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.


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 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:

Recommended for those interested in reading further:
Sat Sept 15  Publishing I: Books

REQUIRED READINGS:

Recommended for those interested in reading further:
Bookjobs [jobs in publishing - and how to get one]. [http://www.bookjobs.com/]
BookCloseOuts. [online bookstore specializing in remainders] [http://www.bookcloseouts.com]
The Online Books Page [25,000+ free online books] [http://onlinebooks.library.upenn.edu/]

Sat Sept 22  Publishing II: Serials, Etc.

REQUIRED READINGS:

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.umd.edu/information/news/exhibits/money/ - try the quiz, too]

Sept 29  Copyright & Licensing

REQUIRED READINGS:
Sept 29 - Recommended for those interested in reading further:
Particularly highly recommended: University of Texas System. Copyright Crash Course
Particularly highly recommended: Yale University Libraries. LibLicense: Licensing Digital Information
[http://www.library.yale.edu/~license/index.shtml]
[http://www.aallnet.org/about/policy_fair.asp]
[http://www.arl.org/pb/ppcopyright/copyresources/copytimeline.shtml]
July/August 2001. [http://www.dlib.org/dlib/july01/bell/07bell.html]
Copyright Clearance Center. [http://www.copyright.com/ccc/home.do]
Creative Commons. [http://creativecommons.org/]
LibraryLaw.com [http://www.librarylaw.com]
[http://www.gnu.org/philosophy/right-to-read.html]
[http://digital-law-online.info/CONTU/contu1.html]

Oct 6 Distribution & Acquisitions I (Basic Functions, Single Orders, Out of Print)
RECOMMENDED READINGS:
ALA. ALCTS. Acquisitions Section. Statement on Principles and Standards of Acquisitions Practices

Recommended for those interested in reading further:
BUBL Link Catalogue of Internet Resources: Acquisitions. [http://bubl.ac.uk/link/a/acquisitions.htm]
Internet Library for Librarians: Acquisitions, Serials, and Collection Development.
[http://www.itcompany.com/infotretriever/acqsercd.htm]
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 ***

RECOMMENDED READINGS:
Association of Subscription Agents. The Work of Subscription Agents
Maxwell, Kim, et al. (2004). The Art of Claiming: Background Information for Claiming
Oct 13 - Recommended for those interested in reading further:
Yankee & Gobi [approval / blanket order plans] Questions and Answers.  
http://www.library.ucsb.edu/collman/cmyankee.html
D-Lib Magazine, October 2000 (vol. 6 no. 10).  
http://www.dlib.org/dlib/october00/montgomery/10montgomery.html

Oct 20    MIDTERM EXAM (in class)

Oct 27  Selection & Weeding
REQUIRED READING:
http://firstmonday.org/issues/issue8_5/keller/index.html

Recommended for those interested in reading further:
The following two articles are best read together - and are both highly recommended:
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  
Baltimore County Public Schools. Selection Criteria for School Library Media Collections.  
http://www.bcps.org/offices/lis/office/admin/selection.html
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:
July/Aug, 2004  http://www.dlib.org/dlib/july04/lavoie/07lavoie.html

Recommended for those interested in reading further:
Nov 3 - Recommended for those interested in reading further, continued:
Inland Empire Libs Disaster Response Network. Sample Disaster Plan. [http://www.ieldrn.org/sample.htm]
And...some articles on Google Books and other web-based initiatives:

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:
Academic libraries:
Boston College Libraries. Collection Development [Competencies]. [http://www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/ulib/staff/cdbasic.html]

Public Libraries:

...and...some articles on Google Books and other web-based initiatives:
Nov 17 - Recommended readings, continued:
School Libraries:
[ http://www.sldirectory.com/libsf/rest/coldev2.html ]
[ http://fno.org/apr04/technosavvy.html ]
[ Dangers in books recommended to kids for science fair projects ]
http://www.psla.org/
[ http://www.ala.org/ala/aasl/aaslpubsandjournals/slmrb/slmrcontents/volume52002/shannon.cfm ]
Special Libraries
[ http://www.sla.org/content/Shop/Information/infoonline/2002/aug02/finnerty.cfm ]
[ 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:
[ http://www.ala.org/ala/oif/basics/notcensorship.htm ]
ALSO: Browse through one issue of the Newsletter on Intellectual Freedom.

Recommended for those interested in reading further:
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/ftoolkits/ifmanual/fifthedition/academiclibraries.htm ]
Index on Censorship [ http://www.indexonline.org/ ]
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/ ]
[ http://www.rcfp.org/handbook/index.html ]
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:
[ http://www.ala.org/ala/rusa/rusaprotools/referenceguide/interlibraryloancode.htm ]

Recommended for those interested in reading further:
[http://www.ala.org/ala/rusa/rusaprotools/referenceguide/interlibrary.htm]
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/l-108g.htm ]

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 15\textsuperscript{th} 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 II B,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.