Syllabus

Department: Division of Library and Information Science

Course Number and Title: LIS 263 Marketing and Advocacy in Information Organizations

Bulleting Description: [25 words maximum]

This course prepares students to design, implement, and evaluate marketing, communications, and advocacy plans in order to improve service experiences of information users.

Prerequisite(s): None
Co-requisite(s): None

Course Objectives:
Upon completion of this course, students will be able to:
- Define and explain marketing terminology and concepts as applied to information organizations.
- Articulate the role of marketing principles and concepts in conducting a community's information needs analysis.
- Apply marketing theories, tools, and techniques to improve the service experiences of customers of information organizations.
- Discuss how branding, advertising, public relations, and outreach are used by information organizations to strengthen relationships with their users.
- Explain and employ key research relevant to advocacy for libraries and information organizations.
- Create a marketing or advocacy plan for an information organization by applying the marketing concepts, methods, strategies, and best practices.

Program Goals and Outcomes:
1B) Understand the history of human communication and its impact on libraries, and the importance of effective verbal and written advocacy for libraries, librarians, other library workers and library services.
1D) Demonstrate effective communication techniques (verbal and written) used to analyze complex problems and create appropriate solutions.
5C) Understand and apply the principles of assessment towards communities, user preferences, and services and resources, as well as promoting methods of advocacy through development and services.
8A) Understanding the principles of planning and budgeting in libraries and other information agencies, as well as developing effective personnel practices and human resources.
8B) Understanding the concepts behind, issues relating to, and methods for the following: assessment and evaluation of library services and their outcomes, developing partnerships, collaborations, networks, and other structures, and principled, transformational leadership.

Units of Instruction:

Unit	Topic
1	• What is marketing? • Key Concepts in Marketing of Information Services
2	• Products Vs Services Marketing • Customer Experience Management
3	• Market Segmentation • Services Marketing Mix
4	• Marketing Communications & Public Relations
5	• Internal Marketing • Service Promise Management
6	• Perceived Service Quality • SERVQUAL & LIBQUAL (Gaps Model)
7	• Service Encounters • Market Orientation and Service Performance
8	• Integrated Marketing communication • Permission Marketing • Marketing and Social Media
9	• Information Branding • Internal Branding • Brand Advocacy
10	• Service Leadership • Advocacy & Lobbying

Learning Activities

This course is designed to help students learn and practice real-world marketing and advocacy concepts and skills relevant to library and information professionals. Students will learn how to scan an information organization's environment and conduct a community needs analysis. They will also learn how to develop an appropriate mix of service and marketing in order to benefit and attract an information organization's target communities.

There will be ongoing online discussions, individual projects, and a group project to facilitate learning key marketing and advocacy concepts and practice. One individual project will focus on using marketing research to improve community service and increase community awareness of the organization. There will also be a collaborative project applying marketing and advocacy concepts and techniques to create a marketing/advocacy plan for an information organization.

Assessment

1. Course-Level Assessment

    a) The online discussions and individual projects mentioned in the Learning Activities section will be designed to reinforce one or more of the course objectives listed above.

    b) The collaborative group project will be designed to apply to all course objectives, although some objectives may have a greater emphasis depending on the feedback from the earlier assignments. A sample rubric used for the assessment of the collaborative group project is appended to this syllabus (Appendix A).

2. Program-Level Assessment. The MS LIS program is re-accredited every seven years by the American Library Association (ALA). The program was last re-accredited in Fall 2011. As part of this accreditation process, all constituents (students, faculty, alumni, and employers) participate in ongoing assessments providing continuous feedback which is applied towards improving the MS LIS program. The following two assessments apply.

    a) Faculty-Selected Assessment. Over a four year period each course in the MS LIS program is assessed to determine how well students are learning the program goals related to the course's content. For each course, faculty will select one or more artifacts (e.g. assignment, exam, or semester project) as a representative measure of learning the course's related program goals. At the end of the course, the faculty member writes a report describing the class' performance, reviewing the artifact's role as a measure, and any course revisions prescribed as a result. Sample artifacts with their respective reviews are provided for the ALA-CoA External Review Panel (ERP) visit. A template for the report is appended to this syllabus (Appendix B). In LIS 263 Marketing and Advocacy in Information Organizations, the collaborative group project will be designed to cover the program goals and outcomes listed in the aforementioned section of the syllabus. This artifact will be used to assess the course. The instructor may elect to include additional artifacts in the assessment.

    b) Student-Selected Assessment. Throughout their program of study, students select artifacts (assignments, discussion posts, projects, etc.) from their coursework to include in their e-portfolios. The ePortfolio is the end-of-program assessment for the MS LIS. Students include artifacts and write explanatory reflections as evidence of satisfying each of the eight program goals of the MS LIS. The eight program goals are based on the eight core competencies of the American Library Association (ALA). Each reflection explains how the artifact/s relate to the respective program goal and describes the artifact/s impact on their learning. In LIS 263 Marketing and Advocacy in Information Organizations, the collaborative group project will be designed to cover the program goals and outcomes listed in the aforementioned section of the syllabus. Students may include this project in their e-portfolio as evidence of satisfying the program

goals in LIS 263's syllabus. The rubric used for assessment is posted for the students (http://campusguides.stjohns.edu/ld.php?content_id=14727403).

