<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting called by: Regular Faculty Meeting</td>
<td>Type of meeting: November 12, 2012 Faculty Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time: 12:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Place: SLIS Conference Room</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Agenda

**School of Library and Information Studies**  
**Faculty Meeting Agenda**  
**November 12, Noon-1:30 pm**

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

(included are notes from meeting prior to the faculty meeting with Dean Bell and Kathy Wullstein)

A. Approval of the SLIS Faculty Meeting Minutes, October 15, 2012 (e-mail attachment)

B. Announcements
   a. FOCUS* Funding received for SLISboration, “Celebrating OUr Roots,” Joy Harjo, April 27, 2013, OU Law Center, Timberdell & Chautauqua
   b. Program Modification Status
   c. Professional and Faculty Advisory Training with Kristi Brooks, November 12 @ 3 pm
   d. Online Teaching Information and D2L Upgrade:
      i. Beth McCoy, December 3 @ noon aka December Brown Bag
   e. A&S Holiday Open House, December 6, 4 to 6 pm, Ellison Hall
   f. December 2012 Convocation, Friday, December 14 @ 6:30 pm, Lloyd Noble Center
   g. Faculty News

C. Discussion Items
   a. Faculty Office Hours (Committee A)
   b. SLIS P&T Document Policy & Procedures Update (Committee A)
      i. Policies out of OU SLIS
      ii. Special strength
      iii. # of publications
      iv. Additional considerations

D. Action Items
   a. Responsibilities of SLIS Committee Chairs (e-mail attachment)
   b. Revised SLIS VMGO (email attachment)

E. Reports
   - Accreditation
   - Ad Hoc PhD
   - Admissions
   - Aspire 2020 Liaison
   - Committee A
   - Curriculum
### Special notes:
At 11:00 a.m. on November 12, 2012, faculty met with Dean Paul Bell and Kathy Wullstein to discuss online and hybrid course approvals. Information from this discussion is included as the first item in these minutes.

### Meeting called by: Type of meeting:

### Additional information:

### Members present: Abbas, Brown, Burke, Kim, Koh, Martens, Rubenstein, Snead, Taylor, Taylor, White, Zemke

### Members absent: Van Fleet

### Additional attendees: Ryan

### Minutes
**Item: Online and Hybrid Courses**

**Name: Dean Bell and Ms. Wullstein**

Discussion: The discussion began with a definition of different types of courses (delivery methods). An online course meets 100% online. A face to face (f2f) course meets 100% face to face (sixteen 50 minute hours per credit hour) There can be supplemental instruction online for a 100% f2f course. A class that meets less sixteen 50 minute hours per credit hour f2f (with remaining instruction done online) must have the same outcomes as the 100% f2f class. The formula for determining how much time students must meet f2f for one credit is based on the Carnegie credit hour. Deviations from this formula are discussed in terms of Carnegie equivalents. Students must have the same learning outcomes. There is a belief among some that faculty aren’t working hard enough. Last year legislation was introduced to require every faculty member to spend 20 hours every week in the classroom. It was defeated. There is a stated expectation on the part of some that faculty are only being paid to teach, and nothing else. This is not the case because faculty must meet research and service expectations. President Boren is not enthusiastic about online instruction. A situation with an intro to psych course was discussed. Students enrolled in the course learned on their first day of class that it was a blended (f2f and online instruction) course. Some of the students informed President Boren, who was displeased. Dean Bell’s position on hybrids is this: A well designed blended class achieves better learning outcomes than either a 100% f2f or 100% online course. Blended courses give instructors more flexibility/more instructional options. He wants faculty to development good blended classes. Online classes are not getting the political scrutiny of blended classes. Designing online instruction is more work than designing a 100% f2f. He stressed the importance of making sure blended classes are very well designed to accomplish the best pedagogical outcomes possible. Ms. Wullstein is the Director of the CAS online program and it is her job that online course meet national standards. The courses must make sense pedagogically and she must also be able explain their design to those who feel like faculty don’t work enough. These courses must stand up to any kind of scrutiny anyone wants to throw out.

