

LSC 608: *Collection Development*

Course Description

Instructor: Sydney Pierce (pierce@cua.edu; phone 301-277-3036)

COURSE DESCRIPTION: Principles & practices in selecting, evaluating, and managing collections in all types of libraries and information formats. Survey of factors affecting collection building: institutional goals, user characteristics and needs, the publishing industry, special characteristics of materials in particular subject fields, formats, and genres. Consideration of such topics as collection development policies, resource sharing, and digital collections. (3 credits; no prerequisites)

OBJECTIVES: Upon completion of the course, students should be able to:

1. Identify production, marketing, and distribution practices that determine availability;
2. Describe how materials are acquired by libraries and other information agencies, or otherwise made available to their users.
3. Analyze user needs and develop collections responsive to them;
4. Discuss legal and ethical issues involved in the production, distribution, and use of materials, including responding appropriately to attempts to restrict collection content or use.

TEXT: NONE. See the course schedule below for required readings. The course schedule also includes additional readings that are "*recommended for those interested in reading further*". They are not required.

Students who need help with library jargon used in class and readings may find Joan Reitz's **ODLIS: Online Dictionary of Library & Information Science** (<http://www.lu.com/odlis>) useful.

AcqWeb [<http://www.acqweb.org/>] - though currently inactive - and the journals ***Against the Grain*** and ***Library Collections, Acquisitions, & Technical Services*** are recommended for browsing as are ***The Acquisitions Librarian***, ***Ariadne*** [<http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/>], ***D-Lib Magazine*** [<http://www.dlib.org/>], **Independent Publisher** [<http://www.independentpublisher.com/>], ***Journal of Scholarly Publishing***, ***Journal of Electronic Publishing*** [<http://journalofelectronicpublishing.org/>], ***Library Resources & Technical Services***, ***Publisher's Weekly***, ***Publishing Research Quarterly***, and ***The Serials Librarian***. For policies and procedures, see the **ARL SPEC Kits** (recent items summarized on the ARL web site at: <http://www.arl.org/pubs/spec/complete.html>) or the ALA/ACRL **CLIP Notes** (Mullen Z675.U5 C45).

ASSIGNMENTS: 2 projects (one on reviewing - 15% of grade, the other on collection evaluation - 15% of grade for part A, 20% of grade for part B), and 2 essay exams (an in-class midterm and a take-home final, each 25% of grade). Assignment sheets for projects are attached. Questions for the midterm will be selected from questions distributed a week in advance.

GRADING: A 12-point system will be used to grade exams and projects. Grading criteria are given on assignment sheets and on lists of exam questions. Points received for projects and exams will be weighted as indicated above, and grades assigned on the following basis: 12 = A, 11 = A-, 10 = B+, 9 = B, 8 = B-, 6 - 7 = C, less than 6 = F. Grades will be based on assignments and exams as submitted or completed. No rewriting, no retaking exams, no "extra credit."

DUE DATES: Projects may be handed in up to 10 PM the following Saturday night without excuse or penalty. (Electronic submission is always welcome.) Those received later will be penalized one point for each 12 hours (or portion thereof) of lateness. No extensions granted after the original due date, so be sure to have at least a draft ready on the due date, in case disaster strikes later.

CLASS ATTENDANCE: Attendance has no direct effect on course grades, but class content is important. Should you miss class, for whatever reason, it is your responsibility to get notes from classmates. The instructor is happy to discuss what was covered, but does not guarantee completeness, nor does she prepare class notes for student use.

ADA ACCOMMODATION: Students with disabilities requiring ACCOMMODATION under federal regulations should present a written accommodation request to the instructor by the second class meeting. It is strongly recommended that the student contact the **Office of Disability Support Services**, Suite 207, Pryzbyla Center (<http://disabilitysupport.cua.edu/> , [http://cuadisabilityservices@cua.edu](mailto:cuadisabilityservices@cua.edu) 202-319-5211). This is the University office responsible for disability accommodation and services, and its staff can answer questions about services and requirements regarding documentation.

ACADEMIC HONESTY: Please read the policy on “Student Academic Dishonesty” in the University’s Online Student Handbook - see <http://policies.cua.edu/academicundergrad/integrity.cfm> . Incidences of academic dishonesty, defined in the Handbook as “failure to observe rules of fairness in taking exams or writing papers, plagiarism, fabrication, and cheating” will result in a grade of F (0 points) on the project or exam in question, and will be reported to the Dean for possible further action (including failure in the course). See the *Handbook* or discuss the problem with your instructor if you have questions about what is involved in such offenses. Plagiarism will not be tolerated. The University defines plagiarism to include “[1] intentionally or knowingly representing the words or ideas of another as one’s own in any academic exercise; [2] failure to attribute any of the following: quotations, paraphrases, or borrowed information from print sources or websites; [3] buying completed papers from other to use as one’s own work”. For more on what constitutes plagiarism and how to avoid it, please read (carefully) Margaret Proctor’s “**How Not to Plagiarize**” [<http://www.utoronto.ca/writing/plagsep.html>] .

SCHEDULE OF CLASSES

Sat Sept 1 * LABOR DAY WEEKEND *** *** PROJECT I ASSIGNED in lieu of class *****

Sat Sept 8 Marketing Library Materials: Reviews & Reviewing * PROJECT I DUE ***
REQUIRED READINGS:**

ALA/ACRL. (2004). *Choice*. Selection Policy.

