Committee
Meeting called by: Regular Faculty Meeting
Time: 11:30 a.m.
Chair
Type of meeting: March 5, 2012 Faculty Meeting
Place: SLIS Conference Room

Agenda

School of Library and Information Studies
Faculty Meeting Agenda
March 5th, 11:30 to 1:00 pm
OU SLIS Conference Room (Norman) and Video (Tulsa)

A. Approval of the SLIS Faculty Meeting Minutes, February 6th, 2012 (email attachment)

B. Calendar
   a. The OU SLIS 2011-12 Faculty Meetings will take place from 11:30 to 1:00 on 4/9 and 5/7.
   b. March 9th, 1:00 pm: Discussion of Youth Service Assistant Professor Candidates
   c. March 9th, 5:30: SLIS 50% PubNight @ Abners
   d. March 12th: Brown Bag, Background Checks, etc... by Greg Heiser.
   e. March 26th, 9 to 11: Comprehensive exam question preparation meeting
   f. March 28th to 30th: OLA, Embassy Suites, Norman, OK
   g. April 12th-16th: Spring 2012 Comprehensive Exam
   h. April 21st: SLISebration, Zarrow Hall, Time TBA
   i. May 12th: A&S Convocation, 10 a.m., Lloyd Noble Center
   j. August 16th: SLIS Planning Day

C. Discussion Items
   I. Faculty Teaching Load Policy, Brown

II. Committee Reports & Charges, Committee A

III. Curriculum Discussion, Van Fleet

IV. Meet-Up Data, Brown

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

VI. Third Year Review
   a. Tenured Faculty Members Discussion, March 5th, 9 to 10 am
   b. Snead and Tenured Faculty Members Discussion, March 12th, 9 to 10 am

D. Reports
   I. Ad Hoc PhD
   II. Admissions
   III. Committee A
   IV. Curriculum
### Additional Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special notes:</th>
<th>Type of meeting:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Meeting called by:** [Name]

**Additional information:**

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

Members absent:

Additional attendees: Moreau, Ryan

### Minutes

**Item: Approval of the SLIS Faculty Meeting Minutes, February 6, 2012**

**Name: Dr. Brown**

**Discussion:**

**Conclusions:**

**Action items:** Send corrections/changes to Maggie Ryan.

**Person responsible:** faculty

**Deadline:**

**Item: Calendar**

**Name: Dr. Brown**

**Discussion:** Dr. Brown reviewed the calendar items. Greg Heiser will be the guest at the brown bag lunch on March 12th in the SLIS conference room. He will discuss background checks, sexual harassment, faculty responsibilities and student responsibilities, etc.

Faculty will meet at 1:00 on Friday, March 9th to discuss the faculty search candidates. Faculty can return their impressions to Dr. Brown before the meeting if they cannot attend. March 9th is also pub night at Abner’s. Faculty discussed whether or not to invite a speaker to the August 16, 2012 fall planning meeting. Due to the need to plan for COA and other issues, a speaker may not be invited.

**Conclusions:**

**Action items:**

**Person responsible:**

**Deadline:**
Item: Faculty Teaching Load Policy  Name: Dr. Brown

Discussion: Faculty received the policy from Dean Bell, who received it from President Boren. The basic expectation is faculty need to teach 75 students each year. Only about 5% of CAS faculty are not meeting this expectation. There is a need for creative ways to show what else faculty are doing. SLIS needs to continue to explain what faculty are doing in the School. Do faculty want Dr. Brown to say anything to the Dean? There is no course release for the faculty member who serves as graduate liaison.

Conclusions:
Action items: Faculty can send their ideas/messages to Dr. Brown to send on to Faculty Senate, and to Dr. Van Fleet to send to the CAS Advisory Board.

Person responsible: Deadline:

Item: Committee Reports and Charges  Name: Committee A

Discussion: Committees will wrap up their tasks for this year in April, and report at the May faculty meeting (try not to introduce anything new at the May faculty meeting). The August 16th planning day can be used to create charges. Charges could be discussed at the May meeting. Both short-term and long-term planning can be discussed at the August 16th meeting. The charges need to have input from everyone.

Conclusions:
Action items:

Person responsible: Deadline:

Item: Curriculum Discussion  Name: Dr. Van Fleet

Discussion: The committee has been working on many charges. They have discussed combining or not combining courses and what should be included in courses. Two goals came out of their discussions with Dr. Brown: 1) to increase enrollment in individual courses, and 2) maintaining meaning in what is taught to students. Talking points included whether or not to maintain the current curriculum structure? Is the balance/structure correct? Should the committee work within the structure that exists? The current structure was created to utilize faculty in the best manner possible, and to have a parallel structure for the MLIS and MSKM degrees. The 2nd tier of courses (guided electives) was to deepen knowledge in the core areas, and the 3rd tier was for general electives. Problems were identified. For example, in the organizational development and management guided elective category there is no option for students interested in careers in archives. What could be done about that? What is the definition for each guided elective category and which courses should go in each? There can be overlap between some courses. Perhaps this is a two part question: 1) Should the core courses be kept as they are, and 2) What courses should be kept in the 2nd (guided electives) and 3rd (general electives) tiers? Prior to this structure, the curriculum was more LIS oriented. What do faculty think about having 5 core requirements (5023, 5033, 5043, 5053 and 5063)?

