Committee
Meeting called by: Regular Faculty Meeting
Time: 12:00 p.m.

Chair
Type of meeting: (fill in date) Faculty Meeting
Place: SLIS Conference Room

Agenda

A. Approval of the SLIS Faculty Meeting Minutes, February 4, 2013

B. Announcements
   a. Comps Timetable:
      i. March 8, 2013: Comps Questions to Dr. Kim
      ii. March 25, 2013 @ noon to 1:00: All faculty comps discussion during BB
      iii. April 11 through 15, 2013: Comps
      iv. April 23, 2013: Individual evaluations due to Maggie
      v. April 23 to 30: Reading teams meet
      vi. April 30 @ noon: Reading team feedback to Maggie
   b. Plan for Program Presentation for CoA, March 24, 2013
   c. OLA SLIS Alumni Reception, Thursday, April 4, 2013, 5:30 pm
   d. A&S Spring Faculty Meeting, Thursday, April 4, 2013, 4:00 pm
   e. A&S Student Awards Ceremony, April 16, 4 pm. OMU, Molly Shi Boren Ballroom
   f. OU Faculty Tribute, April 18, 3 pm, Sandy Bell Gallery, FJMA
   g. April 22, 2013, Brown Bag Topic—Improving Student Writing?
   h. FOCUS* Funding received for SLISebration, “Celebrating the Story Matrix: Libraries and Writing,” Joy Harjo, April 27, 2013, OU Law Center, Timberdell & Chautauqua
   i. A&S Convocation, Lloyd Noble Center, May 11, 10 am
   j. OU Commencement, May 10, 7 pm. Stadium
   k. CoA Review Panel Site Visit, March 10-11, 2014
   l. Faculty news

C. Discussion Items
   a. OU-Tulsa Programs Chairs & Directors Meeting
   b. Justifying Faculty Hire
   c. Behavioral Intervention Team—BIT
   d. Program Plan for ALA Accreditation
   e. *NEW* Graduate Admission Criteria
   f. Qualtrics or Survey Monkey?
D. Action Items
   a. Assistant Professor of Information Retrieval Search

E. Reports
   Accreditation
   Ad Hoc Ph.D.
   Admissions
   Aspire 2020 Liaison
   Committee A
   Curriculum
   Graduate Studies
   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

Special notes:
Meeting called by: Type of meeting:
Additional information:

Members present: Abbas, Brown, Burke, Kim, Koh, Martens, Rubenstein, Snead, Taylor, White, Zemke
Members absent:
Additional attendees: Barringer, Ryan

Minutes

Item: Approval of the SLIS Faculty Meeting Minutes, February 4, 2013
   Name: Dr. Brown

   Discussion:
   Conclusions: approved
   Action items: send corrections to Maggie Ryan

Item: Announcements-Faculty News
   Name: Dr. Brown

   Discussion: Dr. Abbas’ promotion to full professor has been approved by the College of Arts and Sciences.
   Conclusions:
   Action items:
**Item:** Assistant Professor of Information Retrieval Search  
**Name:** Dr. Brown, Faculty, Ms. Barringer

**Discussion:** Ballots were distributed; and each faculty member and Ms. Barringer were asked to share their impressions of each candidate.

**Summary of comments:**

Jaewook Ahn: Strong research, personality, thought students would engage well with him; presentation was clear, could fit in well, personable, interesting research, good candidate; easy to talk to and understand, could contribute to BAIS degree; could review the position description if that would help; knowledgeable about LIS/info behavior; good fit, calm personality, only issue would be where would he go beyond visualizing use of the library, understands info studies, so could plug into the discipline easily; liked what he was doing, good people skills, good understanding of users, grasp of what the program is about; understands LIS and CS, overall had a nice personality; hasn’t done a lot of online teaching, did like the presentation, personality would fit well; unsure about where his research goes beyond his presentation; would fit well in this dept. as well as across campus, little concern didn’t see a lot of advancement in Dr. Ahn’s tools from those created in the 1990’s, interacted well with audience; only thing was did not see a lot of enthusiasm (some saw a lot of enthusiasm); record shows he has worked hard; letters are very strong.

