR Terms. (2009). <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LN0vKCFsXPE>

*Linked data*  
Fons, T. (2016). Making libraries visible on the web. *Library Journal* 141(13): 44-46. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

Hastings, R. (2015). Linked data in libraries: Status and future direction. *Computers in Libraries* 35(9): 12-16. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

*Additional resources:*Clarke, R. I. (2015). Breaking records: the history of bibliographic records and their influence in conceptualizing bibliographic data. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 53(3-4): 286-302. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

Library of Congress. (2004). *Understanding MARC Bibliographic*. (Part I-VI). <http://www.loc.gov/marc/umb>

Wong, E. Y. (2016). UCLA CRSG semantic web resources. *Technical Services Quarterly* 33(3): 340-341. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

**Assignment:**Digital collection assessment (Individual Assignment 2)

**(6) February 20 – Database design**

**Readings:**Harrington, J. L. (2016). *Relational Database Design and Implementation Clearly Explained* (4th ed.). Amsterdam: Morgan Kaufmann/Elsevier. <https://vufind.carli.illinois.edu/vf-uiu/Record/uiu_8046038>  
Chapter 3. Why good design matters (pp. 47-53)  
Chapter 4. Entities and relationships (pp. 55-88)

Video: Entity-Relationship (E-R) diagrams. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c0_9Y8QAstg>

Leigh, K. (2013). Collaborating over the centuries: Creating the What Middletown Read database. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 51(1-3): 224-237. [e-journal]  
[Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

Wilson, B. (2015). The archive of eating. *New York Times.* October 29. <http://www.nytimes.com/2015/11/01/magazine/the-archive-of-eating.html?_r=1>

**Assignment** (ungraded assignment to be discussed in class):  
Database design (LibraryThing)

**(7) February 27 – Search and discovery**

**Readings:***Searching and search systems*Breeding, M. (2018). Index-based discovery services: Current market positions and trends. *Library Technology Reports* 54(8): 5-11 (Chapters 1 and 2).

LaFrance, A. (2016). Searching for lost knowledge in the age of intelligent machines. *The Atlantic.* December 1. <http://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2016/12/the-search-for-lost-knowledge/506879/>.   
  
*Browsing and serendipitous discovery*Bell, S. J. (2014). Collections are for collisions: design it into the experience. *American Libraries* 45(9/10): 46-49. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]  
  
Maloney, A.; Conrad, L. Y. (2016). *Expecting the unexpected: Serendipity, discovery, and the scholarly research process.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publishing. <http://us.sagepub.com/sites/default/files/serrdiscovery.pdf>

Thorp, J. (2018). Uncovering surprises in the collections, serendipitously. *Library of Congress Blog.* December 10. <https://blogs.loc.gov/loc/2018/12/uncovering-surprises-in-the-collections-serendipitously/>

*Recommending*Behnert, C.; Lewandowski, D. (2015). Ranking search results in library information systems—Considering ranking approaches adapted from web search engines. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 41(6): 725-735. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

*Online catalogs*Owen, W.; Michalak, S. C. (2015). Engine of innovation: Building the high performance catalog. *Information Technology and Libraries* 34(2): 5-18. <http://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ital/article/view/5702/pdf>

*Young users*Gossen, T.; Nünberger, A. (2013). Specifics of information retrieval for young users: a survey. *Information Processing & Management* 49: 739-756. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

*Mobile access*McCrillis, A.; Piazza, A.; Larson, C. (2017). Seeing the big picture through smaller screens: Characterizing the library users’ experience on mobile devices. *Journal of Electronic Resources in Medical Libraries* 14(3-4): 114-119. . [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

**(8) March 6 – Evaluation of information retrieval systems**

**Readings:***Measuring performance of information retrieval systems*  
Beall, J. (2008). The weaknesses of full-text searching. *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 34(5): 438-444. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

Lancaster, F. W. (2017). Precision and recall [ELIS classic]. *Encyclopedia of Library and Information Sciences*, 4th ed., 3708-3713. [ebook] [Locate full text from: <http://www.library.illinois.edu/infosci/research/#encyclopedias>]

Saracevic, T. (2017). Chapter 9. Conclusions. In: *The Notion of Relevance in Information Science: Everybody knows what relevance is. But what is it really?* San Rafael, CA: Morgan & Claypool, 89-93. <https://vufind.carli.illinois.edu/vf-uiu/Record/uiu_8153974>

*Selected recent evaluation studies*Cohen, R. A.; Pusnik, A. T. (2018). Measuring query complexity in web-scale discovery: A comparison between two academic libraries. *Reference & User Services Quarterly* 57(4): 274-284. <https://journals.ala.org/index.php/rusq/article/view/6705>