The committee discussed changing the name of 5053 (Info Users in the Knowledge Society) to something like Information Mediation. This might clarify the focus of the course from information behavior in the abstract to helping people use information. It was suggested that there is a need to eliminate the word “knowledge.” Do the guided electives bind students too much to libraries? What about potential students who may not be interested solely in libraries? What about opening the curriculum up to attract students interested more broadly in information studies? Students don’t have to take specific courses from the list of courses under each category. The program planning guides are to be used to suggest courses to students with specific areas of interest. The guided electives reflected basic principles, such as access to knowledge structures, etc. The guided electives were set up to assure that students had instruction in basic applications. This structure can be helpful to students to craft a program without close supervision from the faculty advisor. Perhaps they could be called something other than ‘guided electives.’ Is the list of suggested courses in each area still needed? The curriculum was designed to help students be as marketable as possible. A disadvantage is if a student takes too many courses in one of the areas. It was noted that the numbering scheme/taxonomy is helpful.

Courses listed in each guided elective category are suggestions. Students are not required to take a course on the list for a particular area. The guided elective categories are for advising purposes.
The motion was made and seconded that students are not required to take a specific course for each of the 3 non-research guided elective categories. Motion passed.

The committee is also discussing combining the two research courses back into one again. Instead of type of library courses in management section, the committee requested that faculty consider thinking about developing functional courses in this category. For example, personnel, community relations and advocacy, leadership and communication/professional communication, policy development, planning, project management, etc.

Conclusions:

| Action items: Think about changing from type of library administration courses in the organizational development category to courses reflecting functions. | Person responsible: Faculty | Deadline: |

**Item: Meet-up Data**  
Name: Dr. Brown

Discussion: Based upon the data received, the most recent meet-ups were the best received. The Tulsa meet-up was done differently from the Norman one this semester. Because fewer students attended in Tulsa, a panel discussion was held. Breakout sessions were done in Norman, which were very popular with Norman student participants. It was suggested that there be both a panel discussion and break-out sessions at the Norman meet-up. The panel can introduce the different disciplines (what it means to be an academic librarian, or a public librarian, or discuss the reference function) and then students will have a better idea which breakout sessions to attend.

Conclusions:

| Action items: | Person responsible: | Deadline: |

**Item: Comprehensive Examination**  
Name: Dr. Taylor

Discussion: Motion for faculty to approve to release to students of the last 4 comp exam questions (to allow all students equal access to old questions). Motion passed unanimously.

Conclusions:

| Action items: | Person responsible: | Deadline: |

**Item: Third Year Review**  
Name: Dr. Brown

Discussion: Dr. Snead will meet with tenured faculty members on March 12th from 9:00-10:00 a.m.

Conclusions:

| Action items: | Person responsible: | Deadline: |

**Item: Ad Hoc Ph.D. Committee**  
Name: Dr. White

Discussion: This committee is now meeting twice each month, and it has begun exploring designs of other Ph.D. programs. The committee will be surveying faculty to get their feedback on their areas of specialization and their suggestions for core courses. This information will be used to help determine if a Ph.D. program would be sustainable. It might be interesting to look at new Ph.D. program in architecture.

Conclusions:

<p>| Action items: | Person responsible: | Deadline: |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item: Admissions Committee</th>
<th>Name: Dr. Snead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion: the committee will meet later today (3-5-12) to award scholarships. have discussed moving up scholarship selections so students will know sooner and will do this today, March 5th. Will talk about GPA and GRE requirements for admission. There is a new software program CAS is using to award scholarships. This will be used next year in SLIS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions:</td>
<td>Action items:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item: Graduate Studies Committee</th>
<th>Name: Dr. Taylor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion: The committee has spent much of its time this year with the development of the new take-home comp exam. The committee is looking now at changing EPA surveys to a different format.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions:</td>
<td>Action items:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item: OLISSA</th>
<th>Name: Dr. Snead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion: OLISSA is talking about conducting a book drive, possibly working through a library. They are also looking at doing a reading program through the same library they’ll work with on the book drive. OLISSA officers are keeping notes on information they will pass on to next year’s officers. Officers for 2012-2013 will be elected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions:</td>
<td>Action items:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item: Undergraduate Studies Committee</th>
<th>Name: Dr. Abbas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion: This committee has been reviewing syllabi for courses that might be added to the BAIS degree. They will submit some to the curriculum committee. They are also looking at changing the degree check sheet to make it more fluid; make it possible for students to hold less rigidly to the list of courses. LIS 3003 will be moved from required courses and added under I.T. courses. LIS 4223 will be added to the required courses. The committee is also looking at courses to slash-list, for example, online information retrieval and government publications. Instructors for those courses will be asked to give their opinions on slash-listing those courses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions:</td>
<td>Action items:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item: Search Committee</th>
<th>Name: Dr. Brown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion: The last candidate’s talk is today at 3:30. Faculty were asked to send their rankings to Dr. Brown.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions:</td>
<td>Action items:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item: Miscellaneous</th>
<th>Name: Dr. Brown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion: The North Central accreditation team is on campus this week.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions:</td>
<td>Action items:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discussion:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclusions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action items:</strong></td>
<td>Person responsible:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item</strong></td>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discussion:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclusions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action items:</strong></td>
<td>Person responsible:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item</strong></td>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discussion:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclusions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action items:</strong></td>
<td>Person responsible:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item</strong></td>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discussion:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclusions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action items:</strong></td>
<td>Person responsible:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Date: February 6, 2012
To: SLIS Faculty
From: Connie Van Fleet for the 2011 – 2012 SLIS Curriculum Committee
Re: SLIS Curriculum Structure and Direction

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.