SLIS Faculty Graduate Studies Committee

Committee Meeting Minutes

September 13, 2010 – April 25, 2011
SLIS Faculty Graduate Studies Committee
Minutes – Monday, September 13, 2010, 3-4 p.m. (video connect to Tulsa)

PRESENT: Cecy Brown, ex officio as SLIS Director; Susan Burke; Tommy Snead; Jennifer Tatum, Tulsa student representative; Sara Vaughan, Norman student representative;

ITEM: Introductions of committee members, discussion of role of committee members

ITEM: Standing charge for committee highlights
ACTION: Current year charges are being distributed by the Director (after review by Com A on the 13th); R. Taylor will forward to Committee

ITEM: Recording minutes
ACTION: Task will be rotated among faculty members of committee (Taylor—September)

ITEM: Reviewing the handbooks for EPA
ACTION: All members are asked to review the current iterations of the handbooks for the 3 EPAs, to identify unclear, inaccurate, or conflicting information. This should be done before the October meeting. Handbooks are online:

Comprehensive exam: (was a live link; dead one now—R. Taylor will report)
Portfolio: http://www.ou.edu/cas/slis/SLIS_10/PDFs/Portfolio_Hdbk.pdf

ITEM: Progress on research on EPAs at other institutions (Burke and Snead)—item continued from Spring.
REPORT: IRB approval; pre-test to be distributed very soon with the survey disseminated shortly after that; data analysis to begin this fall; preliminary findings to share with faculty in early spring.

ITEM: Purchase of equipment for potential mounting of EPA orientations online—item continued from Spring.
ACTION: Dr. Brown will proceed with purchase and will consult with T. Snead and Gary Bates as needed.

[student members excused prior to next item]

ITEM: Discussion of fall exam processes and question
ACTION: R. Taylor will be in contact with faculty members of the committee regarding initial capture of questions. Process and questions will be topics at October 27 all faculty discussion meeting for comprehensive exam. Committee will continue to discuss data gathering for processes.

FUTURE MEETINGS (Mondays):
[October 27, all faculty discussion of comprehensive examinations, 9 to 10:15—faculty]
[October 15 comprehensive examinations]
October 25, 11:30 to 12:30
November 22, 11:30 to 12:30
January 31, 11:30 to 12:30
Feb. 28, 11:30 to 12:30
March 21, 2 to 3
April 11, 2 to 3
END
UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
SCHOOL OF LIBRARY AND INFORMATION STUDIES
GRADUATE STUDIES COMMITTEE

DRAFT Meeting Minutes, October 25, 2010

Present: Rhonda Taylor, Kathy Latrobe, Tommy Snead, Susan Burke, Sara Vaughan

Meeting called to order at 11:30

Minutes for September were approved as distributed

Discussions:
1. Discussed committee charges for this year. No major concerns with them.
2. Any proposed changes to comps, thesis, portfolio handbooks? Kathy suggested there might be redundancies. Rhonda will send email to faculty asking them to examine the handbooks and offer any recommendations. Our handbooks cannot be in conflict with Grad College policy so Rhonda is having her G.A. examine the grad college’s for any differences in suggestions already raised.
3. SLIS will buy earplugs in bulk to provide at comps (procedural change on behalf of committee).
4. Student asked SLIS office for extension on one-year required retake of the comps, but we have not heard from her again. She will have to petition the committee.
5. Could out of state distance student take oral defense of comps from a distance? Kathy suggested perhaps not offering the comps option to distance students. Rhonda said need to introduce to faculty the time and cost for SLIS office staff to offer the distance option. Would we have to pay distance proctors? Rhonda also said students cannot do oral in their home office. Rhonda will inform faculty that in short term we are introducing a procedure not a policy; policy will need to be considered by faculty, especially in light of online program expansion.
6. Discussion about SLIS orientation on agenda but Cecy not here (at conference) so tabled item.
7. End of Program Assessment research update: Tommy reported that due to a variety of reasons he and Susan are now applying for funding to send a paper survey. Survey split into institutional questions and individual questions. Susan has agreed to put Rhonda’s questions about ‘what is wrong with comps’ up on Survey Monkey to gather data from OU SLIS faculty.
8. Online options for Program Plan discussion. Rhonda thinks this is an administrative rather than a committee jurisdiction. If well designed could be efficient, useful for future planning for enrollment, and other planning. Longevity of Survey Monkey account may be an issue. What are other departments doing? Rhonda will present general topic to faculty.
SLIS Faculty Graduate Studies Committee  DRAFT
DRAFT Minutes – Monday, November 22, 2010, 11:30-12:30 p.m., by Tommy Snead (skype connect to Tulsa)

