

School of Information and Library Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

**INLS 890-164: Advanced Selected Topics - Scholarly Communication**  
**Fall Semester 2009, Wednesday, 6:00p.m.-8:30p.m., in 208 Manning Hall (3 cr.)**

**Instructor:** Phillip M. Edwards [ [phillip\\_dot\\_m\\_dot\\_edwards\\_at\\_unc\\_dot\\_edu](mailto:phillip_dot_m_dot_edwards_at_unc_dot_edu) ]  
**Office hours:** Mon., Tue., & Wed., 11:00a.m.-12:00p.m., in 207A Manning (+ by appt.)  
**Chat:** [phillip\\_dot\\_m\\_dot\\_edwards\\_at\\_gmail\\_dot\\_com](mailto:phillip_dot_m_dot_edwards_at_gmail_dot_com)  
**Instructor's site:** <http://www.unc.edu/home/pmedward/>  
**Class materials:** <https://sakai.unc.edu> [ Log in with your onyen and password ]  
**Class schedule:**

Google: [http://www.google.com/calendar/embed?src=tcqu0u18tjpp12p7jdro40knpk%40group.calendar.google.com&ctz=America/New\\_York](http://www.google.com/calendar/embed?src=tcqu0u18tjpp12p7jdro40knpk%40group.calendar.google.com&ctz=America/New_York)  
 iCal: <http://www.google.com/calendar/ical/tcqu0u18tjpp12p7jdro40knpk%40group.calendar.google.com/public/basic.ics>

[Last Updated: 2009-08-01, 12:00p.m.]

**Course description:**

This course is geared toward individuals who are interested in working in academic libraries, building or managing digital collections of scholarly materials, and/or conducting research on scholarly communication practices (i.e., master's paper research, doctoral dissertations, and beyond). While there are no formal prerequisites, students who have completed INLS 500 (or equivalent) might be better prepared for the course than those who have not. There is also a great deal of intentional synergy (but little overlap) with SILS courses on digital libraries (INLS 740), collection building in libraries and cultural heritage institutions (INLS 513), and digital preservation (INLS 752). During the semester, in-class discussions will be very people- and practice-focused. We will address (1) how scholars across academic disciplines approach their research and scholarly work (including reading behaviors, the selection of 'interesting' research problems/questions, writing and publication practices, and research evaluation); (2) the characteristics of relevant social relationships in academic settings (such as faculty-student mentoring, laboratory work, the structure of schools/departments, and 'invisible colleges'); (3) perspectives of external stakeholders—publishers, colleges and universities, libraries, funding agencies, and scholarly/professional societies—who support the scholarly communication system; (4) current and potential impacts of emerging authoring/sharing technologies (e.g., blogs, wikis, reference and data management tools, social networking sites) and venues (e.g., open access journals, 'open notebook science', subject-based or institutional repositories) upon scholarly work practices.

**Learning outcomes:**

By the end of the course, it is expected that students will be able to...

- *Engage in sophisticated inquiry*—some may think of this as “research”, others might think of this as collecting evidence to support the design and evaluation of systems, services, and programs—around practical aspects of the scholarly communication system within a particular work context;
- *Critique recent literature* on scholarly communication—from a variety of perspectives and in a variety of settings—in order to understand the major questions, issues, consequences, philosophies, models, and other forces at work;
- *Identify key authors* whose writing on scholarly communication issues typifies the nature of discourse within a particular discipline;
- *Articulate similarities and differences* between the practices and processes that characterize scholarly work across a range of disciplines, academic roles, and institutional contexts.
- *Reflect* upon their attitudes and practices for the purposes of self-assessing their performance as developing professionals.

**Required textbook [available at the UNC Student Stores in the Daniels Building]:**

Borgman, Christine L. *Scholarship in the Digital Age: Information, Infrastructure, and the Internet*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2007. [also available on reserve at the SILS Library]

**Other materials on reserve [available for limited circulation from the SILS Library]:**

Amdur, Robert J., and Elizabeth A. Bankert. *Institutional Review Board Member Handbook*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Boston: Jones and Bartlett, 2007.

Boice, Robert. *Advice for New Faculty Members: Nihil Nimus*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 2000.

Bowker, Geoffrey C. *Memory Practices in the Sciences*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2005.

Deneef, A. Leigh, and Craufurd D. Goodwin (Eds.). *The Academic's Handbook*. 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007.

Germano, William. *Getting it Published: A Guide for Scholars (and Anyone Else) Serious about Serious Books*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.

Hartley, James. *Academic Writing and Publishing: A Practical Handbook*. London: Routledge, 2008.

Katz, Richard N. (Ed.). *The Tower and the Cloud: Higher Education in the Age of Cloud Computing*. Washington, D.C.: EDUCAUSE, 2008. Full-text also available at: <http://www.educause.edu/thetowerandthecloud>

Knorr-Cetina, Karin. *Epistemic Cultures: How the Sciences Make Knowledge*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999.

Kuhn, Thomas S. *The Essential Tension: Selected Studies in Scientific Traditions and Change*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977.

Locke, Lawrence F., Waneen Wyrick Spirduso, and Stephen J. Silverman. *Proposals that Work: A Guide for Planning Dissertations and Grant Proposals*. 4<sup>th</sup> edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2000.

Merton, Robert K. *The Sociology of Science: Theoretical and Empirical Investigations*, edited by Norman W. Storer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977.

Ries, Joanne B., and Carl G. Leukefeld. *Applying for Research Funding: Getting Started and Getting Funded*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1995.

Willinsky, John. *The Access Principle: The Case for Open Access to Research and Scholarship*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2006.

