**Agenda**

A. Approval of SLIS Faculty Meeting Minutes, April 8, 2013 (email attachment)

B. Announcements
   a. OU Commencement, Football Stadium, May 10, 7 pm
   b. A&S Convocation, Lloyd Noble Center, May 11, 10 am
   c. 2012-2013 Committee Reports, for SLIS Server, May 14
   d. Health Information Symposium, June 18, 9-5
   e. Call for papers for the Dr. Frances Laverne Carroll Student Paper Aware, June 30
   f. OU SLIS Planning Day, Norman Campus, August 16, 9 to 4 pm
   g. Fall 2013 SLIS Meet-Ups: Tulsa, August 24, 1:30 to 4:00 pm
      Norman, August 31, 1:30 to 4:00 pm
   h. First Day of Class, August 19
   i. CoA Review Panel Site Visit, March 10-11, 2014
   j. Faculty news

C. Discussion Items
   a. 2013-14 Committee Memberships

D. Action Items
   a. Committee A Ballot
   b. Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures (email attachment)

E. Committee Final Reports
   - Accreditation
   - Ad Hoc Ph.D.
   - Admissions
   - Aspire 2020 Liaison
   - Committee A
   - Curriculum
   - Graduate Studies
   - Library Liaison
   - OLISSA
   - School Librarian Certification
   - Search
   - Undergraduate Studies
F. New business (any matter not known about or that could not have been reasonably foreseen prior to the time the agenda was prepared).

### Additional Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special notes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting called by:</th>
<th>Type of meeting:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional information:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Members absent: White

Additional attendees: Ryan

### Minutes

**Item: Approval of SLIS Faculty Meeting Minutes, April 8, 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: Dr. Brown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conclusions:</th>
<th>Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action items:</th>
<th>Person responsible:</th>
<th>Deadline:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Item: Announcements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 16th is the date of the fall 2013 planning meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Fall meet-up dates are August 24, 1:30-4:00 in Tulsa and August 31, 1:30-4:00 in Norman. |

| Dr. Abbas’ promotion only lacks the final approval of the regents. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conclusions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action items:</th>
<th>Person responsible:</th>
<th>Deadline:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item:</strong></td>
<td>Discussion Items: 2013-14</td>
<td><strong>Name:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Memberships</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion: Faculty were asked to send their committee membership preferences to Dr. Brown. Also, they were asked to indicate if they are willing to serve as chair.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclusions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action items:</td>
<td>Send committee membership preference (and whether or not they are willing to serve as chair) to Dr. Brown</td>
<td>Person responsible:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Item:</strong></th>
<th>Proposed COA replacement panelists.</th>
<th><strong>Name:</strong></th>
<th>Dr. Brown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discussion:</strong></td>
<td>COA replacement panelists have been proposed. Dr. Brown will follow up.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclusions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action items:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Person responsible:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Item:</strong></th>
<th>Committee A Ballot</th>
<th><strong>Name:</strong></th>
<th>Dr. Brown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discussion:</strong></td>
<td>Ballots were distributed. Faculty voted. Dr. Abbas was elected to serve on Committee A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclusions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action items:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Person responsible:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Item:</strong></th>
<th>Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures</th>
<th><strong>Name:</strong></th>
<th>Dr. Brown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discussion:</strong></td>
<td>This was presented at the last faculty meeting. There was no more discussion. Faculty unanimously approved the policies and procedures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclusions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action items:</td>
<td>Faculty unanimously approved the policies and procedures.</td>
<td>Person responsible:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Item:</strong></th>
<th>Committee Final Reports</th>
<th><strong>Name:</strong></th>
<th>Dr. Brown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discussion:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclusions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action items:</td>
<td>Reports will be submitted to Dr. Brown from each committee.</td>
<td>Person responsible:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Item: Accreditation**

Name: Ms. Zemke

**Discussion:** Accreditation

Name: Dr. Brown

Discussion: It is coming along well. Ms. Zemke and Cameron Smith are continuing the work on the program presentation. It should be in good shape.

**Conclusions:**

**Action items:**

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

**Item: Ad hoc Ph.D. Committee**

Name: Dr. Brown

**Discussion:** At its last meeting, the committee talked about graduate college requirements. They drafted potential coursework and discussed funding sources.

**Conclusions:**

**Action items:**

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

**Item: Admissions**

Name: Dr. Burke

**Discussion:** Dr. Burke reviewed the committee’s report. She pointed out the a table at the end of the report that had information on conditional admits.

The committee’s handbook has been revised. Revisions included updating language and removing KM references. A copy was sent to faculty. The committee’s charges for next fall will be a different from this year’s.

Dr. Burke reviewed the information on inactive students.

Recruiting charge: possibly look at research studies of successful recruiting programs.

Dr. Brown thanked the committee for its work.

