LSSL 5396 Computer Science Applications to Librarianship
Spring 2018

LSSL 5396 is a required course for Master of Library Science
College of Education
Department of Library Science

Instructor: Dr. Elizabeth Gross
Department of Library Science
Office: AB4-421
Phone: (936) 294.4857
Email: eag041@shsu.edu
Mobile: 810.765.2903

Day/time the class meets: This class meets online. You can request a meeting using Skype or Google Hangouts anytime. Just email Dr. Gross for an appointment.

Location of class: This course is virtual (online only).

Office Hours: Virtual office hours Wednesday evening from 6-9pm. This means that I will be available at this time via Skype, Google Hangouts, or email. Since this class meets online, you can also request a meeting using Skype or Google Hangouts anytime. Just email Dr. Gross for an appointment.

Course Description:
History and current status of automated library services. Examination of the international standards, hardware, and software commercially available to support cataloging, circulation, online catalogs, reference services, and administrative tasks. Prerequisite: LSSL 5370.

IDEA Objectives: In this course, our focus will be on these major objectives (as assessed by the IDEA course evaluation system):

Essential: Gaining factual knowledge (terminology, classifications, methods, trends)

To do this, you will read your textbook and take notes on your reading. To demonstrate development of the background of the subject, you will complete an online, timed multiple-choice test.

Essential: Developing specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed by professionals in the field most closely related to this course

To do this, you will:

Explore and evaluate school library web sites, wikis, and online catalogs (OPACs)
Conduct a group presentation related to a specific school library automation system
Work collaboratively to produce a sandbox school library web site that is creative and innovative in its potential to reach its intended readers

Important: Acquiring skills in working with others as a member of a team

To do this, you will work in a designated group to:
Evaluate a specific automation system and present your findings to your fellow course members
Construct a sandbox school library web site with your group members

Required Textbook:

Bilal, D. (2014). Library automation: Core concepts and practical systems analysis. Santa Barbara, California: Libraries Unlimited. ISBN: 978-1-59158-922-8

Recommended:

American Association of School Librarians. (2009). Empowering learners: Guidelines for school library media programs. Chicago: American Library Association.

American Association of School Librarians. (2009). Standards for the 21st-Century learner in action. Chicago: American Library Association.

A Tk20 Account is required for this course. Tk20 is an electronic toolkit used by candidates to provide evidence that they have mastered state and professional standards for the profession. Additional information regarding Tk20 is available at: https://tk20.shsu.edu/. Further instructions regarding submissions to TK20 will be forthcoming as needed.

Course Format:

The content of this course is delivered using BlackBoard and additional Web 2.0 technologies. In addition, course concepts are learned through self-study, collaborative study, group discussions, and small group presentations. Evaluation consists of self-evaluations, peer evaluations, and professor assessments using rubrics for products, discussions, and presentations.

Course Content:

This course is designed for the preparation of school librarians to learn fundamental principles, generalizations, and theories so that they may be the facilitators who bring the skills, information, and instructional resources of the global community into their schools through the use of library automation and the school library web site. The preparation includes developing specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed by professionals in the field. The course explores and evaluates automated systems for school libraries. Evaluating automation systems, preparing for automation, and incorporating automation into the school library will be emphasized. Active participation in the course to collaborate will be required. In addition, planning and developing school library web sites will be covered.

Units of Study:

1. Assessment of Pre-Knowledge
2. Review and Compare School Library Web Sites and Catalogs
3. Knowledge of Automation Systems
4. Sandbox School Library Web Site Design
5. Evaluation of Automation Systems

Assignments, Due Dates, and Points Possible

Assignment	Points	DUE DATE
START HERE tasks:		
Read Syllabus		**18 Jan**
Preparing to Become a School Librarian Quiz	5	**20 Jan**
Online Discussion Unit One	10	**20 Jan**
Assistive Technology Quiz	5	**3 Feb**
Review and Compare School Library Websites	5	**3 Feb**
Online Discussion Unit Two	10	**3 Feb**
Knowledge of Automation Systems Test	70	**24 Feb**
~Spring Break 12-16 Mar~		
Sandbox School Library Web Site Design	60	**24 Mar**
Peer Feedback	20	**31 Mar**
Evaluation of Automation Systems Presentation	50	**21 Apr**
Evaluation of Group Projects	40	**27 Apr**
Total Points	275	