Kun Lu: talk and research were expected given his major advisor, but not a lot of change from what he is doing from what they were doing, great idea for research to provide better access, didn’t see a lot of enthusiasm for data curation, has background, but may lack passion, would fit well into the undergrad program, teaching experience may be stronger than other candidates, engaged well with students, enthusiasm for teaching; liked his personality, experience with undergrad and online courses, wasn’t really engaged and didn’t want to ask students a lot of questions, could have been more curious about the program; very enthusiastic, personable, passionate about what he is doing; liked his talk, concerns about teaching-didn’t have ideas about how to teach certain things, had questions about who would set the servers and computers up, concerned about possible lack of back end tech knowledge; strong in research; has already published, should be productive; he has an understanding of how to grow a Ph.D. program (member of one of the first UW-Milwaukee cohorts), should be able to write grant applications; personable, concerned about tech background (short conversation), didn’t expand much on technology knowledge needed for teaching undergrad courses; personable, confident in presentation, would be confident in face-to-face class, wants to teach statistics; difficult to hear his presentation in Tulsa, resume looks good, thinks he could learn to teach on video and online; most looked forward to meeting, looks good on paper, but share concern about him not wanting to dig deep technically for what the School needs, not hearing that this person has an interest in learning technology needed; asked good questions about where the school is going, talked about getting numbers of undergrad students up.

Vinod Vydiswaran: could not get a word in edgewise, delightful, handled technical problems well, good presentation experience; adaptable to environment, confident, more computer engineering oriented, but has potential to bring grants and collaborate with computer engineering faculty, smart; fabulous, handled himself well when technology became a problem, most likely of the 3 to go out in the academic community and forge ties with other depts.; personable, very passionate about what he wants to do and how to do it, not totally comfortable with online teaching, but could learn, not well versed in what SLIS is trying to do with BAIS; would be strong with collaboration with other departments, concern with exactly what he would teach; independent, outgoing, would be a good teacher; he identifies himself/interests are with IS only for info retrieval aspect, concerned that he might not stay, too computer science/systems oriented, but SLIS is more people oriented; had good questions about how to approach online teaching/technology issues (only one of the 3 who seemed proactive about this), said he would like the challenge to grow something new, do something different (all 3 said they would teach info retrieval), he does have good tech skills; he has potential to be a very good fit in this dept., seemed interested in learning online teaching skills and looked forward to learning ways to improve how it is done, would collaborate well with other departments; liked his presentation, dynamic, handled snafus well, would engage well with students, most interactive with students, wanted to know what the students thought of the program, what their areas of interest are and what they like/don’t like about online classes, how could he create the best environment with students, asked a lot about collaboration with other faculty, students and across other departments, good understanding of applications to libraries, proactive, engaged, other students also liked that he engaged with students wanting to know about their interests (other 2 candidates didn’t engage as well with students), felt he would delve into D2L to improve; nice person, engaged well with students at distance site, research well thought out, but do see some gaps/flaws in his research, very interested in BAIS program and interested in developing more technical courses for that program, could help to bring
5063 to next level – address mid-point between CS and LIS – MLIS students may think his grad courses might be too difficult, asked good questions about engaging students when teaching online, how faculty deliver content online, CS background teaching model is in the classroom with small classes of students, would collaborate across campus and has potential for collaborating with faculty in SLIS, didn’t transfer his knowledge to actual skills that could be taught to students, didn’t see a translation of how his research could extend/connect with other research on campus; talked about different kinds of research going on across campus, nothing negative to say about him; not convinced he’d be a good fit, can’t see what he would teach that is info studies related; talked about 3003, 5063, would need some mentoring, think SLIS faculty need some mentoring on technology; speaking styles differ depending on sociological background. Felt he is looking for a place to settle in. Seemed to be some differences in different people’s experiences with him;

Important to give some consideration to others’ speaking styles, but need to consider what OU SLIS faculty need in a new colleague.

Compare or vote? Will the unit be happy with any of these or are there any that should not be considered. Faculty will vote on the slate of three. If SLIS decides they want all 3, offers would be extended in the order in which they are ranked by faculty vote (offers to all three if needed; if 1st and/or 2nd choices don’t accept offer(s)).

