Meeting Locations  
Norman: SLIS Conference Room  
Tulsa: Conference Room  

Committee Members  
Present:  
Yong Mi Kim, Tulsa Faculty  
Connie Van Fleet, Norman Faculty (Chair)  
June Abbas, Norman Faculty  
Stacy Zemke, Norman Faculty, BAIS Coordinator  
Gwendolyn Gillson, Norman Student  
Emrys Moreau, Tulsa Student  
Tommy Sneed, Norman Faculty (Representative of Undergraduate Studies Committee)  

Meeting called to order at 1:32 P.M. by Chair, Dr. Van Fleet.  

Dr. Van Fleet informed the Curriculum Committee (hereafter “the Committee”) that the meeting would begin with a discussion of the proposal from the Undergraduate Committee for the benefit of Dr. Snead. She also stated that there was no agenda because she felt the conversation should be free-flowing.  

Proposal from Undergraduate Studies Committee  
- Dr. Abbas explained that the Undergraduate Studies Committee had been working on revisions to the undergraduate curriculum all year and the proposal sent to the Committee is the result of their year’s work.  
- Proposal 1 Over the course of the 2012 Spring semester the UGC reviewed the current course offerings of the BAIS and are suggesting the following changes:  
  - Move LIS 3003 Object-Oriented Information Systems from the Information Studies Required courses category to the Information Technology category  

Discussion: Dr. Van Fleet asked if the “Requirements for the Bachelor of Arts in Information Studies” sheet reflects the current or proposed curricular structure. Dr. Abbas confirms. Dr. Kim said the movement from Information Studies Required to Information Technology is a good idea because Information Technology is the focus. Professor Zemke said programming is not as important for non-technical track students;
many want a pre-MLIS track and moving this requirement will help non-technical students find courses more appropriate.

**Action:** Approved for submission to faculty.

*Move LIS 4223 Information Technology Management from the Leadership category to the Information Studies Required courses category.*

**Discussion:** Professor Zemke stated that this change took a lot of consideration. Since the course is already popular, it makes sense at this point to simply move it rather than attempt to create a new course. Dr. Van Fleet expressed concern about only one course remaining in the Leadership category but Professor Zemke said that problem was addressed in the next proposal.

**Action:** Approved for submission to faculty.

- **Proposal 2** *After thorough review by the UGC of undergraduate course syllabi from other programs (COMM, HR, HSC, LSAL, etc.) we are suggesting the addition of new courses to the current course categories, and also suggesting that some courses be moved from the category they are currently listed under and placed under a more appropriate category.*

**Discussion:** Dr. Abbas explained that the Undergraduate Studies Committee included five new courses in the Leadership section which should allay concerns about a lack of choices in that category. Undergraduate Studies reviewed syllabi for every class on the suggested list and used these syllabi to move courses around to the most appropriate area. Dr. Kim asked why MGT 3013 was placed under the Leadership section and Dr. Abbas responded that the contents of the syllabus placed it in that category. Dr. Van Fleet noted problems with students being able to enroll in management courses. Professor Zemke reported that she had talked to the business and management instructors. They told her BAIS students would need to go through the colleges and get permissions for the classes but enrollment should not be a problem. Dr. Van Fleet asked about moving/changing the courses and how students would deal with changing courses. Professor Zemke responded that moving courses will need to be tracked. Students may take courses in new areas if they want, but courses previously taken will not be re-applicable in different areas. Dr. Van Fleet suggested placing something the advising handbook to help students with these issues. Professor Zemke noted that she has retained all the syllabi and suggested it be placed in a binder in the office. Dr. Van Fleet proposed telling faculty about the notebook.

**Action:** Approved for submission to faculty.

- **Proposal 3** *We are also proposing the following graduate level courses be slashlisted as undergraduate level courses.*
**LIS 5143 Government Publications**

**Discussion:** Dr. Snead informed the Committee that 5123 should be in Information and Society on the proposed Course List, not Information and Enterprise. He then said that he teaches Government Publications like information retrieval including search strategies and information use and policy. It is a good course for undergraduates because they get exposure to different databases and internal database architecture. He noted that it does not need to be added to the schedule since it is already on the rotation but it will be offered in fall odd years online. Professor Zemke said it is time to change the description; it would be good to market in the business school. Dr. Kim said it would appeal to people in public administration and political science. Dr. Van Fleet pointed out that it would appeal to the entire campus community but it needs a new name. Dr. Kim wanted a further explanation of the course. Dr. Snead responded that his general approach is an overview of national, state, local, tribal, and international governments. Students look at laws for information requirements, explore different finding aids, website search engines, and look at the laws that guide creation. In the future, he will encourage students to keep a toolkit because books are so frequently outdated. Professor Zemke asked if he covers FOIA requests. Dr. Snead responded that he does. He also covers authenticity and public access among many other issues that are woven throughout the course. Dr. Kim said the course sounds very useful for management. Dr. Van Fleet asked if FOIA is covered and Dr. Snead responded that he does. He also covers accessibility and public access among many other issues that are woven throughout the course. Dr. Van Fleet said it is important to take advantage of the change; the course does not sound appealing and it would be a good idea to move learning objectives into the description. Professor Zemke asked if the description is from the 1980s. Dr. Van Fleet said that if they get the forms in, the better. Dr. Snead noted that the description is from the 1980s. Dr. Van Fleet encouraged the creation of an appealing course description for good marketing.