- Late assignment policy: Late assignments lose a percentage of points daily. After one day – one-third of the points; two days – one-half of the points. No assignments earn points after the second day, but must be completed in order to pass the course.
- Students must participate in eCollege discussions in order to make a "A" in this course. However, participation does not guarantee an "A" in the course. In fact, in order to earn an "A" in the course, all assignments must be completed, even the little ones worth 5 points.
- Rewrites: The student is expected to do his or her best work the first time around. Professionalism counts. Any work that must be rewritten will be considered late and subject to a significant point loss.
- Time requirement: Since this is an online course, the graduate student is expected to check his or her SHSU email account daily. The graduate student should take into account that if the course were in fact a face-to-face course; he or she would meet weekly for three hours with the professor and classmates. The equivalent amount of time should be devoted to the introduction of the assignments and the readings. In addition, study time should be built into this schedule to allow the graduate student ample time to develop the work required for the assignments while learning the course material to prepare for a profession in school librarianship.
- Professionalism Policy: Graduate students are expected to be active, enthusiastic, and collegial participants during the semester in their interactions in the online environment, Web 2.0 interactions, and in workshops in which they may be involved.

- SHSU Academic Policy:
  - Procedures in Cases of Academic Dishonesty #810213
  - Disabled Student Policy #811006
  - Student Absences on Religious Holy Days #861001
  - Academic Grievance Procedures for Students # 900823
  - Use of Telephones and Text Messages in Academic Classrooms and Facilities #100728
- Visitors in the classroom: Only registered students may attend/access class. Exceptions can be made on a case-by-case basis by the professor. In all cases, visitors must not present a disruption to the class by their attendance/presence.

NCATE Accreditation

The Sam Houston State University, College of Education has the distinction of NCATE accreditation since 1954. As an NCATE accredited program, the College of Education ensures that the best-prepared teachers will be in classrooms teaching the next generation of leaders how to solve problems, communicate effectively, and work collaboratively.

In November 2010, NCATE merged with the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) to become the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), combining the two premiere accrediting organizations as a single accrediting agency for reform, innovation, and research in educator preparation. SHSU will continue to be NCATE accredited through its next review scheduled for November 2015.

NCATE Standards

CAEP Standards

The Conceptual Framework and Model

The_COE_Conceptual_Framework establishes the shared vision of the college in preparing educators to work with P-12 students through programs dedicated to collaboration in instruction, field experience, and research, the candidates in Sam Houston State University's Educator Preparation Programs acquire the knowledge, dispositions, and skills necessary to create a positive learning environment preparing educators to work with P-12 students. Employing a variety of technologies, candidates learn to plan, implement, assess, and modify instruction to meet the needs of diverse learners. The Conceptual Framework (CF) incorporates five (5) indicators throughout the framework that serve to identify areas tied to course work where there is evidence of Conceptual Framework and goals assessment. The five indicators are: Knowledge Base (CF1), Technological Learning Environment (CF2), Communication (CF3), Assessment (CF4), and Effective Field Experience with Diverse Learners (CF5)

	DDP	CF	CAEP	NCATE
1.	Demonstrates an attitude of reflection and thoughtfulness about professional growth and instruction.	2	1.1 (InTASC #10) & 3.3	1. c., 1.g., & 4. c
2.	Demonstrates a commitment to using technology to create an authentic learning environment that promotes problem-solving and decision making for diverse learners.	2	1.5 & 3.4	1.b, 4.a., & 6.d.

