

**FACULTY OF INFORMATION AND MEDIA STUDIES**  
**LIS 9315 – COLLECTION MANAGEMENT**  
**FALL 2020 (DE)**

**Learning Actives Delivery:**  
Asynchronously between  
September 8 – December 9

**Instructor:** Asen Ivanov, PhD

**Office:** n/a

**Office hours (via Zoom):** Fridays 10:00 am – 11:00 am and by appointment

**OWL site:** ...

**Email:** [aivanov6@uwo.ca](mailto:aivanov6@uwo.ca)

**Description:**

This course addresses the theory and practice of library collection management. Through lectures and practical assignments, the course allows students to gain the knowledge and skills necessary to develop and manage print and electronic collections in public and academic libraries. The course covers a range of topics of practical concern to librarians including collection policy; selection criteria and tools; copyright and licensing; acquisition; evaluation of print and electronic collections; deselection (weeding); and the preservation of print and digital materials. In addition to these practical topics, classes 1,2, 7 & 8 provide a historical and theoretical context for situating collection management within the framework of librarianship and the publishing industry.

**Upon completing the course, students will be able to:**

- Understand the role of collection development and management within the framework of librarianship and the publishing industry
- Understand how intellectual freedom and intellectual property issues apply to collection management, including the management of digital materials
- Develop critical awareness of professional values, standards and ethics in the context of collection management
- Analyze a library's community information needs and develop collections based on this analysis
- Analyze academic researchers' information needs and develop collections based on this analysis
- Evaluate and apply review sources and tools for developing library collections
- Evaluate and apply citations statistics and journal rankings tools for developing library collections

## Course Policies

**Course Participation:** This distance education course is delivered in an asynchronous format. This means that there is no set time each week when students are to meet. Instead, required weekly readings, discussion questions, and learning activities will be posted on the course OWL site, alongside instructions on how to complete them as well as learning materials (including lecture notes). To successfully complete the course, students are expected to complete all of the weekly activities for the duration of the course. This includes: **(1)** reading the required weekly readings, **(2)** reviewing the lecture notes and videos, **(3)** making at least two posts on the course discussion board in selected weeks during the course (see A1 instruction below).

**Email:** Please email me only from your [@uwo.ca](mailto:@uwo.ca) email account. I reply to email quickly, but please allow for up to 48 hours to get back to you. If your email requires my immediate attention, type URGENT in the subject line.

**Discussion board etiquette:** For six weeks of the course, we will be using the discussion board as a learning tool (See, A1 instructions). Please communicate online by posting on the discussion board substantive post. Substantive posts are posts that contribute original thoughts, ideas, and/or point to examples that advance the class discussion. They are written in full sentences and make effective use of text formatting (i.e., they use **bold**, *italics*, tables, and bullet-lists when needed). Substantive posts do not need to be long (although often they may have to), but they need to be engaged and contribute something new to the discussion. Please avoid making unessential posts that add little to the discussion such as “Oh, Cool!”, “Nice!”, “Fire[emoji],” “I like your post!” The purpose of this rule is to ensure that we maximize the use of the discussion board to exchange ideas and practice professional and academic writing.

Please note that there is a **SOCIAL FORUM** on the discussion board, where you are encouraged to post in any way you like on any topic you like as long as it is in keeping with the University [CODE OF STUDENT CONDUCT](#).

If you want to share a document (an image, article, video, etc.) in a discussion board post, please try to post an external link rather than uploading the document to OWL.

**Virtual Interactions:** You are encouraged to join the weekly Zoom office hours. The Zoom office hours are intended to act as social space in which we can all meet and interact more directly. You are also encouraged to schedule one-on-one Zoom office hours with me as frequently as needed.

**Plagiarism:** Plagiarism is a serious academic offence. The University’s plagiarism policy requires instructors to remind students that, “Students must write their assignments and essays in their own words. Whenever students take an idea, or a passage of text from another author, they must acknowledge their debt by using quotation marks when quoting directly from another work and by proper referencing such as footnotes or in-text citations. Plagiarism is a

major academic offence (see Scholastic Offences Policy in the Western Academic Calendar).” See the MLIS student handbook for more details. Some of the assignments in this course are conducive to plagiarising (e.g., A1 & A3.1). Do not be tempted. It is a serious academic offence.