**Journals, serial publications, mailing lists, sites, and blogs related to themes in this course:***Learned Publishing*

[<http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/alpsp/lp>]

*Council on Library and Information Resources Reports*

[<http://www.clir.org/pubs/reports/>]

*D-Lib Magazine*

[<http://www.dlib.org/>]

*The Scholarly Kitchen*

[<http://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/>]

*Directory of Open Access Journals*

[<http://www.doaj.org/>]

*CreateChange*

[<http://www.createchange.org/>]

*Creative Commons*

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

## CNI-ANNOUNCE mailing list

[[http://www.cni.org/forums/subscribe\\_announce.html](http://www.cni.org/forums/subscribe_announce.html)]

*Liblicense-L* mailing list

[<http://www.library.yale.edu/~llicense/ListArchives/>]

## SIGMETRICS mailing list

[<http://web.utk.edu/~gwhitney/sigmetrics.html>]

## SPARC Open Access Forum newsletter and mailing list

[<http://www.arl.org/sparc/publications/soan/>]

*Registry of Open Access Repositories (ROAR)*

[<http://roar.eprints.org/>]

*Directory of Open Access Repositories (OpenDOAR)*

[<http://www.opendoar.org/>]

*RoMEO (Rights Metadata for Open archiving)*

[<http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo/>]

## How to succeed in this course

Graduate courses vary with regard to their classroom dynamics, how the literature is approached, and the learning objectives for students. Rather than hoping that you will “figure this out as we go,” the following suggestions are provided to illustrate techniques that might help you to prepare yourself for class, efficiently read the required materials, and effectively engage with course activities in the classroom.

***Preparing for class.*** Of the 10-13 hours you should expect to spend each week on coursework for INLS 890-164, we spend approximately 2.5 of those hours in class. Each week, you should spend roughly 1-2 hours searching for relevant literature about a particular discipline’s scholarly communication issues. To make the most efficient use of our time together, I expect students to have already (1) completed the required readings for that day [for more information, see *Completing the required readings* below]; (2) considered any reading questions and explored any additional resources posted on Sakai; and (3) prepared to talk about the literature they have located since the previous class session.

***Completing the required readings.*** I expect all students to have completed any required readings prior to the class session in which they are discussed. Many of the readings adopt a particular perspective on scholarly communication practices; I expect you to develop your own set of attitudes and opinions about your practices, but in order to position yourself in the field, it is essential that you are able to critically analyze—and sometimes experiment with or role play—the perspectives of other authors.

***Participating during (and reflecting after) class.*** The majority of our time in class will be spent in discussion—as an 800-level course, I structure class sessions as seminars rather than full lectures/activities—and, as such, you should be confident in your understanding of the readings and the implications that these topics hold for your professional development. Many students may find it helpful to devote time immediately after class to reflect upon that day’s discussions and jot brief notes for themselves to follow up with before the next session.

***Writing and editing.*** If you have any concerns about the quality of your written work for this class, please feel free to share whatever drafts you’ve produced (*especially* during office hours) or visit the UNC Writing Center (<http://www.unc.edu/depts/wcweb/>) before an assignment is due.

***Periodic assessment of your learning and the class.*** In this class, regular feedback on your work—from me and from your peers—is integral to your success. Keep in mind that any criticism you give or receive should be, above all, constructive. Similarly, I have a strong interest in learning about which aspects of the course are helping or hindering your learning. I will periodically ask you to perform short assessments of your learning, the effectiveness of class activities and experiences, and the progress you’ve made on your class projects.

***Late work, missing class, and other unfortunate events.*** Life is unpredictable, and occasionally circumstances beyond your control may have an impact on your life as a student. Advance notice of any anticipated difficulties is appreciated; last-minute notice is not. Please ask me if you have any questions on how to successfully navigate this course and assignments.

## Course Schedule

*Note: numbers in parentheses indicate one suggested order for reading these pieces: (1), (2), (3),...*

Week 1	<p><b>Session 1 – Wednesday, August 21, 2009 – Introduction to the course</b></p> <p>Read prior to session:</p> <p>(1) Borgman (2007). [Preface], [Acknowledgements], and "Scholarship at a crossroads" (Ch. 1) [required text]</p> <p>(2) Edwards, Phillip M., Elaine Z. Jennenich, and Jennifer L. Ward. "Supporting a culture of library research at the University of Washington at Seattle." Ch. 5 in <i>An Introduction to Staff Development in Academic Libraries</i>, edited by Elizabeth Connor, pp. 77-89. New York: Routledge, 2009.</p>
Week 2	<p><b>Session 2 – Wednesday, September 2, 2009 – Definitions, frameworks, and Science &amp; Technology Studies</b></p> <p>Read prior to session:</p> <p>(2) Borgman (2007), "Building the scholarly infrastructure" (Ch. 2) and "Embedded everywhere" (Ch. 3) [required text]</p> <p>(1) Schuster, Jack H., and Martin J. Finkelstein. "Appendix F. Academic appointments: Historical milestones." In <i>The American Faculty: The Restructuring of Academic Work and Careers</i>, pp. 422-428. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006.</p> <p>(3) Taylor, Robert S. "Value-added processes in the information life cycle." <i>Journal of the American Society for Information Science</i> 33, no. 5 (1982): 341-346. [FOCUS ON: Figure 1, "Value-added spectrum"]</p>
Week 3	<p><b>Session 3 – Wednesday, September 9, 2009 – Forms of scholarly communication</b></p> <p>Read prior to session:</p> <p>(3) Borgman (2007), "The continuity of scholarly communication" (Ch. 4), "The discontinuity of scholarly publishing" (Ch. 5), and "Building an infrastructure for information" (Ch. 7) [required text]</p> <p>(1) Guédon, Jean-Claude. "In Oldenburg's long shadow: Librarians, research scientists, publishers, and the control of scientific publishing." From <i>Creating the Digital Future</i> (138<sup>th</sup> Association of Research Libraries Membership Meeting), Toronto, ON, 2001. Available at: <a href="http://www.arl.org/resources/pubs/mmproceedings/138guedon.shtml">http://www.arl.org/resources/pubs/mmproceedings/138guedon.shtml</a></p> <p>(2) Søndergaard, Trine Fjordback, Jack Andersen, and Birger Hjørland. "Documents and the communication of scientific and scholarly information: Revising and updating the UNISIST model." <i>Journal of Documentation</i> 59, no. 3 (2003): 278-320. Available at: <a href="http://www.emeraldinsight.com/10.1108/00220410310472509">http://www.emeraldinsight.com/10.1108/00220410310472509</a> [SKIM]</p> <p>—AND—</p> <p>(4) Brockman, William S., Laura J. Neumann, Carole L. Palmer, and Tonya J. Tidline. "Scholarly work in the humanities and the evolving information environment." Washington, D.C.: Digital Library Federation and the Council on Library and Information Resources, 2001. Available at: <a href="http://www.dlr.org/pubs/reports/pub104/pub104.pdf">http://www.dlr.org/pubs/reports/pub104/pub104.pdf</a> [SKIM]</p> <p>—OR—</p> <p>(4b) Kling, Rob, and Geoffrey McKim. "Not Just a Matter of Time: Field Differences and the Shaping of Electronic Media in Supporting Scientific Communication." <i>Journal of the American Society for Information Science</i> 51, no. 14 (2000): 1306-1320. Available at: <a href="http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/1097-4571(2000)9999:9999&lt;AID-ASH1047&gt;3.0.CO;2-T">http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/1097-4571(2000)9999:9999&lt;AID-ASH1047&gt;3.0.CO;2-T</a></p>
Week 4	<p><b>Session 4 – Wednesday, September 16, 2009 – Scholars-in-development</b></p> <p><i>For session 4 through session 9, we will devote half of our class time to discussing student-selected readings from a particular discipline related to the topic of each class. Today, for example, we will be discussing doctoral education across the disciplines with an eye toward how new faculty members are socialized into their disciplines. The readings that you discuss in each class should be added to your annotated bibliographies (Assignment #2) as we move through the semester.</i></p> <p>Read prior to session:</p> <p>(2) Walker, George E., Chris M. Golde, Laura Jones, Andrea Conklin Bueschel, and Pat Hutchings. "A call to action." Ch. 7 in <i>The Formation of Scholars: Rethinking Doctoral Education for the Twenty-First Century</i>, pp. 141-159. San Francisco: Jossey Bass (for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching), 2008.</p> <p>(1) Zuckerman, Harriet. "Masters and apprentices in science." Ch. 4 in <i>Scientific Elite: Nobel Laureates in the United States</i>, pp. 96-143. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1996 [originally published, 1977].</p>