Dahlen, S. P. C.; Hanson, K. (2017). Preference vs. authority: A comparison of student searching in a subject-specific indexing and abstracting database and a customized discovery layer. *College & Research Libraries*  78(7): 878-897. <http://crl.acrl.org/index.php/crl/article/view/16786/18341>

Matusiak, K. K. (2017). User navigation in large-scale distributed digital libraries: The case of the Digital Public Library of America. *Journal of Web Librarianship* 11(3-4): 157-171. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

Trapido, I. (2016). Library discovery products: Discovering user expectations through failure analysis. *Information Technology and Libraries* 35(3): 9-26. <https://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ital/article/view/9190/pdf>

Wakeling, S.; Clough, P.; Connaway, L. S.; Sen, B.; Tomás, D. (2017). Users and uses of a global union catalog: A mixed-methods study of WorldCat.org. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology* 68(9): 2166-2181. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

**(9) March 13 – Preservation**

**Readings:***Selection for preservation*Madrigal, A. C. (2017). Future historians probably won’t understand our Internet, and that’s okay. *The Atlantic.* December 6. <https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2017/12/it-might-be-impossible-for-future-historians-to-understand-our-internet/547463/>

Sheffield, R. T. (2016). More than acid-free folders: extending the concept of preservation to include the stewardship of unexplored histories. *Library Trends* 64(3): 572-584. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

Teper, J. H. (2014). Selection for preservation: a survey of current practices in the field of preservation. *Library Resources & Technical Services* 58(4): 220-232. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

Video: Centeno, M. Introduction to preservation. [linked in Moodle course space]

*Digital preservation*

Barone, F.; Zeitlyn, D.; Majer-Schönberger, V. (2015). Learning from failure: The case of the disappearing website. *First Monday* 20(5). <http://firstmonday.org/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/5852/4456>

Broussard, M. (2015). The irony of writing online about digital preservation. *The Atlantic.* November 20. <http://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2015/11/the-irony-of-writing-about-digital-preservation/416184/>

Houghton, B. (2016). Preservation challenges in the digital age. *D-Lib Magazine* 22(7/8). <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/july16/houghton/07houghton.html>

Video: Preserving our history in the digital age. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8r4e0xWxrO8>

**Assignment:**Search and Discovery I (Individual Assignment 3)

**(10) March 20 – Spring break** (no class session)

**(11) March 27 -- Subject analysis**

**Readings:**Joudrey, D. N.; Taylor, A. G.; (2018). *The Organization of Information.* 4th ed. Santa Barbara, CA: Libraries Unlimited. Appendix A. An approach to subject analysis (pp. 579-584). [linked in Moodle course space]

Fidel, R. (1994). User-centered indexing. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* 45(8): 572-576. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

Klenczon,W.; Rygiel, P. (2014). Librarian cornered by images, or how to index visual resources. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 52(1): 42-61. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

Gross, T.; Taylor, A. G.; Joudrey, D. N. (2015). Still a lot to lose: The role of controlled vocabulary in keyword searching. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 53(1): 1-39. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

Hedden, H. (2016). Chapter 1. What are taxonomies? *The Accidental Taxonomist.* 2nd ed. Medford, NJ: Information Today, 16-32. <https://vufind.carli.illinois.edu/vf-uiu/Record/uiu_8104155>

Nesset, V. (2018). Indexing databases for our users, not ourselves. *The Indexer* 36(3): 105-109. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

Rafferty, P. (2018). Tagging. *Knowledge Organization* 45(6): 500-516. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

**(12) April 3 – Subject languages**

**Readings:***Subject headings*Ferris, A. M. (2018). Birth of a subject heading. *Library Resources and Technical Services* 62(1): 16-27. <https://journals.ala.org/index.php/lrts/article/view/6555>

*Classification*Martínez-Avila, D. (2016). BISAC: Book Industry Standards and Communications. *Knowledge Organization* 43(8): 655-662. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

*Limitations of subject languages*Buckland, M. K. (2012). Obsolescence in subject description. *Journal of Documentation* 68(2): 154-161**.** [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

Bates, J.; Rowley, J. (2011). Social reproduction and exclusion in subject indexing: A comparison of public library OPACs and LibraryThing folksonomy. *Journal of Documentation* 67(3): 431-448. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

Adler, M.; Huber, J. T.; Nix, A. T. (2017). Stigmatizing disability: Library classifications and the marking and marginalization of books about people with disabilities. *Library Quarterly* 87(2): 117-135. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

Howard, S. A.; Knowlton, S. A. (2018). Browsing through bias: The Library of Congress Classification and Subject Headings for African American studies and LGBTQIA studies. *Library Trends* 67(1): 74-88. . [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

Nesset, V. (2016). A look at classification and indexing practices for elementary school children: who are we really serving? *The Indexer* 34(2): 63-65. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