**Statement on Academic Offences:** Scholastic offences are taken seriously and students are directed to read the appropriate policy, specifically, the definition of what constitutes a Scholastic Offence, at the following Web site:

[http://www.uwo.ca/universec/handbook/appeals/scholastic\\_discipline\\_grad.pdf](http://www.uwo.ca/universec/handbook/appeals/scholastic_discipline_grad.pdf)

**Support Services:** Students who are in emotional/mental distress should refer to Mental Health@Western <http://www.uwo.ca/uwocom/mentalhealth/> for a complete list of options about how to obtain help.

**Special Accommodations:** If you require special accommodations of any kind, please do not hesitate to contact me.

#### **Evaluation:**

|   |             |
|---|-------------|
| <b>A1</b> Discussion post assignment                              | <b>10%</b>  |
| <b>A2</b> Managing a collection (group):                          | <b>60%</b>  |
| <b>A2.1.</b> Community assessment and collection evaluation (25%) |             |
| <b>A2.2.</b> Managing and building your collection (25%)          |             |
| <b>A2.3.</b> Presentation (10%)                                   |             |
| <b>A3</b> Managing eResources (individual):                       | <b>30%</b>  |
| <b>A3.1.</b> Electronic licensing (15%)                           |             |
| <b>A3.2.</b> Journal citation study (15%)                         |             |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>100%</b> |

#### **A1 - Discussion post assignment (10%)**

Starting in week two (2), for each week during the course you are expected to act as discussion leaders and participants by posting at least two posts a week. The two posts could include: an analysis of the required weekly readings; questions emerging in the weekly readings; response to one of the weekly discussion questions provided in the syllabus and/or course activities (see, lecture schedule below); or a combination thereof. The posts would not be formally graded, but their quality will be evaluated, and feedback will be provided on the discussion board on a weekly basis. Posts that do not demonstrate an awareness of the weekly course material and do not show earnest effort to engage in a productive discussion will not be counted as marks towards the final grade. Posts in the SOCIAL FORUM would not be counted towards this assignment (see, Course Policy above).

### **A2 - Managing a collection (group; three parts) (60%)**

This capstone assignment will be completed in groups and will involve managing a library collection at a real library and will consist of three parts: **(1)** Community assessment and collection evaluation (25%); **(2)** Managing and building your collection (25%); and an **(3)** in-class group presentation (10%). The library can be any type: academic, public, school, corporate, special, government, etc. Your choice of the library and the size, scope, and subject coverage of the library collection will vary depending on the intellectual and professional specialization your group decides to pursue.

### **A3 - Managing eResources (35%)**

This assignment develops a range of electronic collection management skills. It consists of two hands-on exercises: (1) an electronic licensing analysis (15%); (2) a journal citation study tracing the publication of Western university faculty member of your choice (15%).

**\*Detailed instructions and rubrics** for all assignments will be provided on OWL under “Assignment Instructions” in the Resources Folder, in advance of the due dates.

**Assignments formatting:** All assignments are due to me by the dates specified in the table below. There will be NO unscheduled examinations in this course. Assignments should be submitted electronically in **MS Word format, double spaced, 12pt font, and include the name of student, name of course, title, and date submitted on the first page (there is no need for a separate cover page)**. All assignments should be formatted with care (as in grad school). **Use APA citation style** (if you are a staunch adherent of another style, send me an email). Occasional typos and grammar errors are inconsequential but **work that has not been edited and proofread cannot be eligible for grades in the A range**. I will use Prof. Robert M. Seiler’s “Detailed Marking Code” for grading writing, URL: <http://people.ucalgary.ca/~rseiler/code.htm> If you are including images, tables, or charts, please add them as an appendix to your assignment. **Please make sure to re-size all images to avoid excessive file size.**

**Assignments submission:** All assignments should be submitted through the course OWL website by midnight on the due date.

**Grade Penalties:** Late assignments will be subject to a penalty of 5% per day, unless extension has been granted before the deadline.