Week 5	<p><b>Session 5 – Wednesday, September 23, 2009 – Scholars-as-searchers and -readers</b>  Read prior to session:</p> <p>(1a) Ellis, David. "Modeling the information-seeking patterns of academic researchers: A grounded theory approach." <i>Library Quarterly</i> 63, no. 4 (1993): 469-86. Available at: <a href="http://www.jstor.org/stable/4308867">http://www.jstor.org/stable/4308867</a>  –OR–</p> <p>(1b) Ellis, David, Deborah Cox, and Katherine Hall. "A comparison of the information seeking patterns of researchers in the physical and social sciences." <i>Journal of Documentation</i> 49, no. 4 (1993): 356-69.  –OR–</p> <p>(1c) Ellis, David, and Merete Haugan. "Modelling the information seeking patterns of engineers and research scientists in an industrial environment." <i>Journal of Documentation</i> 53, no. 4 (1997): 384-403. Available at: <a href="http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/EUM0000000007204">http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/EUM0000000007204</a>  –OR–</p> <p>(1d) Ellis, David, and Hanna Oldman. "The English literature researcher in the age of the internet." <i>Journal of Information Science</i> 31, no. 1 (2005): 29-36. Available at: <a href="http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0165551505049256">http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0165551505049256</a>  –OR–</p> <p>(1e) Meho, Lokman I., and Helen R. Tibbo. "Modeling the information-seeking behavior of social scientists: Ellis's study revisited." <i>Journal of the American Society for Information Science &amp; Technology</i> 54, no. 6 (2003): 570-87. Available at: <a href="http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/asi.10244">http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/asi.10244</a>  –AND–</p> <p>(2a) Belefant-Miller, Helen, and Donald W. King. "How, what, and why science faculty read." <i>Science &amp; Technology Libraries</i> 19, no. 2 (2001): 91-112. Available at: <a href="http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J122v19n02_08">http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J122v19n02_08</a>  –OR–</p> <p>(2b) Dalton, Margaret Stieg, and Laurie Charnigo. "Historians and their information needs." <i>College &amp; Research Libraries</i> 65, no. 5 (2004): 400-25. Available at: <a href="http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/publications/crljournal/2004/sep/dalton.pdf">http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/publications/crljournal/2004/sep/dalton.pdf</a>  –AND–</p> <p>(3) Covi, Lisa M. "Material mastery: Situating digital library use in university research practices." <i>Information Processing and Management</i> 35, no. 3 (1999): 293-316. Available at: <a href="http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0306-4573(98)00063-6">http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0306-4573(98)00063-6</a></p>
Week 6	<p><b>Session 6 – Wednesday, September 30, 2009 – Scholars-as-scholars</b>  Read prior to session:</p> <p>(2) Borgman (2007), "Data: The input and output of scholarship" (Ch. 6) [required text]</p> <p>(3) Gilbert, G. Nigel, and Michael Mulkay. "Contexts of scientific discourse." Ch. 3 in <i>Opening Pandora's Box: A Sociological Analysis of Scientists' Discourse</i>, pp. 39-62. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1984.</p> <p>(1) Latour, Bruno, and Steve Woolgar. "An anthropologist visits the laboratory." Ch. 2 in <i>Laboratory Life: The Construction of Scientific Facts</i> (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.), pp. 43-90. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986 [originally published by Sage, 1979].</p> <p>(4) Seiber, Joan E. "Openness in the social sciences: Sharing data." <i>Ethics &amp; Behavior</i> 1, no. 2 (1991): 69-86. Available at: <a href="http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&amp;db=aph&amp;AN=7314897&amp;site=ehost-live">http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&amp;db=aph&amp;AN=7314897&amp;site=ehost-live</a></p> <p>(5) <i>Useful Chemistry</i> (Jean-Claude Bradley @ Drexel University): <a href="http://usefulchem.blogspot.com/">http://usefulchem.blogspot.com/</a> [SKIM]</p> <p>(6) <i>Science Commons</i>: <a href="http://sciencecommons.org/">http://sciencecommons.org/</a> [SKIM]</p>
Week 7	<p><b>Session 7 – Wednesday, October 7, 2009 – Scholars-as-writers and -citers</b>  *** Due prior to the start of class (via Sakai): <i>Assignment #1, Conversation with a scholar</i>***  Read prior to session:</p> <p>(2) Frohmann, Bernd. "Literary Technologies of Science." Ch. 5 in <i>Deflating Information: From Science Studies to Documentation</i>, pp. 159-198. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004.</p> <p>(1) Latour, Bruno. "Literature." Ch. 1 in <i>Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers through Society</i>, pp. 21-62. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987.</p> <p>(3) <i>Nature Proceedings</i>: <a href="http://proceedings.nature.com/">http://proceedings.nature.com/</a> [SKIM]</p> <p>(4) <i>SciVee</i>: <a href="http://www.scivee.tv/">http://www.scivee.tv/</a> [SKIM]</p> <p>Optional readings:</p> <p>(6) Cronin, Blaise. "Hyperauthorship." Ch. 3 in <i>The Hand of Science: Academic Writing and its Rewards</i>, pp. 41-70. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2005.</p> <p>(5) Evans, James A. "Electronic publication and the narrowing of science and scholarship." <i>Science</i> 321, no. 395 (2008, July 18): 395-399. Available at: <a href="http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.1150473">http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.1150473</a></p>