What about the structure within the university to assure a course meets acceptable standards? When a course is approved, the mode of delivery is not taken into consideration because learning outcomes should be the same no matter how the course is delivered. Expectation is the learning outcomes will be equivalent no matter what the mode of delivery, which is why blended courses must receive separate approval. There is no oversight on different amounts of time over which f2f courses are offered; e.g., 4 weeks, 8 weeks, etc. Dean Bell must be able to explain to the President why courses are being offered as they are; he must be able to justify (using a review process; people hired to screen courses to make sure they meet standards; that they can be justified).

There will be a process for reviewing all existing general education courses. Approving courses to be taught online or blended is a similar process. It must be demonstrated that learning outcomes will meet established standards.

An occasional online component to accommodate unplanned absence from teaching f2f (due to faculty illness, other emergency) does not have to be approved.

Could Dean Bell walk faculty through the new process? If it is a class that will change mode of delivery (a f2f course that is to be offered online/hybrid, approval must be sought. If a hybrid course is requested, Kathy W’llullstein will get in touch with the faculty member to discuss if the course will meet existing standards; that it will make best use of online space. There is not a one size fits all. All courses are designed by instructors and the process makes sure faculty member can take full advantage of the online environment. How does the f2f component relate to the online component? Are best practices being implemented in the two different components? How are online discussions continued in class? By making sure the two components are fully and properly integrated. The faculty member and Ms. Wullstein discuss these aspects and then the proposal goes to Dean Bell, who needs to make sure he understands why a hybrid course is being proposed. He needs to be able to expand the rationale for a proposed hybrid and make sure students can find their way around the course; that it makes sense to the students. Also, to make sure faculty are aware of new technologies and that they are making use of the full range of tools. Online courses must now also meet federal guidelines for accessibility. Some institutions have received major fines for not complying with such guidelines. Again, there is not a one size fits all. Kathy Wullstein is happy to work with faculty, provide support, answer questions. Guidelines for online courses are much more stringent than they are for f2f courses. Courses are scrutinized under the Higher Education Act, oversight is local, state and federal. Online courses must meet the federal definition of an online course. None of this is specific to OU. Correspondence courses do not receive such scrutiny because students cannot receive financial aid for correspondence courses. There is much more engagement with faculty in online classes.
Who in Tulsa works with faculty on online courses? Kathy Wullstein will go to Tulsa to meet with Tulsa faculty. She can also meet with the via videoconference, Skye, or whatever works best for the faculty member. Dean Bell and Ms. Wullstein are trying to provide quality assurance and also make sure everything is consistent with all the different layers of regulations. They make sure it all comes together so no one gets in trouble by not meeting some federal or state regulation.

There is resistance among some faculty for blended classes. There has been a big uptick in courses offered online in the summer. Some students would prefer to go home in summer and take an OU online course instead of a community college course (f2f and online) not offered by OU.

Many classes need to be offered online in order to make. OU wants to make sure courses are the highest quality they can be. There will be more and more blended instruction, and these courses must be sufficiently rigorous. Students need to be learning.

Concern was expressed that COA expects the department to have power over its own courses. How does this approval for hybrids play into COA expectations? Other programs must also meet these standards and go through the approval processes. The process just assures that regulations are being met. COA is more concerned with content. No department can’t just do whatever it wants. COA dictates content for the MLIS degree, and SLIS must meet those standards.

To begin the process of offering hybrid courses that haven’t been offered as hybrids before, contact Ms. Wullstein to initiate the process before courses are put on the schedule. Course schedules are fluid and can be changed. Ms. Wullstein needs to be consulted at the time a course is being planned to be offered. She understands the syllabus may not be complete. Most of the time it shouldn’t create that much more work for the faculty member. They are trying to protect faculty. Checking to see if courses meet federal guidelines/standards shouldn’t require that much additional work on the part of the professor. Ms. Wullstein is assuring that the course will make sense on the part of a student. The three main questions she is asking are: 1. what is it about the hybrid format that enhances learning outcomes/pedagogy; how does it accomplish better learning outcomes; 2. Does the schedule make sense; how does the proposed schedule support pedagogy; are there learning outcomes involved; and 3. Is this a course that the college can afford? The college receives no extra income from offering blended courses. They are funded as f2f classes, so there is no extra money to offer? The number one consideration is how does the proposed course enhance/maximize learning outcomes?

Dr. Brown thanked Dean Bell and Ms. Wullstein for meeting with faculty today.