**Conclusions:**

**Action items:**

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

**Item: Aspire 2020**

Name: Dr. Abbas

**Discussion:** Dr. Abbas attended the April 10th meeting. The liaisons saw a demo of the schematic mapping and got to see a visualization tool. There was not much different from one seen before. The tools will be useful for external people to search for collaborators. Dr. Abbas will send a link to faculty for them to update their research interest information.

Susanne Walden was introduced. The research office wants more faculty involvement in undergraduate research efforts. The faculty travel assistance program officially has been turned over to the Deans. Travel proposals for travel to be done through June 30th will still be submitted to the VPR office. Once the Travel program is turned over to the individual Colleges, the Deans will need to establish criteria to award the money to faculty. The VPR has reviewed which departments have requested travel assistance money in the past and have allocated the money according to this past history of requests. The new process will be evaluated every year by the VPR. An arts and humanities faculty fellowship is up and running. Lastly, current research liaisons have been asked to serve another year for continuity. Dr. Abbas is fine with turning it over to someone else who might want to serve or she is willing to serve another year. Please let Dr. Brown know if you are interested in serving as Research Liaison.

Dr. Brown thanked Dr. Abbas for her service as the School’s Aspire 2020 Liaison.

**Conclusions:**

**Action items:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person responsible</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Item: Curriculum Committee  
Name: Dr. Abbas  

Discussion: This has been an exploratory year.

Some charges were completed:
Proposal to remove Math 2123 Calculus II as a BAIS requirement: Faculty voted to approve this change.

The committee took on a larger, more complex charge: explore and examine the ‘type of library’ courses to determine if some of them should be replaced with functional courses. They discussed what should be done. The program planning guides will be revised to reflect the new curriculum structure.

Charge #2: Explore advantages and disadvantages of replacing “type of library courses” (i.e., Public Library Administration”) currently in the Organizational Dynamics and Management Category with functional courses (i.e. Community Relations and Advocacy). Brown has collected feedback from the SLIS External Advisory Board concerning this charge.

The committee did a lot of research on this. The met with SLIS advisory board who provided useful information. Erin McLean completed a 97 page report on other programs’ management offerings; type of library vs. function. Most schools offer a mix of both. Lot of schools offer school library programs separately. It appears that some of them are moving more toward functional type of courses.

Also under charge #2: A Current Topics in Library Administration course will be offered in the fall to provide an option for more study into administration, and also to explore it as a future course option (functional, not type of library). Dr. Brown will teach the course and report to the curriculum committee on the experience of offering this course. The committee recommends that this charge be continued. The committee will update the program planning guides and the office will do the program planning forms. The committee also is working on a new program planning matrix and how to restructure that so it will be helpful for advising students. The committee will continue with this in the next year. Committee has begun brainstorming. Dr. White has something on paper he could share. This is further explained in the report. The committee has also reviewed course prerequisites and slash-listed courses.

Charge #6: Work with Brown to explore the use of specialty tracks within SLIS for Health Library & Information Centers; Library & information Services for Indigenous Peoples; Archival Services for Indigenous Peoples.

The committee explored specialty tracks. Drs. Brown, Kim, White, Marty Thompson, and Rubenstein advised on the health informatics course. Sub-committees could explore development of specialized tracks. Courses for Tulsa students needs to be considered. Development of a data literacy track with the new faculty member was discussed. The committee recommends that this charge move forward as well.

Charge #7: Work with Undergraduate Studies Committee and Director to explore the options and market for a post-baccalaureate in an area related to Library and Information Studies.

The curriculum committee has been working with the undergraduate studies committee to explore opportunities for a post-baccalaureate program. There are at least three potential options: a post-baccalaureate program, an accelerated masters degree, or designing graduate certificates in certain areas of the curriculum. The committee will move forward with these to see if there is a real need for these types of options before spending more time with these.

Charge #8: Work with Zemke and Brown to inventory materials needed for the Program Presentation.

The curriculum committee has worked with the undergraduate studies committee. This is more pro forma to show these two committees are involved in each other’s work.

Post-baccalaureate certificates are being pushed by Evans Hall.

Dr. Brown thanked the committee for its work.

Conclusions:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item: Graduate Studies</th>
<th>Name: Dr. Kim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charge #1: Continue review of EPA guidelines. The guidelines for the comprehensive weren’t quite clear, so changes were made to the SLIS comp exam handbook. The committee presented and faculty approved changes to internship policies #6 and #9 having to do with requiring face to face supervision of internships at a considerable distance (6) and allowing for interns to be paid (9). The committee analyzed inactive students, including students who didn’t matriculate. Faculty may inform the office of students with potential problems, but must protect students’ privacy. The committee recommended that faculty work more closely with OLISSA to more widely disseminate information students may need to know. Next year the committee recommended looking at getting a better datagathering response rate. Dr. Brown thanked the committee for its work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item: Library Liaison</th>
<th>Name: Dr. Burke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining printed current periodicals will be placed in other parts of the library. Space in lower level one where periodicals were housed is being renovated. Dr. Burke has reviewed the list of printed periodicals to be discontinued with Janet Croft. If there is electronic access, there doesn’t seem to be a need for having print copies. The library will have access to some children’s comprehensive literature databases.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item: OLISSA</th>
<th>Name: Dr. Snead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most officers are in place for next year. There was a good turnout in Tulsa at the last OLISSA meeting. Some visiting academic librarians gave an excellent presentation on preparing for job hunting. Excellent program. Will recommend that it be done again next year. There were only three students in Norman, but a good number for Tulsa. It was very worthwhile.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item: School Librarian Certification</th>
<th>Name: Dr. Brown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The committee worked on advising guides for students pursuing school librarian certification and faculty advisers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item: Search Committee</th>
<th>Name: Dr. Brown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. White will chair next year’s search committee for someone with expertise in social and community informatics.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Item:** Undergraduate Studies  
Name:

**Committee**

Discussion: Faculty unanimously approved the list of BAIS degree course options presented in April (copied below). The BAIS checksheet did change. The Undergraduate Studies Committee will maintain the official list of course options for the Major Requirements categories. The current list of options is available in the SLIS office and on the SLIS website, in the section for BAIS students. The different categories (information and enterprise, interpersonal communication, organizational communication, leadership, information and society, information technology, and technical writing) will have flexible course selections managed by the USC. Each category is listed as well as a description of the main objectives that courses within that category should meet. No single course should be listed in more than one category. The department will now control the list of set courses in each area, which will allow department to control the list of course options. The other big change will be the removal of calculus II as a requirement for the degree. Students already in the program have one year to change to the new program that doesn’t require calculus II, but it will also put them under other changes to the curriculum. Students must formally declare a change to the new set of degree requirements.

Another thing is that the regents have passed a rule/policy about developmental math. Every student must take math until they achieve a certain level of mastery. If such mastery has not been met before a degree is declared, the student must continue to take math until the student has met the requirement. The math department will manage this. Students will get letters if they are math deficient. If students inquire about this requirement, they can be referred to the math department.

Dr. Brown thanked the committee for its work.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action items:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Item:** Adjournment  
Name:

Moved and seconded, and approved to adjourn at 1:00.

Dr. Brown thanked Dr. Taylor for her years of service.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action items:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Item:**  
Name:

Discussion:  

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action items:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Item:**  
Name:

Discussion:  

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action items:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Item:**  
Name:

Discussion:  

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action items:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Policy and Procedure: BAIS Major Requirements Course Options Changes

Policy:
The purpose of this policy is to outline the methodologies for the School in selecting courses for the Information Studies degree’s Major Requirements categories.

Introduction:
The Information Studies (I.S.) Undergraduate degree is a multi-disciplinary degree, with 18 core courses taught within the School, and the remainder of the degree (21 hours in Major Requirements and 15 from Major Support Requirements) structured with courses from various College of Arts and Sciences and other University colleges including options from SLIS.

In the past, the list of courses in each of the Major Requirements Categories and the Major Support Requirements Categories were maintained in a prescribed set of courses. To add or remove a course from the list, a complete Program Change Request had to be submitted to the University, a one-year process. In 2012 the School approved the adoption of a more flexible course listing format, where the list of course options would be maintained within the School and publicly available, but no longer printed on the Information Studies check sheet.

SLIS Course Option Maintenance Policy:
The Undergraduate Studies Committee (USC) of the School will maintain the official list of courses approved as options for the Major Requirements categories. The committee will review courses periodically to add or remove specific courses within any category according to the procedure described below. The USC must maintain an archive of all courses approved or deleted for each Major Requirements category. The current list will be archived in May of each year. This archived lists will be available on the SLIS website and on the SLIS document server. The USC will also generate a summary report on additions, deletions and changes every 4 years and forward it to the College of Arts and Sciences Course and Curriculum Committee for review.

Procedures:
This procedure outlines the maintenance of the official list of course options within the Major Requirements categories for the Information Studies degree.

The Undergraduate Studies Committee will maintain the official list of courses options for the Major Requirements categories.

The current list of options is available in the SLIS office and on the SLIS website, in the section for I.S. students.

The following categories will have flexible course selections managed by the USC. Each category is listed as well as a description of the main objectives that courses within that category should meet. No single course should be listed in more than one category

- Information and Enterprise:
  - Working in any information environment requires not only basic business acumen – knowing how businesses work and understanding fundamental business processes – but also strategic and tactical understanding of the roles played by public and private
organizations and the ways in which those roles fit into the social fabric. Information workers must understand how organizations operate and be familiar with the economic and social cultures of organizations. The role of technology in organizations and in the economy, and the ways in which policy and practice are shaped are of particular importance. Vision, creative thinking, and understanding evolve from a core knowledge of societal and organizational functions.

- **Summary:** Exploring the economic impact of information products, services, and transfer on industry.