Smith-Yoshimura, K. (2018). Creating metadata for equity, diversity, and inclusion. November 7. <http://hangingtogether.org/?p=6833>

Video: Christen, K. (2017, July 13). We have never been neutral: Search, discovery, and the politics of access. OCLC Distinguished Seminar Series. <https://www.oclc.org/research/events/2017/07-13.html>

**Assignment:**Indexing Consistency/Impact of Vocabulary on Access (Individual Assignment 4)

**(13) April 10 – Issues in description and access**

**Readings:***Future of catalogers*Cerbo, M. A. (2011). Is there a future for catalogers? *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 49(4): 323-327. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

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

Pittman, B. (2018). Why archive the web? *Online Searcher* 42(6): 53-56. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

*Multilinguality*Albarillo, F. (2016). Evaluating language functionality in library databases. *International Information & Library Review* 48(1): 1-10. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

McElroy, K.; Bridges, L. M. (2018). Multilingual access: Language hegemony and the need for discoverability in multiple languages. *College & Research Libraries News* 79(11). <https://crln.acrl.org/index.php/crlnews/article/view/17472/19276>

*Participatory culture*Benoit, E.; Munson, A. L. (2018). Proceed with caution: Deepening practitioner concers about social tagging within digital collections. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy* 18(4): 759-779. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

Liew, C. L. (2016). Social metadata and public-contributed contents in memory institutions: “Crowd voice” versus “authenticated heritage”? *Preservation, Digital Technology & Culture* 45(3): 122-133. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

*Privacy*  
Pekala, S. (2017). Privacy and user experience in 21st century library discovery. *Information Technology and Libraries* 36(2): 48-58. <https://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ital/article/view/9817/pdf>

*Additional resources:*

IFLA. (2016). Statement of International Cataloguing Principles (ICP). <https://www.ifla.org/files/assets/cataloguing/icp/icp_2016-en.pdf>

**(14) April 17 – Authority control/Data quality issues**

**Readings:***Metadata*Beall, J. (2005). Metadata and data quality problems in the digital library. *Journal of Digital Information,* 6(3). <https://journals.tdl.org/jodi/index.php/jodi/article/viewArticle/65>

Yasser, C. M. (2011). An analysis of problems in metadata records. *Journal of Library Metadata* 11(2): 51-62. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

Walker, L. A.; Armstrong, M. (2014). “I cannot tell what the dickens his name is”: Name disambiguation in institutional repositories. *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication* 2(2): eP1095. http://jlsc-pub.org/articles/abstract/10.7710/2162-3309.1095/

*Digital imaging and OCR*

Conway, P. (2013). Preserving imperfection: Assessing the incidence of digital imaging error in HathiTrust. *Preservation, Digital Technology & Culture* 42(1): 17-30. . [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

Kean, S. (2018). Artificial intelligence is cracking open the Vatican’s secret archives. *The Atlantic.* April 30. <https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2018/04/vatican-secret-archives-artificial-intelligence/559205/>

Kichuk, D. (2015). Loose, falling characters and sentences: The persistence of the OCR problem in digital repository e-books. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy* 15(1): 59-91. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

*Authority files and catalogs*  
Loesch, M. F. (2011). VIAF (Virtual International Authority File). *Technical Services Quarterly* 28(2): 255-256. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

Petrucciani, A. (2015). Quality of library catalogs and value of (good) catalogs. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 53(3-4): 303-313, 2015. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

**Assignment:**Search and Discovery II (Individual Assignment 5)

By April 18 complete at least 3 of the 4 required Reading Responses

**(15) April 24– Visions of the future**

**Readings:***Context*Lesk, M. (2012). A personal history of digital libraries. *Library Hi Tech* 30(4): 592-603. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

Rainie, L.; Anderson, J. (2017). Code-dependent: Pros and cons of the algorithm age. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center. <http://www.pewinternet.org/2017/02/08/code-dependent-pros-and-cons-of-the-algorithm-age/>

*Future visions and new roles*Kwanya, T.; Stilwell, C.; Underwood, P. G. (2013). Intelligent libraries and apomediators: Distinguishing between Library 3.0 and Library 2.0. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science* 45(3): 187-197. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

O’Donnell, J. (2015). What will libraries be like in 2100? *Slate*. November 17. <http://www.slate.com/articles/technology/future_tense/2015/11/what_will_libraries_be_like_in_2100.html>

Enis, M. (2017). Visualizing the future. *Library Journal.* October 1. <https://www.libraryjournal.com/?detailStory=visualizing-future-techknowledge#_>

