

## Syllabus

**Department:** Division of Library and Information Science

**Course Number and Title:** LIS 264 Project Leadership for Information Professionals Capstone

**Bulletin Description:** [25 words maximum]

Students will demonstrate through a series of major projects their leadership potential and the skills they have developed as a result of this program.

**Prerequisite(s):** None

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

### Course Objectives:

Upon completion of this course, students will be able to:

- Examine critically the multifaceted role of information professionals in managing their organizations in contemporary society with consideration of social justice, responsibility, and ethics.
- Articulate learning reflections from the certificate management courses by presenting related course artifacts.
- Articulate a personal leadership philosophy and build a personal leadership development plan.
- Present a change management plan for an information organization by applying change management concepts, strategies, and best practices.

### Program Goals and Outcomes:

1A) Demonstrate knowledge of the ethics, values, and foundational principles and the role of library and information professionals in the promotion of democratic and legal principles and intellectual freedom.

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.

7A) Continue professional development by maintaining and practicing the purpose and role of providing quality service for the lifelong learning of patrons and the promotion of library 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	• Leadership and Influence
2	• Journey to Leadership
3	• Leadership and Professional Ethics in Information Organizations
4	• Organizational Development and Innovation in Information Organizations
5	• Personal Leadership Development Plan

**Learning Activities**

This course is designed to enhance students’ management and leadership potential with consideration of social justice, responsibility, and ethics.

There will be ongoing online discussions, individual projects, and a group project to facilitate learning key management concepts and practices. One individual project will demonstrate students’ learning reflections about various management and leadership skills they gained from the management certificate program. They will be required to present their learning reflections with the help of corresponding course artifacts they completed in the prior courses of this certificate. In other individual project, students will build a personal leadership development plan. There will also be a collaborative applying change management concepts, strategies, and processes to preparing a change management 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 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 264 Project Leadership for Information Professionals Capstone, 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 264 Project Leadership for Information Professionals Capstone, 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 262's syllabus. The rubric used for assessment is posted for the students ([http://campusguides.stjohns.edu/ld.php?content\\_id=14727403](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 (15%)
- b) Individual Projects (25%)
- c) Group Project (45%)
- d) Final Exam (15%)

### **Bibliography**

Bennis, W. (2009). *On becoming a leader*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Bennis, W., & Goldsmith, J. (2010). *Learning to lead: A workbook on becoming a leader*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Cangemi, J.P., Burga, B., Lazarus, H., Miller, R.L. & Fitzgerald, J. (2008). The real work of the leader: A focus on the human side of the equation. *Journal of Management Development*, 27(10), 1026-1036.

Collins, J. (2001). *Good to great: Why some companies make the leap ... and others don't*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.

Collins, J. (2011). Level 5 leadership. In *HBR's 10 Must Reads on Leadership* (pp.115-136). Boston: Harvard Business Review Press.

Collins, J., & Hansen M.T. (2011). *Great by choice: Uncertainty, Chaos, and luck – why some thrive despite them all*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.

Drucker, P.F. (2011). What makes an effective executive? In *HBR's 10 Must Reads on Leadership* (pp.23-36). Boston: Harvard Business Review Press.

Ericksson, K A, Prietula, M J & Cokely, E T (2007). The making of an expert. *Harvard Business Review*, July-August, 115-121.

George, B., & Gergen, D. (2015). *Discover your true north: Becoming an authentic leader*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Kotter, J. P., & Cohen, D. S. (2012). *The heart of change: Real-life stories of how people change their organizations*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2012). *The leadership challenge: How to make extraordinary things happen in organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Riggs, D. E. (2011). The crisis and opportunities in library leadership. *Journal of Library Administration*, 32(3-4), 5-17.

Rowley, J. (2011). Should your library have an innovation strategy? *Library Management*, 32(4/5), 251-265.

Scupola, A. & Nicolajsen, H. W. (2010) Service innovation in academic libraries: Is there a place for customers? *Library Management*, 31(4/5), 304-318.

**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

Criteria	Excellent	Satisfactory	Inadequate
<b>Contributions (5 Points)</b>	<p>All project requirements and objectives are identified, evaluated, and completed.</p> <p>The deliverable offered new information or approach to change management and organizational development in information organizations.</p>	<p>All project requirements are identified but some objectives are not completed.</p> <p>The deliverable offered some new information or approach to change management and organizational development in information organizations.</p>	<p>Many project requirements and objectives are not identified, evaluated, and/or completed.</p> <p>The deliverable offered no information or approach to change management and organizational development in information organizations.</p>
<b>Subject Knowledge (15 Points)</b>	<p>The deliverable demonstrated knowledge of the course content by integrating properly conducted situational analysis with extensive supporting documentation, and specific change management goals and objectives.</p> <p>The deliverable discussed specific and clear application of relevant change management theories and concepts, and other major considerations into the proposed change management plan.</p> <p>The deliverable also demonstrated evidence of extensive research effort in preparing the change management plan.</p>	<p>The deliverable demonstrated knowledge of the course content by integrating vaguely conducted situational analysis with some supporting documentation, and general change management goals and objectives.</p> <p>The deliverable provided vague application of change management theories and concepts, and limited considerations into the proposed change management plan.</p> <p>The deliverable also demonstrated evidence of limited research effort in preparing the change management plan.</p>	<p>The deliverable did not demonstrate knowledge of the course content, evidence of the research effort in preparing the proposed change management plan.</p>
<b>Reflection (5 Points)</b>	<p>Reflection provides in-depth information about the processes and activities, including decision-making approaches, an explanation of factors influencing the change process, with clear linkages to leadership theories.</p>	<p>Reflection describes the full range of processes and activities completed as part of the project leadership capstone.</p>	<p>Reflection includes an incomplete and/or superficial description of activities completed as part of the leadership capstone.</p>

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Inadequate</b>
<b>Composition (5 Points)</b>	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.
<b>Teamwork (5 Points)</b>	The team worked well together to achieve objectives. Each member contributed in a valuable way to the project. Team members indicated a high level of mutual respect and collaboration.	The team worked well together 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.	The team did not 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.
<b>Communication of Results (10 Points)</b>	Written, and oral reports clearly document the leadership practicum including specific recommendations. Discussion focuses on alternative strategies for implementation of recommendations.  The presentation was imaginative and effective in conveying ideas to the audience.	Written and oral report documents the process and results of the leadership practicum. Discussion focuses on application of results.  The presentation was effective in conveying main ideas, but a bit unimaginative.	Written summary report describes basic facts about the leadership practicum process and results.  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?