PRESENT: Rhonda Taylor; Susan Burke; Tommy Snead; Jennifer Tatum, Tulsa student representative; and Sara Vaughan, Norman student representative

ITEM: Approval of draft October minutes; Susan Burke motion and Rhonda Taylor second; motion passed by vote

ITEM: Thesis review - continuing consideration of thesis process; Maggie Ryan currently reviewing faculty suggestions and Graduate College Policy, which Rhonda Taylor will also review, for next GSC meeting (Jan. 2011)

ITEM: Student petition to retake comprehensive exams – a student petitioned the GSC for approval to retake the comprehensive in the Spring of 2011, due to two failed questions–beyond the SLIS one calendar year window; Susan Burke motioned to allow the student to retake the exams, spring 2011; Tommy Snead seconded the motion; motion passed; Rhonda Taylor will forward the GSC committee recommendation to Dr. Brown, SLIS Director, as a memo

ITEM: Susan Burke update on faculty comps survey – Susan presented data that relates students’ undergrad GPA and GRE scores to successful first attempt passing of comps; Susan also presented results of faculty members’ responses to the Comps Survey and first iteration of the EPA Survey. Rhonda Taylor motioned that the survey results be forwarded to the faculty by email for review prior to the next faculty meeting; and, that faculty meet for a ½ day retreat to discuss the comp survey results, conducting comp exams and orals in the online environment, and the administrative burden of distant students’ comp exams on SLIS faculty. Rhonda made a friendly amendment to the motion that the ½ day retreat occur the week of Jan. 17-21, 2011 and that faculty revise the comprehensive exam faculty feedback sheet to obtain more specific feedback. Susan Burke seconded the motion. The motion passed with a vote.

ITEM: EPA updates (Tommy Snead) – IRB approved the change from an emailed survey to a mailed survey. Tommy and Susan are applying for university Research Foundation funding to cover the costs of mailed surveys. Update at the Jan. 2011 GSC meeting.

ITEM: New orientation procedure – Tommy Snead asked if new spring 2011 students have been informed of the change in orientation procedure. Rhonda Taylor volunteered to discuss this with CeCe Brown, SLIS Director.

ITEM: Other business – Tommy Snead asked about students’ selecting the thesis option prior to completion of 9 or 12 hours. Tommy will review the Student Handbook and Thesis handbook and report back to the GSC.

Next GSC meeting is scheduled for Monday, January 13, 2011 from 11:30-12:30 p.m.
1. Review of “Graduate Studies Committee Report on Comprehensive Exam,” “Admissions Committee Report for the December 6, 2011, Faculty Meeting” and the current Graduate College policy (as noted in Rhonda’s email sent to the faculty listserv, 11/29/10): http://gradweb.ou.edu/Current/gcBulletin/GCBulletin.pdf
2. Should the comprehensive examination be continued, or is it passé?
3. Potential options

To summarize, the Graduate Studies Committee is planning (1) an introduction with review of two recent SLIS surveys and of Graduate College policy (which has significance particularly with the move toward online programs); (2) a discussion of faculty preferences in regard to discontinuation, revision, or maintenance of the current comprehensive examination; and (3) dependent upon the faculty’s assessment of the viability of the current examination, brainstorming and evaluation of potential long-term options for end-of-program assessments within the School.
Summary of Comprehensive Exam Changes  
School of Library and Information Studies  
University of Oklahoma  
January 21, 2011

I. Format of Questions
   a. Standard framework that includes the objects from the comprehensive exam handbook
   b. Each semester faculty will choose a broad topic area
      i. Ad-hoc comps committee that will change each semester will choose area and submit to Graduate Studies Committee. GSC will submit to faculty for vote
         1. Broad topic may include an expected framework within the question that needs to be addressed, or
         2. An expected answer framework might be subsumed within problem solving aspect of question
   c. Students will apply their area of interest and expertise to answer the question