3.	Practices ethical behavior and intellectual honesty.	3	1.1(InTASC #9) , 3.3, & 3.6	1.g. & 4.a.
4.	Demonstrates thoughtfulness in communication and an awareness and appreciation of varying voices.	3	3.1, 3.3	4.a.
5.	Demonstrates knowledge of second language acquisition and a commitment to adapting instruction or programs to meet the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse learners.	3 & 5	1.1 (InTASC #2)	4.a.& 4.d.
6.	Demonstrates ability to be understanding, respectful and inclusive of diverse populations.	3 & 5	3.1	4.a. & 4.d.
7.	Uses assessment as a tool to evaluate learning and improve instruction for all learners	4	1.1 (InTASC #6)	1.d. & 4.a.
8.	Demonstrates a commitment to literacy, inquiry, and reflection.	1 & 4	1.1 (InTASC #9) & 3.3	1. d, 1. g., & 4.a.
9.	Leads diverse learners to higher level thinking in cognitive, affective, and/or psychomotor domains.	5	1.1 (InTASC, & #2)	4.a.
10.	Demonstrates a commitment to adapting instruction or programs to meet the needs of diverse learners.	5	1.1 (InTASC #2 and #9), & 1.4, 2.3	1.c., 3.c., 4.a., & 4.d.

SHSU Dispositions and Diversity Proficiency (DDP) Standards

CF: Conceptual Framework
CAEP: Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (see page 20-21 of CAEP Standards for cross-cutting themes and diversity characteristics)
NCATE: National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education

The Dispositions and Diversity Proficiency (DDP) Standards are administered and evaluated in prescribed courses to all educator preparation student in initial and advanced programs (please provide additional information for the candidate if the DDP is administered during your course).

College of Education Information:
Please be advised that the College of Education conducts ongoing research regarding the effectiveness of the programs. You will receive one survey in the final semester prior to graduation regarding the operations of the unit during your time here. A second survey will occur within one year following graduation from or completion of a program, and will be sent to you and to your employer. This survey will focus on the preparation received at SHSU. Please remember that your response to these surveys is critical to SHSU program excellence.

Matrix:
- Course Objectives - stated in measurable performance terms/behavior
- Course Activities/Assignments
- Performance Assessments
- Standards (either list the standards used or provide a link to the standards)
  - Required Program Standards (SPA – i.e., ALA/AASL)
  - NCATE Standard 1 (all applicable elements) used when there is not a SPA

- State Standards/Competencies for certification if applicable
- Diversity and Disposition Proficiencies
- Conceptual Framework Alignment
- ISTE NETS Technology Standards (for technology integrated curriculum)

Topic(s)/Objective(s)	Activities/Assignments (including field-based activities)	Measurement (including performance-based)	Standards Alignment **S**—SPA Standard Alignment **TS**—Texas Educator Standards/Competencies **DDP**—Diversity and Disposition Proficiencies **CF**—Conceptual Framework Indicator **N**—NCATE Standard 1 (if there is no SPA) **NETS** – ISTE NETS Technology Standards
Assess prior knowledge concerning the use of a school's automation system	Unit 1	Questionnaire Discussion 1	S – 3.3b TS – II.003 CF – 1 D/DP – 2
Review and compare school library web sites and their online catalogs	Unit 2 Field experience	Written Evaluation Discussion 2	S – 1.3b, 1.3c, 3b TS – III.006 CF – 1, 5 D/DP – 1, 5
Indicate the benefits of automation; identify and describe the core functions of automation; and list the order of preparation for automating a school library	Unit 3	Test	S – 2.3c TS – I.002, II.003, III.005, III.006 CF – 1 D/DP – 4 NETS – 3a
Design an example of an appropriate school library web site collaboratively	Unit 4	Sandbox SL Web Site	S – 1.1a, 1.3b, 2.1c TS – I.001, I.002, II.003, III.005 CF – 1, 5 D/DP – 1, 4, 5, 6 NETS – 2a, 3c, 4b
Collaboratively evaluate a school library automation system and compare it with other systems	Unit 5	Online Presentation	S – 2.3c TS – I.002, III.005 CF – 1 D/DP – 4, 5, 11 NETS – 3a

Program specific URL address for Specialty Program Association (SPA) standards: http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/aasl/aasleducation/schoollibrarymed/ala-aasl_slms2003.pdf

State Standards: http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index2.aspx?id=5938

Course Evaluation:

Because your active participation is so important, it is imperative that all assignments be submitted on dates due. Assignments will be considered "on time" if submitted by midnight of the day due. (NOTE: All due dates/times are based on Central Standard Time.) Submission of

work after midnight will be considered late. All assignments must be completed in order to pass this course.