Secker, J.; Morrison, C.; Stewart, N.; Horton, L. (2016). To boldly go…the librarian’s role in text and data mining. *CILIP blog.* [https://archive.cilip.org.uk/blog/boldly-go-librarians-role-text-data-mining](https://webmail.illinois.edu/owa/redir.aspx?C=dSYOahwb2C9aTnEN_iHZLLpPBqeyu3bubzwNevlcpf5XsTltXVfVCA..&URL=https%3a%2f%2farchive.cilip.org.uk%2fblog%2fboldly-go-librarians-role-text-data-mining)

*Progress in digital libraries/discovery systems*Breeding, M. (2015). The future of library resource discovery. *Information Standards Quarterly* 27(1): 24-30. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

Buckland, M. K. (2017). Library technology in the next 20 years. *Library Hi Tech* 35(1): 5-10. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

Cook, M. (2018). Virtual serendipity: Preserving embodied browsing activity in the 21st century research library. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 44(1): 145-149. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

Meyer, R. (2015). After 10 years, Google Books Is Legal. *The Atlantic.* October 20. <http://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2015/10/fair-use-transformative-leval-google-books/411058/>

*Additional resources:*Video: BBC. (2013). Google and the World Brain. <http://vufind.carli.illinois.edu/vf-uiu/Record/uiu_7419245>

MIT Institute-wide Task Force on the Future of Libraries. (2016). *Preliminary Report. Executive Summary.* <https://future-of-libraries.mit.edu/sites/default/files/FutureLibraries-PrelimReport-ExecSumm-Final.pdf>

**(16) May 1 – Group presentations [Final project]**

**Assignment:**Web-based Collection Report: Genre-specific Considerations (Group Assignment)

**ASSESSMENT / ASSIGNMENTS**

**Assignments:**

All assignments are required for all students. Late or incomplete assignments will not be given full credit unless the student has contacted the instructor prior to the due date of the assignment (or in the case of emergencies, as soon as practicable). There will be five individual written assignments and one group assignment. In addition, you will submit four reflective reading responses and participate in class discussion during live sessions and on the course forums. The weighting of each assignment in the final grade is noted below in parentheses.

Individual

1. Information Needs/Information Seeking Behavior (12%)

Due: January 30

1. Digital Collections Assessment (12%)

Due: February 13

1. Search and Discovery I (15%)

Due: March 13

1. Indexing Consistency/Impact of Vocabulary on Access (12%)

Due: April 3

1. Search and Discovery II (12%)

Due: April 17

Group  
 Web-based Collection Report: Genre-Specific Considerations (20%)   
 Due: May 1

Writing exercises  
 Reading responses (four) (3% each for a total of 12%)  
 Due: Throughout the semester, by 11 p.m. on the day following the class when  
 the reading is due

Class participation (5%)

Papers will be evaluated on:  
 the understanding of the topic made evident in the paper  
 the analytical approach of the paper  
 the organization and articulation of the paper’s content

Forum contributions will be evaluated on:  
 the application of readings and lectures to the discussion  
 the relevance of the posting to the topic  
 the clarity of material presented

**Class Participation: 5 points total**

*Applicable learning outcome:* Communicate capably with diverse stakeholders, promoting not just access to but also effective use of information services and systems in specific contexts.

As you move into your professional lives, it will be necessary to articulate your ideas in both written and oral form. It is important that you think critically and present your ideas throughout the duration of the course.

Class participation constitutes 5% of your grade. Participation includes both involvement in weekly live sessions and postings to the Moodle forums. Assessment of student participation will be based on the quality of the contribution and level of student engagement, not on the quantity of participation.

Participation can include:

* Post questions or respond to other students’ postings on forums
* Analyze arguments in readings
* Provide examples and counter-examples
* Criticize readings
* Propose alternative literature, websites or resources
* Engage in breakout discussions and reporting out during live sessions

**INDIVIDUAL ASSIGNMENTS**

**Writing exercises: 12 points total**

**Reading responses (4 worth 3 points each)**

*Applicable learning outcome:* Apply foundational concepts, theories, and principles to problems of information organization and access

You are responsible for writing brief two paragraph (300-400 words) reading responses for *four* class sessions. Post to the forum set up for the week’s discussion by 11 pm on the day following the class meeting for that week. Include Reading Response #N in the subject line, so it will be clear which of your posts is to be evaluated as a reading response.

Before you begin

Read each assigned chapter or article carefully and critically. What are the key points? What are the key assumptions? How do the themes in the readings connect with others you have completed for this course or others? Do you have any experiences which relate to the readings? Stating criticisms of the readings are acceptable provided you make a clear argument and provide examples to back it up. Suggesting other readings or resources is perfectly acceptable, but tell us why/how you chose these alternative sources.

Rationale

Analysis and integration of readings, lectures, and class discussion are enhanced by opportunities to reflect on and synthesize the ideas presented. This assignment is designed to allow you to explore questions that you have or connections you have made between your own experiences, readings for this course or other coursework you have completed. These responses will provide an opportunity to demonstrate your ability to synthesize concepts, theories and practices covered in this course.