Grading Scheme

The course grade will be determined from the following activities. The percent in parentheses is that of the overall course grade.

a) Online Discussion (20%)
b) Individual Projects (25%)
c) Group Project (40%)
d) Final Exam (15%)

Bibliography

Adeyoyin, S.O. (2005). Strategic planning for marketing library services. *Library Management*, 26 (8/9), 494-507.

Arons, M. D. S., Driest, F.V.D., & Weed, K. (2014). The ultimate marketing machine. *Harvard Business Review*, July-Aug, Retrieved from https://hbr.org/2014/07/the-ultimate-marketing-machine

Borges, M. (2005). Library advocacy starts at home. *The Bottom Line: Managing Library Finances*, 18(3), 110-111.

Brady,M. K., & Cronin Jr, J J. (2001). Some new thoughts on conceptualizing perceived service quality: A hierarchical approach. *Journal of Marketing*, 65 *(July),* 34-49.

Burg, B., & Mann, J. D. (2010). *Go-givers sell more*. New York: Portfolio.

Burg, B., & Mann, J. D. (2007). *The go-givers: a little story about a powerful business idea*. New York: Portfolio.

Chernatony, L., & Segal-Horn, S. (2003). The criteria of successful service brands. *European Journal of Marketing*, 37(7/8), 1095-1118.

Ettenson, R., Conrado, E., & Knowles, J. (2013). Rethinking the 4P's. *Harvard Business Review*, Jan-Feb, Retrieved from https://hbr.org/2013/01/rethinking-the-4-ps/ar/1

Fisher, P H. & Pride, M. M. (2006). *Blueprint for your library marketing plan: A guide to help you survive and thrive.* Chicago: American Library Association.

Grönroos, C. (2009). Marketing as promise management: regaining customer management for marketing. *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, *24 (5/6)*, 351-359.

Grönroos, C. (1997). From marketing mix to relationship marketing: Towards a paradigm shift in marketing. *Management Decision*, *35(4)*, 322-329.

Grönroos, C. (2001). The perceived service quality concept – a mistake? *Managing Service Quality, 11*(3), 150-152.

Godin, S. (1999). *Permission marketing: Turning strangers into friends, and friends into customers.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Godin, S. (2002). *Purple cow: Transform your business by being remarkable.* New York: Portfolio.

Grönroos, C. (2004). The relationship marketing process: communication, interaction, dialogue, value. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, *19(2),* 99-113.

Gronroos, C. (2007). *Service management and marketing: Customer management in service competition*. Chichester: Wiley.
Kenneway, M. (2006). Branding for libraries: Communicating your values for increasing readers awareness and usage of the library service. *Serials, 19(2)*, 120-126.

Lovelock, C., & Gummesson, E. (2004). Whither services marketing? In search of a new paradigm and fresh perspectives. *Journal of Services Research, 7(1)*, 20-41.

Meraz, G. (2002). The essentials of financial strength through sound lobbying fundamentals. *The Bottom Line: Managing Library Finances*, *15*(2), 64-69.

Martensen, A., & Gronholdt, L. (2003). Improving library users' perceived quality, satisfaction and loyalty: an integrated measurement and management systems. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *29(3),* 140-147.

Pine II, B. J., & Gilmore, J H (2000). Satisfaction, sacrifice, surprise: three small steps create one giant leap into the experience economy. *Strategy & Leadership*, *28(1),* 18-23.

Pine II, J. B., & Gilmore, J. H. (2011). *The experience economy*. Boston, MA: Harvard Review Press.

Rafiq, M., & Ahmed, P.K. (2000). Advances in the internal marketing concept. *Journal of Services Marketing*, *14(6),* 449-462.

Rose, R., & Johnson, C. (2015). *Experiences: the 7th era of marketing*. Cleveland, Ohio: Content Marketing Institute.

Rowley, J. (2003). What a tangled information brand web we weave. *Information Services & Use*, *24*, 73-82.

Rowley, J. (2003). Information Marketing: seven Questions. *Library Management*, *24(1/2),* 13-19.

Rowley, J. (2006). *Information marketing.* Burlington: Ashgate.

Singh, R. (2014). Engaging your library community through effective brand advocacy: STEPPS to Success. *Feliciter*, *60*(3), 27-29.