Week 8	<p><b>Session 8 – Wednesday, October 14, 2009 – The many dimensions of modern “scholarship”</b>                  *** Due at the start of class (<u>in print</u>): Draft of <i>Assignment #2, Annotated bibliography</i> ***                  Read prior to session:                  (1) Boyer, Ernest L. “Enlarging the perspective” (Ch. 2) and “The Faculty: A Mosaic of Talent” (Ch. 3). In <i>Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate</i>, pp. 15-25 and pp. 27-41. New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching/Jossey-Bass, 1990.</p>
Week 9	<p><b>NO CLASS (Fall break) – Wednesday, October 21, 2009</b>                  *** Schedule <i>individual conferences</i> with me between 10/14/2009 (after session 8) and 11/4/2009 (session 9). ***</p>
Week 10	<p><b>NO CLASS (PME @ 4S Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C.) – Wednesday, October 28, 2009</b>  <a href="http://www.4sonline.org/meeting.htm">http://www.4sonline.org/meeting.htm</a>                  Edwards, P. M. (2009, October/November). <i>Opportunity knocks: Authors' writing and publishing decisions when manuscripts are solicited</i>. Paper presentation at the annual meeting of the Society for Social Studies of Science (4S), Washington, DC.</p>
Week 11	<p><b>Session 9 – Wednesday, November 4, 2009 – Scholars working together and across boundaries</b>                  Read prior to session:                  (4) Borgman (2007). “Disciplines, Documents, and Data” (Ch. 8) [required text]                  (1) Lamont, Michele. “On Disciplinary Cultures.” Ch. 3 in <i>How Professors Think: Inside the Curious World of Academic Judgment</i>. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009.                  (2) Palmer, Carole L. “Scholarly Work and the Shaping of Digital Access.” <i>Journal of the American Society for Information Science &amp; Technology</i> 56, no. 11 (2005): 1140-53. Available at: <a href="http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/asi.20204">http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/asi.20204</a> [SKIM]                  (3) Kling, Rob, Lisa B. Spector, and Joanna Fortuna. “The Real Stakes of Virtual Publishing: The Transformation of E-Biomed into PubMed Central.” <i>Journal of the American Society for Information Science &amp; Technology</i> 55, no. 2 (2004): 127-48. Available at <a href="http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/asi.10352">http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/asi.10352</a>                  (5) Kling, Rob, Lisa Spector, and Geoff McKim. “Locally controlled scholarly publishing via the internet: The guild model.” <i>Journal of Electronic Publishing</i> 8, no. 1 (2002). Available at <a href="http://dx.doi.org/10.3998/3336451.0008.101">http://dx.doi.org/10.3998/3336451.0008.101</a> [SKIM]</p>
Week 12	<p><b>NO CLASS (PME @ ASIS&amp;T Annual Meeting in Vancouver, BC) – Wednesday, November 11, 2009</b>  <a href="http://www.asis.org/Conferences/AM09/">http://www.asis.org/Conferences/AM09/</a>                  Edwards, P. M., Daniel, E., Greenberg, J., Kramer-Duffield, J., Taylor, H., Woodbury, D., et al. (in press). Evaluating technology-, information literacy-, and content-related learning outcomes among undergraduate students in face-to-face and social networking environments. In <i>Proceedings of the American Society for Information Science &amp; Technology Annual Meeting, Vol. 46. Thriving on diversity – Information opportunities in a pluralistic world</i>. Wiley InterScience/American Society for Information Science &amp; Technology. [POSTER]                  Nathan, L., DeLap, A., Edwards, P., &amp; Freier, N. (in press). Institutional review boards: Ethics, regulations and the research agenda. In <i>Proceedings of the American Society for Information Science &amp; Technology Annual Meeting, Vol. 46. Thriving on diversity – Information opportunities in a pluralistic world</i>. Wiley InterScience/American Society for Information Science &amp; Technology. [PANEL]                  Sugimoto, C. R., &amp; Edwards, P. M. (in press). Application of literature-enhanced concept mapping to curriculum design: A case study in the domain of scholarly communication. In <i>Proceedings of the American Society for Information Science &amp; Technology Annual Meeting, Vol. 46. Thriving on diversity – Information opportunities in a pluralistic world</i>. Wiley InterScience/American Society for Information Science &amp; Technology. [POSTER]</p>