Faculty voted and votes were tallied. The candidates were ranked as follows:
First Choice: Jaewook Ahn
Second Choice: Vinod Vydiswaren
Third Choice: Kun Lu
**Item: Justifying Faculty Hire  Name: Dr. Brown**

Discussion: The School would have to say what the person would teach, why the position is needed, etc. Committee A and Dr. Brown have discussed. Faculty were asked to contribute reasons to create a compelling case for why the position is needed. Community and social informatics; taking librarianship more to a context view, as opposed to a container; making it a broader umbrella. The faculty member would teach 1013 and community relations and advocacy, and develop more courses along those lines. SLIS must submit a justification and a position description. The position description can be based on the justification. Consider mission/goals of unit. How does SLIS see itself? How would the position move the department forward? Libraries already exist as community centers, so could think about broadening that particular outreach; being more proactive. What do libraries provide? Need concrete examples of what we’re trying to train students to do in terms of providing people to expand those types of outreach. Another consideration is that SLIS (a 2nd idea) might want to look at hiring another person specializing in information retrieval and information technology (similar to the current search). In smaller communities the roles of the public libraries has and is changing rapidly; lots going on in the public library community right now. Some graduate students are interested in information architecture, but discover that there is not as strong of an IT presence for students wanting to focus on information architecture, which is becoming an increasingly marketable skill. Part of the School’s mission is to serve libraries/information centers in Oklahoma. If there was someone hired with strong expertise in information architecture, where would s/he fit in? What about information leadership? It is important to keep the mission of serving the library community alive.

The question was asked what should be done for students who would have taken courses that Dr. Van Fleet taught; what is the plan for those students? They are being taken care of individually. Faculty advisors will direct those students to internship/project experiences; whatever will serve their interests.

**Item: BIT Behavior Intervention  Name: Dr. Brown**

**Team**

Discussion: A flyer describing this program was distributed via email. There has been a little confusion. There is some resemblance to OU Cares, which focuses on assisting students with improving their academic skills, but BIT is more about referring people who might hurt themselves or others. It is important to report quickly in order to establish and maintain records. You are not alone; there is somewhere to go with concerns.

**Item: COA Program Plan  Name: Dr. Brown**

Discussion: If faculty have anything to add/correct/change, please send those suggestions to Stacy Zemke by March 8th.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item: “NEW” Graduate Admission Criteria</th>
<th>Name: Ms. Ryan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion: Admissions and scholarships committee will look at GPA requirement changes for admission.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action items: Discuss and recommend changes (if any) to faculty</td>
<td>Person responsible: Admissions and Scholarship committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item: Committee Report: Graduate Studies</th>
<th>Name: Dr. Kim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion: The committee is proposing changes to the internship policies (#6) and to the comp exam student handbook (based on feedback from students who have taken the exam). Student feedback had to do with their expectations on which courses the question is based upon. Dr. Brown did not receive the proposed changes. These changes will be considered at the April faculty meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action items:</td>
<td>Person responsible:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item: Committee Report: Admissions and Scholarships</th>
<th>Name: Dr. Burke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion: This committee met on Monday, March 4th and determined the scholarship awards for 2013-2014.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action items:</td>
<td>Person responsible:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item: Graduate Assistants for 2013-14</th>
<th>Name: Dr. Brown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion: Dr. Brown will contact faculty who will need a new GA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action items:</td>
<td>Person responsible:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item: Adjournment</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion: Meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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Introduction and Background:

The University of Oklahoma School of Library and Information Studies (SLIS) participates in three regular review structures:

- the University of Oklahoma Campus Departmental Review Panel (CDRP) process, conducted over the years 2008 to 2009 and the next review is tentatively scheduled for 2015, and now refereed to as the Academic Program Review Committee.
- the University of Oklahoma annual Program Assessment Report
- the American Library Association Committee on Accreditation (COA) review, last completed in the spring of 2007, and scheduled for review in spring of 2014.

SLIS began activities in preparation for the 2014 accreditation review by the American Library Association Committee on Accreditation (COA) in the fall of 2012 by appointing the Chair and Co-chair for Accreditation Program Presentation and Review; holding a fall faculty planning meeting to review and discuss the accreditation plans and processes prior to the beginning of the semester; and appointing the Accreditation Review Committee and Subcommittees.