**Action:** Dr. Snead will write a revised course description and send it to the Undergraduate Studies Committee. By March 26th, it will be sent to Dr. Van Fleet who will then forward it to the Committee.

**Action:** Approval of slashlisting but wait for description before final approval.

**LIS 5223 Online Information Retrieval**

**Discussion:** Dr. Abbas reported that she and Dr. Brown agreed on course changes. The course covers topics such as the web, the invisible web, database process and communication cycle, dialog commands, and specialty search engines. Dr. Van Fleet asked if the course description is current and Dr. Abbas confirmed it was. Professor Zemke asked about the prerequisite structure and if it needed to be revised. Dr. Van Fleet asked if 5053 was an important prerequisite. Dr. Abbas responded that the 5053 is not
necessary because the type of information behavior in 5223 is different than that covered in 5053. She also asserted that undergraduates should be fine without prerequisites. Dr. Van Fleet suggested that assignments might reflect prerequisites and Dr. Abbas agreed. Dr. Abbas said the description is fine and Professor Zemke suggested removing prerequisites now while it is fairly simple. Dr. Van Fleet asked Dr. Abbas to remove “reference interview” from the syllabus because undergraduates need less context specific education.

**Action:** Remove 5053 as prerequisite for 5223.

**Action:** Dr. Abbas will look at her syllabus and send out any changes to Committee members.

**Action:** Approved for submission to faculty.

- **Proposal 4** Previously SLIS faculty approved a proposal submitted by the UGS to change the process for updating the BAIS Checksheet when course categories or courses changed. UGS proposed the use of a fluid Checksheet that would not require continuous revision and the need for SLIS to complete a Program Change Request with the College and University every time we wanted to add or remove a course option in a specific subject area. Instead we would maintain a list of courses in the SLIS and would keep it updated. This request was turned down by the provost committee in 2009. We are now proposing that we submit this proposal again. It would be a Program Change that would have to go through the College and University approval process.

**Discussion:** Professor Zemke explained that currently the “Requirements for the Bachelor of Arts in Information Studies” is owned and edited by the College of Arts and Sciences. About three years ago, a proposal was submitted to CAS that asked for an open checksheet that would be owned and updated by the school with an outline owned by CAS but the proposal was rejected. Undergraduate Studies wants to try to submit the proposal again. They have prepared by compiling information that will help their case: a maintenance schedule, committee oversight, and consultations with other departments who already have this format in place. If the proposal is rejected again, the curricular changes will be submitted in the normal fashion. The list of courses would be kept in the SLIS office, online, and available through Degree Navigator. Dr. Van Fleet said the process is similar to what is currently in place for the MLIS. She suggested tying it into the 5 year graduation initiative because broader flexibility will help students graduate on time. Professor Zemke said if CAS is given a thorough plan, it should be approved; she will add information about the 5 year graduate initiative. Dr. Van said it is good to have reasons for the change and prior planning. Dr. Abbas and Professor Zemke said that during the last proposal most of the policy was already developed. Ms. Moreau stated that it seemed like a good idea. Ms. Gillson stated she thought it was a good idea as long as the information is readily available. Professor Zemke responded that the information will be posted in three or four places and Degree Navigator.

**Action:** Approved.
Proposal 5 We are proposing the removal of MATH 2123 Calculus II for Business, Life and Social Sciences from the Major Support Requirements category. Removal of this course will allow BAIS students to fulfill the 3 credit hours previously met by this course with another course more relevant to the BAIS program goals.

Discussion: Dr. Abbas said that removal of Calculus II will give students more time to take more relevant courses and Dr. Kim agreed. Professor Zemke said that they would keep the requirement for Calculus I but there would be no course substitution for the removal of Calculus II because it will not change the required hours as it is a support requirement. Dr. Snead noted that other calculus classes can substitute for Calculus II. Professor Zemke said she did not see why students need to take Calculus II, read the course description or Calculus I and II, and noted that the requirement was original chosen to fulfill such needs as business skills and computation skills. She did not see how Calculus II would enhance these ideas more than Calculus I but noted that pressure from above initially influenced its inclusion. Dr. Van Fleet noted that the degree is a Bachelor of the Arts not a Bachelor of Science and asked if students usually take the course elsewhere. Professor Zemke said most students take it elsewhere because it is cheaper and easier. Dr. Kim agreed. Dr. Van Fleet asked if major support requirements will change with the proposed changes to the CheckSheet. Professor Zemke said it will not because the options are so strict but statistics could be flexible on the checksheet. Dr. Van Fleet said that consistency should be kept.

