Minutes

Present: Betsy Martens, Mary Parker (MLIS/Norman Student Representative), Chrissy Shackle (MLIS/Tulsa Student Representative), Connie Van Fleet (Chair), Kelvin White
Stewart Brower, Director OU-Tulsa Library (Invited guest),

Introduction of New Members and Guests/ Welcome
New members and invited guest were introduced and welcomed. Van Fleet reminded committee of the need to get new students on the committee, including an MSKM student.

Minutes of September 3, 2009 meeting approved.

Report on Committee Motion re: Planning Guides
Van Fleet report that the committee recommendation to accept the program planning guides for School Library Media Specialist and for Children and Youth Services was approved at the September 11, 2009 faculty meeting. (A report was sent out to members.) She reported that the three procedural recommendations (consistent versions of planning guides, date stamping all of the guides, and pdf only versions) received general support. Further, the faculty agreed that a clause will be inserted the standing charge of each committee to review portions of the webpage relevant to its responsibilities. Standard wording is to be developed and distributed by Committee A.

Information Technology Program Planning Guide
The Program Planning Guide for Information Technology is the only remaining guide to be reviewed and is need of extensive revision.

Discussion: Is an information technology planning guide necessary, given the need to infuse technology throughout the curriculum? Martens pointed out that we are not preparing students to be system librarians under the current curriculum. Brower noted that there is more blending between technical and public services than there used to be. Van Fleet discussed that the program planning guide is outdated. Students who want to work in a library but need to learn technology skills would not know what classes to take without a program planning guide. Stewart said that there is an expected level of expertise that librarians should have including knowledge of website design, content management, and ILS. Martens said that she did not know any of the faculty who were interested in developing technology skills at such a high level and that interested students must be immersed in technology to attain that level. Van Fleet noted that the faculty needs to decide the direction to take or see if courses outside of the program can be included and melded with the library program. As a summary of this discussion, Van Fleet said that we do need tech infused throughout curriculum so there is a base level of expertise among all librarians. But we need to step it up for those who want to work in tech services and need separate programming guide for those who want a tech focus. This may help us identify gaps where we need more courses.
**Action:** Martens volunteered to be a liaison and talk to relevant people about courses for the Information Technology Planning Guide.

**Action:** Van Fleet will send a copy of the guide in Word format to everyone.

**Action:** All committee members will make suggestions for revisions, including SLIS courses and courses from other departments (at both sites) to Martens by October 15.

**Action:** Martens will synthesize, consult with faculty most likely to work in the technology area (Abbas, Kim, Snead, and Zemke) and report to the committee.

**Course Summary Templates**

Members reviewed the one-page course summaries completed by Martens and White. Van Fleet noted that course objectives were included in the school’s formal program planning guide and asked if objectives should be included in the course summary template which already has a list of topics. After discussion, with particular attention given to student member input, all agreed that the topics are much more helpful to students than just having broad statements about overall objectives.

**Action:** An Expectations section, which will list prerequisites and basic knowledge required prior to taking the course, will be added after Audience and before Topics on the course summary templates.

**Action:** All faculty members should complete one or two of these summaries and send to the committee for review by September 24.

**Action:** All committee members will review and be prepared to make suggestions for finalizing the summaries at the October 1 meeting.

**Action:** Shackle and Parker will solicit student feedback on the summaries and report to the rest of the Committee by October 1.

**Survey on the Integration of Technology into Individual Courses Form**

The Committee agreed that this form would be useful in determining how technology is currently integrated into the curriculum. There was some discussion about the utility of the forms and the lack of awareness among faculty. It was agreed that both regular and adjunct faculty should be asked to complete the Survey on the Integration of Technology into Individual Courses form.

**Action:** Van Fleet will send a request that faculty complete the Survey on the Integration of Technology into Individual Courses form, with a request for return by October 1.

**Action:** Van Fleet will request a list of adjunct instructors who regularly teach for the school from Latrobe and send the request for completion of the survey form, with request for return by October 1.

**Action:** Van Fleet will create a draft procedure for course development to include the forms such as the recommended syllabus template, and the surveys for integration of multidisciplinarity, technology, and diversity.

**End of Program Assessment Analysis**

Van Fleet reported that she had received the end of program assessments from the SLIS office and sent them to committee members. The committee discussed the low response rate and the impact on the validity of any analysis. White proposed that something should be put in place that requires students to fill out the questionnaire before they can graduate.
Action: Van Fleet will get numbers of graduates by semester to determine actual response rate (by October 1).
Action: Any report on the data will call attention to the low response rate and contain a caveat regarding validity.
Action: Committee will review data and develop procedure for analyzing at October 1 meeting.

Certificate in Knowledge Management and Urban Development
Dr. Latrobe requested that the committee review a draft proposal for a Certificate in Knowledge Management and Urban Development sent to her by Dr. Hawamdeh, who is working on this project with Shawn Schaeffer, Assistant Professor in Architecture on the Tulsa Campus. The Committee did not have at its disposal the criteria, guidelines, and procedures for implementing a graduate certificate program. Van Fleet explained that this information was difficult to find, that there had been recent revisions, and that she had been in contact with the Graduate School (in Norman, as any certificate program offered by SLIS would need to follow the process on the Norman campus) and expected to receive the information shortly. The committee discussed the push for multi-disciplinary approaches, particularly on the Tulsa campus, and the market for certificate programs. Further discussion underscored the need to create programs that were integral to a strategic plan. It was noted that the faculty will begin a planning process in November of this year. The consensus was that the proposal should be tabled until the criteria is found and examined and the proposal’s relevance to the new SLIS strategic plan can be evaluated.

Action: Dr. Van Fleet will respond to Dr. Latrobe and briefly explain the motion to table.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fill out one or two course summary templates and distribute to committee</td>
<td>All faculty committee members</td>
<td>September 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student members get feedback from students re: summaries</td>
<td>Student members Parker and Shackle</td>
<td>October 1 meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review templates; comment</td>
<td>All committee members</td>
<td>October 1 meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond to Dr. Latrobe about CKMUR proposal</td>
<td>Van Fleet</td>
<td>September 18, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send request for Integration of Technology Form to faculty</td>
<td>Van Fleet</td>
<td>September 18 (October 1 due date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request adjunct faculty list; send Integration of Technology to adjuncts</td>
<td>Van Fleet</td>
<td>September 18 (October 1 due date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find certification criteria/distribute to committee</td>
<td>Van Fleet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send end of program assessment response rate to members</td>
<td>Dr. Van Fleet</td>
<td>October 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop process/timeline for end of program assessment analysis (review data in advance)</td>
<td>All committee members</td>
<td>October 1 meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include quality of end of program assessment data in report to faculty</td>
<td>Van Fleet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send program planning guide suggestions to Martens</td>
<td>All faculty committee members</td>
<td>October 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create procedure for course development for faculty handbook</td>
<td>Van Fleet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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