[<http://www.ala.org/ala/acrl/acrlpubs/choice/selectionpolicy/selectionpolicy.cfm>]

_____. Information for Reviewers [<http://www.ala.org/ala/acrl/acrlpubs/choice/inforeview/reviewers.cfm>]

Cox, Jim. (2004) “How the Book Review System Works.”

[<http://www.midwestbookreview.com/bookbiz/advice/system.htm>]

Recommended for those interested in reading further:

Beckerman, Gail. (2004) “The Education of Stacy Sullivan.” *Columbia Journalism Review*, Sept-Oct 2004.

[<http://cjrarchives.org/issues/2004/5/ideas-books-beckerman.asp>]

Complete Review. “Links to Book Review Sites” [<http://www.complete-review.com/links/links.html>]

Dalhousie Univ Library. (2000) “How to Write a Book Review”. [<http://www.library.dal.ca/how/bookrev.htm>]

Eisenberg, Howard. (1987). “So Many Books, So Little Space.” *Publishers Weekly*, April 10, 1987, pp. 25-30.

Horning, Kathleen. (2006). *From Cover to Cover: Evaluating and Reviewing Children’s Books*. New York: HarperCollins, 1997.

Howard, G. (1997). “Cultural Ecology of Book Reviewing.” In Dennis, E. et al. (eds.), *Publishing Books*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books), pp. 75-91.

Krupczak, M. (1999). “Different Books for Different Folks: Where Book Reviews Come From....” *Library Collections, Acquisitions, & Technical Services* 23: 196-198.

Span, Paula. (2001). “Bestseller Dreams.” [Plight of the midlist author] *The Washington Post* [Sunday] *Magazine*, 4 February 2001, pp. 10-15, 23-29.

Sager, D. et al. (1993). “Reviewing the Reviewers.” *Public Libraries* 32:11-12, 14, 16-17.

Wilson, M & Bishop, K. (1999). “Criteria for Reviewing Children’s Books.” *Library Resources & Technical Services* 49: 3-13.

Yahoo. Directory: Book Reviews. [<http://dir.yahoo.com/Arts/Humanities/Literature/Reviews/>]

Sat Sept 15 Publishing I: Books

REQUIRED READINGS:

- Lynch, Clifford. (2001). "The Battle to Define the Book in a Digital World." *First Monday* 6(6), June 2001. [http://www.firstmonday.org/issues/issue6_6/lynch/index.html]
- Wikipedia. "Publishing" [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Book_publishing]

Recommended for those interested in reading further:

- Bookjobs [jobs in publishing - and how to get one]. [<http://www.bookjobs.com/>]
- Bookwire. *Book Industry Statistics*. [<http://www.bookwire.com/BookIndustryStatistics.asp>]
- BookCloseOuts. [online bookstore specializing in remainders] [<http://www.bookcloseouts.com>]
- Epstein, J. (2002). *Book Business: Publishing Past, Present, Future*. New York: Norton.
- Esposito, J. (2005). "The Processed Book." *FirstMonday*, March 2003, rev. 2005. [http://firstmonday.org/issues/issue8_3/esposito/index.html]
- Murphy, Patricia C. (1999). *Books are Dead, Long Live Books* [<http://web.mit.edu/comm-forum/papers/murphy.html>]
- The Online Books Page [25,000+ free online books] [<http://onlinebooks.library.upenn.edu/>]
- Schiffirin, A. (2000). *The Business of Books: How International Conglomerates Took Over Publishing and Changed the Way We Read*. New York: Verso.
- Terry, A. A. (2001). "Author Care: The Rights Publishers Offer and What Authors Think." *Against the Grain*, June 2001, pp. 24, 26, 28.
- Thatcher, S. G. (1994). "Listbuilding at University Presses." In R. J. Simon & J. J. Fyfe (eds.), *Editors as Gatekeepers*, (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield), pp. 209-258.

Sat Sept 22 Publishing II: Serials, Etc.

REQUIRED READINGS:

- Guedon, J-C. (2001). "In Oldenburg's Long Shadow." In: Proceedings of the 138th Annual Meeting, ARL, May 23-25, 2001. [<http://www.arl.org/resources/pubs/mmproceedings/138guedon.shtml>]
- Van Orsdel, L. & Born, K. (2007). "Journals in the Time of Google." *Library Journal*, April 15, 2006. [<http://www.libraryjournal.com/article/CA6321722.html>]
- Wikipedia. "Peer Review" [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Peer_review]

Recommended for those interested in reading further:

Particularly highly recommended - some attempts to educate users about serials prices:

- Brown: http://www.brown.edu/Administration/George_Street_Journal/vol24/24GSJ19c.html
- U of Maryland: <http://www.hshsl.umaryland.edu/information/news/exhibits/money/> - try the quiz, too
- Particularly highly recommended: Association of Research Libraries. *Scholarly Communication: Libraries in the Marketplace*. [<http://www.arl.org/sc/marketplace/index.shtml>].
- Bergstrom, T. & McAfee, P. *Journal Cost-Effectiveness Search*. [<http://www.journalprices.com/>]
- Daly, C., et al. (1996). *The Magazine Publishing Industry*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Jeon-Slaughter, H. et al. (2005). "Economics of Scientific and Biomedical Journals: Where Do Scholars Stand?" *First Monday*, March 2005. [http://www.firstmonday.org/issues/issue10_3/jeon/]
- Luther, J. (2001). *White Paper on Electronic Journal Usage Statistics*. 2nd ed. Washington, DC: CLIR. [<http://www.clir.org/PUBS/reports/pub94/contents.html>]
- Stevens-Rayburn, S. & Bouton, E. (1999). *If It's Not on the Web, It Doesn't Exist at All* [<http://www.stsci.edu/stsci/meetings/lisa3/stevens-rayburns.html>]
- Weller, Ann C. (2001). *Editorial Peer Review: Its Strengths and Weaknesses*. Medford, NJ: Information Today.