- **Interpersonal Communication:**
  - The information enterprise – in business, industry, government, education, or elsewhere – is dependent on high-quality written and spoken communication. Graduates will be responsible for analyzing client needs, interacting in a team environment with designers and programmers, developing plans and reports, and effectively communicating needs and solutions. Understanding communication structures and facilitating communication processes at the micro and macro levels is essential, as is knowledge of both competitive and collaborative processes.
  - **Summary:** Exploring information transfer through the use of verbal and nonverbal communication between individuals.

- **Organizational Communication:**
  - The information enterprise – in business, industry, government, education, or elsewhere – is dependent on high-quality written and spoken communication. Graduates will be responsible for analyzing client needs, interacting in a team environment with designers and programmers, developing plans and reports, and effectively communicating needs and solutions. Understanding communication structures and facilitating communication processes at the micro and macro levels is essential, as is knowledge of both competitive and collaborative processes.
  - **Summary:** Exploring the use of communication between organizations, businesses, and groups, nationally and internationally.

- **Leadership:**
  - Graduates of the B.A.I.S. program are expected to move quickly into team leadership positions and to have the potential for rising into increasingly responsible leadership roles in the organizations by which they are employed. Elements of leadership are also found in the required Information Studies Field Project (the capstone experience for the degree) and the required Internship in Information Studies.
  - **Summary:** Theories and techniques of management and leadership of people and resources.

- **Information and Society:**
  - Knowledge of the interaction between information and various societal factors influencing communication of information is critical to understanding the impact of information in society. Analysis of the differing effects of such factors as ethnicity, culture, national philosophy, political system, delivery medium, and historical development on the interaction of information and the individual operating in a particular societal framework is a core component in assessing the role of information in today's environment.
  - **Summary:** Cultural, social, and economic implications of information.

- **Information Technology:**
  - As members of a connected and technology intensive society, information workers must not only have a solid foundation in current information technology applications, but have the ability to respond to rapid changes in this realm. Evaluating the use of information technology, keeping abreast of new developments as well as applying creative solutions and problem solving for organizations through technology is essential for information professionals.
Summary: Understanding of current information technologies as well as developing the skills to evaluate and adapt to future technologies.

- **Technical Writing:**
  - In all organizations, a mastery of written communication is critical. Understanding the specific writing methods and modes that pervade organizational and personal communication in technology-rich environments is important not only from a communication theory approach, but from a structural formatting approach.
  - Summary: Understanding the formats and methods for communication in technology-rich organizations.

**To add a course:**

The USC will review the existing course offerings in each category periodically, and look to new or revised courses within both the CAS and other University colleges for offerings that meet the specific goals of that category. New courses may be found through student substitution petitions, new course announcements from the University, and through departmental marketing and partnerships.

1. The USC will review all proposed courses for any category. The review includes the course description, a sample syllabus and, if possible, meeting with current course instructor/s.
2. A USC representative will contact the appropriate representative in the department offering the course (Faculty, Chair or Advisor) to discuss any prerequisites and to gain permission for SLIS to add the course as a possible option.
3. The USC will vote to approve the course in a specific Major Requirements category.
4. The recommendation of the USC will be submitted for approval to the SLIS Curriculum Committee.
5. If approved by the Curriculum Committee and by the SLIS faculty, the course will be added to the official list of approved options, including the following:
   - The list available through the SLIS office will be updated.
   - The list available at the SLIS website will be updated.
   - An announcement to students of the new course option will be made using current methods of student contact (e.g. the BAIS listserv, updating the Undergraduate Studies Student Manual).
   - An announcement to SLIS faculty of the new course option will be made using current methods of contact (e.g. the faculty listserv, updating the Advising Manual).
   - The College of Arts and Sciences Advisor for the IS degree (currently Kristy Brooks) will be notified of the addition.
   - The manager of the Degree Navigator program in the Admissions will be notified of the addition (currently Curtis Ensler).
6. Once all parties have been notified and all updates have been made, the course is considered an option for all I.S. students.

**To Remove a course:**

1. The USC will review the course offerings in each category periodically, including reviews of course content and the course syllabus; as well as solicit feedback from I.S. students about the course.
2. The USC will vote to remove any course in a specific Major Requirements category that is not longer appropriate or that no longer meets the parameters of that category.
3. The recommendation for removal by the USC will be submitted for vote to the SLIS Curriculum Committee.

4. If approved by the Curriculum Committee, and by the SLIS faculty the course will be removed from the official list of approved options including the following:
   - The list available through the SLIS office will be updated.
   - The list available at the SLIS website will be updated.
   - An announcement to students of the removed option will be made using current methods of student contact (e.g. the BAIS listserv, updating the Undergraduate Studies Student Manual).
   - An announcement to SLIS faculty of the removed option will be made using current methods of contact (e.g. the faculty listserv, the Advising Manual).
   - The College of Arts and Sciences Advisor for the I.S. degree (currently Kristy Brooks) will be notified of the deletion.
   - The manager of the Degree Navigator program in the Admissions will be notified of the deletion (currently Curtis Ensler).