The **OU SLIS Accreditation Advisory Committee** was designed to gather input from various constituencies of the School. Members of the committee will participate in the review of the Program Presentation, with leadership by the Director and the Accreditation Coordinator. The Committee is comprised of the following members:

- All SLIS Full-time faculty
- All SLIS administrative staff
- Members of the OU SLIS External Advisory Board (SLIS EAB)
- Members of the OU SLIS Librarian Certification Committee
- Sharon Saulmon, SLIS Alumni, President-elect of the SLIS Alumni Association and Director of the Learning Resources Center, Rose State College - Midwest City, OK (Retired)
- Amanda Barringer, President of the Oklahoma Library and Information Studies Student Association

The **OU SLIS Accreditation Working Committee** will research and prepare the Program Presentation Draft for review and approval by the Advisory Committee. The working committee will include

- Dr. Cecelia Brown, Professor and Director of SLIS
- Ms. Stacy Zemke, accreditation coordinator and full-time faculty member
- The SLIS administrative staff

Each standard has been assigned to one of five OU SLIS’s standing committees, which are comprised of full-time faculty and students, for review and editing of the relevant section. Where appropriate, additional students and members of the SLIS EAB will be involved.

The assignments are as follows:

- **Standard I: Mission, Goals, and Objectives**
  - **Graduate Studies Committee**
    - Yong-Mi Kim (Chair)
    - Betsy Martens
    - Rhonda Taylor
• Standard II: Curriculum
  o Curriculum Committee
    ▪ June Abbas (Chair)
    ▪ Yong-Mi Kim (Member)
    ▪ Kelvin White (Member)
    ▪ Stacy Zemke (Undergrad Studies Liaison, Voting Member)
• Standard III: Faculty
  o Committee A,
    ▪ Cecelia Brown (Member)
    ▪ Susan Burke (Member)
    ▪ Betsy Martens (Member)
  o Jenifer Fryar (Administrative Assistant)
• Standard IV: Students
  o Admissions Committee,
    ▪ Susan Burke (Chair)
    ▪ Kyongwon Koh (Member)
    ▪ Maggie Ryan (Member)
  o Margaret Ryan (Coordinator of Admissions and Academic and Student Support)
• Standard V: Administration and Financial Support
  o Dr. Cecelia Brown (Director),
  o Jenifer Fryar (Administrative Assistant)
• Standard VI: Physical Resources and Facilities
  o Undergraduate Studies Committee,
    ▪ Stacy Zemke (Chair)
    ▪ Ellen Rubenstein (Member)
    ▪ Tommy Snead (Member)
  o Jenifer Fryar (Administrative Assistant)

The director, the administrative assistant, and the coordinator will coordinate the gathering of documentation and will write the first draft of the document.

As a unit of the College of Arts and Sciences, the Dean will be regularly briefed on the progress and review the final Program Presentation.

The Program Presentation will document the changes in the program, including
• the addition of an archival based area of study lead by new faculty member Kelvin White, this area of study that has never been offered through an accredited program in the state
• the addition of six (fall 2013 hire pending) new faculty members (out of 12 total faculty) in this accreditation cycle, who have increased the departmental diversity by adding new areas of expertise and variety of course offerings.
• the loss of one Tulsa based faculty line.
• the recently opened faculty line, awaiting approval to hire from the College (replacing a full Professor who died in January of 2013
• the adoption of a more flexible program planning structure for students to allow all them to have more flexibility in designing their electives.

In addition to these areas of significant modification, general adaptations in curriculum, facilities, personnel and policy will be addressed.

Timeline
Accreditation review activities began in the fall of 2012. The specific activities that have taken place to date include;
• appointment of the Accreditation Advisory Committee and Working Committee
• appointment and meeting of the Subcommittees
• surveys of alumni and employers
• design of overall structure for the Program Presentation
• development of a detailed timeline for preparation of the Program Presentation and for related accreditation review activities
• initial identification of documents that will serve as supporting evidence for compliance with the Standards
• approval/acceptance of dates for the review (March 10-11, 2014) and associated deadline dates for the Program Presentation
• approval of the proposed Panel Chair, C. Allen Nichols
• construction of the digital infrastructure to facilitate the work of the Subcommittees as they share and edit documents as well as identify and accumulate evidence

During the summer of 2013, an accreditation tracking website will be developed to document the accreditation process and make specific evidence available to our constituencies, including faculty, the EAD, and alumni. The site will include any documentation that is not confidential.

**Layout of the Program Presentation**
The Program Presentation will follow the 2008 Standards for Accreditation. The document will be prepared in three formats:

1. A paper format, double-spaced, with spiral binding; other format details include;
   • labeled tabs for different sections
   • table of contents, including figures and tables
   • index of evidence documents showing location and keyed to Program Presentation section
   • list of evidence/sources of information following each analysis section
   • use of different font type for standards statements to facilitate reading

   Supporting documents that need to be provided to the panel prior to the visit will be available via the supporting website.