Writing

Some issues you may want to consider in your writing include:

1. The response must show you have read the article and thought about it, but it should not be a mere summary of what is in the article or reading(s). So,
2. Try to concentrate your writing on a focused topic. This may be a single article, or about a single topic that brings in several readings (that may include references to other material from outside of the class readings).
3. Try to make an argument, that is, support your opinion (viewpoint) with points from the article or your experience. You may also refute some points from the article. Try starting the response with a statement about the reading(s), and then see what you can write about it.
4. Why are you saying this? (For example, why is this topic or point important? Alternatively, how does it relate to class?)
5. When drawing parallels or making connections, explain the nature of the connection. In addition to referring to the class reading(s), you also might cite other readings for this connection if you want.

Submitting

Post to the forum set up for the week’s discussion by 11 pm on the day following the class meeting for that week. Include Reading Response #N in the subject line, so it will be clear which of your posts is to be evaluated as a reading response. Assessment will be based on evidence of engagement with issue(s) related to the class topic. Each response is worth a possible 3 points.

**1. Information Needs/Information Seeking Behavior**

**January 30 (12 points)**

*Applicable learning outcome:* Use evidence to help address information problems, meet information needs, and create relationships in their institutions, communities, profession, and the world.

Rationale  
The purpose of this exercise is two-fold. First, it is intended to allow you to examine the factors that condition the information needs or influence the information seeking behavior of a specific user group. Second, it affords you the opportunity to explore what types of research methods are used to do research on specific user groups. (See: <http://guides.library.illinois.edu/c.php?g=347168&p=2342339> and the Sage Methods Map <http://methods.sagepub.com/methods-map>).

Tasks  
1. Select a category of information user that interests you (e. g., high school student, scientist, health care consumer, migrant farm worker).   
2. Identify a published research study that investigates information needs and/or information seeking behavior of individuals from this population. The article should be a peer-reviewed piece of academic research. If you are uncertain whether a given article is appropriate for this exercise, feel free to consult with the instructor.

Deliverable  
In a brief essay of 600-750 words discuss your article’s research question, methods, findings, and implications for design of information systems and services (in-person, web-based, or both). Integrate relevant readings from those assigned for class in support of your arguments as appropriate.

Submission  
 Post your essay to the forum set up for this purpose.

Strategies for locating research studies:

Articles indexed under the subject “Information needs” or “Information-seeking behavior” in Library & Information Science Source (LISS link from <http://www.library.illinois.edu/infosci/>)

Articles indexed under the descriptor “Information seeking” or “Information needs” in ERIC (link from <http://www.library.illinois.edu/infosci/>)

Studies need not be recently published, but an example of a recent study of this type is the following:  
Suh, Minhyang (Mia); Hsieh, Gary. 2019. The “had mores”: Exploring Korean immigrants’ information behavior and ICT usage when settling in the United States.  
*Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology* 70(1): 38-48.  
Abstract  
The process of settling in a new country can be extremely challenging, entailing various information needs to cope with rapid changes and adjustments to a new environment. Through interviews with 16 Korean immigrants in the United States, we explored their information behaviors in the settlement process. In line with prior work (Shoham & Strauss, 2008), we found that Korean immigrants needed various types of information: housing, work, banking, transportation, law, school, health, and language. Out of these information types, the Korean immigrants prioritized information for education and struggled to seek health and legal information. We further uncovered that various information needs are closely intertwined and found an additional type of information need: to build a new social network after migration. They often used Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) as information sources while adapting the ICT infrastructures of the U.S. into their information practices. ICTs enabled them to build and maintain *“local”* and *“global”* identity; however, they may struggle to assess user‐generated content in the new context. We noted that their strong use of ICTs for intraethnic interaction might slow down their integration into the host society. We discuss implications for future work to support immigrants' settlement in the host country.  
  
To determine whether the full text of an article is available online, search for the journal title at: <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>. The text of the article may also be freely available on the web (e. g., on the author’s web site), so you might also try doing a Google search using the article title. If the text is not available online, you will need to request a copy of the article. See the LibGuide for Distance Learners and Instructors: Library Resources & Services: <http://guides.library.illinois.edu/friendly.php?s=distance_learners>

**2. Digital Collections Assessment**

**February 13 (12 points)**

*Applicable learning outcome:* Compare and critique contemporary information practices, structures, and standards in relation to historical and global alternatives.

Rationale  
 Issues around collections will become more understandable to you by critically examining an exemplar.  
   
 Tasks  
 Do some browsing across the two differing approaches to digital collections listed below.  
 Pick one DPLA exhibition or one Library of Congress digital collection of interest to you as an exemplar for your analysis.