CAS had almost 11,000 individual student enrollments in online classes last year. The largest amount were in summer. They brought in $9 million. The request for approval of these courses is not aimed specifically at SLIS. Dean Bell stated that SLIS courses could be held up as models.

### Conclusions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Approval of Agenda of SLIS Faculty Meeting, November 12, 2012 (today)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Dr. Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Discussion with Dean Bell and Kathy Wullstein earlier today will be included in the minutes for today’s meeting. Faculty will discuss what they learned from Dean Bell and Ms. Wullstein later today.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Conclusions: |
| Action items: |

<p>| Person responsible: | Deadline: |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item: Approval of SLIS Faculty</th>
<th>Name: Dr. Brown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: Dr. Brown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Discussion:

**Conclusions:** Approved

**Action items:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person responsible:</th>
<th>Deadline:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Item: Announcements | Name: Dr. Brown |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: Dr. Brown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:**

- **FOCUS* Funding received for SLISebration, “Celebrating OU Roots,” Joy Harjo, April 27, 2013, OU Law Center, Timberdell & Chautauqua.** Funding was received to bring Joy Harjo for SLISebration. The National Weather Center cancelled the reservation SLIS had for this event. It will be held in the OU Law Center. Joy Harjo will also be the keynote speaker at OLA. Dr. Patterson will be honored.

- **Program Modifications Status.** The MLIS program modification (add 5713 or 5733 to core requirements and eliminate guided elective categories) has been approved by CAS and the graduate council. The changes should be in effect next fall. Modifications to the BAIS degree will be considered in the spring.

- **Professional and Faculty Advisory Training with Kristi Brooks today, November 12 @ 3 pm**

- **Online Teaching Information and D2L Upgrade:**
  - **Beth McCoy, December 3, @ noon aka December Brown Bag.** The upgrade will be postponed until spring, so this meeting will be used to discuss comps

- **Arts & Sciences Holiday Open House, December 6, 4 to 6 pm, Ellison Hall**

- **December 2012 Convocation, Friday, December 14 @ 6:30 pm, Lloyd Noble Center**
  Dr. Snead and Ms. Zemke will serve as marshals, and Tara Davis (MLIS) will carry the SLIS banner.

- **Faculty news**
  - Dr. White – invited to teach next May for a week in Croatia on archives and memory.
  - Dr. Taylor – this month is deadline for students to submit proposals to SW Pop Culture Association. A chapter about Native American detectives will be in a new book to be published by Salem Press.
  - Dr. Snead - the TSI roundtable discussion went very well. There was very good attendance and they received good feedback from students.
  - Dr. Martens – submitted an abstract to Library Trends for a special issue on “The Philosophy of Information” at Dr. Abbas’ suggestion, and it was accepted.
  - Dr. Kim – OLISSA had a meeting to discuss professional organization involvement/membership.
  - Dr. Abbas – received confirmation a book on children in the digital age which will have 2 chapters by her is supposed to be out by end of this year. Two students from digital collections class submitted posters to the digital libraries session at ASIST and there was good feedback from this presentation. Dr. Abbas has the posters if faculty would like to see them.
  - Dr. Brown – The Advisory Board met last Friday (video connection to 2 sites in Tulsa). The meeting went very well. SLIS curriculum and the faculty search were discussed.
  - Dr. Rubenstein – her talk at ASIST was well received.

### Item: Discussion Items | Name: Dr. Brown |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: Dr. Brown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:**
Faculty office hours (at least 5 hours per week) need to be posted on office doors. Please post them as soon as possible.

The other discussion item is LIS Promotion and Tenure policies. The current policy is difficult to read and doesn’t completely line up with university policy. Committee A thought faculty should be discuss the policies on special strengths and number of publications.