#### **Due dates**

| <b>A#</b> | <b>Assignment</b>         | <b>Date Due*</b>                  | <b>Weight</b> |
|-----------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|
| A 1       | Discussion Post           | Ongoing                           | 10%           |
| A 2.1     | Capstone assignment pt. 1 | Oct 9, 2020                       | 25%           |
| A 2.2     | Capstone assignment pt. 2 | Nov 6, 2020                       | 25%           |
| A 2.3     | Group presentations       | Nov 6, 2020                       | 10%           |
| A 3.1     | Electronic licensing      | Dec 2, 2020                       | 15%           |
| A 3.2     | Journal citation study    | Dec 9, 2020 (last day of classes) | 15%           |

## **Suggested textbooks:**

Peggy Johnson (2014). *Fundamentals of Collection Development*, 3rd Edition, Chicago: American Library Association. *This is a good source to use as a supplement to the course materials and provides clarification for some of the issues and processes discussed in class. I will also post relevant chapters on the course website.*

Sara Holder (Ed.) (2013). *Library Collection Development for Professional Programs: Trends and Best Practices*. Hershey, PA: Information Science Reference. *This is a selection of articles/chapters focusing on collection development for specific disciplines or professional programs.*

## **Weekly topics**

**Week 1** – Introduction: What is Library Collection Management

**Week 2** – The Information Landscape and Library Infrastructure

**Week 3** – Collection Analysis and Evaluation

**Week 4** – Selection Processes: Public Libraries

**Week 5** – Selection Processes: Academic Libraries

**Week 6** – Deselection (weeding)

**Week 7** – The Political Economy of Scholarly Communication & Intellectual Freedom

-----/\***Research week**\* /-----

**Week 8** – Collection Management Assignment Presentations

**Week 9** – Scholarly Communication: Open Access, Institutional Repositories, and Consortia

**Week 10** – Licensing and Copyright

**Week 11** – Serials Management and Evaluation

**Week 12** – Digital Curation of e-resources

**Week 13** – Library Futures: Interactivity, Makerspaces, and the Digital Humanities

## Course Schedule and Readings

**Week 1— Sept 8-11, 2020**

### **Introduction: What is Library Collection Management?**

In this module, we discuss the goals, scope, and activities of collection management, and identify the expertise and skills required for professional realization in this field of work. We situate this discussion in the historical development of collection management practice in public and academic libraries in North America up to the present day. The Module also includes an overview of the courses' content, learning objectives, and assignments.

#### **Discussion Questions:**

What is collection management?

What is the difference between collection development and management?

What is the relationship between collection management and other library operations and services?

#### **Readings:**

Corrall, S. (2012). The concept of collection development in the digital world. In M. Fieldhouse & A. Marshall (eds), *Collection development in the digital age*. London: Facet Pub.

Wray, C. C. (2016). Learning collection development and management on the job. *Collection Management*, 41(2), 107-114.

Any of Andrew Abbott's papers and talks on library and knowledge, available on his personal website, URL: <http://home.uchicago.edu/~aabbott/library.html>

#### **Further reading:**

Havens, B. & Rosenfeld, J. (2016). Integrating Services: Instant information for the end user. In Newton Lee, ed. *Google It: Total Information Awareness*, pp. 326-332.

Söderholm, J., & Nolin, J. (2015). Collections redux: the public library as a place of community borrowing. *The Library Quarterly*, 85(3), 244-260.

Peggy Johnson, Chapter 1, pp. 1-33.

## Week 2— Sept 14-18, 2020

### The Information Landscape and Library Infrastructure

Building on the previous module, we continue discussing the modern library and the place of collection management within it. We discuss the sociological, technological, and cultural forces that have changed the nature of library infrastructure, and subsequently the remit and objectives of collection management, throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century. We also reflect on how collection management practices mediate the relationship between data, information, knowledge, understanding, and possibly even wisdom. Lastly, we discuss the research field of information behaviour and its role in collection management.

#### Discussion Questions:

How library infrastructure in general, and collection management in particular, mediate the relationship between data, information, knowledge, understanding and possibly even wisdom? How sociological, technological, and cultural factors change library use and users in public and academic libraries?

What is information behaviour, and how it relates to collection management?

#### Readings:

Abbott, A. (2011). Library research infrastructure in for humanistic and social scientific research scholarship in the twentieth century.” In Camic, C., Gross, N., and Lamont, M, (Eds.) *Social Knowledge in the Making* (pp. 43–89) Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Bates M. J. (2010). Information behavior. In Bates M. J. and Maack M. N. (Eds.) *Encyclopedia of Library and Information Sciences* (pp. 2381–2391). New York: CRC Press.