Week 13	<p><b>Session 10 – Wednesday, November 18, 2009 – Institutions and other stakeholders</b>                  *** Due at the start of class (in print): <i>Draft of Assignment #3, IRB application</i> (3 copies) ***                  Skim these organizational websites for scholarly communication-related position statements prior to session:                  American Association of University Professors [<a href="http://www.aaup.org/">http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/</a>]                  American Council of Learned Societies [<a href="http://www.acs-ls.org/">http://www.acs-ls.org/</a>]                  Alliance for Taxpayer Access [<a href="http://www.taxpayeraccess.org/">http://www.taxpayeraccess.org/</a>]                  Coalition for Networked Information [<a href="http://www.coi.org/">http://www.coi.org/</a>]                  Council of Graduate Schools [<a href="http://www.cgsnet.org/">http://www.cgsnet.org/</a>]                  National Institutes of Health [<a href="http://publicaccess.nih.gov/">http://publicaccess.nih.gov/</a>]                  Office for Scholarly Communication, Harvard University [<a href="http://osc.harvard.edu/osc.php">http://osc.harvard.edu/osc.php</a>]                  Society for Scholarly Publishing [<a href="http://www.sspnet.org/">http://www.sspnet.org/</a>]                  Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition [<a href="http://www.sparc.org/index.shtml">http://www.sparc.org/index.shtml</a>]</p>
Week 14	<p><b>NO CLASS (Thanksgiving Recess) – Wednesday, November 25, 2009</b></p>
Week 15	<p><b>Session 11 – Wednesday, December 2, 2009 – Visions of the future</b>                  *** Due prior to the start of class (via Sakai): <i>Assignment #2, Annotated Bibliography</i> ***                  *** Due at the start of class (in print): <i>Peer reviews of Assignment #1 drafts</i> (2 copies of each review) ***                  Read prior to session:                  (1) Borgman (2007), "The View from Here" (Ch. 9) [required text]                  (2) Boyle, James, "Mertonianism unbound: Imagining free, decentralized access to most cultural and scientific material," Ch. 5 in <i>Understanding Knowledge as a Common: From Theory to Practice</i>, edited by Charlotte Hess and Elinor Ostrom, pp. 123-143. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2007.</p>
Week 16	<p><b>Session 12 – Wednesday, December 9, 2009 – Conclusions and scholarly communication in LIS</b>                  *** Due via Sakai by 8:30p.m. on 12/11/2009: <i>Assignment #3, IRB application for research or program evaluation</i> ***</p>

## Assignment Summary

	<u>Percentage of your grade</u>
<i>Assignment #1, Conversation with a scholar</i> (Due <u>via Sakai</u> : 10/7)	10%
<i>Assignment #2, Discipline-specific annotated bibliography</i> (Due <u>via Sakai</u> : 12/2)	35%
Draft of <i>Assignment #2</i> (Due <u>in paper</u> : 10/14)	0%
<i>Assignment #3, IRB application for research or program evaluation</i> (Due <u>via Sakai</u> by 8:30pm, 12/11)	35%
Draft of <i>Assignment #3</i> (Three copies, due <u>in paper</u> : 11/18)	0%
Peer reviews of classmates' <i>Assignment #3</i> drafts (Two copies, due <u>in paper</u> : 12/2)	5%
Individual conferences related to <i>Assignments #1, #2, #3</i> (S8: 10/14/2009 – S9: 11/04/2009)	5%
<u>Class participation</u>	<u>10%</u>
	100%

Based on UNC Registrar Policy for courses (<http://regweb.unc.edu/resources/rpm24.php>), semester grades will be H, P, L or F for graduate students and A-F for undergraduate students. Grades for individual assignments will be based on the points obtained on each assignment, weighted by percentages given above, in order to calculate final semester grades. Numerical grades roughly translate into the following letter grades:

### Graduate:

98.0 - 100%	H
95.0 - 97.9%	P+
91.0 - 94.9%	P
88.0 - 90.9%	P-
85.0 - 87.9%	L
< 84.9%	F

If you have any questions or concerns about your grades in this course, please feel free to ask me.

### Final notes

Above all, have fun, learn as much as you can from this experience, and be open to where your interests in this broad topic might take you. I am here to help you succeed—both by creating an environment that supports your explorations and by pointing you in the direction of resources that might be useful to your development as a professional.

I am also happy to connect with any student via any social systems/tools which might be personally or professionally valuable to you: LinkedIn, FriendFeed, Google Reader, Facebook, Twitter, Goodreads, LibraryThing, delicious, etc.—all are fair game. Now, I will never make a request for *you* to connect with *me*—which I consider to be something that oversteps and muddles the nature of the teacher-student relationship—but I have no hesitations about accepting your requests for *me* to connect with *you*. I should add, however, that I consider any traffic I might observe from you via those various social systems/tools is 'off the record' as far as I'm concerned, and it neither positively nor negatively impacts your grade in this course. Even so, if you'd ever like to connect after the semester is over, that would be fine, too. [Maybe I belabor this point, but I think it's worth mentioning from the outset.]

School of Information and Library Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

**INLS 890-164: Advanced Selected Topics - Scholarly Communication**  
**Fall Semester 2009, Wednesday, 6:00p.m.-8:30p.m., in 208 Manning Hall (3 cr.)**

---

**Assignment #1, Conversation with a scholar (10% of course grade)**

*Due via Sakai before the start of class session 7 (10/07/2009)*

[Last updated: 2009-08-01, 1:00p.m.]