In order to get tenure, the current policy is that the candidate must show special strength in research or teaching or service. Policies of other LIS schools and other CAS departments were examined. Some OU departments have a specific number of publications required in order to be approved for tenure. It is up to the candidate to explain the quality of publications. There is a difference between qualitative and quantitative research. What about comparisons between those who have divergent focuses? There are not supposed to be comparisons between candidates. The Human Relations department and School of Social Work at OU state in their research requirement that candidates for tenure are expected to publish six refereed articles. SLIS policy states one per year to meet basic competence, but that doesn’t meet requirement for excellence. Excellence means more than six, but one question is how many more than six constitute excellence? It would be helpful for junior faculty to have something more definitive. A candidate submits six external reviewer names and the School comes up with six names. All of those are asked to review the tenure dossier. The associate dean must approve the list. Should SLIS continue with special strength requirement or not. Research success needs to be more closely defined. Some institutions have flexibility in how criteria are defined/applied. The 40/40/20 ratio is not carved in stone. Each faculty member can define/propose to committee A how to distribute across the three areas. Junior faculty need to meet the 40/40/20 unless they obtain a large grant, which could reduce the teaching or service requirements. Independent study instruction doesn’t count toward teaching load, but it is factored into the tenure decision. There is confusion about the policies. What do faculty think about the policies? Should the requirements for exhibiting special strength be retained because there is precedent in the School and in the field for having this touchstone/reference point for candidates. COA is concerned that the policy is applied fairly and consistently. They are interested in changes being explained. It does allow for a range/variety of competencies across the faculty. Could special strength be kept as whatever the person’s area of research is. If special strength is eliminated, would that mean that there would be an assumption that the candidate must be a researcher and teaching is not as relevant, or would it mean that candidate must be excellent in both research and teaching. It is difficult to assess teaching when the tenure review is done. Teaching evaluations are not available to reviewers; they have the candidates’ statements on teaching. It can be difficult to translate this outside the unit, which puts the onus on the candidate on why they should be tenured and how their teaching should be considered. Special strength is meaningful within the unit, but not outside the unit. Research is the main consideration. Everyone is expected to be an exemplary instructor. Looking at candidates holistically makes it difficult to set specific standards/numbers for research. A certain number of articles may not be applicable to every candidate. Some might write books or produce research in ways other than articles in refereed publications. Does the policy on special strength make it difficult for external evaluators to assess special strengths. Different criteria are not applied to different candidates. Letters from Committee A and the Director reflect/define qualitative strengths/weaknesses of candidates. Special strengths evolve over time and may not be definable early in a faculty member’s career. There is not a simple answer to the question about the trajectory of one’s career/involvement as a faculty member. University policies are all over the map. Different fields have different criteria defined by the discipline. There is no one size fits all; each department is different. Every LIS program has different expectations of their faculty. The Purpose of this discussion is to make OU SLIS policy more clear. The policy allows for objectivity, but things like teaching remain more subjective. Should the goal be more clearly defined and the policy adjusted to meet that goal? Do faculty need to define as objective as possible criteria to measure the three areas. Could also look at special strength as an advantage to allow for more leeway in who is hired in the future. Teaching and research must remain in line with university expectations. SLIS can’t be too flexible and go beyond university expectations. OU SLIS policy does lay out additional expectations for those who define specific strengths. For example, teaching. The policy lays out what defines special strengths in the area of teaching.

What is a reasonable way of judging publications? If a number is stated, what should that number be? How is a publication defined? It was suggested that this discussion continue at a later time in order to consider other items on
today’s agenda. There was some sense that special strength should be kept, but it needs further definition, and more emphasis should be placed on research, which could affect the number and types of research that are acceptable if the School moves toward offering a Ph.D. program. It is important to emphasize to non-tenured faculty they are considered under the policy in place when they are hired unless they choose to be evaluated under a later policy.

Conclusions:
Action items: Post office hours
Continue the discussion on P&T policy at a later time.

Item: Responsibilities of SLIS Committee Chairs
Name: Committee A
Discussion: This is brought to faculty from committee A. Motion to approve comes from Committee A

Conclusions: The revised responsibilities of SLIS committee chairs was passed unanimously.
Action items: 

Item: Revised SLIS VMGO
Name: Dr. Brown
Discussion: Faculty comments/suggestions have been incorporated in the document distributed prior to today’s meeting. Drs. Brown, Taylor, White, and Van Fleet worked together on this. This ad hoc committee moves that it be approved. 2nd. Approved unanimously.

Conclusions: 
Action items: Add to the bottom of the document “revised by faculty August 20, 2012 and approved by faculty November, 12, 2012

Item: Accreditation
Name: Dr. Brown and Ms. Zemke
Discussion: Everyone has approved the panel chair suggested by COA.

Conclusions: 
Action items: 

Item: Ad Hoc Ph.D.
Name: Dr. White
Discussion: The committee has been looking at the graduate college handbook sections on doctoral programs. They will parse it down to have a faculty discussion by the end of this academic year. A new program proposal will have to be submitted. Standards for a Ph.D. program will need to be written, and students will need 90 hours of coursework.