(1) Digital Public Library of America (DPLA) exhibitions: <http://dp.la/exhibitions>  
 about: <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1caBYKDdQCpFCildS5XquNML5YzaugSL7Jf3CdBIIqOA/edit?pref=2&pli=1>  
 More information about DPLA can be found in: Ismail, Lizah. Digital Public Library of America. *The Charleston Advisor* 19(2): 25-30. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

(2) Library of Congress digital collections: <https://www.loc.gov/collections/>

Deliverable  
 For the exemplar you select, please write a narrative assessment of the content, organization, and potential users and uses. This should be in the form of an evaluative essay with an introduction and conclusion (750-800 words total). Integrate relevant readings in support of your arguments as appropriate.  Include the following considerations:

* How would you characterize the content and scope of your exemplar?
* How would you characterize the arrangement and organization of your exemplar?
* What categories of users is your exemplar intended to serve?
* How do the available content and organization serve the needs of the intended users?
* Can a user easily grasp the scope and arrangement?
* Who stewards the collection? What individuals and institutions are responsible for your exemplar?
* Are any changes in the content and organization conceivable? What implications would those have for the users, and for the stewards of the exemplar?
* Do universal design or accessibility appear to have been taken into consideration? How or how not? What implications are there for the users, and for the stewards of the exemplar?
* Do you consider your exemplar a collection? Justify why or why not, drawing on the readings.

Submission  
 Post your essay to the forum set up for this purpose.

**3. Search and Discovery I**

**March 13 (15 points)**

*Applicable learning outcome:* Compare and critique contemporary information practices, structures, and standards in relation to historical and global alternatives.

Rationale  
 Users may begin their search for information on a topic with a known item, but be interested in expanding their search to locate related material. In a physical collection, they can do this by locating an item on the shelf and then browsing the titles in proximity to that item to look for other material of potential interest. In catalogs, retrieval systems, and search engines, other approaches are needed to help the user locate related material once the record describing the initially sought item has been found.

Tasks  
In this assignment you will explore how efficient and effective various search tools are in leading you to material related to the item that is the starting point for your search. In this case you will be looking for two books: a (non-fiction) book by John G. Palfrey and Urs Gasser, *Born Digital: How children grow up in a digital age* and a (fiction) book by Toni Morrison, *Home.*  Consult the following search tools:

UIUC classic catalog   
<https://webvoyage.carli.illinois.edu/uiu/cgi-bin/Pwebrecon.cgi?DB=local&PAGE=First>

UIUC VuFind catalog <https://vufind.carli.illinois.edu/vf-uiu/>

Amazon <https://www.amazon.com>

As background for the VuFind catalog, you may find it interesting to read:

Brink-Drescher, J, (2014). VuFind: A next generation overlay. *The Charleston Advisor* 16(2): 46-54. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

As background on Amazon, you may find it interesting to read:  
De Fino, M. (2012). Amazon for technical services librarians: Making order of the jungle. *Technical Services Quarterly* 29(4): 280-291. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

For each interface, note the following, including any differences between the fiction and non-fiction title:

1. the content of the entry describing each book
2. mechanisms available to find related items
3. recall and precision of such mechanisms for search expansion—to what extent do they lead to additional relevant material and to what extent do they clutter the search results with items not likely to be of interest
4. design of the search interface and search result displays

Deliverable  
Write a paper summarizing your findings in either narrative or tabular form and comparing the strengths and weaknesses of these different tools for search and discovery. Integrate relevant readings in support of your arguments as appropriate.

Submission  
Submit your assignment through Moodle.

**4. Indexing consistency/impact of vocabulary on access**

**April 3 (12 points)***Applicable learning outcome:*  
 Apply foundational concepts, theories, and principles to problems of information organization and access

Rationale  
 The aim of this exercise is to become aware of the variations in indexing practices and to consider the access implications for user groups.

Tasks  
 The task is to assign keywords to a journal article and then compare the descriptors assigned for that article by professional indexing services.

The article to be used for the assignment is:  Nakata, Martin, Vicky Nakata, Gabrielle Gardiner, Jill McKeough, Alex Byrne, and Jason Gibson. (2008). "Indigenous Digital Collections: An Early Look at the Organisation and Culture Interface." *Australian Academic & Research Libraries* 39, no. 4: 223-236.  [Access the article at <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>].

1. Begin by reading the paper and determining what 3 keyword terms or phrases you think are the most important for describing and providing access to that paper.
2. *After you have assigned your own terms,*retrieve the bibliographic records for the paper from the following three article indexes.  Please note:  you’ll get *much* more out of this assignment if you make your own choices first, without looking at those in the existing indexes below, so please be sure to do it in that order!  
    (1) Library & Information Science Source (LISS)  
    (2) ERIC  
    (3) Inspec  
    [These can be located through the list of database links at <http://www.library.illinois.edu/infosci/>].
3. Identify the full subject headings, keywords, and/or descriptors that have been assigned to the article by each source.