#### Further reading:

Allison, D.A. (2013). A Culture of Technology, in *The Patron Driven Library*, (pp 23-37). Oxford Cambridge New Delhi: Chandos Publishing.

Baron, N. (2016, July). Why digital reading is no substitute for print. *New Republic*, URL: <https://newrepublic.com/article/135326/digital-reading-no-substitute-print>

Breeding, M. (2017). The complicated story of ebooks in libraries. *Computers in Libraries*, 37(5), 16-18.

*DIKW pyramid*. Wikipedia. URL: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/DIKW\\_pyramid](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/DIKW_pyramid)

Gold, A. (2010). *Data Curation and Libraries: Short-Term Developments, Long-Term Prospects*. California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, CA. URL: [http://digitalcommons.calpoly.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1027&context=lib\\_dean](http://digitalcommons.calpoly.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1027&context=lib_dean)

Hjørland, B., and Albrechtsen, H. (1995). Toward a new horizon in information-science— Domain-analysis. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 46(6), 400–425.

Heidorn, P. B (2011) The emerging role of libraries in data curation and e-science. *Journal of Library Administration*, 51(7-8), 662-672.

### Week 3— Sept 21-25, 2020 Collection Analysis and Evaluation

In this module, we review the process of collection analysis and evaluation. We begin by discussing the function of the collection policy as an anchor of collection analysis and evaluation. We examine the characteristics of key indicators including, usage, subjects, and formats, as well as, quantitative and qualitative approaches for their evaluation. We identify and discuss standards, tools, and best practices.

**Learning activity:** Discuss the evaluation of your collection based on the table in the lecture notes and chapter 7 in Johnson. Explain which approach (user-centered, collection-centered or both) is best for your collection and why and the methods you would use to evaluate the collection.

#### Readings:

Peggy Johnson, Chapter 7 & Chapter 3 (pp. 98-112, only).

Bushing, M. (2005). Collection mapping: An evolving tool for better resources and better access. *Signum* 39(3), 9-19.

Agee, J. (2005). Collection evaluation: A foundation for collection development. *Collection building* 24 (3), 92-95.

#### Further reading:

Horava, T. & Levine-Clark, M. (2016). Current trends in collection development policies and practices. *Collection Building*, 35(4), 97-102.



Monroe-Gulick, Amalia & Currie, Lea (2011). Using the Worldcat Collection Analysis Tool: Experiences from the University of Kansas Libraries. *Collection Management*, 36(4), 203-216.

Arizona State Library and Archives, Collection Assessment and Mapping, URL: <https://www.azlibrary.gov/libdev/continuing-education/cdt/collection-assessment-mapping>

Greiner & Cooper (2007). Analyzing Library Collection Use with Excel. Available in GRC and course website.

Finch, J.L., & Flenner, A.R. (2016). Using data visualization to examine an academic library collection. *College and Research Libraries*, 77(6), 765-778.

Linton, J. & Ducas, A. (2017). A new tool for collection assessment: One library's response to the Calls to Action issued by Canada's Truth and Reconciliation Commission. *Collection Management*, 42(3/4), 256-279.

**Week 4— Sept 28- Oct 2, 2020**

**Selection Processes: Public Libraries**

This module introduces the selection of library materials for public libraries. To this end, we discuss selection philosophies and theories; the function of selection; selection criteria; organizational roles in selection; factors affecting selection choices; and selection aids.

**Learning activity:** Listen to this discussion between Prof. Catherine Johnson (FIMS) and David McCord (Collection Management Coordinator, London Public Library) [https://youtu.be/ZY9D\\_uB2ipA](https://youtu.be/ZY9D_uB2ipA) and reflect on the question: What are the major issues public libraries are facing with increased digital collections?

#### **Readings:**

Johnson, Chapter 4.

Rawlinson, N. (1981). Give 'em what they want. *Library Journal*, 6 (November 15, 1981), 2189-2190. \*\*

Bob, Murray C. (1982). The case for quality book selection. *Library Journal*, 107 (September 15, 1982), 1707-1710. **\*\*read these two articles together.**

#### **Further reading:**

Albright, Meagan (2006). The public library's responsibilities to LGBT communities: recognizing, representing and serving, *Public Libraries*, 45(5), 52-56.