Action: Approved for submission to faculty.

Report and Repercussions of Faculty Meeting

Dr. Van Fleet asked if the meeting could be extended in order to address the recent curriculum changes approved at the faculty meeting. There was unanimous agreement.

Dr. Van Fleet reported that the faculty voted to keep the current five core courses and research and evaluation but to remove the guided electives resulting in 18 free choice hours for students. The faculty also expressed a desire to maintain listing courses in the guided electives categories but to use the categories for advising as opposed to options to fulfill requirements. She continued by saying that there were five implications/questions from this change.

Implication 1 Prerequisite structure – what does it mean now?

Discussion: Dr. Van Fleet asked if questioning instructors concerning prerequisites for courses would be a good idea. She also asked if the categories should be functional or theoretical.

Action: Dr. Van Fleet and Ms. Gillson will email faculty members asking if prerequisites are important for their guided elective courses.
Implication 2. Should there be a continued distinction between guided electives and general electives or should they be combined?

Discussion: Professor Zemke asked if advisors should help students by using the current guides for electives. Dr. Van Fleet said that the guided electives were part of the background for the basis of an LIS education. Core courses help introduce undecided students to areas in which they may have an interest which can be followed by the guided electives. Students who know what they want will not need to be forced into classes which hold no interest for them. Professor Zemke said a tool to help students is important. Dr. Van Fleet said she thought it would be important to keep the categories as advising tools. Dr. Abbas stated that she had another implication that she could not identify. Ms. Moreau stated that adding general electives into the guided elective categories is a good idea because students want to know what area classes fall under and it helps give ideas. Dr. Kim said she gives an overview of courses and categories, especially for new students. Professor Zemke suggested thinking of courses as a matrix so that all courses can be placed in all areas that they address. Dr. Van Fleet agreed and reminded the Committee that there have been problems in the past about placing courses in categories. Professor Zemke asked if the Committee should evaluate courses and create new categories from the evaluation. Dr. Van Fleet suggested creating functional categories. Dr. Abbas said it is important to have a way for the faculty to decide whether their course fits into a category or not.

Action: Dr. Van Fleet will create a matrix outline by March 26th and send to Committee members to determine if the matrix is a viable direction.

Implication 3. What changes need to be made to the Program Planning Guides?

Action: Suggest charge for next year’s Curriculum Committee.

Implication 4. How should School Library Media and Archives be treated?

Implication 5. How does this affect the current examination of the research and evaluation courses?

Discussion: Dr. Van Fleet reported that she is holding a meeting with professors who teach research and evaluation. She noted that most of her Evaluation course is less social science focused and more about management evaluation. It utilizes workflow analysis and Ishikawa diagrams whereas Research is much more academically focused. Dr. Van Fleet stated it would not be a good idea to fold the classes together especially since they both are filling normally. Dr. Kim noted that her research class is extremely academic but it seems like students are usually not ready for it because students are practitioner oriented. She said research needs to include some evaluation. Ms. Moreau said she wanted to learn evaluation in her research class. Ms. Gillson pointed out that most students do not see a difference between the two classes and pick them based on convenience. Dr. Abbas said that when she began working at OU the explanations she was given for these course were that research was for academic librarians and evaluation was for public and special librarians. Professor Zemke read the descriptions for both courses and said that they seem accurate. Ms. Gillson stated that students frequently do
not see the differences between the descriptions. Dr. Van Fleet indicated that the inclusion of management in the evaluation description could probably make the differences clearer. Dr. Abbas noted that Dr. Burke taught bought courses recently which might explain why students do not see the different; Ms. Gillson agreed. Dr. Van Fleet said Dr. Burke had not taught evaluation previously and her class will inevitably be a reflection of her interest in research. Professor Zemke said that the classes are serving different populations so there is not a problem with the courses but rather a problem with the perceptions of the courses. Dr. Abbas said convenience is a factor in student decisions. Professor Zemke noted that students will take courses to get done with the program, regardless of whether the classes are the most appropriate ones. Dr. Van Fleet stated that the Committee cannot do much about student choice. Dr. Abbas noted that combining the courses might water them down.

Action: Dr. Van Fleet will meet with research and evaluation instructors and report back to the Committee in April.

Action: The Implications list will be presented to the faculty at the next faculty meeting.

Approval of Minutes
- Dr. Van Fleet called for approval of December minutes.
- December minutes were unanimously approved.

Next Meeting: April 16, 2011, 1:30 – 2:30

Meeting adjourned at 3:00 P.M. by Dr. Van Fleet.

Minutes submitted by Gwendolyn Gillson