Deliverable  
 Please write a two-to-three page paper. Some students find this more easily accomplished in the form of a table - select the method of presentation that best works for you.  Integrate relevant readings in support of your arguments as appropriate.

Please discuss:  
 1. The differences in subject coverage among the three indexes (and your own assigned terms).   
 2. Why the sources might differ in content and scope of indexing  
 3. The effectiveness of the headings for subject access by user groups likely to search for information on this topic  
  
 Submission  
 Submit your assignment through Moodle.

**5. Search and Discovery II**

**April 17 (12 points)***Applicable learning outcome:*  
 Compare and critique contemporary information practices, structures, and standards in relation to historical and global alternatives.

Rationale  
As the number and variety of resources in digital form have increased, libraries have sought to assist users through new tools supporting federated search and resource discovery. At Illinois this currently takes the form of a locally developed federated search recommender system called Easy Search (<http://www.library.illinois.edu/>). Information Sciences Easy Search (<http://www.library.illinois.edu/infosci/>) is a more specialized federated search recommender system that searches the major Information Sciences journal and book databases and other sources simultaneously.

Tasks  
To learn more about how Easy Search works, read the following: Mischo, W. H.; Schlembach, M. C.; Bishoff, J.; German, E. M. (2012). User search activities within an academic library gateway: implications for web-scale discovery systems. In *Planning and Implementing Resource Discovery Tools in Academic Libraries* (IGI-Global), pp. 153-171. [ebook] <http://vufind.carli.illinois.edu/vf-uiu/Record/uiu_6925214>.   
In this assignment you will also be using Google Scholar. More on this resource can be found in: Brown, C. C. (2017). Google Scholar *The Charleston Advisor* 19(2): 31-34. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]; Herther, N. K. (2017). Google Scholar: Library partner or database competitor?. *Online Searcher* 41(5): 30-34. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]. More about Google Scholar can be found in the LibGuide *Google for Scholars* <http://guides.library.illinois.edu/google>.

For this assignment, choose a topic covered in this course that you would like to learn more about.   
1) Try searching for it in *Information Sciences Easy Search* (http://www.library.illinois.edu/infosci/) both in title and as keywords.   
For each search (title vs. keywords), note the term(s) you searched and:  
 1) the number of items found in each of the resources searched  
 2) which resources yielded some relevant items among the first few items displayed  
 3) whether each resource yielded any unique items among the first few items   
 displayed   
2) Also do a keyword search for your topic in Google (<http://www.google.com>) and Google Scholar (<http://scholar.google.com>) to explore how useful these tools are compared to the library resources searched by Easy Search.

Deliverable  
Write a paper summarizing your findings in either narrative or tabular form. What do you see as the strengths and weaknesses of these alternative approaches to locating material on a topic? Integrate relevant readings in support of your arguments as appropriate.

Submission   
Submit your assignment through Moodle.

**GROUP ASSIGNMENT**

**Web-based Collection Report: Genre-specific considerations**

**May 1 (20 points)**

(completed by groups of 3-4)

*Applicable learning outcomes:* Use evidence to help address information problems, meet information needs, and create relationships in their institutions, communities, profession, and the world.   
 Communicate capably with diverse stakeholders, promoting not just access to but also effective use of information services and systems in specific contexts.  
 Apply core ethical principles to professional practice.

Your information organization has received a grant to develop a small collection, and your group has been put in charge of managing the grant. All of the items in the collection will be of a single genre or type of material of your choice and it is a medium that your organization has not handled before. As a first step, your group has been asked to prepare a web-based report that explores the important issues and approaches to dealing with this collection. You will post the URL of the report on the last day of class to the forum set up for this purpose. You will choose one or more group members to do a short live presentation on the project during the final class period. Other roles which individual members can fill include schedule coordination/project manager and site editing.

In organizing the group to complete this project, it will probably work best for each member of the group to take primary responsibility for one of the topics. Once the individual areas of responsibility have been worked out, each individual investigates his/her topic and collaborates with the website coordinator to put together the webpage(s) needed to convey the desired information (e. g., preservation of this type of material). The website should include a simple introductory page that points to the individual pages. In addition to hosting your website on an iSchool server, there are a number of other options for setting up your website, including those described here: <https://courses.ischool.illinois.edu/course/view.php?id=2743>. For some example projects from fall semester 2018, see:

Art <https://digitalcultures.wixsite.com/throughourfingers>  
Music <https://501musicgroup.wixsite.com/hammereddulcimer>  
Rare Books <https://jessicalicklider0.wixsite.com/is501>

Possible genres include:

Art  
Biological specimens  
Comics/Graphic novels  
Cookbooks  
Datasets  
Fiction  
Folklore  
Games  
Genealogical resources  
Institutional records  
Legal materials  
Maps  
Music  
Oral histories  
Personal papers  
Photos  
Picture books  
Rare books  
Software  
Toys  
Video  
Young Adult literature

Resources that will be useful to you as background for completing this assignment include:

Arizona State Library, Archives & Public Records Collection Development Training   
<http://www.azlibrary.gov/libdev/continuing-education/cdt>

Smyth, Elaine B. (1999). A practical approach to writing a collection development policy. *Rare Books and Manuscripts Librarianship* 14(1): 27-31. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

**Required components:**

**Report: (15 points)**Organize your web-based report around the pertinent topics of this course:

**use and users** (who are they/what are their information seeking needs)  
**collections** (what type of collection material is proposed, what are the likely sources, what type of use is anticipated)  
**organization** (item description/metadata scheme and physical arrangement of items)  
**subject access** (subject vocabulary, classification, controlled or uncontrolled)  
**preservation** (preservation considerations and strategies for this material).

Include your own findings and analysis as well as relevant resources for someone interested in learning more about organization of and access to this type of material. Post the URL for the final report to the forum created for this purpose on the day of your presentation.

**Individual component: (5 points)**

By the day following your presentation each group member will turn in a brief summary (no more than one page) of your own observations about the project itself. Note any elements of the project to which you directly contributed, anything that you think went especially well, what could have been improved, and anything that you would have liked to do differently. Submit this through Moodle.

**UNGRADED ASSIGNMENT**

**February 20**

**Database Design (LibraryThing)***Applicable learning outcome:* Apply foundational concepts, theories, and principles to problems of information organization and access

For this assignment, you will create an entity-relationship diagram outlining a possible data model for the commercial website LibraryThing (<https://www.librarything.com/>). You should browse the LibraryThing website, identifying the major entities about which LibraryThing records information, the attributes for each of those entities, and the relationships which exist between the various entities. Here are some recommendations for how to familiarize yourself with LibraryThing and the information it records:

1. You should first obtain a basic familiarity with LibraryThing's features and operation. Take the tour of the site (<https://www.librarything.com/tour/>) and look at the “About LibraryThing” page (<https://www.librarything.com/about>) and the “LibraryThing Concepts” page (<https://www.librarything.com/concepts>).
2. Next, study how LibraryThing records information about bibliographic entities. You might want to first read the page “About Books and Works” at <https://www.librarything.com/about_works.php> to see how LibraryThing approaches the issues that FRBR tries to address. Then, examine the information that LibraryThing records on some individual items. Look at the information available for Alberto Manguel's *A History of Reading* (<https://www.librarything.com/work/2968>) and Tracy Chevalier’s *The Lady and the Unicorn* (<https://www.librarything.com/work/2987>)*.*  Look at **all** the information and the “Conversations,” as well as the "Recommendations" section.
3. In addition to traditional subject headings, LibraryThing supports the assignment of user defined "tags" to works. Look at the information available on user assigned tags by looking at the page for a particular tag (e.g,, “unicorns” at <https://www.librarything.com/tag/unicorns>).
4. Next you should look at the types of information that LibraryThing uses to enable its various social features. You should start by looking at the information available regarding individual users by examining some user profile pages. Some librarians who inhabit LibraryThing include the user LAKobow (<https://www.librarything.com/profile/LAKobow>) and librarygeekadam (<https://www.librarything.com/profile/librarygeekadam>)
5. Look over the information available on Groups at <https://www.librarything.com/groups_top.php> and also look at a particular group's information, such as “Librarians who LibraryThing” (<https://www.librarything.com/groups/librarianswholibrar>). Make sure to look at a group's forum.

Based on your examination of the various forms of information available through LibraryThing, you will need to develop an entity-relationship diagram which describes the major entities present in LibraryThing, their respective attributes, and their relationships to one another. Your diagram should include three or four entities: (1) Work; (2) Book; and at least one other (such as Author). Each entity needs at least two attributes within your diagram. You will not submit the diagram; instead we will allow time in class to discuss them.

Background article:

Melton, R. (2016). LibraryThing: A review. *Journal of Electronic Resources in Medical Libraries* 13(4): 171-176. [e-journal] [Locate full text from <https://sfx.carli.illinois.edu/sfxuiu/az>]

For updates you can peruse the LibraryThing blog:   
<http://blog.librarything.com/main/>

As some of you may use Goodreads, here is one example of opinions on LibraryThing vs. Goodreads: <https://www.quora.com/What-are-the-pros-and-cons-of-Goodreads-compared-to-A-Library-Thing-in-terms-of-overall-usefulness-to-book-lovers>

And related posts at LibraryThing: <https://www.librarything.com/topic/223452>