### Committee Chair

Meeting called by: Regular Faculty Meeting
Time: 11:30 a.m.

Type of meeting: February 6, 2012 Faculty Meeting
Place: SLIS Conference Room (Norman), Video (Tulsa)

### Agenda

**University of Oklahoma, School of Library and Information Studies**

**Faculty Meeting Agenda**

**February 6th, 11:30 to 1:00 pm**

**OU SLIS Conference Room (Norman) and Video (Tulsa)**

A. Approval of the SLIS Faculty Meeting Minutes, December 5th, 2011 (email attachment)

B. Visit with A&S Dean Bell

C. Calendar
   a. The OU SLIS 2011-12 Faculty Meetings will take place from 11:30 to 1:00 in the SLIS Conference Room on 3/5, 4/9, and 5/7.
   b. February 13th: Brown Bag, *Everything you wanted to know about BAIS advising but were afraid to ask* by Stacy Zemke.
   c. February 17th: A&S Junior Faculty Summer Fellowship Proposals to Director,
   d. February 23rd: Third round of FEGs to SLIS Committee A,
   e. March 1st: Annual evaluations to A&S Dean
   f. Comprehensive exam question preparation meeting, March 26th, 9 to 11
   g. March 28th to 30th: OLA, Embassy Suites, Norman, OK
   h. April 12th-16th: Spring 2012 Comprehensive Exam
   i. April 21st: SLISEbration, Zarrow Hall, Time TBA
   j. May 12th: A&S Convocation, Time TBA
   k. SLIS Planning Day, tentative date: August 16th
   l. Tenure and Post Tenure Review Dates (email attachment FYI)

D. Action Items
   I. Youth Services Faculty Position Candidate Invitations to Campus
      a. Application materials on D2L Space as “SLIS Faculty Search 2012”

E. Discussion Items
   I. Curriculum Discussion, Professor Van Fleet
   II. Meet-Ups

III. Comprehensive Exam Items
   a. Comps question meeting, March 26th, 9 to 11
   b. Date for Fall 2012?

IV. Third Year Review
   a. Dossier available for review by tenured faculty members, February 13th to 27th.
   b. Tenured Faculty Members Discussion, February 27th, 10 to 11
   c. Snead and Tenured Faculty Members Discussion, March 12th, 9 to 10 am

F. Reports
   I. Ad Hoc PhD
   II. Admissions
### Additional Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special notes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of meeting:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional information:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Meeting called by:**

**Members present:** Abbas, Brown, Burke, Kim, Martens, Rubenstein, Snead, Taylor, Van Fleet, White, Zemke

**Members absent:** Latrobe

**Additional attendees:** Deans Paul Bell and Kelly Damphousse, Zimmermann, Ryan

### Minutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item: Approval of The SLIS Faculty Meeting Minutes, December 5, 2011</th>
<th>Name: Dr. Brown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discussion:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclusions:</strong> approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action items:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item: Review of Calendar Items (agenda)</th>
<th>Name: Dr. Brown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discussion:</strong> Faculty will soon be asked to nominate students for BPM, and for this year’s Tomberlin and Laughlin scholarships.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclusions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action items:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Person responsible: |
| Deadline: |
Item: Meet-Ups  
Name: Faculty

Discussion: Faculty heard positive comments about the meet-up sessions. Presenters delivered a panel in Tulsa and answered lots of questions from the students/prospective students who attended. The event in Norman was well attended.

Conclusions:
Action items:  
Person responsible:  
Deadline:

Item: Visit with A&S Deans Bell and  
Name Damhousse

Discussion: Dean Bell talked about challenges facing the university. This is the third year of budget cuts. CAS has approximately $4 million less today than it had 3 years ago. Adjustments have been made. One piece of good news is that the college made a strategic decision to take money from central one-time instructional funds and protect the permanent money. CAS now has the largest number of full-time faculty than ever and the college has become increasingly efficient. The college is in pretty good shape. There will be another cut next year, between 2-4%. If it is a $700,000 (2%) cut, it can be taken from one-time funds. There is not enough in one-time funds to cover a $1.4 million (4%) cut. The only way to do cover a $1.4 million cut would be to have to come from vacant faculty positions (this has happened before). The college may be forced to carry more vacant positions. This downturn pales in comparison to the oil bust in the 80’s (resulted in furloughs, etc.). Dean Bell discussed the growing political dimension to the current situation. Some feel that funding for higher education is not “good.” Some feel that college is too expensive and too many faculty are teaching too few students. Taxpayers should not pay faculty to do research (they should generate external funding to pay for research). Efforts are being made to help legislators understand the good that comes from supporting higher education. Efforts are being made to hold the center. It’s not democrats vs. republications. It is people who have a different vision who suggest public money should no longer be spent to support education. There is an attitude that tuition is too high. Tuition has gone up. One driver behind this is states reducing their funding of higher education, which drives tuition up. How much faculty teach is coming under increasing scrutiny. This is based on a belief that teaching should be the only function of higher education. A group called the Oklahoma Council on Public Affairs (OCPA) have received information on every college and university in Oklahoma including the annual salary for every instructor, how many sections they teach, and how many students. They are looking for faculty whose salaries exceed their teaching load. Dean Bell emphasized that faculty must continue to do a good job and the university must be efficient in its use of resources. The university must make sure it can justify what it is doing. Dean Bell will be meeting with chairs and directors to go over spring and fall teaching numbers. Are faculty teaching a full load? Are there too many adjuncts? These are management questions. The President has developed some guidelines, which simply state that faculty should teach their full contractual load, all faculty should teach approximately 75 students per year in both ‘organized instruction’ and independent studies. It is the numbers of students, not credit hours that counts. Departments that teach freshman should make sure that their best teachers are teaching freshman. There is concern about having adequate resources for teaching all the students and the university is focusing on alternative revenue streams. English and Modern Language departments are more restricted in how many online courses can they offer. SLIS courses are not so limited, and may continue with the only online degree on campus (BAIS). Some funds generated by online offerings are used to subsidize on-campus classes. Profit from summer teaching will be distributed to departments who generated those funds. Summer enrollment can increase and it will become an increasingly large part of what the university does. There is not a lot of money to grow fall and spring. In time the university will become a year-round institution; some universities have gone to a trimester model. Summer becomes more and more important, both for students to have more classes available to take, and to generate more revenue. An almost unlimited number of sections can be offered in summer. Departments need to think creatively and be sensitive to the needs and limitations of their students. If there are lots of students who work full-time in school, those student may have more time to take courses in the summer and should be given more options. Online courses in summer are primary vehicles for generating revenue. This year’s is the largest freshman class in history. As long as there are many more new students, there is money generated for faculty travel, instructional support, etc. The political situation is very difficult, so the university must keep doing a good job and use its resources intelligently to garner support and advocacy from students, alumni, parents and other constituents.

The President believes that if faculty want to teach extra, they should be paid extra. The university must move away from the arbitrary definition of the academic year (which was defined by the Carnegie commission over 100 years ago; it included definitions of class hours, number of minutes for a credit hour, etc.). Faculty need to teach a minimum of 75 students, which is sections of 19 students. Are there any special considerations for graduate programs? If a program only...
has graduate students, graduate classes are usually smaller and there is an expectation that those courses would have slightly lower enrollment. But there is also an expectation that those smaller sections would be offset by teaching large undergraduate sections. The university needs to be sure what that what it is doing can be justified. Are there exceptions? Yes. Faculty on sabbaticals and those with administrative responsibilities will teach fewer students. About 65% of CAS faculty teach 75 or more students per year. Some faculty bring in lots of research money and also teach lots of students. If a department is teaching too few students, it means there are too many faculty in that department and they could lose faculty positions. Right now, the university is not even close to eliminating programs; that would be a last resort, but there are faculty teaching too few students, and that needs to change, the university is doing extremely well, but it is frustrating that political forces are driving policy decisions. The equation is not balancing in favor of students. There is an online scholarship program in CAS. Dean Bell would like to see the BAIS program continue to develop. SLIS continues to be at the leading edge of technology, combining technology with providing a good education. The issue is the quality of the education, not the vehicle, the method of delivery. Another coming trend is that the academic major will become less and less important; they are to some extent arbitrary. Majors are defined by faculty. There is certain knowledge students should have, but, increasingly, students want to design their own majors. They desire a much more fine tuned program of study than what faculty can define/design for them. The internet opens up possibilities that can’t even be imagined now. What counts is what employers see as important. The baccalaureate degree will not always be the gold standard. Accumulation of “badges” could impress employers.

Certificate programs were discussed, both post-baccalaureate and post-graduate. It is important to examine what potential students want and need. Credit certificates are credentials that seem to have some relevance and more are being created. Credentialing/certificate programs (not a degree) now come under new federal definitions. Credentials (certificates) are good, but they have to be about employment—what employers need and want. There is a new rule (not yet enforced) that online courses/education delivered to another state has to have permission of that other state. It is a nightmare. The state Regents have collected the standards for 48 other states, and there are some that have regulations that cannot be met/are too expensive, which will preclude offering online courses to students in those states. There must be pedagogical solutions. Students must be given assignments that cannot be purchased on the internet or they can have someone else do for them. One recommendation for online classes is that all written assignments should have a trail of creativity: drafts/outlines, a topic approved by the faculty member. Also, exams should be proctored. Math and Spanish have uniformed proctored exams.