Sept 29 Copyright & Licensing

REQUIRED READINGS:

- American Assn of Law Libraries. (2004). *Principles for Licensing Electronic Resources*, 2nd ed. [http://www.aallnet.org/committee/reports/licensing_com_final_rep.pdf]
- Farb, Sharon. (2006). "Libraries, Licensing, and the Challenge of Stewardship." *FirstMonday*, 11 (7), July 2006. [http://www.firstmonday.org/issues/issue11_7/farb/index.html]
- Harper, Georgia K. (2001). *Copyright Endurance and Change* *Journal of Electronic Publishing*, 7 (1), August 2001. [<http://www.press.umich.edu/jep/07-01/harper.html>]

Sept 29 - Recommended for those interested in reading further:

Particularly highly recommended: University of Texas System. Copyright Crash Course
[<http://www.utsystem.edu/OGC/IntellectualProperty/cprtindx.htm>]

Particularly highly recommended: Yale University Libraries. LibLicense: Licensing Digital Information
[<http://www.library.yale.edu/~llicense/index.shtml>]

Amer Assn of Law Libs. (2001). *AALL Guidelines on the Fair Use of Copyrighted Works by Law Libraries*
[for libraries in profit-making institutions] [http://www.aallnet.org/about/policy_fair.asp]

Assn of Research Libraries. (2007). *Copyright Timeline: A History of Copyright in the United States*
[<http://www.arl.org/pp/ppcopyright/copyresources/copytimeline.shtml>]

Bell, S.J. (2001). The New Digital Divide: Dissecting Aggregator Exclusivity Deals . *D-Lib Magazine*,
July/August 2001. [<http://www.dlib.org/dlib/july01/bell/07bell.html>]

Committee on Intellectual Property Rights et al. (2001). The Digital Dilemma: Intellectual Property in the
Information Age. National Academy of Sciences. [http://www.nap.edu/html/digital_dilemma/]

Copyright Clearance Center. [<http://www.copyright.com/ccc/home.do>]

Creative Commons. [<http://creativecommons.org/>]

Gasaway, L. (2003). *When Works Pass Into the Public Domain* [<http://www.unc.edu/~uncing/public-d.htm>]

Horava, Ton7. (2007). "Licensing e-Resources for Alumni". *CRL News*, July/Aug 2007.

[<http://www.ala.org/ala/acrl/acrlpubs/crlnews/backissues2007/julyaugust07/licesingeresources.cfm>]

LibraryLaw.com [<http://www.librarylaw.com>]

Stallman, Richard. (1997). " The Right to Read " Communications of the ACM 40 (no.2, Feb 1997).

[<http://www.gnu.org/philosophy/right-to-read.html>]

U. S. National Commission on New Technological Uses of Copyrighted Works.(CONTU). *Final Report*.

[<http://digital-law-online.info/CONTU/contu1.html>]

U of Texas. *Fair Use: Electronic Reserve*. [<http://www.utsystem.edu/ogc/intellectualProperty/rsrvguid.htm>]

Oct 6 Distribution & Acquisitions I (Basic Functions, Single Orders, Out of Print)

REQUIRED READINGS:

ALA. ALCTS. Acquisitions Section. Statement on Principles and Standards of Acquisitions Practices
[<http://www.ala.org/ala/alctscontent/alctspubsbucket/alctsresources/acquisitionsres/ethicsacq/principlesstandards.htm>]

Ariz State Library. Acquisitions. [<http://www.dlapr.lib.az.us/cdt/acquis.htm>]

Recommended for those interested in reading further:

ARL. (1999) SPEC Kit 241. *The Gifts and Exchange Function*. [

<http://www.arl.org/bm~doc/spec241web.pdf>] Better Business Bureau. *Phony Invoice Schemes* [<http://www.bbb.org/alerts/article.asp?ID=453>]

Boissonnas, Christian M. (1987). "The Cost Is More Than That Elegant Dinner: Your Ethics Are at Steak."
Library Acquisitions: Practice & Theory 145: 145-152.

R.R. Bowker Co. ISBN FAQ. [<http://www.isbn.org/standards/home/isbn/us/isbnqa.asp>]

BUBL Link Catalogue of Internet Resources: *Acquisitions*. [<http://bubl.ac.uk/link/a/acquisitions.htm>]

Clark, John R. (2007). *Publisher's Hall of Shame*. [<http://personalpages.tds.net/~berek/shame.html>]

Internet Library for Librarians: Acquisitions, Serials, and Collection Development.

[<http://www.itcompany.com/inforetriever/acqsercd.htm>]

Maxwell, Kim. (2007). *The Art of Claiming*. [<http://libstaff.mit.edu/colserv/seracq/claiming/>]

Orkiszewski, P. (2005) "...Amazon.com as a Library ... Vendor." *Lib Resources & Tech Servs* 49: 204-209.

Smith, Scott A. (1999). "The Cost of Service: Understanding the Business of Vendors", pp. 59-74 in: K. A. Schmidt (ed.), *Understanding the Business of Library Acquisitions*. Chicago: ALA.