**Learning outcomes:**

- To engage a scholar in conversation about his or her scholarly communication practices within the context of a particular discipline
- To develop strategies for designing and conducting qualitative interviews and analyzing the resulting data
- To reflect upon successful strategies and any challenges associated with conducting these kinds of conversations in the field

**Deliverables:**

- A 2- to 3-page [est.] critical summary of a 45- to 60-minute conversation/interview with a scholar at an academic institution
- A 2- to 3-paragraph [est.] personal reflection on your strategies for initiating and sustaining this conversation, any aspects of your approach that you consider to be particularly successful, and any challenges you encountered during your session with the scholar.
- *Submit these pieces in a single Word doc via Sakai before the start of class session 7 (10/07/2009)*
- Photocopies of all fieldnotes taken during this conversation (submitted in print; not graded)

**Requirements and procedural aspects:**

- For the discipline you have chosen to explore this semester, identify a scholar working within that discipline at an institution of higher education in the Triangle area
- Locate as much information about this scholar as you can via unobtrusive means: looking on the Web for information about their research, projects, laboratory, area of study, etc.; searching in relevant academic databases for their recent publications; or browsing a publicly-available version of his or her curriculum vitae.
- Arrange a time to meet with this individual, in his or her office or elsewhere, for the purposes of having a 45- to 60-minute conversation about his or her current research as well as practices related to the publication and sharing of the written products of this scholarship. You should aim to discuss at least two different projects and/or four different publications during your conversation.

- To structure this session, you might have your scholar begin by talking about his or her current/recent research and the papers he or she has recently published. For each paper or project, the following questions or prompts may be helpful:
  - Please tell me about this article.
  - Please tell me about the project that it reports about.
  - When did you start to think about writing this article?
  - Why did you consider posting/publishing this article here?
  - Are there any other places that you would have considered publishing/distributing this article? Why did you decide against these options or for the option you selected?
  - Where else do articles related to this project reside?
  - Who was responsible for deciding where they would appear?
  - What helped as you thought about where to publish? What hindered as you thought about where to publish?
- As possible, take notes during this conversation. Try to record key phrasings, in the scholar's own words, but if this becomes overwhelming, try to capture the gist of the scholar's comments; for example, identifying events, ordering of events, and any names of people, organizations, or journals/monographs/conferences might be elements to record in earnest.
- Immediately after your conversation, find a secluded, quiet space to review your notes and to clarify or augment any statements based on your memory of the interaction.
- Shortly after your conversation, write a 2- to 3-page synthesis of the key points emerging from your conversation about research and publishing/distribution practices for that scholar. You should include some information about the scholar as well, including his or her current rank (Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor) and the discipline in which his or her research resides. Also compose a 2- to 3-paragraph personal reflection on your strategies for initiating and sustaining this conversation, any aspects of your approach that you consider to be particularly successful, and any challenges you encountered during your session with the scholar.
- In addition to the above pieces of writing, submit a photocopy of your fieldnotes. (The quality of fieldnotes will not be considered in your grade for Assignment #1 but will be referenced during your individual consultation with me between 10/14/2009 [end of class session 8] and 11/04/2009 [start of class session 9].)
- Your written summary and reflection will ultimately be assessed on (1) the depth of your analysis and reflection; (2) the application of specific themes from the course to the scholar's responses; (3) and the overall quality of your presentation (i.e., grammar and usage matter).

**Suggestions for approaching this assignment:**

- From *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes* by Robert M. Emerson, Rachel I. Fretz, and Linda L. Shaw (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995):

“Although taking down jottings may at first seem odd or awkward, after a time it often becomes a normal and expected part of what a fieldworker does... Yet even when some people become familiar with open writings in their presence, others may become upset when the researcher pulls out his [or her] pad and begins to write down their words and actions. Ethnographers may try to avoid the likely challenges and facilitate open, extensive note-taking by positioning themselves on the margins of the interaction. Even then, they may still encounter questions, as reflected in the following comment by a field researcher observing divorce mediation sessions:

I tried to take notes that were as complete as possible during the session. My sitting behind the client had probably more to do with wanting to get a lot of written notes as unobtrusively as possible as with any more worthy methodological reason. While taking copious amounts of notes (approximately 50 pages per session) did not seem to bother the clients, a few mediators became quite defensive about it. One mediator wanted to know how I ‘decided what to write down and what not to write down.’ At staff meetings, the same mediator would sit next to me and try to glance over to see what I had written in my notebook.

Given the delicacy of this and similar situations, fieldworkers must constantly rely upon interactional skills and tact to judge whether or not taking jottings in the moment is appropriate.” (pp. 22-23)

School of Information and Library Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

**INLS 890-164: Advanced Selected Topics - Scholarly Communication**  
**Fall Semester 2009, Wednesday, 6:00p.m.-8:30p.m., in 208 Manning Hall (3 cr.)**

---

**Individual conferences related to Assignments #1, #2, #3 (10/14/09-11/04/09)**  
**(5% of course grade)**

[Last updated: 2009-08-01, 1:00p.m.]

**Suggestions for approaching individual conferences:**

- These conferences, typically ranging from 45- to 60-minutes, are first and foremost to help *you* as you grapple with course assignments and with relating what we're doing in class to the professional goals that you have. If you have questions specific to your projects for this course, please come with those questions in mind for your scheduled conference.
- I will be prepared to debrief about the conversation you had with your scholar (via fieldnotes from *Assignment #1*), the materials you've been gathering for your annotated bibliography (via the draft of *Assignment #2* you submit on 10/14/2009), and the ideas you have for your IRB application for research or program evaluation (*Assignment #3*).
- My schedule, which I update as I agree to commitments, is available here: [http://www.google.com/calendar/embed?src=phillip.m.edwards%40gmail.com&ctz=America/New\\_York&mode=AGENDA](http://www.google.com/calendar/embed?src=phillip.m.edwards%40gmail.com&ctz=America/New_York&mode=AGENDA) and to schedule your individual consultation, please suggest (via email) two or three times that would work for you when I'm not listed as 'busy'—at any time after class session 8 (10/14/2009) and through the start of class session 9 (11/04/2009).
- Your grade for this individual conference is associated with attending our scheduled session.