Singh, R., & Ovsak, A. (2013). Library experience matters! Touchpoints to community engagement. *Journal of Library Administration*, *53*(5/6), 344-358.

Singh, R. (2005). *Marketing culture of Finnish research libraries: An analysis of marketing attitude, knowledge and behaviour.* Åbo: Åbo Akademi University Press.

Singh, R. (2009). Mind the gap: Unlocking the relationship between market orientation and service performance. *Library Review*, *58(1),* 28-43.

Walters, S. (2004). *Library marketing that works.* New York, NY: Neal-Schuman.

Walters, S., & Jackson, K. (2013). Breakthrough branding: Positioning your library to survive and thrive. Chicago, IL: Neal-Schuman.

Wirtz, J., & Lovelock, C. (2016). *Service marketing: People, technology, strategy.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Zeithaml, V. A., Bitner, M. J., & Gremler, D. D. (2009). *Services marketing: Integrating customer focus across the firm.* Boston, MA: McGraw Hill.

Wilkie,W L., & Moore, E S. (2007). What does the definition of marketing tell us about ourselves? *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, *26(2),* 269-276.

Instructional Time Requirements: 150 hours for 3 credits (10 hours per week for our 15 week semester)

      Asynchronous or synchronous Lecture
      Assigned weekly reading
      Weekly assignments (individual and group)
      Active participation in online discussions
      Research for semester-long projects (term papers, projects)
      Presentations (online or face to face)
      Academic Service-Learning projects (where appropriate)

APPENDIX A

Collaborative Group Project Assessment Rubric

Component	Excellent	Satisfactory	Inadequate
Contribution (5 Points)	All project requirements and objectives are identified, evaluated, and completed. The deliverable offered new information or approach to marketing and advocacy in information organizations.	All project requirements are identified but some objectives are not completed. The deliverable offered some new information or approach to marketing and advocacy in information organizations.	Many project requirements and objectives are not identified, evaluated, and/or completed. The deliverable offered no information or approach to marketing and advocacy in information organizations.
Subject Knowledge (15 points)	The deliverable demonstrated knowledge of the course content by integrating clear marketing goals and objectives, thorough marketing audit and research, and clear identification of market segmentation. The deliverable discussed properly designed services marketing mix elements including but not limited to public relations, advertising, advocacy, and other major considerations into the proposed marketing and advocacy plan. The deliverable also demonstrated evidence of extensive research effort in preparing the marketing and advocacy plan.	The deliverable demonstrated knowledge of the course content by providing somewhat vague marketing goals and objectives, general marketing audit and research, and inadequate identification of market segmentation. The deliverable explained inadequate services marketing mix elements including public relations, advertising, advocacy, and limited considerations into the proposed marketing and advocacy plan. The deliverable also demonstrated evidence of limited research effort the marketing and advocacy plan.	The deliverable did not demonstrate knowledge of the course content, evidence of the research effort about the proposed project proposal.
Composition (5 Points)	The deliverable was well organized and clearly written. The underlying logic was clearly articulated and easy to follow. Words were carefully chosen that precisely expressed the intended meaning and supported reader comprehension. Sentences were grammatical and free from errors.	The deliverable was organized and clearly written for the most part. In some areas, the logic and/or flow of ideas were difficult to follow. Words were well chosen with some minor expectations. Sentences were mostly grammatical and/or only a few spelling errors were present but they hinder the reader.	The deliverable lacked the overall organization. The reader had to make considerable effort to understand the underlying logic and flow of ideas. Grammatical and spelling errors made it difficult for the reader to interpret the text in places.
Teamwork	The team worked well together	The team worked well together	The team did not

Component	Excellent	Satisfactory	Inadequate
(5 Points)	to achieve objectives. Each member contributed in a valuable way to the project. Team members indicated a high level of mutual respect and collaboration.	most of the time, with only a few occurrences of communication breakdown or failure to collaborate when necessary. Members were mostly respectful of each other.	collaborate or communicate well. Some members would work independently, without regard to objectives or priorities. A lack of mutual respect and regard was frequently noted.
Presentation and Creativity (10 Points)	The presentation was imaginative and effective in conveying ideas to the audience.	The presentation was effective in conveying main ideas, but a bit unimaginative.	The presentation failed to capture the interest of the audience and/or is confusing in what was communicated.

APPENDIX B

Course Artifact Assessment Form (revised 12/14/2015)

Course:

Term:

Instructor:

Date:

Complete each of the following sections.
1. Program Goals/Outcomes Related to the Course
2. Description of Artifact/s
3. Describe the students' overall performance.
4. Did students' performance on the artifact meet your expectations with regards to satisfying the program goals and outcomes?
5. If expectations were not met, what actions do you recommend to improve the course?