Oct 13 Distribution & Acquisitions II (Approval Plans, Standing Orders, Serials)

***** MIDTERM QUESTIONS DISTRIBUTED IN CLASS *****

REQUIRED READINGS:

Association of Subscription Agents. *The Work of Subscription Agents*

[<http://www.subscription-agents.org/documents/asa11.html>]

Grahame, Vicki & McAdam, Tim. (2004). *Managing the Licensing of Electronic Products*. ARL Spec Kit
282. Washington, DC: ARL. [<http://www.arl.org/bm~doc/spec282web.pdf>]

Maxwell, Kim, et al. (2004). *The Art of Claiming: Background Information for Claiming*

[<http://libstaff.mit.edu/colserv/seracq/claiming/background.html>]

Oct 13 - Recommended for those interested in reading further:

Particularly highly recommended: University of California, Santa Barbara. Libs. Task Force,, (2004).

Yankee & Gobi [approval / blanket order plans] *Questions and Answers*.

[<http://www.library.ucsb.edu/collman/cm Yankee.html>]

ALA/ALCTS. Serials Section Acquisitions Committee. (1997). *Guide to Performance Evaluation of Serials Vendors*. Chicago: ALA.

Anderson, Rick & Zink, S. (2003). "Implementing the Unthinkable: Demise of the Periodical Check-In." *Library Collections, Acquisitions, and Technical Services* 27: 61-71.

Flood, Susan, Ed. (1998). *Guide to Managing Approval Plans*. Chicago, ALA.

MacLennan, Birdie. (2006). *Serials in Cyberspace* [<http://www.uvm.edu/~bmaclenn/>]

Montgomery, C. H. (2000). "Measuring the Impact of an Electronic Journal Collection on Library Costs". *D-Lib Magazine*, October 2000 (vol. 6 no. 10).

[<http://www.dlib.org/dlib/october00/montgomery/10montgomery.html>]

Sennyey, P. (1997). "Assessing Blanket Order Effectiveness: A Neglected Task...." *Library Acquisitions: Practice & Theory* 21: 445-54.

Oct 20 MIDTERM EXAM (in class)

Oct 27 Selection & Weeding

REQUIRED READING:

Arizona State Library. *Collection Development Policies*. [<http://www.lib.az.us/cdt/colldev.htm>]

Keller, Michael A, et al. (2003). "What is a Library Anymore, Anyway?" *First Monday*, 8(5), May 2003.

[http://firstmonday.org/issues/issue8_5/keller/index.html]

Klopfert, K. (2000). "Weed It!" [http://www.wmrls.org/services/colldev/weed_it.html]

Recommended for those interested in reading further:

The following two articles are best read together - and are both highly recommended:

Pearl, Nancy & Buthold, C. (1992). "Upgrading the 'McLibrary'." *Library Journal*, 15 Oct 1992, pp. 37-39.

Rawlinson, Nora. (1990). "Give 'Em What They Want!" *Library Journal*, 15 June 1990, pp. 77-79.

Particularly highly recommended: UC- Santa Barbara. Univ Libs. Task Force... (2004). *Helpful Hints for*

Developing Subject Expertise ... [<http://www.library.ucsb.edu/collman/cmmhelpfulhints.html>]

Particularly highly recommended: Univ of Maryland Libs. *Collection Development Policy: Electronic*

Resources. [<http://www.lib.umd.edu/CLMD/COLL.Policies/elecrescdp.html>]

Baker, S. L. (2002). *The Responsive Public Library Collection*. 2d ed. Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.

Baltimore County Public Schools. *Selection Criteria for School Library Media Collections*.

[<http://www.bcps.org/offices/lis/office/admin/selection.html>]

Frey, Thomas (2005). *The Future of Libraries: Beginning the Great Transformation*. Louisville, CO:

DaVinci Institute. [<http://www.davinciinstitute.com/page.php?ID=120>]

Rutledge, J. & Swindler, L.(1987). "Selection Decision." *College & Research Libraries* 48:123-131.

University of Arizona. Library. *Needs Assessment Tutorial*. [how to do a community needs assessment]

[<http://digital.library.arizona.edu/nadm/tutorial/index.htm>]

Nov 3 Evaluating Collections & Preservation

***** PROJECT II (A and B) ASSIGNED *****

REQUIRED READINGS:

Lavoie, B & Dempsey, L. (2004) "Thirteen Ways of Looking at ... Digital Preservation." *D-Lib Magazine*,

July/Aug, 2004 [<http://www.dlib.org/dlib/july04/lavoie/07lavoie.html>]

Henty, Margaret. (2004). *Guide to the Collection Assessment Process*.

[<http://www.nal.gov.au/libraries/help/guide.html#tech>]

Recommended for those interested in reading further:

Particularly highly recommended: Patkus, Beth. (2003). *Assessing Preservation Needs: A Self-Survey*

Guide . Andover, MA: Northeast Document Conservation Center.

[<http://www.nedcc.org/oldnedccsite/selfsurvey/contents.htm>]

Nov 3 - Recommended for those interested in reading further, continued:

ALA Office of Intellectual Freedom. Evaluating Library Collections. .

[<http://www.ala.org/ala/oif/statementspols/statementsif/interpretations/evaluatinglibrary.htm>]

Baird, J.B. et al. (1997). "Findings from the Condition Surveys Conducted by the University of Kansas Libraries [durability of paperbacks]." *College & Research Libraries* 58: 115-126.

Baker, N. (2001). *Double Fold: Libraries and the Assault on Paper*. New York: Random.

Biggs, Mary. (1990). "Discovering How Information Seekers Seek: Methods of Measuring Reference Collection Use." *The Reference Librarian* 29: 103-117.

Cornell University Libraries. (2003). Digital Preservation Management [tutorial].

[http://www.library.cornell.edu/iris/tutorial/dpm/eng_index.html]

Inland Empire Libs Disaster Response Network. *Sample Disaster Plan*.