School of Information and Library Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

**INLS 890-164: Advanced Selected Topics - Scholarly Communication**  
**Fall Semester 2009, Wednesday, 6:00p.m.-8:30p.m., in 208 Manning Hall (3 cr.)**

---

**Assignment #2, Discipline-specific annotated bibliography**  
**(35% of course grade)**

*Draft of preliminary bibliography due in paper at the start of class session 8 (10/14/2009; not graded)*

*Final bibliography due via Sakai before the start of class session 11 (12/02/2009)*

[Last updated: 2009-08-01, 1:00p.m.]

**Learning outcomes:**

- To identify and critique relevant literature on scholarly communication issues within a particular discipline or field of study
- To reflect upon the quality and scope of current scholarly communication research

**Deliverables:**

- A 30- to 40-item critical bibliography of articles, papers, books, and other media reflecting scholarly communication issues within a particular discipline or field of study
- A 4- to 5-paragraph introduction and personal reflection on the scope and construction of your bibliography (i.e., why are the included items included, why are any excluded items excluded, how did you locate/identify these items) as well as a list of individuals you would consider to be key authors in this area.
- *Submit these pieces in a single Word doc via Sakai before the start of class session 11 (12/02/2009).*
- *A preliminary draft of your bibliography is due in print at the start of class session 8 (10/14/2009).*

**Requirements and procedural aspects:**

- For the discipline you have chosen to explore this semester, you will assemble a critical\* annotated bibliography of articles, papers, books, and other media that reflect the scholarly communication practices of scholars who work within that discipline or field of study.  

*\* What do I mean by "critical"? A critical (or evaluative) bibliography is one in which you assess the strengths and weaknesses of each item in addition to describing the methods, participants, conclusions, etc. There is more information about critical/evaluative annotations available from the UNC Writing Center ([http://www.unc.edu/depts/wcweb/handouts/annotated\\_bibliographies.html](http://www.unc.edu/depts/wcweb/handouts/annotated_bibliographies.html)), and I've also posted a pdf excerpt (with examples) from the "Kinds of Abstracts" chapter of Abstracting Scientific and Technical Literature (1971) if it would be helpful in clarifying the difference between more descriptive approaches and more evaluative (or critical) ones.*
- For each entry/item in your bibliography, please include the full reference to the item in APA style—Questions? See: <http://www.lib.unc.edu/instruct/citations/apa/index.html> — as well as descriptive elements (e.g., the item's main points, objectives, methods, conclusions, etc.) and critical elements (e.g., the strengths or limitations of the item, any (dis)connections to what others have previously found).

## ASSIGNMENT #2, DISCIPLINE-SPECIFIC ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- With your final submission, also include a 4- to 5-paragraph introduction and personal reflection on the scope and construction of your bibliography (i.e., why are the included items included, why are any excluded items excluded, how did you locate/identify these items) as well as a list of individuals you would consider to be key authors in this area. This introduction should set the context for the types of items that the reader is going to find (or not find) in the bibliography and how an interested reader might replicate or verify your strategies for building the bibliography.
- As an estimate of how extensive your bibliography should be, you might aim to select between 30 and 40 items; more extensive bibliographies are acceptable so long as the depth of analysis for each annotation does not suffer as a result.
- Your annotated bibliography for your chosen discipline will ultimately be assessed on (1) the depth of your analysis for each annotation; (2) the organization of your bibliography; (3) the criteria you use to determine the scope of the bibliography; (4) the strategies you describe using to build the bibliography; and (5) and the overall quality of your presentation (i.e., grammar and usage matter).

### Suggestions for approaching this assignment:

- Starting in session 4 (and continuing through session 9), we will be devoting roughly half of our time in class to discussing the items that students have found for their disciplines that relate to each class session's topic. Any items that you bring forward for discussion are good candidates for inclusion in your annotated bibliography, and the discussion around those items might be helpful for understanding how "good" or "limited" your selected items are in the broader range of scholarly communication studies.
- You will be meeting with me individually between 10/14/2009 and 11/04/2009 (see the description for *Individual conferences related to Assignments #1, #2, #3*), and the preliminary draft of your annotated bibliography is of the things that we could discuss during our conference. At that time, I will offer suggestions and ask clarifying questions related to the on-going development of your bibliography.

School of Information and Library Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

**INLS 890-164: Advanced Selected Topics - Scholarly Communication**  
**Fall Semester 2009, Wednesday, 6:00p.m.-8:30p.m., in 208 Manning Hall (3 cr.)**

---

**Assignment #3, IRB application for research or program evaluation**  
**(final IRB application [35%] + peer reviews [5%] = 40% of course grade)**

*Three copies of your draft of Assignment #3 due in print at the start of class session 10 (11/18/2009)*

*Two copies of peer reviews of your classmates' drafts due in print at the start of class session 11 (12/02/2009)*

*Final IRB application due via Sakai by 8:30p.m. on 12/11/2009*

[Last updated: 2009-08-01, 2:30p.m.]

**Learning outcomes:**

- Articulating a researchable/"evaluate-able" set of questions to guide systematic inquiry related to scholarly communication issues
- Planning and documenting (via one "standard form", an IRB application) a research or evaluation protocol that can (1) generate new knowledge or program modification and (2) yield results which can be shared with the professional community.
- Offering constructive feedback to colleagues related to research/evaluation in a professional context

**Deliverables:**

- A completed IRB application (including relevant additional documents) that describes study protocols related to an issue (or issues) in the area of scholarly communication
- *Submit the above pieces as one or more Word docs via Sakai before 8:30p.m. on 12/11/2009*

--AND--

- Peer reviews of two classmates' in-progress drafts of their IRB applications

**Requirements and procedural aspects:**

- This assignment is the most self-directed of the activities you will complete for this course, but there are several potential "tracks" that you might choose to follow:
  - For students interested in working professionally in academic libraries: You may propose the design of a new scholarly communication-related service or program within a particular "real" work context. (The IRB application, then, will detail the general parameters of the new service/program as well as the mechanisms you would use to evaluate its outcomes.) The particular setting in which this service/program is may be of your choice, but it must be "real", i.e., *not* a hypothetical situation/setting. The setting you choose may be a place you work or have a personal connection to (e.g., the site of a field experience) or would like to have a connection to (e.g., an organization where you might seek employment in the future). I would encourage anyone working in a setting where your service/programming could actually be implemented to think about using this as an opportunity to write a design/evaluation proposal for a service/program with "real world" impact. You might consider an

initiative that would be targeted toward education, advocacy, research support, outreach, etc. involving a specific population (e.g., tenured faculty members, faculty members from a particular set of disciplines, or graduate students).