Bartlett, Wendy K. (2014). The History of Floating Collections. Chapter one in *Floating Collections: A Collection Development Model for Long-Term Success*. Santa Barbara, CA: Libraries Unlimited. pp. 1- 14.

Special Issue on Indigenous collections/collecting. *Collection Management* 2017, Vo. 42, Issue 3/4. **[browse the issue and read as many articles as possible]**

Gray, R. & Howard, V. (2017). Young adult use of e-books: An analysis of public library services and resources. *Public Library Quarterly*, 36(3), 199-212.

## **Week 5—Oct 5-9, 2020**

### **Selection Processes: Academic Libraries**

This module introduces the selection of library materials for academic libraries. To this end, we discuss the function of selection; roles and responsibilities of collection librarians; the role of university faculty in the selection process; factors affecting selection choices; selection aids and approval plans; acquisition; as well as, the negotiations and transactions among libraries, vendors, and publishers.

#### **Discussion questions in class:**

What are some of the major trends in collection development in academic libraries?

What are the implications of these trends?

What is the role of evaluation in collection development?

#### **Readings:**

Mueller, S. (2005). Approval plans and faculty selection: Are they compatible? *Library Collections, Acquisitions & Technical Services*, 29(1), 61-70.

Fischer et al 2012. Give 'em what they want: A one-year study of unmediated patron driven acquisition *College & Research Libraries*, 3(5), 469-492.

Walters, W.H. (2013) Ebooks in academic libraries: Challenges for discovery and access. *Serials Review* 39(2), 97-104.

#### **Further reading:**

Bales, S. & Gee, C. (2013). Critical interpretive synthesis for informing collection decisions. *Collection Building* 32(2), 51-56.

Caminita, Cristina (2014). E-Books and Patron-Driven Acquisitions in Academic Libraries. In Karl Bridges (ed). *Customer-based Collection Development: An overview*. (Chapter 1, pp. 1-12), Chicago: ALA Editions.

Ke, I., Gao, W. & Bronicki, J. (2017). Does title by title selection make a difference? A usage analysis on print monograph purchasing. *Collection Management* 42(1), 34-47.

Muir, L. & Hawes, G. (2013). The case for ebook literacy: Undergraduate students' experience with ebooks for course work. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 39(3), 260-274.

## **Week 6— Oct 12-16, 2020**

### **Deselection (weeding)**

This module introduces the deselection of library materials (also known as *weeding*). We discuss criteria and approaches for weeding and consider how contextual factors (e.g., the type and size of a library and the availability of materials online) influence weeding decisions. We also discuss the practical and ethical challenges of weeding.

#### **Discussion questions in class:**

What criteria would you use for weeding ebooks in either academic or public libraries?  
What is the function of weeding?  
Should librarians ensure that weeding is objective and warranted?

#### **Readings:**

Johnson, Chapter 5

Crosetto, A. (2012). Weeding e-books. In Polanka, Sue (ed.) *No Shelf Required 2: Use and management of electronic books*, Chicago: ALA. On OWL website.

#### **Further reading:**

Dubicki, E. (2008). Weeding: facing the fears. *Collection Building* 27(4), 132-135.

Ferguson, C. L. (2015). In favor of weeding. *Serials Review* 41(4), 221-223.

Hightower, B. E. & Gantt, J. T. (2012). Weeding nursing ebooks in an academic library. *Library Collections, Acquisitions & Technical Services* 36(1-2), 53-57.

Martin, J., Kamada, H. & Feeney, M. (2013). A systematic plan for managing physical collections at the University of Arizona Libraries. *Collection Management* 38(3), 226-242.

McAllister, A.D. & Scherlen, A. (2017). Weeding with wisdom: Tuning deselection of print monographs in book-reliant disciplines. *Collection Management* 42(2), 76-91.

The Practical Librarian's Guide to Collection Development, 2014. American Libraries Magazine <http://americanlibrariesmagazine.org/2014/05/20/the-practical-librarians-guide-to-collection-development>

**Suggested Weeding Resources:**

Crew Weeding guidelines. Available on OWL.

**Week 7—Oct 19-23, 2020**

**The Political Economy of Scholarly Communication & Intellectual Freedom**

In this module, we consider additional factors that shape the context of collection management. These are the political economy of scholarly communication and the commercialization of academic publishing, as well as, libraries obligation to promote intellectual freedom while balancing community interests.