Conclusions: 
Action items: 

Item: Admissions
Name: Dr. Burke
Discussion: The committee is looking at some data, including GRE scores and grade point averages of students, graduation rates, etc.

Conclusions: 
Action items: 

Person responsible: 
Deadline: ASAP
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item: Aspire 2020</th>
<th>Name: Dr. Abbas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion: The liaisons are setting agendas for meetings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions:</td>
<td>Action items:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person responsible:</td>
<td>Deadline:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item: Curriculum</th>
<th>Name: Dr. Abbas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion: The committee is gathering data on post-masters and certificate programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions:</td>
<td>Action items:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person responsible:</td>
<td>Deadline:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item: Graduate Studies</th>
<th>Name: Dr. Kim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion: The question of paid internships was discussed. Disallowing paid internships could exempt students from some good opportunities. Faculty discussed a proposal to eliminate the restriction on financial remuneration (#9 under “Policies” from the SLIS internship packet: No financial remuneration for the internship will be received by the student, the placement supervisor, or the institution.). The discussion will be today and faculty will vote at the December 9th faculty meeting. Faculty discussed the meaning of financial remuneration. How do agencies define remuneration? It is possible that a salary wouldn’t count, but a stipend might be o.k. Is the student accountable to the internship site or the School? Would remuneration erode or remove the School’s authority over the internship experience? “Doing an internship where a student already works” means they must do something either above their current job description or a special project. Students get credit and are paid for such experiences in other units. A requirement of an internship is that objectives be stated and approved. Requiring that interns write papers at the end of internships might assist students to better really understand their experiences. The next item discussed was the requirement that faculty visit the intern on site. Support was voiced to allow faculty to meet with internship students and site supervisors via Skype, videoconference, etc.? Should the requirement that the faculty member must physically visit the site be eliminated even if the intern is local? Some sense that may not be a good idea. The committee could propose more explicative language regarding “local” vs. “distance.” A motion was made and approved at 1:30 to extend the meeting for fifteen-twenty minutes. The third item the committee has invited faculty to discuss is The committee’s charge to work with Director to examine SLIS’s current policies and procedures regarding academic probation, automatic termination, and withdrawal of graduate students, and to recommend any systemic informational and assistance enhancements that might further facilitate the provision of relevant resources for the use of potentially at-risk students. Dr. Kim reviewed the information on the handout sent by the committee prior to the meeting, which included the behaviors demonstrated by students indicating the student could be in distress, and suggestions on actions that could be taken by faculty (students’ instructors/advisors and/or the SLIS director) to assist these students. Some of these actions are already done; faculty follow procedures sent out by the president and provost on what to do for students who are experiencing difficulties. What about academic misconduct and ongoing, chronic problems. The committee is discussion possible ways to keep track of such problems (e.g., document plagiarism and, whether or not it recurs), and how to create a record that might inform or be helpful to other instructors – how to share information in terms of assisting students. Both personal and academic dishonesty issues were discussed, and the committee is attempting to develop a mechanism or guidelines to help these students, which includes sharing information. The committee asked faculty to think about formalizing a process to survey students who do not matriculate to find out why they did not matriculate and to report to faculty. Faculty discussed where students’ responsibilities begin/end, and the responsibilities of the School and faculty members. The graduate studies committee was asked to investigate what would be allowed in terms of establishing a paper trail; how could it be documented; how could information be shared? The list of suggestions is helpful, but faculty need to know their legal boundaries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item: <strong>OLISSA</strong></td>
<td>Name: Dr. Snead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion: OLISSA is supposed to be doing a book drive. Sean O’Brien will be stepping in as president after this semester. OLISSA didn’t receive some funding they could have received this year because last year’s officers were not aware it needed to be requested.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item: <strong>School Librarian Certification</strong></th>
<th>Name: Dr. Brown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion: This committee will meet later today.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item: <strong>Undergraduate Studies</strong></th>
<th>Name: Ms. Zemke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion: This committee be bringing items to the faculty for their consideration in the spring semester.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item: <strong>ADA Related to Online Courses</strong></th>
<th>Name: Dr. Brown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion: More information is forthcoming from chairs and directors meeting. There is very much a need for faculty to have more information. There are questions about captioning videos? Another meeting is scheduled in February on this and Dr. Brown said faculty are invited to attend.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Conclusions: |
| Action items: |
| Person responsible: |
| Deadline: |
## Vision, Mission, Goals & Objectives