2. A web document with links to all supporting documents available on the web and an index to both web and paper documents.

3. A downloadable PDF of the paper formatted document.

**Outline of the Program Presentation**
The Program Presentation will be written in three sections, with the second section containing six subsections corresponding to the six standards.

Section 1: Background and overview
• Brief history of the School and accreditation status
• Context/environment of the School
• Current profile of the School
• Process used for preparing the Program Presentation

Section 2: Analysis of how the MLIS program meets each of the six standards, including evidence for each standard:
• Planning process and planning documents relevant to the review for each of the standards
• How assessments are made to evaluate success in meeting goals related to the standard
• Processes for incorporating findings from assessments into planning
• Description of how various constituency groups are included in the planning and assessment mechanisms for that standard area
• Summary commentary relative to conformity of the standard, including identification of any changes needed, in progress, or planned to improve this area

Section 3: Summary section
• Review of the extent to which each separate standard is met
• Statement synthesizing the extent to which overall standards are met

Appropriate charts, graphs, and matrices that will facilitate understanding of how the program meets the standards are planned. The following are examples of the types of visual presentations that will be included:

Curriculum section
• matrix of SLIS courses aligned to library and information studies professional competencies and standards
• matrix matching program objectives to courses
• chart showing frequency of course offerings

Faculty section
• matrix of faculty expertise, teaching areas, and course assignments
• chart of faculty with name, position, education, research/teaching interests, course assignments (separate charts for full-time and adjuncts)

Student section
• charts of student characteristics: gender, full-time versus part-time, ethnicity, location, undergraduate major, advanced degrees

Administration and financial resources section
• graphs of budgets/expenditures and percentages of contribution from parent institution

Structure of supporting documents:

Supporting evidence will include materials from the University, College of Arts and Sciences, and the School. It is anticipated that all relevant University and College level documents will also be available on the web. All documents will be accessible through the links in the web version of the Program Presentation or through the Program Presentation support website.

SLIS evidence, with the exception of sample course materials and confidential materials, will be available on the password protected Program Presentation support website. The non-confidential material of public interest will be available on the publically accessible accreditation tracking web site or the SLIS website (http://slis.ou.edu).

Materials that cannot be converted to web documents or provided in paper format prior to the visit will be made accessible in the on-site panel workroom or through use of a location index. Such items include student files, budget reports, annual faculty evaluation files, student course evaluations, faculty publications, historical course syllabi, and examples of student work.
Evidence by Standard:

Though much of the evidence for the Program Presentation is mapped to a specific standard, some of the specific pieces apply to all of the standards. This evidence includes, biennial reports to COA (2008, 2010, 2012), annual Program Assessment Reports reviewed by the Dean and Oklahoma Regents, ALISE reports, and annual student surveys. Specific sources of evidence for each standard are

Standard I – Mission, Goals, and Objectives

- SLIS Advisory Board Agenda and Roster
- SLIS Committee Structure, Membership and Annual Reports
- SLIS Evaluations of Student Learning Outcomes
- SLIS Fall Planning Meeting Documentation
- SLIS Graduate Student Handbook
- SLIS Policies on Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Raises
- SLIS Procedures for Implementation of the “Policies on Tenure, Promotion, and Merit raises”
- SLIS Strategic Planning Process, 2009-2010
- SLIS Unit Evaluations
- SLIS Vision, Mission, Goals, and Objectives
- University of Oklahoma 2012 Commission on Higher Education Self-Study Report
- University of Oklahoma Campus Departmental Review Program; Self-Study, Final Report, and Response
- University of Oklahoma General Catalog 2009-2011
- University of Oklahoma Mission Statement
- University of Oklahoma Organizational Structures