[<http://www.ieldrn.org/sample.htm>]

Lundin, A. H. (1989). "List-Checking....." *Collection Management* 11 (3/4): 103-112.

Northeast Document Conservation Center. *Online Course: Preservation 101*

[<http://www.nedcc.org/education/online.php>]

National Library of Australia. *PADI: Preserving Access to Digital Information*. [<http://www.nla.gov.au/padi/>]

Shisler, C.M. (2007). "Evaluating Your Nursing Collection." *Journal of the Med Lib Assn*, July 2007.

[<http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=1924961>]

Slote, Stanley. (1997). *Weeding Library Collections*. 4th ed. Englewood, CO: Libs Unlimited.

Texas State Library & Archives. 1995. *The CREW Method: Expanded Guidelines for Collection Evaluation and Weeding* [<http://www.tsl.state.tx.us/ld/pubs/crew/>]

UC-San Diego. Preserving Library Materials. [<http://orpheus.ucsd.edu/preservation/ieduc.html>]

And...some articles on Google Books and other web-based initiatives:

Albanese, A. R. (2007). "Scan This Book [Google vs. Open Content Alliance]." *Library Journal*, August 15, 2007. [<http://www.libraryjournal.com/article/CA6466634.html>]

Duguid, Paul. (2007). "Inheritance and Loss? A Brief Survey of Google Books." *First Monday* 12 (8), August 2007. [http://www.firstmonday.org/issues/issue12_8/duguid/index.html]

Sat Nov 10 * NO CLASS *** ASSIGNMENT IN LIEU OF CLASS: PROJECT II-A *****

Nov 17 Different Institutional Types * PROJECT II-A DUE *****

REQUIRED READINGS: None .

Recommended for those interested in reading further:

Colorado State Lib. *Research and Statistics about Libraries*. [<http://www.lrs.org/index.php>]

Academic libraries:

Assn of Research Libs. *Strategic Plan, 2005-2009*. [<http://www.arl.org/arl/governance/stratplan.shtml>]

Assn of Southeastern Research Libs. (2000). *Shaping the Future...Competencies for Research Librarians*. <http://www.aserl.org/statements/competencies/competencies.htm>

Boston College Libraries. *Collection Development* [Competencies].

[http://www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/ulib/staff/cdbasic.html]

Budd, J (1991). "Allocation Formulas in the Literature". *Library Acquisitions: Practice & Theory* 15: 95-107.

Joswick, K. E. & Stierman, J. K. (1997). "The Core List Mirage." *College & Research Libraries* 58: 48-55. [Faculty vs. student journal preferences in an academic library]

Univ of California, Santa Barbara. Libraries. (2007). *Collection Manager's Manual*

[<http://www.library.ucsb.edu/collman/index.html>]

Public Libraries:

Arizona. Collection Development Training for Arizona Public Libraries.

[<http://www.dlapr.lib.az.us/cdt/index.htm>]

Baker, Sharon L. (2002). *The Responsive Public Library Collection: How to Develop and Market a Winning Collection*. 2d ed. Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.

Memorial Hall [Public] Library [Andover, MA]. (2005) *Collection Development Manual*.

[<http://www.mhl.org/about/policies/cd/>]

Molz, K. & Dain, P. (1999). *Civic Space / Cyberspace: The ... Public Library in the Information Age*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Nov 17 - Recommended readings, continued:

School Libraries:

ALA/AASL/AECT. (1998). *Information Power*. Chicago: ALA

Bertrand, Linda. Resources for School Librarians: Collection Development.

[<http://www.sldirectory.com/libsf/resf/coldev2.html>]

MacKenzie, Jaime. (2004). "The Techno-Savvy, Book-Rich Media Center." *From Now On*, April 2004.

[<http://fno.org/apr04/technosavvy.html>]

Manning, P & Newman, A.R. (1986). "Safety Isn't Always First." *School Library Journal*, Oct 1986, 99-102

[Dangers in books recommended to kids for science fair projects] <http://www.psla.org/>

Shannon, D. (2001). "Education and Competencies of ... Media Specialists." *School Lib Media Research*, 5

[<http://www.ala.org/ala/aasl/aaslpubsandjournals/slmrb/slmrcontents/volume52002/shannon.cfm>]

Todd, Ross. (2001). *Transitions for Preferred Futures of School Libraries*. IASL Conference, 2001,

Auckland, NZ. [<http://www.iasl-slo.org/virtualpaper2001.html>]

Van Orden, P. & Bishop, K. (2001). *Collection Program in Schools*, 3rd ed. Englewood, CO: Lib Unlimited
Special Libraries

Finnerty, C. (2002). "Library Planning in the Electronic Era." *Information Outlook*, Aug 2002.

[<http://www.sla.org/content/Shop/Information/infoonline/2002/aug02/finnerty.cfm>]

Franklin, B. & Plum, T. (2004). "Library Usage Patterns in a Networked Environment."

Information Research 9(4), July 2004. [<http://informationr.net/ir/9-4/paper187.html>]

Schmidt, C. & Eckerman, N. (2001). "Circulation of Core Collection Monographs...." *Journal of the Med Lib*

Assn, April 2001 [<http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=31723>]

Special Libraries Association. (2003). *Competencies for Information Professionals of the 21st Century*.

[<http://www.sla.org/content/learn/comp2003/index.cfm>]

Nov 24 * NO CLASS *** THANKSGIVING HOLIDAY *** NO CLASS *****

Dec 1 Intellectual Freedom & Censorship

***** PROJECT II-B DUE *****

REQUIRED READINGS:

Asheim, Lester. (1953) "Not Censorship but Selection." *Wilson Library Bulletin*, Sept 1953, pp. 63-67.