- For students interested in conducting original research (e.g., for you master's paper): You may propose a study that would involve directly engaging with scholars (via survey, interviews, or other methods) to address a particular set of research questions, either via a hypothesis-based approach or something more exploratory in nature. (The IRB application, then, will detail the general parameters of your study, how you would recruit participants, the method or methods you would use, how you plan to analyze the responses you receive, etc.) You may want to think about the gaps in our understanding of scholarly communication practices or areas of professional practice where there are persistent challenges—these are places where “interesting” questions and problems live.
- Regardless of your “track”, information from the following UNC websites will be integral to your project:
  - Research at Carolina: <http://research.unc.edu/services/index.php>
  - IRB-Related Forms: <http://research.unc.edu/services/forms.php#human>
  - CITI Program: [http://research.unc.edu/ohre/browser\\_check.php](http://research.unc.edu/ohre/browser_check.php)
- Your final submissions will be evaluated on (1) the level of sophistication in presenting your program or study; (2) the extent to which you support your program/study with relevant literature and background information; (3) the completeness, thoughtfulness, and clarity of your planning process (evidenced by the creation of all necessary documentation that might supplement the IRB application form); and (4) the quality of your presentation (i.e., grammar and usage matter).
- Before your final project is due, you will have opportunities to give and receive feedback on a preliminary written draft:
  - **Peer reviews of your classmates' drafts.** Each student will have the opportunity to critique the drafts of two other students from the class. When you're reviewing another's proposal, you may ask questions similar to those I've posed in this piece from *College & Research Libraries News* in November 2007: [http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/publications/crlnews/2007/nov/Developing\\_a\\_writer.cfm](http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/publications/crlnews/2007/nov/Developing_a_writer.cfm) or you may offer feedback according to a more individualized set of criteria. Each peer review will be graded on a three-level scale: 'excellent' [5 points], 'acceptable' [3 points], or 'unacceptable' [0 points]. Excellent peer reviews will provide the student receiving the critique with substantive feedback on how to improve the quality of the draft. Acceptable peer reviews will be lacking in some respect but still display a noticeable amount of thoughtful analysis on the part of the reviewer. Unacceptable peer reviews will exhibit significant lack of depth and observable effort on the part of the reviewer. Two copies of each of your peer reviews are due at the start of class session 11 (12/02/2009); please make a photocopy of your reviewed documents and comments—the copy will go to me, and the original review will go to the proposals' authors.

**Suggestions for approaching this assignment:**

- Many (if not most) of the students in the course may have neither designed a service, program, or research study nor completed an IRB application before. Because I believe that these are essential skills for any practicing professional, I plan to work closely with you to refine and shape these proposals as well as to help you grapple with the logistics of preparing this kind of documentation. That said, I cannot compel you to volunteer any difficulties or challenges you might be facing, privately, with regard to this assignment. I expect that if you run into any obstacles while working on this assignment, it is your responsibility to approach me with your concerns. Above all, I am here to help, advise, brainstorm, problem-solve, inspire, focus, refer, connect, suggest, and otherwise consult with you. If it would be helpful, you could think of me as a partner in this process—I am genuinely eager to see what you propose and how you describe your project.
- If you have already been working on an IRB application for some other purpose or in consultation with your master's paper advisor, please ask me about the potential for using this application in the context of the class. I will be looking for some amount of new effort to be expended in furthering the proposal/application, but there is no good reason to artificially construct an additional class-related hurdle if you are trying to further develop a partially-conceptualized project.
- This assignment derives inspiration from several sources, which—if you are interested in reading additional materials on service design, research, or professional practice—would be helpful starting points:

Bell, Steven J., and John D. Shank. *Academic Librarianship by Design: A Blended Librarian's Guide to the Tools and Techniques*. Chicago: American Library Association, 2007.

Hernon, Peter, Ronald R. Powell, and Arthur P. Young. *The Next Library Leadership: Attributes of Academic and Public Library Directors*. Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited, 2003.

Schein, Edgar H. *Professional Education: Some New Directions*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

Watson-Boone, Rebecca. "Academic librarians as practitioner-researchers." *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 26, no. 2 (2000): 85-93. Retrieved from [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0099-1333\(99\)00144-5](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0099-1333(99)00144-5)

School of Information and Library Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

**INLS 890-164: Advanced Selected Topics - Scholarly Communication**  
**Fall Semester 2009, Wednesday, 6:00p.m.-8:30p.m., in 208 Manning Hall (3 cr.)**

---

**Class participation (10% of course grade)**

[Last updated: 2009-08-01, 1:00p.m.]

**Suggestions for approaching participation:**

- I take into account a variety of aspects of participation: asking or answering questions in class; contributions during small-group discussions and other in-class activities; attempts to bring relevant scholarly communication-related bits from the outside world into class (*especially* during our first 10- to 15-minutes of questions/sharing at the start of class); posting links and/or commentary in the 'Blogger' area of Sakai; documenting what we've been covering in class in preparation for a 12/06/2009 submission to the Sparky Awards); and actively engaging during the portion of classes (*particularly* session 4 through session 9) where student-shared references to the literature (building toward Assignment #2) drive our discussions. I do not keep an exhaustive tally of the number of times that you might do any of these things, but I do base my assessment on my reflections of your contributions to the various things we do in class from day to day.
- Just so there are no surprises, when we're about halfway through the semester, I'll offer anyone who would be interested in seeing what kind of grade their current level of participation would merit a chance to see how I might be assessing his or her performance so far. At that point, if there are contributions that you think I might be overlooking, please feel free to let me know.