5. Once all parties have been notified and all updates have been made, the course will no longer be considered an option for IS students.

6. Notes,
   - If students successfully completed a course to meet the specific requirements of a Major Requirements Category, and that course is subsequently removed from the list of accepted courses for that category, the students will not have to take an additional class within that category. Students will only be held to the specific set of course options at the time of their entry into the program.
   - Students may still individually petition for any course to be accepted as a substitution for Major Requirements and Major Support Requirements through the established substitution petition process.

Summative report to the College of Arts and Sciences Course and Curriculum Committee:
Every four (4) years, beginning in the Fall of 2016, the USC will submit a summative report of the list of approved courses in the Major Requirement Categories to the College of Arts and Sciences Course and Curriculum Committee.

1. During the Spring of the preceding semester, when the USC updates the list of approved courses at all official information outlets (see above) it will draft the summative report.

2. The report will include:
   - A list any course additions to Major Requirement Categories, including the semester the course was added and a brief justification
   - A list any course deletions from the Major Requirement Categories including the semester the course was deleted and a brief justification.
   - A list any course changes (moving from one category to another for example) including the semester the course was changed and a brief justification.
   - A complete list of all courses currently approved for each Major Requirement Category for the Information Studies degree.

3. The report will be submitted to the School of Library and Information Studies Director for review.

4. The report will be submitted to the Arts and Sciences Course and Curriculum Committee in the following Fall.

5. Reporting Falls will include:
   - Fall 2016
   - Fall 2020
• Fall 2024
• Fall 2028 (etc)
I. Introduction

The following document is intended to provide guidelines for the Annual Faculty Evaluation and the awarding of tenure, promotion, and salary increases to the faculty of the School of Library and Information Studies.

The School of Library and Information Studies, a unit within the professional programs cluster in the College of Arts and Sciences, offers two programs: the Master of Library and Information Studies and the Bachelor of Arts in Information Studies. The School has the only master's program in library and information studies in the state accredited by the American Library Association (ALA) Committee on Accreditation. The standards for that accreditation in the area of faculty (American Library Association, Standards for Accreditation of Master's Programs in Library & Information Studies 2008, "III. Faculty"), together with the expectations of the University of Oklahoma, as set forth in the Faculty Handbook sections 3.6–3.7, and the requirements of the College of Arts and Sciences, form the framework in which the School's guidelines for annual evaluation, tenure, and promotion are cast.

The mission of the School is three-fold:

• 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;
• to provide excellence in education, preparing leaders for a diverse, highly technological, information-based global society; and,
• to meet the complex information needs of society through public and professional service.

Therefore, the general expectations for performance of the faculty of the School fall within the traditional categories of research, teaching, and service. These categories are interpreted within the context of the connection of all three to the
intellectual development of the discipline of library and information studies, to the improvement of professional practice in the service of society, and to the advancement of the goals and objectives of the School, the College, and the University.

Each faculty member should become familiar with the University’s guidelines and the criteria for the awarding of tenure and promotion and as stipulated in this document. The guidelines provide the faculty and the School’s administration basis for judgment in evaluating the performance of individuals and equitably rewarding meritorious performance.

This document also provides the faculty with a guide for the distribution and kind of academic effort that will optimally benefit their careers, and the goals of the School, the College, and the University. It is the intention of these guidelines to provide a quantitative basis for the evaluation of the performance of each faculty member. The weighting of criteria is intended to indicate the relative importance placed on various faculty functions in the School of Library and Information Studies and should not provide a strictly quantitative basis for regarding merit or distributing academic effort. An assessment of the quality of performance of all faculty members will be made on the basis of their position descriptions, and the same documentation will be used for evaluation of all faculty members having similar job descriptions.

The following guidelines define the requisite quality of achievement, assuming a 40/40/20 percent effort distribution in teaching, research, and service, respectively with a 2:2 teaching load. Faculty with special duties will be informed of their job descriptions and unique criteria for tenure and promotion considerations by the department at the time of appointment. Changes in the effort distribution of a faculty member can occur after appointment with the approval of the Director and the Dean in consultation with the faculty member. The Provost will be informed of any changes in a faculty member’s distribution of effort.

II. Criteria for Evaluation of Promotion, Tenure, and Salary Increase

Annual evaluations will indicate assessment of performance levels in each of the areas of research and scholarship, teaching, and service as presented and documented by the faculty member. It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to submit a complete and accurate evaluation packet.

For each area, the methods of assessment and sources of evidence are given below.

Research

Within this category, the School employs a broad definition of scholarship encompassing research and creative activities that contribute to the intellectual development of the discipline or that generate new applications for the improvement of professional practice.

Assessment

Evaluation in this category is assumed to rest on the communication and dissemination of the research and scholarship to members of the disciplines and, as appropriate, to the fields of practice. Normally, communication takes the form of public dissemination of research results in journal articles, books, and book chapters. Presentation of research in papers at professional meetings also constitutes a research achievement, although often as step on the way toward publication, and is considered of somewhat less importance or merit. Research proposals and grants will also be considered in evaluating research activity.