[<http://www.ala.org/ala/oif/basics/notcensorship.htm>]

Ohio Library Council. ORE on the Web, Module 6: Ethics [<http://www.olc.org/ore/6intro.htm>]

ALSO: Browse through one issue of the *Newsletter on Intellectual Freedom*.

Recommended for those interested in reading further:

American Lib Assn. *Intellectual Freedom Basics*. [<http://www.ala.org/ala/oif/basics/Default2272.htm>]

American Library Association. *Intellectual Freedom Manual*, 7th ed. Chicago: ALA, 2006.

LibraryLaw.com. *Intellectual Freedom*. [<http://www.librarylaw.com/Intellectual.html>]

American Library Association. Guidelines and Considerations for Developing a Public Library Internet Use Policy . [<http://www.ala.org/ala/oif/challengesupport/dealing/internetusepolicy.pdf>]

Jones, Barbara M. Academic Libraries and Intellectual Freedom.

[<http://www.ala.org/ala/oif/iftoolkits/ifmanual/fifthedition/academiclibraries.htm>]

Index on Censorship [<http://www.indexonline.org/>]

Nuzum, Eric. Music Censorship In America. [<http://www.ericnuzum.com/banned/index.html>]

Parents Against Bad Books in Schools website [Fairfax County group - includes examples of passages in books found in local school libraries to which PABBIS objects] [<http://www.pabbis.com/>]

Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press. (2003). *The First Amendment Handbook*

[<http://www.rcfp.org/handbook/index.html>]

Robbins, Louise.(1996). *Censorship & the American Library*. Chicago:ALA.

Univ of Penn. Libs. Banned Books Online. [<http://onlinebooks.library.upenn.edu/banned-books.html>]

Dec 8 Cooperation, Conclusions

*** TAKE-HOME FINAL EXAM DISTRIBUTED ***
BRIEF REPORTS, PROJECT II-A&B

REQUIRED READINGS:

ALA. RUSA Reference Guidelines: Interlibrary Loan Code for the United States: Explanatory Supplement
[<http://www.ala.org/ala/rusa/rusaprotools/referenceguide/interlibraryloancode.htm>]
Colaiani, Lois. (2001). "Making Stone Soup." *INSPEL* 35: 166-171.
[<http://www.ifla.org/VII/d2/inspel/01-3colo.pdf>]

Recommended for those interested in reading further:

American Lib Assn. Reference & User Services Association. Interlibrary Loan Code for the U. S.
[<http://www.ala.org/ala/rusa/rusaprotools/referenceguide/interlibrary.htm>]
Ballard, T. (1982). "Public Library Networking: Neat, Plausible, Wrong." *Library Journal* 107: 679-683.
Beaubien, A. K. (2007). ARL White Paper on Interlibrary Loan.
[http://www.arl.org/bm~doc/ARL_white_paper_ILL_june07.pdf]
Iowa State Univ Lib. Interlibrary Loan Cost & Performance Studies.
[http://www.lib.iastate.edu/cfora/generic.cfm?cat=gen_libinfo_self&navid=11075&parent=3038]
Northwestern University. School of Law Library. ILLWeb . [Links to info and resources on interlibrary loan]
[<http://www.law.northwestern.edu/lawlibrary/illweb/>]
Shipman, Jean P. (2007). Document Delivery Suppliers [click on each for services and fees]
[<http://www.library.vcu.edu/tml/docsupp/>]
Univ of Texas. Copyright in the Library: Interlibrary Loan.
[<http://www.utsystem.edu/OGC/Intellectualproperty/I-108g.htm>]
Washington Research Library Consortium. [<http://www.wrlc.org>] - see especially "cooperative holding of journal titles" [<http://www.wrlc.org/resource/colldev/poljour.shtml>]

**FINAL EXAM (TAKE-HOME) - Distributed in Class December 8th -
electronic submission (to pierce@cua.edu)
DUE by 10 PM on WEDNESDAY DECEMBER 12th
(1 point subtracted for each 12 hours of lateness, or portion thereof)**

LSC 608: Collection Development PROJECT I ASSIGNMENT SHEET Due: September 8th

Please note: Projects may be handed in without penalty up to 10 PM on September 15th.

Electronic submission (pierce@cua.edu) is fine (even encouraged).

Projects received later than this will lose one point for each 12 hours (or portion thereof) they are late.

PURPOSE: To evaluate how well review journals alert selectors to materials available for purchase

1. **Select 15 items published in 2005** that interest you. For each, provide a full bibliographic citation (author, title, publisher or producer, date if available). Your choices must be distributed as follows:
 - 10-13 books** from at least 6 different publishers. Find them by using *WorldCat* (electronic database on ALADIN) limiting the date to "2005 - 2005". You can also use *American Book Publishing Record* or *Books in Print* [neither at CUA, but held by other libraries], if you wish - looking for items published in 2005--but do not use review sources - select from bibliographic sources, not book reviews!;
 - 1-2 government publications** issued in 2005, from the Catalog of U. S. Government Publications (<http://catalog.gpo.gov/>) - use the advanced search and enter 2005 to 2005 as the date;
 - 1-2 periodicals or magazines**, chosen from a serials directory (e.g., Ulrich's - print or electronic) - anything that was being published in 2005, no matter how long ago it began publication.