**Discussion questions in class:**

What factors contribute to what among librarians is known as *the serials crisis*?

How could the current model of academic publishing be made more equitable for authors, publishers, and libraries?

**Readings:**

Beverungen, A., Bohem, S. & Land, C. (2012). The poverty of journal publishing. *Organization* 19(6), 929-938.

Lariviere, V., Haustein, S., & Mongeon, P. (2015). The Oligopoly of Academic Publishing in the Digital Era. *PLoS ONE* 10(6). pp. 1-15.

**Further reading:**

Budd, J. (2006/07). Politics and Public Library Collections. *Progressive Librarian* 28. On course website

Budd, J. (2014). Scholarly Information as a political economy. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 40 (1), 3-9.

Curry, A. (1994). American Psycho: A collection management survey in Canadian public libraries. *Library & Information Science Research* 16(3), 201-217.

Didegah, F.& Gazni, A. (2011). The extent of concentration in journal publishing. *Learned Publishing* 24(4), 303-310.

Library Bill of Rights: <http://www.ala.org/advocacy/intfreedom/librarybill/>

Monbiot, G. (2011). Academic Publishers make Murdoch look like a Socialist. *The Guardian* 23 August 2011: <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2011/aug/29/academic-publishers-murdoch-socialist>

Oltmann, S. M. (2016). Public librarians' views on collection development and censorship. *Collection Management* 41(1), 23-44.

Whelan, D. L. (2009). A dirty little secret. *School Library Journal* 55(2), 27-30. Available at: <http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=10&hid=12&sid=54b62ae9-74bb-4408-a208-508c1834be56%40sessionmgr15>

---

## Oct 26 - 30, 2020 – No Learning Activities; RESEARCH WEEK

---

### Week 8—Nov 2-6, 2020 Collection Management Assignment Presentations

You will provide the course material for this module. Specifically, you will provide narrated video presentation of their capstone projects, including additional notes (See, A 2.3 instructions).

### Week 9— Nov 9-13, 2020 Scholarly Communication: Open Access, Institutional Repositories, and Consortia

This module focuses on the actors, politics, and dynamics of scholarly communication. We discuss the emergence of open access publishing; the organizational and technological

strategies librarians use for taking ownership of digital resources; as well as strategies for cooperative collections development and cooperative bargaining through library consortia.

**Discussion questions in class:**

Why is open access considered by some as a *failed experiment*?

Why are scholars reluctant to publish in open access journals?

What role consortia play in mediating the business interactions between publishers and libraries?

**Readings:**

Johnson, Chapter 9.

Bjork, B. C. (2012). The hybrid model for Open Access publication of scholarly articles: A failed experiment? *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 63(8), 1496-1504.

**Further reading:**

Bostick, S. L. (2001). The history and development of academic library consortia in the United States: An overview. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 27(2), 128-30.

Commentary on Open Access from the *Journal of Academic Librarianship* editors. Vol. 39, pp. 20-22, and 445-446.

Horava, Tony (2013). Today and in perpetuity: A Canadian consortial strategy for owning and hosting ebooks. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 39, 423-428.

Little, G. (2011). Solutions in search of problems? The challenges and opportunities of Institutional Repositories. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 38(1), 65-67.

Lynch, C. (2017). Updating the agenda for academic libraries and scholarly communication. *College and Research Libraries*, 78(2), 126-130.

McCabe, M. J., Snyder, C.M., & Fagin, A. (2013). Open Access versus traditional journal pricing: Using a simple "Platform Market" model to understand which will win (and which should). *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 39(1), 11-19.

Tenopir, C. (2017). Imagining a Gold Open Access Future: Attitudes, Behaviors, and Funding scenarios among authors of academic scholarship. *College and Research Libraries*, 78(6), 824-843.

**Week 10—Nov 16-20, 2020**  
**Licensing and Copyright**

In this module we discuss key aspects of the contractual obligations between libraries, vendors, and publishers.

**Discussion questions:**

What do you consider the most important access provisions that should be included in an e-resource license?

Should librarians seek legal advice regarding licensing and copyright, or perhaps these issues could be handled safely (and inexpensively) in-house?