Numerically specific criteria regarding acceptable quantity of research are inappropriate in Library and Information Studies, in part because of the diversity of research areas and venues for publication. Normally, the publication of one peer reviewed journal article per each year in rank, or one new book or monograph, will constitute an acceptable quantitative standard of research productivity for tenure and/or promotion. The School considers the quantity and, more importantly, the quality, of each faculty member's research and scholarship. In evaluating these activities, Committee A will consider factors such as: quality and prestige of journal/publisher, sole versus lead versus co-authorship, the candidate’s role in the work product, the pertinence of the work to library and information studies and the importance of the work. It is recognized that scholarly work in some areas may be more difficult to publish in “traditional,” high prestige journals than work in other areas.

In keeping with the School's recognition of the value of collaborative approaches to the achievement of the School's mission, collaboration in research and scholarship is encouraged. The School recognizes work that has been conducted with other...
faculty in the School, faculty in other areas of the University, or faculty in other universities, or with students or practitioners, as demonstration of an enriched approach to the solution of information problems.

In accordance with the American Library Association, *Standards for Accreditation of Master's Programs in Library & Information Studies* (2008) the School expects each faculty member to maintain “a sustained record of accomplishment in research or other appropriate scholarship.”

**Sources of evidence**

The primary sources of evidence are the vehicles through which the products of the research and scholarship are disseminated to the members of the discipline or to the field of practice.

Sources of evidence include but are not limited to the sources listed below:

1. Articles published in peer-reviewed journals (indicating extent of involvement)
2. Books published
3. Invited chapters published
4. Books edited
5. Research papers at professional meetings
6. Research funded by external funding agencies, including federal, state, and/or nongovernmental sources
7. Research posters at professional meetings
8. Software produced
9. Research internally funded
10. Non-refereed publications
11. Other research projects in progress
12. Research proposals submitted to external funding agencies and not funded
13. Seminars and symposia
14. Consultation, development, or participation in cooperative research projects
15. Awards for meritorious research
16. Other research productivity

For purposes of consideration for tenure and promotion, in addition to those sources of evidence listed above, assessments of research and scholarship are required from at least six external evaluators from comparable universities.

**Teaching**

Teaching is defined as instruction in regularly scheduled classes, one-to-one instruction in independent studies, supervision of internships, mentoring activities, participation on thesis and portfolio committees, participation on external doctoral committees, teaching/training grants, and design of instructional materials.

**Assessment**

Teaching performance of high quality is expected of all faculty members and such performance is judged on the basis of current and former student evaluations, peer evaluations, course materials, and other pertinent information. The candidate must demonstrate the ability to present relevant and current information and ideas in a manner that promotes and is conducive to learning.

**Sources of evidence**

Sources of evidence include but are not limited to the following:

1. Course evaluations
2. Course enrollment
3. Syllabi and related instructional materials
4. Development of new and/or innovative courses
5. Major course revisions
6. Teaching/training grants
7. Publication of textbooks
8. Development of instructional materials
9. Advising and mentoring of graduate and undergraduate students
10. Formal peer evaluation of delivery of instruction
11. Seminars/workshops presented
12. Service on external graduate student committees
13. Teaching/training grants submitted to external funding agencies and not funded
14. Invitations to teach or lecture in other schools and departments in areas of subject expertise
15. Outside evaluations of teaching at other institutions, off-campus workshops, and institutes
16. Participation in faculty development activities
17. Awards for meritorious teaching
18. Other teaching activity

Service

The School evaluates professional and public service and service in support of School, College, and University governance. Faculty members are expected to contribute in all these service areas. The relationship of service activities to the School's goals, objectives, and priorities will be considered in weighing the value of a faculty member's service.

Assessment

SLIS faculty members are expected to provide leadership in response to the information needs of library and information professionals and to society. The degree and quality of professional activity and service at local, state, regional, national, and international levels will be evaluated. As with research and teaching, consideration is given to the quality as well as quantity of professional and university service. Leadership roles in professional organizations, invited and/or elected service to the discipline, and reviewing activities are evaluated.

All faculty members are expected to serve on committees within the School. Conscientious performance of particularly demanding and time-consuming assignments will be appropriately recognized. Commendable work on College committees and University committees, councils and the like will receive positive recognition. Tenured faculty members have a special obligation to undertake service beyond the School level. Tenure-track faculty members are expected to maintain an appropriate service balance under the guidance of Committee A.