Any set of 15 items properly distributed among books, gov docs, and periodicals is acceptable so long as they were published in 2005 - two years ago, since reviews take time to appear.
2. **Search--carefully and completely--for reviews of your material** in *Book Review Index* (available in print in CUA's Mullen Library - be sure to check all volumes and issues from 2005 on) and *Book Review Digest* (available on ALADIN). (Just those two sources - you don't have to look anywhere else.)
List every review of each of your 15 items that you find indexed. Copying citations as they appear in the indexes is fine--don't worry about format so long as it's clear. Be sure not to miss anything. The ability to conduct a complete and accurate search for information is important in this field--and if your list is incomplete, your whole project is based on faulty data.
3. **Rank the review journals** reviewing your items by the number of items each reviewed. (Be careful - don't count a review more than once just because it was indexed more than once, and don't count multiple reviews of the same item in the same review journal - that's still just one item you found reviewed there, not matter how many times they reviewed it.) **Present these results in a ranked list** headed by the review journal(s) that reviewed the largest number of your items and ending with the review journals that reviewed just one item.
4. **See what you can find out about the books that received no reviews.** Try looking them up on Amazon.com or another online bookstore, and/or see if you can find a web page for their publishers including descriptions of the items. Do they have any characteristics in common? (Don't worry about finding more information about the government documents or periodicals.)
5. Write a **short (perhaps 2-5 double-spaced pages) discussion** of
 - (1) **the coverage of your items in review journals.** Generally speaking, were these materials widely reviewed, or not? Can you say anything about the types of review journals that did or didn't review them? Be sure to mention in your paper how many different review journals you would have to consult to find reviews of items that were reviewed - did one journal review all of them, or would you have needed to read more than one - and if so, how many more?
 - (2) **the types of items that did not get reviewed.** Be sure to mention how many items were not reviewed anywhere. What characteristics they seemed to have in common?

ONE SUGGESTION: . This is a good project to use to find out if you can rely on review journals for selection of materials in an area in which you'd like to work, and to see what review journals would be most helpful in selecting such items. So I'd suggest taking a specific subject (e.g., business) or type of book (e.g., children's nonfiction) that matches your career objectives. But note that you are not required to do this. You can put the list together any way you want.

TWO CAUTIONS: (1) Don't worry if you find no - or hardly any - reviews at all. That's normal for some types of publications - and it's important information for you if it's an area in which you expect to work. So just keep going - it's still a successful project, even if you find no reviews at all and have no review journals to rank.

(2) Everyone's work will be checked. The instructor always checks 2 or 3 items to make sure searches were complete and accurate.

PLEASE NOTE THAT YOU WILL BE HANDING IN THREE (3) THINGS:

1. **YOUR LIST OF 15 ITEMS**, with the reviews each received (see 1 & 2 above)
2. **YOUR RANKED LIST** of review journals, based on the number of items reviewed (see 3 above) - unless, of course, you find no reviews;
3. **YOUR SHORT PAPER** discussing your findings (see 4 & 5 above)

***** GRADING CRITERIA FOR PROJECT *****

Please note: Projects may be handed in up to 10 PM on September 15th without excuse or penalty. Projects received later than this will be penalized one point for each 12 hours of lateness.

12 points: Beyond the call of duty. Such a project fulfills the assignment exceptionally well. Lists and rankings are complete and accurate. It has something important to say about what does and does not get reviewed, and where - and what it says is clearly related to what was done in the project (e.g., the reviews located and the journals examined).

10 points: Good solid work. Such a project fulfills the assignment well. Lists and rankings should be complete and accurate, though conclusions about what types of materials do and don't get reviews are not as clearly presented as in a 12-point project. Even though conclusions may not be clear, all items are included in the discussion, and anything said is clearly based on what was found.

8 points: Good in some respects, though deficient in others. These projects may contain errors in lists of reviews or in rankings (e.g., missing one or two reviews in an index or miscounting reviews in ranking periodicals - if the same review appears in more than one index, be sure not to count it twice!). The discussion may be incomplete (failing to cover some items), or may make statements not clearly related to what was found.

6 points: Seriously deficient. These projects do not fulfill the assignment. They may be based on an incomplete list (fewer than 15 items, fewer than 6 book publishers, etc.) or lack a required part, or be based on a seriously deficient search (e.g., multiple instances of missing reviews or one instance of recording some but not all of the full list of reviews found for an item). Their discussion may make points contradicted by what was found and/or discuss matters unrelated to what was found in the search.

2 points: Unacceptable. These projects are seriously incomplete - lacking more than one required part - or are so full of errors (for example, in data collection) that nothing can be safely concluded from the results.

0 points: No credit. Either there has been some serious violation of university policies on academic honesty (for example, plagiarizing), or the project has been handed in so late that the penalty for lateness reduces the grade to this point.

LSC 608: *Collection Development* COLLECTION EVALUATION PROJECT (Project II - A and B)

PURPOSE: To compare strengths and weaknesses of different collection evaluation methods

Choose a SMALL (10 - 50 titles) collection to evaluate. It should include everything in a specific classification number or range of numbers and/or shelved in a special location (e.g., all the Z687s in a branch library or all the links on a web page). **THINK SMALL:** bigger collections mean less time to think.

GROUP WORK is allowed, with up to 4 members per group. Groups submit a single project, and everyone in the group receives the same grade.

Part A (due November 17) includes a shelf examination and analysis of use of your collection.

Part B (due December 1) includes a plan (just the plan - you are not expected to act on it) for assessing user needs and an analysis of collection quality done by checking an appropriate bibliography or list of recommended works against the collection.