**Learning activity:** Hands on analysis of a journal license (**prep for A 3.1**)

**Readings:**

Cross, W.M. (2012). Restoring the public library ethos: Copyright, e-licensing and the future of librarianship. *Law Library Journal* 104(2), 195-2017.

Eschenfelder, K.R., Tsai, T-I., Zhu, X. & Stewart, B. (2013). How institutionalized are model license terms? An analysis of e-journal license use rights clauses from 2000-2009. *College & Research Libraries* 74(4), 326-355.

**Further reading:**

Harris, Lesley Ellen. 2015. Lawyer or librarian? Who will answer your copyright question? *Intellectual Property Journal* 28 (1), 33-38.

Marshall, D., & Bullock, C. (2014). You Call That Perpetual? Issues in Perpetual Access. *Serials Librarian*, 67(1), 72–75.

Trosow, Sam (2010). Bill C-32 and the educational sector: Overcoming the impediments to fair dealing. In Geist, Michael (ed.) From 'Radical Extremism' to "Balanced copyright": Canadian Copyright and the Digital Agenda. Irwin Law. Available at: [http://ossguy.com/ccda/CCDA\\_18\\_Trosow.pdf](http://ossguy.com/ccda/CCDA_18_Trosow.pdf)

**Week 11—Nov 23-27, 2020**  
**Serials Management and Evaluation**

This module focuses on the management and evaluation of electronic journals (e-serials). We examine the process of serials management. We also examine the strengths and limitations of quantitative and qualitative approaches for journal evaluation, highlighting known measurement validity and reliability issues with both types of approaches. We identify and discuss standards and tools for evaluation.

**Discussion questions:**

Are citation metrics sufficient to make decisions on whether to select or deselect journals?  
What is their impact on knowledge production? (see, Rijcke et al [2016])  
Is the Big Deal a good deal?

**Learning activity:** Hands-on citation analysis tutorial (**prep for A3.2**)

**Readings:**

Baum, J. A. (2011). Free-riding on power laws: Questioning the validity of the impact factor as a measure of research quality in organization studies. *Organization*, 18(4), 449-466.

Rijcke, S. D., Wouters, P. F., Rushforth, A. D., Franssen, T. P., & Hammarfelt, B. (2016). Evaluation practices and effects of indicator use—a literature review. *Research Evaluation*, 25(2), 161-169.

Osterloh, M. and Frey, B.S. (2014). Ranking Games. *Evaluation Review*, 39(1), 102-129.

**Further reading:**

Carroll, J. D. (2014). The big deal and the future of journal licensing in Academic libraries. In Albitz, Avery and Zabel (Edd.) Rethinking collection development and management. Santa Barbara, CA: Libraries Unlimited. Chapter 11, pp. 135-147

Delgado-Lopez-Cozar, E. & Cabezas-Clavijo, A. (2013). Ranking Journals: Could Google Scholar metrics be an alternative to Journal Citation Reports and Scimago Journal Rank? *Learned Publishing* 26, 101-114.

Ke, I. & Bronicki, J. (2015). Using Scopus to study researchers citing behaviour for local collection decisions: A focus on Psychology. *Journal of Library Administration* 55(3), 165-178.



Moisil, I. (2015). Renew or cancel: Applying a model for objective journal evaluation. *Serials Review* 41(3), 160-164.

Pedersen, W.A. , Arcand, J. & Forbis, M. (2014). The Big Deal, Interlibrary Loan, and building the user-centered journal collection: A case study. *Serials Review* 40(4), 242-250.

Powell, A. (2012). Navigating the new norm: Vendor, Publisher, and Librarian strategies to cope with the changing information industry. *Journal of Library Administration* 52(2), 370-395.

Ragazzi, J.J. & Aytac, S. (2008). Author perceptions of journal quality, *Learned Publishing* 21 (3), pp. 225-235.

#### **Journal ranking sources:**

Bergstrom, T. C., Courant, P. N., McAfee, R. P., & Williams, M. A. (2014). Evaluating big deal journal bundles. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(26), 9425-9430.

SJR ScImago Journal rankings: <http://www.scimagojr.com/journalrank.php>

Journal Citation Reports: available from Databases at Western Libraries

Google Scholar Metrics (available from Google Scholar, under Metrics)  
Faculty citations - Scopus allows you to search for UWO faculty authored papers.