Standard II – Curriculum

- College of Arts and Sciences Dual Master’s Degree Guidelines
- College of Arts and Sciences Instructional Evaluation forms and semester results
- Library Journal Student Placements Survey
- LIS 5823 Internship in Library/Information Centers Contract and selected list of placement locations
- LIS 5920 Directed Research Contract and List of Students and Topics
- LIS 5940 Directed Project Contract and List of Students and Topics
- LIS 5960 Directed Readings Contract and List of Students and Topics
- LIS 5980 Research for Master’s Thesis Student Guide and Titles of completed theses, 2007-2012
- Master of Library and Information Studies Degree Requirements. effective Fall 2012
- School Librarian Certification Committee Documentation
- SLIS Advisory Board Agenda and Roster
- SLIS Alumni Survey, 2009
- SLIS Annual Program Assessment Report, prepared for Oklahoma State Regents
- SLIS Biennial Narrative Reports to the ALA Committee on Accreditation
- SLIS Committee Structure, Membership, and Annual Reports
- SLIS Course descriptions and syllabi
- SLIS Course rotation schedule
- SLIS Curriculum revision documents 2007 - 2012
- SLIS Employer Survey, 2010
• SLIS Faculty Handbook
• SLIS Faculty Meeting minutes
• SLIS Fall Planning Meeting Documentation
• SLIS One-Page Course Summaries
• SLIS Program Planning forms
• SLIS Program Planning guides
• SLIS Program Presentation 2007
• SLIS Student Achievement Evaluation forms
• SLIS Student Advisory Council; Agenda and Summary Reports
• SLIS Student Exit Interview responses
• SLIS Student Guide to the Comprehensive Examination for the Master’s Degree
• SLIS Student Guide to the Comprehensive Examination for the Master’s Degree and orientation agenda
• SLIS Student Guide to the Portfolio for the Master of Library and Information Studies
• SLIS Student Guide to the Portfolio for the Master of Library and Information Studies and portfolio orientation presentation
• SLIS Student Self-Evaluations
• SLIS Vision, Mission, Goals and Objectives
• University of Oklahoma Campus Departmental Review Program; Self-Study, Final Report, and Response

Standard III – Faculty

• College of Arts and Sciences faculty recruiting guidelines
• College of Arts and Sciences Instructional Evaluation forms and semester results
• College of Arts and Sciences Online Learning Resource Center [http://casweb.ou.edu/olr/index.htm]
• SLIS Alumni Survey, 2009
• SLIS Committee Structure, Membership, and Annual Reports
• SLIS Course descriptions and syllabi
• SLIS Course schedules
• SLIS Faculty Activity Reports and Mini-Vita
• SLIS Faculty Curriculum Vitae
• SLIS Faculty Handbook
• SLIS faculty position announcements
• SLIS One-Page Course Summaries
• SLIS Policies on Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Raises
• SLIS Procedures for Implementation of the "Policies on Tenure, Promotion, and Merit raises"
• SLIS Reports to ALISE
• SLIS Student Exit Interview responses
• SLIS Unit Evaluations
• SLIS Vision, Mission, Goals and Objectives
• University of Oklahoma Center for Teaching Excellence
• University of Oklahoma Norman Campus Faculty Handbook
• University of Oklahoma Teaching Scholars Initiative
• University of Oklahoma Writing Center

Standard IV – Students

• College of Arts and Sciences Instructional Evaluation forms and semester results
• LIS 5823 Internship in Library/Information Centers Contract and selected list of placement locations
• LIS 5980 Research for Master’s Thesis Student Guide and Titles of completed theses, 2007-2012
• OLISSA listserv archive [http://lists.ou.edu/archives/olissa-l.html]
• OLISSA website [http://www.olissa.ou.edu/]
• SLIS Admission letters
• SLIS Admissions Committee Membership and Annual Reports
• SLIS Advisory Board minutes and Roster
• SLIS Alumni Survey, 2009
• SLIS Annual Program Assessment Report, prepared for Oklahoma State Regents
• SLIS Application Packet
• SLIS Committee Structure, Membership, and Annual Reports
• SLIS Course descriptions and syllabi
• SLIS Employer Survey 2010
• SLIS Graduate Assistant Application Form
• SLIS Graduate Student Database
• SLIS Graduate Student Handbook
• SLIS job listserv archive [http://lists.ou.edu/archives/lisjobs-l.html]
• SLIS Program Planning forms
• SLIS Program Planning guides
• SLIS Recruiting Materials
• SLIS Reports to ALISE
• SLIS Scholarship Application
• SLIS Student Advisory Council; Agenda and Summary Reports
• SLIS Student Exit Interview responses
• SLIS Student Guide to the Comprehensive Examination for the Master’s Degree
• SLIS Student Guide to the Portfolio for the Master of Library and Information Studies
• SLIS Student Meet-ups; Agenda and Reports
• SLIS Student Surveys of Chosen End of Program Assessments
• SLIS Vision, Mission, Goals, and Objectives
• SLIS website [slis.ou.edu]
• State of Oklahoma School Library Media Certification requirements
• SLIS Annual Student Achievement Evaluation forms
• University of Oklahoma Career Services website
• University of Oklahoma General Catalog 2009-2011
• University of Oklahoma Graduate College Bulletin 2011-2012
• University of Oklahoma Graduate Student Senate website
• University of Oklahoma Norman Campus Graduate College website [http://gradweb.ou.edu/]
• University of Oklahoma Tulsa Campus Graduate College website [http://www.ou.edu/tulsa/tulsa-grad-college.html]