Project II A - COLLECTION EVALUATION, PART A (due November 17th):

1. Choose a collection (any subject, any collection - this is up to you - just keep it small).
2. Get a list of all materials in it (e.g., a print-out of catalog records by call number). (You will be handing in this list along with your project - and yes, you may hand in your catalog print-out; retyping not necessary unless you're submitting it electronically) Please do not request special access to anything. If getting a list presents problems, discuss alternatives with the instructor.
3. Do a shelf examination. (a) Look at the collection as it sits on the shelf - is this a collection that would attract use? Are there obvious signs of use (e.g., gaps between books where one has been removed) or disuse (e.g., dust)? (b) Check what is on the shelf against your record of what is supposed to be in the collection - is anything missing? Anything there that is not on your list?) Examine individual items - are they in good condition? Do any need repair or replacement? (d) Do you notice anything else that might affect use of these materials, or indicate something about the collection's value or about user needs?
4. Analyze use. Normally the measure you'll use is circulation - and in many libraries, the most accurate record of use of materials in the circulating collection is the dates stamped in the materials, so you may want to collect information with this along with your shelf examination. (Where all such records are lacking, you may have to rely on physical evidence of use - and include a better plan for studying use in Part B - see IIB,1 below.) Which materials are in demand, and which not?

NOW SUM THIS ALL UP: Evaluate your collection, based on your shelf examination and analysis of use. Be sure to mention any problems in gathering or interpreting data. Write up your evaluation as a four to eight page paper (double-spaced). Hand it in or submit it electronically (as an .rtf file attached to an email message sent to the instructor at pierce@cua.edu) up to 10 PM Saturday Nov 24th.

Project II B - COLLECTION EVALUATION, PART B (due December 1st):

1. Develop a plan for evaluating community information needs relevant to your collection (you must continue with the same collection used for Part A). Remember to include a means of studying use if circulation or equivalent (e.g., date stamp) use records were lacking in doing Part A.
2. Identify the most appropriate bibliography or list of recommended materials on your subject that you can find, and justify your decision. (The ideal bibliography is up to date, reflects current information needs and assessments of material currently available, and is appropriate to the collection size and the nature of the community served. Ideal bibliographies are rarely available - do the best you can, just as you'd have to do on the job - but be sure to mention other candidates, explain why you feel the one you chose was best, and briefly assess the strengths and weaknesses of the bibliography or list you used.)

3. Evaluate your collection by checking your bibliography against it. Don't worry about where something is shelved - if a work in the bibliography is owned by your library, it counts, whether it was cataloged into your collection or not. See how many of the listed works you have, and look for any patterns in what you do and don't have (e.g., all the recommended books on Europe but far fewer on Asia or Africa). Remember to check the bibliography against the library's full collection - which items are owned, no matter where they are housed - and not the collection against the bibliography (whether individual items in your collection are listed in standard bibliographies or not is irrelevant).

4. Compare and contrast what you learned in step 3 of Part B (the bibliography check) to what you learned in step 3 (shelf examination) and in step 4 (analysis of use) of Part A. What does each approach tell you that the others don't? Do you think that all three together give you a complete evaluation of your collection - or do some questions still remain?

NOW SUM THIS ALL UP: Present your plan for evaluating information needs - and where needed, your plan for studying use. Explain how you chose your list or bibliography of recommended books (and why it's the best choice for your collection). Then discuss your collection's quality, based on results of checking your bibliography or list against the collection. Be sure to mention any problems - in developing a plan, in selecting a bibliography, or in gathering or interpreting data - and to include a few pages comparing and contrasting the three different approaches to evaluation (shelf examination, analysis of use, bibliography check) - how do the problems in implementing them, as well as the results, compare? Write this up your evaluation as a five to ten page paper (double-spaced) Hand it in or submit it electronically (as an .rtf file attached to an email message to the instructor at pierce@cua.edu) up to 10 PM on Saturday December 8th.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR PROJECT (Each part graded separately)

12 points: Beyond the call of duty. Careful attention to detail - nothing missed - plus an excellent discussion, making important points and explaining them clearly. Some genuinely original points or observations are made in presenting findings. These projects give thoughtful, detailed, and thorough evaluations. Part B includes an excellent explanation of the bibliography selection process and perceptive analysis of the pros and cons of different approaches to evaluation.

10 points: Good solid work. These projects completely fulfill the assignment, and are competently done, without serious error. They are generally less thoughtful and detailed than projects receiving a 12. The discussion may not go very far beyond pointing out the obvious, and/or may not make adequate reference to actual findings. Projects with a minor error may receive a 10, if they are otherwise truly excellent, but nothing higher.

8 points: Good in some respects, though deficient in others. These projects are more seriously flawed. There may be a serious problem in the application of methods - for example, using an obviously inappropriate bibliography (one that is very old, or inappropriate for the library's clientele), or counting how many items in the collection appear in the bibliography, rather than how many items in the bibliography are held by the library. There may be errors or discrepancies in the presentation of findings. They do, however, contain all the required parts and are clearly written, even if discussions may be weak.

6 points: Seriously deficient. These projects do not fulfill the assignment. They lack a required part or discussion, or fail to connect one part to another (for example, concluding a collection is of good quality in discussion, after presenting results that clearly seem to indicate otherwise).

2 points: Unacceptable. These projects are seriously incomplete - lacking more than one required part or discussion - or are so full of errors (for example, in data collection) that nothing can be safely concluded from the results.

0 points: No credit. Either there has been some serious violation of university policies on academic honesty (for example, plagiarizing), or the project has been handed in so late that the penalty for lateness reduces the grade to this point.