The University of Oklahoma School of Library and Information Studies (OU SLIS) educates professionals qualified to meet the challenges of the information society. The ability to generate, access, and use information has become the key factor in personal, social, and economic growth. The expanding global information society requires the free flow of information; and the impact of rapidly changing information and communications technologies is reshaping our personal, educational, and social activities, our organizational and political practices, and our local, national, and international institutions.

Roles, responsibilities, and career opportunities for professionals who can function as creative, information resource managers; act as culturally sensitive guides, navigators and interpreters for local and global users; and produce customized, culturally relevant, value-added services and products for diverse clienteles are expanding.

These professionals will play an increasingly vital role in empowering individuals, organizations, and communities to maximize the benefits of the information age.

Through a forward-looking curriculum and diverse learning environments, the School prepares graduates who have the knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary to be ethical, culturally aware, and transformative leaders.

**Vision Statement:**

SLIS envisions a global society in which information resources are created, protected, managed, and used for the good of society, including addressing challenges and opportunities in the service of equity and productivity for individuals and communities.

**Mission Statement:**

The mission of the SLIS is to provide excellence in education, preparing leaders for a diverse, highly technological, information-based global society; to engage in research and creative activities that generate new knowledge and applications for effective practice and that foster interdisciplinary approaches to address information challenges; and to meet the complex information needs of society through public and professional service.
THE SCHOOL’S GOALS & OBJECTIVES:

The School’s goals and objectives focus on the three areas of education, research and service.

EDUCATION

A. Goal: Educate students at the graduate professional and postgraduate levels to provide information services and products to a society.

1. Support within required components of the graduate programs the theories, principles, and practices that form the foundation of library and information studies and knowledge management and their relationship to other fields.

2. Offer students a variety of elective courses to provide career-oriented concentrations within library and information studies and knowledge management.

3. Teach interpretation, evaluation, and promotion of information and knowledge resources, technologies, and services within a diverse global context.

4. Provide student advising that promotes informed program choice.

5. Promote through course work and by example professional attitudes regarding scholarship, professional ethics, intellectual freedom, and access to information in a diverse democratic society.

6. Encourage participation in professional activities and organizations at School, university, state, national, and international levels.

7. Promote professional development through student involvement in School planning and governance.

8. Incorporate theories, principles, techniques, and applications of research within all components of the curriculum.

9. Cooperate with other academic units in the sponsorship of specialized educational programs terminating in dual degrees.

10. Deliver courses to students throughout the state.

11. Model the practical and productive use of information technology in instruction.

12. Seek and systematically integrate into planning processes practitioners’ input on the knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed by graduates of the School’s degree programs.

B. Goal: Provide a broadly-based liberal arts education at the undergraduate level that will prepare students for careers in organizational settings in an information-based, pluralistic, global society.

1. Teach the theories, principles, and practices that form the foundation of information studies.

2. Promote understanding of and respect for information ethics, intellectual property, and other related issues in the knowledge society.

3. Provide access to appropriate electives that enrich the foundational components of the degree.

4. Prepare students to work in information intensive environments by enabling them to analyze and process information needs.

5. Provide student advising that enables timely degree completion.
6. Model the practical and productive use of information technology in instruction.

7. Solicit and incorporate into planning processes input and feedback from diverse constituencies on knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed by students at the undergraduate degree level.

RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP

Goal: Participate in and promote research, scholarship, and creative activities.

1. Conduct and direct research, scholarship, and other creative activities.

2. Publish and disseminate findings of research, scholarship, and creative work.

3. Seek internal and external funding for research, scholarship, and creative activities.

4. Engage in interdisciplinary research approaches to the solution of information problems.

SERVICE

A. Goal: Provide leadership, consultation, and guidance to the professional/information communities.

1. Serve in leadership roles for professional activities and organizations.

2. Provide expert-opinion support to meet the needs of information professionals through consultation and facilitation.

3. Support alumni in their professional development through such activities as placement, advisement, communication, and an alumni association.