---

**Week 12—Nov 30 - Dec 4, 2020**

**Digital Curation of e-resources**

---

This module introduces the theory and practice of digital curation (i.e., a holistic approach for the stewardship and preservation of digital resources). We will review digital curation practices (ingest, preservation, storage, and access) as well as leading proprietary and open-source systems for digital curation in large or small libraries.

#### **Discussion Questions:**

What are the threats to the longevity of digital resources?  
What is digital curation as concept and practice?

#### **Readings:**

Colbridge, A. (2010). "Technical overview." In *Building Digital Repository with Limited Resources*, pp. 37-61. Oxford: Chandos Publishing.

Harvey, D. R. (2010). "Conceptual Models" In *Digital Curation: A How-To-Do-It Manual*, pp. 33-43. New York: Facet.

**Further reading:**

Harvey, R., and Mahard, M. (2013). "Mapping the Preservation Landscape for the Twenty-First Century." *Preservation, Digital Technology & Culture* 42(1): 5-16.

Lavoie, B., and Dempsey, L. (2004). Thirteen Ways of Looking at Digital Preservation. *D-Lib Magazine* 10(7/8). URL: <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/july04/lavoie/07lavoie.html>

Schumacher, J., Thomas, L., VandeCreek, D., Erdman, S., Hancks, J., Haykal, A., ... & Spalenka, D. (2014). From Theory to Action: "Good Enough" Digital Preservation Solutions for Under-Resourced Cultural Heritage Institutions. White Paper, URL: [http://commons.lib.niu.edu/bitstream/10843/13610/1/FromTheoryToAction\\_POWRR\\_WhitePaper.pdf](http://commons.lib.niu.edu/bitstream/10843/13610/1/FromTheoryToAction_POWRR_WhitePaper.pdf)

Waters, D., & Garrett, J. (1996). *Preserving Digital Information. Report of the Task Force on Archiving of Digital Information*. The Commission on Preservation and Access CLIR, Washington, DC. [read pp. 1-21] URL: <https://www.clir.org/pubs/reports/pub63/>

Thibodeau, K. (2002). "Overview of Technological Approaches to Digital Preservation and Challenges in Coming Years." CLIR, Washington, DC. URL: <http://www.clir.org/pubs/reports/pub107/thibodeau.html>

**Week 13—Dec 7-9 2020**

**Library Futures: Interactivity, Makerspaces, and the Digital Humanities**

In this module, we cast our gaze on the future of libraries by discussing current trends within public and academic libraries. We will also take time to reflect on our learning experience for this course and consider how what we have learned can advanced our future studies and careers.

**Readings:**

Cun, A., Abramovich, S., & Smith, J. M. (2019). An assessment matrix for library makerspaces. *Library & Information Science Research*, 41(1), 39-47.

Sula, C. A. (2013). Digital humanities and libraries: A conceptual model. *Journal of Library Administration*, 53(1), 10-26.

### Further reading:

Abram, S., & Dysart, J. (2014). The maker movement and the library movement: Understanding the makerspaces opportunity. *Feliciter*, 60(1), 11-13.

Cuong Nguyen, L., Partridge, H., & Edwards, S. L. (2012). Towards an understanding of the participatory library. *Library Hi Tech*, 30(2), 335-346.

Holmberg, K., Huvila, I., Kronqvist-Berg, M., & Widén-Wulff, G. (2009). What is library 2.0?. *Journal of Documentation*, 65(4), 668-681.

How Libraries Are Becoming Modern Makerspaces (The Atlantic), URL:

<https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2016/03/everyone-is-a-maker/473286/>

A Librarian's Guide to Makerspaces: 16 Resources (OEDB), URL: <https://oedb.org/ilibrarian/a-librarians-guide-to-makerspaces/>

Making in the Library Toolkit (YASLA), URL:

<http://www.ala.org/yalsa/sites/ala.org.yalsa/files/content/YALSA%20Making%20Toolkit.pdf>

Wong, S. H. R. (2016). Digital humanities: What can libraries offer? *Libraries and the Academy*, 16(4), 669-690.

Zhang, Y., Liu, S., & Mathews, E. (2015). Convergence of digital humanities and digital libraries. *Library Management*, 36(4/5), 362-377.