Final grades for the course will be assigned according to the following criteria:

A = 265+
B = 250-264
C = 230-249

The professor reserves the right to alter course requirements to better meet the learning needs of the graduate students.

Expectations:

1. Technology requirements: It is expected that graduate students enrolled in this course have the following computer skills: sending/receiving email, attaching documents, creating tables, creating presentations, conduction online searches, utilizing online tools, and utilizing library electronic resources. Microsoft Word (.doc or .docx) or another word processing program that is able to save documents in rich text format (.rtf) or convert to PDF is necessary to complete the assignments unless otherwise stated. It is also necessary for the student to have access to a computer at home since much of this course is completed in the evenings and on weekends. This course moves quickly and all students need to hit the ground running. So, access to online technology is a must.
2. LIB_SCI: It is expected that you have already joined the electronic discussion group for the Department of Library Science and will check your SHSU email EVERY WEEK DAY.
3. Style sheet: It is expected that you understand research conventions and have a style sheet available to you or regularly use an online source for APA style. The Newton Gresham Library provides an APA style sheet http://library.shsu.edu/research/citationguides.php

Bibliography:

American Association of School Librarians. (2009). Empowering learners: Guidelines for school library media programs. Chicago: American Library Association.

American Association of School Librarians. (2009). Standards for the 21st-century learner in action. Chicago: American Library Association.

American Library Association. (2006). Library advocate's handbook. Chicago: American Library Association.

American Psychological Association. (2010). Publication manual of the American Psychological Association, 6th ed. Washington, D.C.: APA.

Barron, A. E., Orwig, G. W., Ivers, K. S, & Lilavois, N. (2002). Technologies for education: A practical guide (4th ed.). Greenwood Village, CO: Libraries Unlimited.

Bell, M., & Kuon, T. (2009). Home alone! Still collaborating. Knowledge Quest, 37(4), 52-55.

Bilal, D. (2002). Automating media centers and small libraries: A microcomputer-based approach. Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.

Boelens, H. (2007). Knowledge management in secondary schools and the role of the school librarian. School Librearies Worldwide, 13(2), 63-72.

Breeding, M. (2002). An update on open source. ILS. Information Today, 19(9), 42-43.

Chu, K. (2009). Inquiry project-based learning with a partnership of three types of teachers and the school librarian. Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology, 60(8), 1671.

Geitgey, G. A., & Tepe, A. E. (2007). Can you find the evidence-based practice in your school