Dean Bell told faculty not to be discouraged. Although there are serious political questions out there, the university is resilient. Its main job is to educate people so they can lead good lives.

A short break was approved at 12:50.

Following the break, faculty agreed to extend the meeting beyond 1:00 to discuss next steps in the faculty search.
Conclusions:

Item: Youth Services Faculty Position

Name: Candidate Invitations to Campus

(Application materials on D2L, space as “SLIS Faculty Search 2012”)

Discussion: There is a need to move ahead. Dr. Brown announced the names of the two candidates (Minjie Chen and Kyungwon Koh) that some faculty felt had the most experience with children’s literature in addition to media. Three others (Robin Kurz, Jami Jones and Lucia Serantes) didn’t seem to have as much “integrated” background (research, practice, participation in the broader community, advocacy and engagement).

Jami Jones: Why was someone who had a tenured position be interested in an assistant position? No explanation was given.

Robin Kurz was perceived to be very outgoing and had good experience. There was some sense that she could potentially do well with relating to the legislature.

Faculty were asked to discuss the selection of a third candidate to invite for an interview (in addition to Koh and Chen). There is some sense that it would be too risky to call it a failed search and hire next year (may not be approved to do so). More applications can be accepted; the search is not closed until a candidate is selected.

Faculty agreed to vote on a third candidate to invite for an interview (from Kurz, Jones and Serantes). Robin Kurz was selected.

Lucia Serantes would be the 4th choice. A motion was made and seconded that the 5th choice (Jones) not be invited for interview. Nine faculty voted to approve the motion. Two abstained.

Dr. Brown will begin the interview invitation process (beginning with Koh and Chen).

Faculty were asked to look over the discussion document from curriculum committee (copied below). It will be discussed at a later faculty meeting.

1:35 voted to adjourn.

Conclusions:

Action items: Faculty candidates Koh, Chen and Kurz will be invited to come for interviews. Person responsible: Dr. Brown Deadline:

<table>
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<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action items:</td>
<td>Person responsible:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusions:

Action items: |

Person responsible: |

Deadline: |
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The Curriculum Committee is seeking guidance from the faculty as we continue our work. As you may remember, several of our charges (at end of this memo) deal with examining courses within a guided elective category to determine whether they can be melded into fewer courses. The examination is resource and enrollment driven; we want to make best use of our resources and to be accountable to upper administration and external constituencies. At the same time, we were asked to examine procedures for offering more special topics courses and service learning based independent projects and research.

We kept two goals in mind:
1. Increase enrollment in individual courses.
2. Provide a relevant and meaningful education to our students.

We are now at something of an impasse. We have met with faculty to discuss the articulation of various courses and examined the courses that populate the guided electives. We have discussed several options for proceeding, but feel we need some sense of the faculty before investing more time and effort. Here are some topics for discussion:

1. Do we want to continue to work within the current course structure of core requirements, guided electives, and general electives? If so, is the balance correct? If not, we may perhaps quit tweaking what we have in favor of a substantive reconfiguration based on our outcomes-based planning session at the SLIS Fall Planning Day.

2. If we are satisfied with the structure, do we want to retain the categories we now have? As we worked with some courses and categories, we had difficulty assigning courses to some categories. The ways in which faculty approach some courses have changed. For instance, in exploring the “Access” courses, we found less overlap than expected because the Online Searching course now has a much greater portion dedicated to information storage and retrieval as well as more in-depth searching of digital resources.

3. Similarly, if we are satisfied with the structure, do we want to try to meet our first objective (increase enrollment) by reducing the number of courses available in each category? How will we define which courses to include?

4. Assuming we keep the structure and the management category, it seems it would reduce duplication and provide students more in-depth knowledge and greater skills to populate that category with functional courses in the place of type of library courses. We currently have a mix, with Community Relations and Advocacy (a functional course) in with Academic, Public, and School Library Administration (type of library courses). Thoughts?

Your ideas are important as we address our work this semester, but even more importantly, will guide our approach to our curriculum discussion at the Fall SLIS Planning Day. We’re looking forward to this preliminary discussion.
Relevant SLIS Curriculum Committee Charges 2011 - 2012

1. Explore opportunities to maximize SLIS resource through course compression and deletion*
   *For example, but not limited to:
   Combining or offering on a rotating versus overlapping sequence:
   5513 and 5523
   5443 and 5453
   Deleting, seeking alternatives on campus, and/or advertising undersubscribed courses:
   5413
   5473
   5553
   5683

2. Review effectiveness and viability of the current course structure:
   a. Review the current access to knowledge structures courses for overlap and gaps in coverage
   b. Review the current content management courses for overlap and gaps in coverage
   c. Review the current organizational development and management courses for overlaps and gaps in coverage with special attention to funding and development (see #6 below)**
   **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.