crossings of these axes. More importantly, by placing emphasis on human activities mediated by information and technology, this articulation shifts the field's focus from agencies of collection such as libraries or archives, which more typically are invoked when describing subject coverage in schools of library *and* information science, to the contexts in which people, information and technology interact.

The invocation of technology within coverage has some downsides, however. As far back as the work of Shera (1967) and Machlup and Mansfield (1983) there were doubts expressed about how the field of librarianship was embracing technology, with particular concern that technology was being treated only as a tool for demonstrating academic relevance rather than as a genuine basis for disciplinary identity. These concerns are not out of place now when new tools arrive at a breakneck pace and each can become a focus of research study divorced from broader contexts of human behavior, but it is reasonable to claim that information schools have largely avoided this technological trap by emphasizing human and social processes enabled through technology and by allowing faculty interest to draw natural boundaries around areas of research concern. Like most distinctions drawn in comparing disciplines however, one would be advised not to treat the line as always clearly drawn.

In my view, this distinguisher of iSchools in terms of coverage is real but subtle, and one has to dig below to surface to recognize it, particularly at the curricular level, though it is a thesis waiting to be conducted. From one viewpoint, LIS curricula are more focused on services and functions within the information lifecycle, with some emphasis on roles and responsibilities for professionals in these specific areas. Technology, in this educational orientation, is conceived more as supportive or supplementary to the skills and practices of the profession. Such an orientation is less obviously found in iSchools curricula

where the move away from an agency-focused model of information has led to coursework treating information in more contextual terms e.g., through the social, cultural or individual dynamics of creation and use, often coupled with deeper computational content within the coursework. In theory, this approach serves the student well, no matter their final career trajectory, but it can prove difficult to determine the direct impact of coursework on careers, and this opens the door to some critics who portray such a curriculum as divorced from current or traditional professional roles (Gorman, 2004).

This shift of emphasis also has consequences for those iSchools seeking ALA-accreditation (currently 17 of the 33 members of the iCaucus) and even within the general framing of coverage under the people, information, and technology axes, there are alternative or complementary articulations of disciplinary coverage reflected in various iSchool web pages and publications. At the University of Texas, we consider information to be a means of accelerating discovery through three core processes: curation of important resources, organization of information for management and use, and understanding and enabling interactions with information in technologically-appropriate ways that work best for real people. Within this framing, libraries can provide one context of study, but they are not privileged as more important than many other possible contexts. Other iSchools have their own interpretations and expressions of coverage too. To be clear, more traditional schools also cover technology and people. However they often do so within a narrower context, placing particular emphasis on this organizational setting in which the practices occur, and in so doing emphasizing particular organizations (libraries and archives, for example) as more important to their focus than others. To be an iSchool is to place greater emphasis on broader human activities over these concerns with the specific agency or organizational form