library? Library Media Connection 25(6), 10-12.
Hamilton, B. J. (2007). Transforming information literacy for NowGen students. Knowledge Quest, 37(2), 48-53.
Hoover, C. (2006). Research-based instructional strategies. School Library Media Activities Monthly, 22(8), 26-28.
Howard, J. K., & Eckhardt, S. A. (2006). Leadership, action research, and the school librarian. Colorado Libraries, 32(4), 61-62.
Howard, J. K., & Eckhardt, S. A. (2005). Action research: A guide for library media specialists. Linworth Publishing, Inc.
Jones, J. B., & Zambone, A. M. (2007). The Power of the Media Specialist to Improve Academic Achievement and Strengthen At-Risk Students. Columbus, OH: Linworth Publishing Co.
Kachka, A. (2009). Differentiating instruction in the library media center. School Library Media Activities Monthly, 25(5), 20-21.
Klinger, D. (2006). School libraries and student achievement in Ontario (Canada). Toronto, ON: Ontario Library Association. Retrieved from http://www.accessola.com/osla/bins/content_page.asp?cid=630-639-923
Kuhlthau, C. C., Maniotes, L. K., & Caspari, A. K. (2007). Guided inquiry: Learning in the 21st Century school. Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited.
Lamb, A., & Johnson, L. (2008). School library media specialist 2.0: A dynamic collaborator, teacher, and technologist. Teacher Librarian, 36(2), 74-78, 84.
Lance, K. C., Rodney, M. J., & Hamilton-Pennel, C. (2005). Powerful libraries make powerful learners: The Illinois study. Canton, IL: Illinois School Library Media Association. Retrieved from http://www.lrs.org/impact.php
Lance, K. C., Rodney, M. J., & Hamilton-Pennel, C. (2000). How school librarians help kids achieve standards: The second Colorado study. Spring, TX: Hi Willow Research and Publishing. Retrieved from http://www.lrs.org/impact.php
Lance, K. C., Rodney, M. J., & Hamilton-Pennel, C. (1993). The impact of school library media centers on academic achievement. Spring, TX: Hi Willow Research and Publishing. Retrieved from http://www.lrs.org/impact.php
Loertscher, D. (2003). The digital school library: A world-wide development and a fascinating challenge. Teacher Librarian, 30(5), 14-24.
Loertscher, D. V., & Todd, R. J. (2003). We Boost Achievement :Evidence-Based Practice for School Library Media Specialists. Salt Lake City, UT: Hi Willow Research and Publishing.
Logan, D. (2008). Putting students first. American Libraries, 39(1/2), 56-59.
Martin, J., & Tallman, J. (2001). The teacher-librarian as action researcher. Teacher Librarian, 29(2), 8-10.
Marzano, R. J., Pickering, D. J., & Pollock, J. E. (2001). Classroom instruction that works: Research-based strategies for increasing student achievement. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
McGhee, M. W., & Jansen, B. A. (2005). The Principal's Guide to a Powerful Library Media Program. Columbus, OH: Linworth Publishing Co.
Mestre, L. (2009). Culturally responsive instruction for teacher-librarians. Teacher Librarian, 36(3), 8-12.
Morrison, G. R., & Lowther, D. L. (2005). Integrating computer technology into the classroom (3rd ed.). Columbus, OH: Pearson.
Naslund, J., & Giustini, D. (2008). Towards school library 2.0: An introduction to social software tools for teacher librarians. School Libraries Worldwide, 14(2), 55-67.
Norris, S. P., & Ennis R. H. (1989). Evaluating critical thinking. Pacific Grove, CA: Critical

Thinking Press & Software.
Pascopella, A. (2005, January). Heart of the school: The school library is as valuable as learning how to read and compute. But it's a tough sell for administrators. District Administration, 41(1), 54-59. Retrieved from http://www.districtadministration.com/viewarticle.aspx?articleid=681
Pitler, H., Hubbell, E. R., Kuhn, M., & Malenoski, K. (2007). Using technology with classroom instruction that works. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
Roscello, F., & Webster, P. (2002). Characteristics of school library media programs and classroom collections: Talking points. Albany, NY: Office of Elementary, Middle, Secondary, and Continuing Education, New York State Education Department.
Sandholtz, J. H., Ringstaff, C., & Dwyer, D. C. (1997). Teaching with technology: Creating student-centered classrooms. New York: Teachers College Press.
Scholastic Research & Results. (2008). School libraries work! (rev. ed.). Scholastic Library Publishing. Retrieved from http://listbuilder.scholastic.com/content/stores/LibraryStore/pages/images/SLW3.pdf
Scott, T. J., & O'Sullivan, M. K. (2005). Analyzing student search strategies: Making a case for integrating information literacy skills into the curriculum. Teacher Librarian, 33(1), 21-25.
Severson, R. W. (1997). The principles of information ethics. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
Sharps, S. (2005). The case for library automation. Library Media Connection, 24(3), 51-53.
Stripling, B. (2008). Inquiry-based teaching and learning – the role of the library media specialist. School Library Media Activities Monthly, 25(1), 2.
Sweller, J. (2009). Cognitive bases of human creativity. Educational Psychology Review, 21(1), 11-19.
Sykes, J. A. (2005). Brain-friendly school libraries. Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited.
Tapscott, D. (2009). Grown up digital: How the net generation is changing your world. New York: McGraw Hill.
Tapscott, D., & Williams, A. D. (2006). Wikinomics: How mass collaboration changes everything. New York: Penguin Group.
Todd, R. J. (2003). Irrefutable evidence: How to prove you boost student achievement. School Library Journal, 49(4), 52-54.
Warlick, D. (2009). Redefining literacy 2.0, (2nd ed.). Columbus, OH: Linworth Books.
Whelan, D. L. (2004). A golden opportunity: Why "No Child Left Behind" is your chance to become indispensible. School Library Journal, 50(1), 40-42.