University of Oklahoma
School of Library and Information Studies
Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes
Monday, April 16, 2012

Meeting Locations
Norman: SLIS Conference Room
Tulsa: Tulsa Conference Room

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

Meeting called to order at 1:31 P.M. by Chair, Dr. Van Fleet.

Approval of Agenda
  ➢ Agenda was approved unanimously.

Approval of Minutes
  ➢ Dr. Van Fleet apologized to the committee because the minutes were not sent out earlier. She asked all corrections be sent to Ms. Gillson.

Really Old Business
  ➢ Dr. Van Fleet apologized for forgetting some of the past Curriculum Committee’s (hereafter the Committee) actions. Some of the action items were not followed through. She reminded the Committee that she sent out a draft summary report.

Committee Charge 1 Resolve the course prerequisites for slash-listed courses. Currently any undergraduate junior or senior-level student can enroll in a slash-listed course without any prior knowledge or preparation while graduate students must have completed three LIS courses. Is this OK?

For example:

• LIS 4453/5453, Digital Collections. The prerequisite for 4453 is listed as junior standing while the listing for 5453 requires three specific LIS (LIS 5033, LIS 5043, LIS 5063) courses for prerequisites.

Discussion: Professor Zemke stated she was supposed to send the information out but the committee she was dealing with was in constant flux. She stated that the Committee had
come up with the idea that graduate courses require more extensive prerequisites due to theory backing and information building. Dr. Van Fleet asked if the Committee wanted to present this notion policy to the faculty or simply fold it into the summary report. Professor Zemke asked if the recent elimination of the guided elective course will change the prerequisite structure and was unsure of how to proceed. Dr. Van Fleet read the section of the summary report dealing with this issue and both Dr. Abbas and Professor Zemke supported the wording. Dr. Abbas suggested the position be included in the summary report and be looked at later.

**Action:** Add something to the summary report’s wording concerning slashlisting.

**Committee Charge 12** Continue to work with the Graduate Studies Committee to monitor the directions that the College/University is moving to provide lectures online (including iTunes University) and any additional curricular-related activities that could be provided online by SLIS faculty.

**Discussion:** Dr. Abbas stated she had forgotten to consult with the Graduate Studies Committee. Professor Zemke reported that her undergraduate capstone students are working on an implementation plan and will be presenting at a brown bag luncheon at noon on April 30, 2012. Dr. Abbas asked if she should talk to Dr. Latrobe. Dr. Van Fleet suggested scratching the action but Dr. Abbas indicated she would be willing to speak to Dr. Latrobe.

**Action:** Place in report that Professor Zemke’s capstone course will give/gave a presentation on iTunesU at the brown bag on 4/30/2012.

**Action:** Professor Zemke will send the powerpoint from the capstone presentation to the Committee to be placed with the summary report.

**Action:** Dr. Abbas will speak to Dr. Latrobe and try to get an update about the Graduate Studies Committee.

**Committee Charge 6** Review the new module on funding and developing that is being developed by Dr. Kim for incorporation in the KM/LIS 5023 core class to determine whether it will sufficiently address the need for funding and development content within the curriculum (see #5c above)**

**It is recommended that a review of the new module on funding and developing that is currently being worked on by Dr. Kim for incorporation in the KM/LIS 5023 core class be added to the 2011-2012 Committee charge to determine whether this will sufficiently address the need for funding and development content within the curriculum.**

**Discussion:** Dr. Van Fleet stated she was confused about the progress of this charge. Ms. Gillson stated that the December minutes indicated that Dr. Kim, Dr. Van Fleet, and Dr. Taylor were supposed to meet to discuss learning objectives and then Dr. Kim was supposed to draft learning objectives to present to the Committee. Dr. Kim said that she completed the objectives a long time ago but the objectives change frequently. Dr. Van Fleet asked if this action should be finished by the end of the year or wait until next year.
Dr. Abbas asked if it needed to go through the formal course change procedure but Dr. Van Fleet stated it did not. Dr. Van Fleet asked if it should be presented at the May faculty meeting. Dr. Abbas reminded the faculty that the May meeting was for reports.

**Action:** Dr. Kim and Dr. Van Fleet will meet to write either learning objectives or course objectives.

**Action:** Dr. Van Fleet will present the module and objectives for approval at the May faculty meeting.

**Committee Charge 14** Identify missing one-page course summaries, and work with the Director and the office to ensure one-page course summaries are submitted

**Discussion:** Professor Zemke reminded the Committee that the SLIS office had completed this charge. She was confused about whether faculty members were supposed to submit new one-page course summaries: every semester or when the content of courses changes substantially. Dr. Van Fleet said that policy states that they should be submitted every semester with the hopes that faculty would get into the routine of submitting them. The SLIS office has sent reminders to faculty and is maintaining the files.