Sources of Evidence

Sources of evidence include but are not limited to the following:

1. Election, appointment, or other leadership in professional organizations
2. Service as editor or on editorial boards
3. Reviews of papers for professional journals
4. Reviews of research proposals for funding agencies
5. Presentation or organization of workshops and seminars
6. Sessions chaired at professional meetings
7. Membership on accreditation teams
8. Service on advisory committees and professional boards
9. Review of tenure or promotion dossiers
10. Service on local, state, or national committees
11. Professional consulting
12. Mentoring of alumni and others within the profession
13. Service publications
14. Awards for meritorious service
15. Other service activities
III. Tenure

A candidate at the rank of Assistant Professor or above, to be considered eligible for tenure, must have demonstrated during the probationary period consistent growth and development in the areas of teaching, research and scholarship, and professional and university service.

Recommendations for tenure must be consistent with the goals and objectives of the School and the goals of the University. Any major change in the direction or purpose of the School will affect tenure deliberations.

Research qualifications will be judged on the basis of an active and meaningful research program. Research and scholarship performance must compare favorably in the combination of quality and quantity with that of colleagues at the same rank in similar schools. Evidence of research quality will be based on a thorough review of all research accomplishments. Especially important in this regard will be the recommendation of external evaluators.

Teaching performance of high quality will be expected of all faculty members and such performance will be judged on the basis of student and former student evaluations, peer evaluations, course materials, student advising and mentoring, and other pertinent information. The candidate must demonstrate the ability to present relevant and current information and ideas in a manner that promotes and is conducive to learning. Teaching performance must compare favorably to colleagues at the same rank in the School incumbent at the time of his/her candidacy. The teaching activities of the candidate during the probationary period should receive favorable peer evaluation by evaluators within the University who are competent to make such evaluations.

Service will be considered in tenure evaluation, however the award of tenure will be primarily based on demonstrated excellence in teaching and research and the promise for continued achievement in these two areas. As far as possible, the School strives to spare tenure track faculty members heavy administrative or committee assignments so as not to impede development of the candidate’s research and teaching programs. New faculty members will be advised by the Director of this fact upon accepting a position in the School and service assignments will be made judiciously.

All tenure-track faculty members will be evaluated for tenure according to the criteria in Section II above, unless the tenure-track faculty member is hired to perform some special task, which would include duties outside usual faculty responsibilities.

Third Year Review
At the beginning of the third year of probation, each non-tenured, tenure-track faculty member will assemble his/her dossier for review by three external evaluators chosen by Committee A from a list of names submitted by the faculty member and Committee A members. These external evaluators will provide written and confidential reports of the candidate’s research program, focusing on progress and potential for future success. All tenured faculty members will review the candidate’s dossier, including the external letters of evaluation. All tenured faculty members of the School will vote, by secret ballot, on whether there has been satisfactory or unsatisfactory progress towards tenure. The outcome of the vote will be shared, in writing, with the candidate and the Dean of the College.

IV. Promotion

The criteria for promotion to the ranks of Associate Professor and Professor emphasize academic and scholarly achievement within the individual faculty member’s field(s) of research specialization and within the university community. Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and the award of tenure will, for most faculty members, be considered concurrently. However, if the evaluations for tenure and promotion are not conducted jointly, a faculty member has the right to request the review of his/her vitae for promotion to Associate Professor or Professor.

Associate Professor

In general the criteria and procedure for promotion to Associate Professor are the same as those for tenure, so that promotion to Associate Professor will accompany the granting of tenure. To be considered eligible for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, a candidate must have demonstrated substantial growth during the time in rank. Growth will be based on excellence in research and scholarly activities and teaching and the promise for continued achievement. Conscientious and active participation in School, University, and Discipline governance and professional service will also be considered but is less
significant than either teaching or research activities. It is expected that the candidate will continue development as a teacher and a scholar and in service to the profession and the university in a manner that will support promotion to Professor in a reasonable period of time.

Professor

To be considered eligible for promotion to the rank of Professor, the criteria will be the same as those for promotion to Associate Professor; however, the level of attainment within these criteria will be greater for promotion to Professor. It is expected that the candidate will demonstrate promise for continued contribution as a teacher and a scholar and in service activities that will enhance the image of the School and the University.

In exceptional cases, promotion to Professor may be based primarily on recognition of superior performance in teaching or service. Such promotion will only be made on the basis of exceptional teaching or service, which, at a minimum, has been recognized by University awards for such activities.

V. Renewable Term Faculty

The following provisions apply to faculty who are appointed year-to-year for a specific term of years. Such faculty will be referred to as “term faculty.” A term faculty member may be given the title of Instructor, Lecturer, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor, as appropriate to the individual’s professional credentials and background. The length of the term will ordinarily be three to five years, except as approved by the unit, Dean, and Senior Vice President and Provost.

Renewable term faculty members with the title of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor are defined as part of the Regular Faculty on the Norman Campus. Such faculty members are recruited and hired using the same University recruitment procedures employed to recruit and hire tenure-track faculty members. Renewable term faculty members at the rank of Instructor and Lecturer may be hired in the same manner as temporary faculty. A national search is allowed but not required.