4. Provide specialized assistance for development of information services for Oklahoma's diverse communities, especially Native Americans.

B. Goal: Contribute to University governance by participation at the departmental, college, and University levels.

1. Facilitate faculty participation in School decision-making and regularly evaluate the effectiveness of established governance structures.

2. Pursue actively opportunities for service through election or appointment of faculty to College of Arts and Sciences governance bodies.

3. Pursue actively opportunities for service through election or appointment of faculty to University-wide governance bodies.

4. Participate as appropriate in the policy structures of other units in the University.

C. Goal: Promote and defend the profession’s values to society.

1. Advocate values of the profession regarding ethics, intellectual freedom, and participation in the democratic process.

2. Support core discipline values of knowledge preservation, equitable dissemination of information, and organization of information for equity and productivity.

SCHOOL'S MLIS STUDENT GOALS AND OBJECTIVES
The School's student goals and objectives for the Master of Library and Information Studies program focus on the three areas of information provision, evidence-based practice and professional service.

A. **Goal: Function effectively in the provision of information services and products to a pluralistic society.**

Upon completion of the program, the student will be able to:

1. Interpret, evaluate, and advocate the theories, principles, and practices that form the foundation of library and information science.
2. Interpret, evaluate and promote the use of information resources, technologies and services.
3. Demonstrate professional attitudes regarding scholarship, professional ethics, intellectual freedom, and access to information in a democratic society.
4. Design and implement information products and services that respond effectively to changes in an increasingly pluralistic society.
5. Demonstrate competency in communication, leadership, and management skills.

B. **Goal: Participate in and promote evidence-based practice.**

Upon completion of the program, the student will be able to:

1. Understand and critically evaluate research and professional literature in the LIS field.
2. Analyze diverse information settings to design information systems and services to provide solutions to information problems.
3. Apply appropriate basic research methods and techniques, when necessary, to conduct applied systematic inquiry.

C. **Goal: Provide leadership, consultation, and guidance to information professions and the communities they serve.**

Upon completion of the program, the student will be able to:

2. Contribute to the development of the professions through speaking, writing, and knowledge-sharing.
3. Assume leadership roles within their professional communities.
4. Pursue opportunities for life long learning and professional development.
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SCHOOL'S BAIS STUDENT GOAL AND OBJECTIVES

The School’s student goal and objectives for the Bachelor of Arts in Information Studies program focus on intermediation between information, information systems, and information users.

Student Goal: Facilitate linkages between information technology workers and information users in a global society

1. Articulate the cultural, social, political, and economic implications of the role of information within and outside of the U.S, and the importance of communication across ethnic, cultural, and social boundaries.

2. Apply human-centered design processes to satisfy user information needs in technologically intensive environments.

3. Analyze the information needs of organizations.

4. Use information architecture to coordinate design, technology, and business goals.

5. Implement and protect information systems and networks, using appropriate technological tools and processes.

6. Demonstrate understanding of information policy, information economics, and information ethics within the information professions.

7. Function in leadership and management roles.

8. Utilize critical thinking, professional writing, professional judgment, and analytical skills.
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School of Library and Information Studies
Responsibilities of SLIS Committee Chairs

September through March:
• Convene monthly meetings of the committee
• Ensure minutes of the meetings are kept, normally the students serving on the committee will not take minutes
• Review the meeting minutes
• Distribute minutes to committee members for approval
• Send approved minutes to SLIS Administrative Assistant for posting at SLIS Archive
• Make reports at faculty meetings as needed
• Distribute motions or other action items necessary for faculty discussion to the faculty at least one week prior to the faculty meeting at which it will be considered, normally voting will take place the month after the item is discussed
• Submit final versions of any approved new or revised policy documents to SLIS Administrative Assistant for posting on SLIS Archive
• Conduct annual review/revision of any handbooks for which the committee has responsibility and bring to the faculty for approval of changes

March:
• Introduce final items for discussion by the SLIS faculty at the March faculty meeting

April:
• Present final items for action/voting by the SLIS faculty at the April faculty meeting

May:
• Distribute annual report of the committee at least one week prior to the last faculty meeting of the year, normally in May
• Present the highlights of the committee’s achievements for the year during the last faculty meeting of the academic year
• Transmit the final version to the SLIS Administrative Assistant for posting in the SLIS Archive by the end of the Spring semester