**Standard V – Administration and Financial Support**
• College of Arts and Sciences Administrative organizational chart
• College of Arts and Sciences website [http://www.cas.ou.edu]
• Director Cecelia Brown Appointment letter
• SLIS Application Packet
• SLIS Committee A minutes
• SLIS Committee Structure, Membership, and Annual Reports
• SLIS Director’s Annual Evaluation Form
• SLIS Director’s Curriculum Vita
• SLIS Faculty Activity Reports and Mini-Vita
• SLIS Faculty Handbook
• SLIS Faculty Meeting minutes
• SLIS Fall Planning Meeting Documentation
• SLIS Graduate Student Handbook
• SLIS organizational chart
• SLIS Policies on Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Raises
• SLIS Procedures for Implementation of the “Policies on Tenure, Promotion, and Merit raises”
• SLIS Reports to ALISE
• SLIS staff position descriptions
• SLIS Unit Evaluations
• SLIS Vision, Mission, Goals, and Objectives
• SLIS website [http://www.slis.ou.edu]
• University of Oklahoma Administrative organizational chart
• University of Oklahoma Board of Regents By-Laws
• University of Oklahoma Budgets 2007 through 2012
• University of Oklahoma Financial Aid Department website [http://www.financialaid.ou.edu/]
• University of Oklahoma Norman Campus Faculty Handbook
• University of Oklahoma Provost organizational chart
• University of Oklahoma Provost website [http://www.ou.edu/provost]
• University of Oklahoma Vice President for Research website [http://vpr-norman.ou.edu]
• University of Oklahoma Course Approval Process
• University of Oklahoma Program Change Process

Standard VI – Physical Resources and Facilities
• College of Arts and Sciences Information Technology (CASIT) Support
• Joint SLIS and College of Arts and Sciences Computer Lab
• SLIS Alumni Survey, 2009
• SLIS classrooms with H.323 videoconferencing capabilities
• SLIS facility floor plans, Norman and Tulsa
• SLIS Fall Planning Meeting Documentation
• University of Oklahoma Bizzell Library website [http://libraries.ou.edu/]
• University of Oklahoma Information Technology (OUIT) website [http://www.ou.edu/it]
• University of Oklahoma Tulsa Campus Library website [http://tulsa.ou.edu/Library/index.htm]
The first phase of the new Graduate Admission Criteria, which was approved by the Norman Campus Graduate Council on May 3, 2012, will change the referral process for Summer 2013 applications and beyond in the following ways:

Transcripts Required for Referral to Department:
• Transcript from last degree-conferring institution
• Transcripts for any graduate work

GPA Documented on Referral:
• Cumulative GPA from the last degree conferred as reported on the institution’s transcript
  o The Graduate College will no longer provide the calculated GPA over the last 60 credit hours of undergraduate work

GPA Requirements for Admission:
• Full-Admission:
  o 3.0 cumulative GPA on the last degree-conferring transcript
• Full-Admission, Low Grades:
  o 2.5-2.99 cumulative GPA on the last degree-conferring transcript with petition approval by the Graduate College
• Conditional Admission:
  o 2.5-2.99 cumulative GPA on the last degree-conferring transcript (automatically offered at the discretion of the department. No petition to the Graduate College is needed)
  o <2.5 cumulative GPA on the last degree-conferring transcript with petition approval by the Graduate College

As a result of the new Conditional Admission requirements, all referrals will be forwarded to the department for evaluation. The Graduate College will no longer automatically deny applicants with a GPA below 2.75.

Please do not hesitate to contact the Graduate College if you have any questions.