Renewable term faculty members shall have all the rights and responsibilities of other faculty members with their titles, except as provided by this policy or by College and University policies. Rights and privileges restricted to tenured and tenure-track faculty members by this policy include voting on tenure decisions, which is reserved to tenured faculty members [Norman Campus Faculty Handbook, section 3.7.5], and serving on Committee A, which is restricted to tenure, tenure-track and ranked renewable term faculty members [Norman Campus Faculty Handbook, section 2.8.2]. Otherwise, renewable term faculty members fully share the rights and duties of the tenured and tenure-track faculty, including but not limited to: involvement in faculty governance and curriculum development; and, eligibility for career development opportunities such as internal college and departmental support for professional activities. The duties of renewable term faculty members will ordinarily emphasize teaching and service with a 3:3 teaching load. However, a renewable term faculty member's distribution of effort may include research, teaching, and service, in any combination consistent with the needs of the School and College and University rules.

Term faculty shall be evaluated annually as part of the process applicable to all faculty members, using criteria listed in this document and as specified in the Faculty Handbook section 3.11. The renewal decision will be accomplished by the same procedure employed for tenure-track faculty in their probationary period. The faculty member will be notified of the Department’s recommendation of annual renewal or non-renewal no later than March 1. During the final year of the term, and prior to notifying the faculty member whether or not he/she will be reappointed to a subsequent term, the faculty member will receive a comprehensive evaluation of his/her performance during the entire term. The faculty member will be notified of the Department’s recommendation of term renewal or non-renewal no later than March 1 of the final year of the term. The Director will accomplish consideration of annual or term renewal, with recommendations from Committee A.

Term faculty members also are eligible for promotion using procedures and criteria in this document and as specified in the Faculty Handbook. To be considered for promotion to the rank of Lecturer or Assistant Professor, the candidate must have completed a doctoral degree in a field appropriately related to the programs and needs of the School of Library and Information Studies.

VI. Salary Increases
The annual award of salary increases in the School of Library and Information Studies will be consistent with the guidelines specified in the Faculty Handbook section 3.11. Merit increases in salary shall be awarded for superior academic performance of faculty members during the preceding academic year.

Because yearly qualification of faculty effort may be difficult to evaluate, it is incumbent on the School’s administration to maintain an awareness of the academic activity of all faculty. The criteria used for salary increase are the same as for the granting of tenure and promotion. The Chair will send recommendations for salary increase to the Dean of the College.

VII. Review Procedures
Each summer the Provost distributes the Call for Tenure and Promotion Recommendations and the Tenure/Promotion Packet detailing the procedures and timetables for tenure and promotion to the candidates for tenure and candidates for promotion as well as e-mails these to the deans, directors, and chairs. The packet is also available on the Provost’s website: (http://www.ou.edu/provost/pronew/content/memorand.html) under “Call for Tenure and Promotion: Committee Dossier Checklist and Forms.”

Similarly the Provost sends out a Call for Annual Faculty Evaluations in December. In late January each faculty member will submit electronically submit a SLIS Annual Faculty Activity Report, their one-page mini-vita, and full vita to the SLIS Administrative Assistant. The SLIS Committee A will review the materials and complete a Summary Report of Annual Faculty Evaluation for each faculty member and submit these to the College typically by March 1. The Director will distribute a calendar chronicling the upcoming tenure, promotion, and annual evaluation events in the Fall.

For tenure and promotion candidates, in March of the academic year preceding the one in which the review will occur, the Director of the School, on behalf of Committee A, notifies the candidate for tenure and/or promotion that the review will take place and the calendar for the review. In addition, the Director requests nominations by the candidate of six individuals who are qualified to serve as external evaluators, following guidelines for such individuals established by the Provost and by the College of Arts and Sciences Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation. The Director also requests copies of the candidate’s statement on research and scholarship, teaching, and service and copies of all the candidate's publications.

Committee A reviews the individuals nominated by the candidate for conformance with the Provost's criteria. In the case where one or more of the nominees do not meet the criteria, the candidate is notified and requested to submit additional nomination(s). Committee A also nominates six individuals to serve as external evaluators and who are qualified to make an accurate assessment of the research and scholarship of the candidate. The Director will forward the resultant list of evaluator names to the College for approval by the Dean or Associate Dean by June. The Director will invite the approved reviewers to participate in the review requesting their letters by early September.

In all cases, recommendation for the award of tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor will be made by a secret ballot vote of the tenured faculty, based in part on evaluation of professional competency solicited from external referees. The candidate will receive a letter notifying him/her of the outcome of the department’s vote to support or deny tenure within a few days of the vote. How individual faculty vote must be kept secret; however the outcome of the vote may be revealed to the candidate at the candidate’s request. The vote of the faculty and the recommendation for tenure will be forwarded to the Dean of the College.

In the case of a candidate for promotion to professor, the same procedure is followed as for Associate Professor detailed above, with the exception that only the members of the tenured faculty who hold the rank of professor review the materials and meet to discuss the candidate. All members of Committee A, regardless of rank, participate in the review of materials and the vote of Committee A on the candidate.