**Items Placed on April Agenda**

**Committee Charge 8** Work with the Director to explore offering the internship as group learning experience and/or practicum with attention to faculty load, site supervisor relationships, and student satisfaction (see #9 below)

**Discussion:** Dr. Van Fleet noted that the Committee previously stated that this charge was a college and university issue. Professor Zemke asked if internships are placed on mini-vita. Dr. Abbas said that they are and also that they are under consideration for summer evaluations. She noted that some professors count internships as both teaching and research. The guidelines state that a directed project can be like the Masterpieces project implements in the Fall 2011. Professor Zemke read the course description of directed projects and internships. Dr. Abbas asked if they count as research or teaching and stated they appear to be teaching and not research. Dr. Van Fleet noted that the charge reads specifically for internships and requirements for internships differ for graduate and undergraduate students. Internships for graduate students are submersion into the daily life of an organization while undergraduate internships are more project-focused. Professor Zemke affirmed the project-focus on undergraduate internships. Dr. Van Fleet said that group experiences should be in 5940 whereas internships are individual. The charge is to explore if internships should be offered as a group. The Masterpieces program was a directed project, not an internship. Dr. Van Fleet then read what she had stated in the summary report and used a personal example with Dr. Kim of a time when two internships could have been indicated differently.

**Action:** Make clear in the summary report that the Committee wishes for internships to remain individual efforts.
Committee Charge 9 *Continue to explore development of courses, course components, or other learning structures that provide opportunities for hands-on utilization and real world applications of information and technology through service learning and/or practicum opportunity (see #8 above)*

**Discussion:** Dr. Van Fleet said that this is an old charge and hard to decide on appropriate actions to resolve it. Dr. Abbas said she liked the statement included in the summary report and Dr. Van Fleet stated she took it almost verbatim from Dr. Abbas’s statement in previous minutes. Dr. Van Fleet stated that the Committee should not decide how to run courses and incorporate elements into them.

Committee Charge 15 *Develop and implement an evaluation and feedback mechanism for new courses (from 2010-11)*

**Discussion:** Dr. Van Fleet stated she took on this charge and then forgot to go through with creating the mechanism so she wrote it recently and sent it out through email to the Committee. She based it on her Evaluation course. She said it is important not to overtake 5970 with permanent new courses. She suggested that since everything is online, it will be easy for an instructor to include all the various information included on the proposed sheet. Professor Zemke asked if courses that are only supposed to be offered once should also complete this form. Dr. Van Fleet said it should only be used for courses that might be offered again. It is not necessary to evaluate one-time courses. However, if during the course the instructor begins to see how the class could become permanent, the evaluation should be done to enhance course development. Dr. Abbas asked about the inclusion of “No” at the top of the evaluation. Dr. Van Fleet said it was to assist in understanding if a course had undergone significant restructuring and how it would differ from the old course. Dr. Kim agreed it is important to know what changes are occurring in courses. Dr. Abbas asked if the Committee has a handbook. Dr. Van Fleet said there is not but that she has been thinking of making one. Dr. Abbas stated that one is needed. She also asked if professors will have a problem sharing their student evaluations. Dr. Van Fleet responded that the evaluations are for courses not instructors and that the Committee should leave it in there. Professor Zemke said that the evaluations are public so anybody can access them anyway. Professor Abbas said they are password protected. Dr. Kim indicated that instructors must agree to publish the evaluation content so the information can be easily provided.

**Action:** Dr. Van Fleet will add a section concerning the history of the course underneath the “No” section.
**Action:** Present form and report at the May faculty meeting.
**Action:** Create new charge for 2012-2013 Committee concerning the creation of a Committee handbook.

**New Items**

**Advising Matrix**
Discussion: Dr. Van Fleet reported that the matrix was a product of both her and Ms. Gillson. She stated she wanted to keep course levels in the current curricular structure which was indicated by the letters in the matrix. Ms. Gillson explained what the letters meant. Professor Zemke said that the use of the word “Core” was confusing and suggested taking out “core” and putting in another term. Dr. Van Fleet stated that it was a confusing system and suggested making all the markings uniform. Dr. Abbas asked if the matrix’s intent was to show where course were or content of courses. Dr. Van Fleet reminded the Committee that they decided on a matrix because they were confused about where guided electives fall. Dr. Abbas said it should be content focused so the key and letter indicators are unnecessary. Dr. Van Fleet said the problem is that retention of the old categories was specifically requested by the faculty. Professor Zemke asked if the planning guides will be changed to eliminate the guided elective categories. Dr. Van Fleet indicated that the elimination of guided electives in the planning guides is a good idea. Dr. Abbas said that the letters are confusing. Professor Zemke stated that getting rid of them might indicate a loss of institutional memory. Dr. Abbas asserted that content should be the main goal of the matrix.

Action: Pass on matrix to 2012-2013 Committee as an advising tool.

Prerequisites

Discussion: Dr. Van Fleet stated that the prerequisite questions should be addressed by next year’s Committee.

Action: Create charge for 2012-2013 concerning the prerequisite structure of the curriculum, especially in light of the elimination of the three tier structure.

Curriculum Committee Final Report

Discussion: Dr. Van Fleet reported that she is still working on the summary report. She will have it finalized by April 30, 2012 for report to the faculty at the May meeting on May 7, 2012. All edits should be submitted to Dr. Van Fleet by April 30, 2012. If there are any other items to be included in the report, they should be sent to Dr. Van Fleet.

Action: Finalize report for submission to faculty.
Action: Send all items to be included in the report to Dr. Van Fleet by 4/30/2012.

Meeting adjourned at 2:37 P.M. by Dr. Van Fleet.

Minutes submitted by Gwendolyn Gillson