II. Expectations of the Product
   a. 2,000 to 3,000 words (title page, references, and appendices do not count towards this word count)
   b. Questions made available through D2L at noon Thursday and answers must be submitted through D2L dropbox by 9 am Monday
   c. The quality of the argument is the most important part of the answer

III. Grading
   a. Two randomly chosen faculty members will read each paper
   b. In case of a tie between these two, a swing grader will read as a tie breaker
   c. The swing grader each term will not also be on any two-grader sets (dedicated swing grader)
   d. In case of failure on the first attempt, the student has the option to rewrite, addressing why their first attempt did not pass (self-reflection). If the swing grader was part of the initial attempt grading, they will also read this rewrite
   e. In case of failure on the exam and the rewrite, the student will take comps with a different question the next semester (or within a year). If a student, on initial failure, chooses not to do the self-reflective essay, they will rewrite a different question the next semester (or within a year)

IV. Implementation Details
   a. First offer the new exam Fall 2011
b. The issue about grandfathering in students was not resolved at this meeting

c. Will not announce the new format until after this spring’s comps are completed

V. To-Do

  a. Dr. Brown will contact the graduate college about implications of changing to this comps process
Meeting Minutes for
Monday, January 31, 10:30-11:30 Meeting

By Susan Burke with edits/additions by T. Snead and R. Taylor

Present:

Faculty: K. Latrobe (chair, spring 2011); S. Burke; T. Snead; R. Taylor; and C. Brown (ex officio).

Students: S. Vaughn; J. Tatum

No November meeting minutes provided. Approval of November minutes will occur via email (Tommy). Meeting activities include:

1. **Review the charges; identify work to be done this semester**:
   - Kathy read the charges and we discussed them.
   - Discussed EPA orientations online and changes made by SLIS, including removing them from the 5033 class.
   - For the charges concerning data gathering forms, we discussed creating new forms that are closed ended or scales for more comparability. Discussed creation of database to identify trends.

2. **Reviewed decisions about student petitions for continuance in the program made during the winter intercession**. We recommended 3 students to be allowed to continue and 1 student not to be allowed to continue. The Graduate College will make the final decision (after the director reviews the committee recommendations)

3. **Updated student committee members about review of current comprehensive exam procedures**.

4. **Informed the student committee members about the faculty comps meeting in January and time frame for announcement of the expected changes**. The next step is Dr. Brown consulting with the Graduate School for suggestions and approval.

5. **Attended to revisions sent forward for the master’s thesis guidelines**. Review is ongoing (Rhonda's GA, Maggie Ryan, and Rhonda) of faculty suggestions made for revision of the current thesis handbook, policy, and procedure. Rhonda will finish the
6. **Addressed policy regarding OU departmental transfers of credit to the SLIS graduate degrees:**

- (Rhonda) Our process has been for OU credits to be an advisor/advisee discussion, while transfer from outside of OU to be a Grad Studies committee matter with a petition.
- The student handbook currently says OU non-SLIS hours should also be a petition, but in practice it has been an advisor issue. This needs to be decided and clarified by the faculty so that the handbook can either be corrected or be updated.
- By Graduate College rules, students can bring in up to 9 hours credit toward the program plan. Rhonda suggests that the handbook be revised to leave selection of OU non-SLIS hours to the advisor/student.
- Kathy said we need to put a motion before the faculty for a vote, i.e. the motion passed in committee is to revise student handbook to state “students meet with their adviser to determine OU credit hours applied to SLIS program plans (up to 9 hours)” and to remove responsibility of OU credit hour transfers/decisions from GSC.

7. **Reviewed data collected on comprehensive and exit interviews:** adapt as needed for fall semester (see the notes about the discussion of the committee charges).

8. **Defined the role of student members on the Graduate Studies Committee:**

- Kathy proposed that students should be excused during discussions of student legal and health issues, and other personal issues to do with grades, etc. Kathy suggests that there are FRPA and HIPPA issues.
- If a student petitions to transfer credits, the student committee members can participate in that decision.
- The question arose about how a student on academic probation enrolled in courses this spring? Also asked: How are students enrolling in our classes without permissions (or are they)? Is this a hole in Ozone? We used to have a stop that had
to be lifted before a student could enroll (pre-Ozone), but it seems that that does not exist anymore?

- Cecy joined the discussion late and added that the reason the student in question was able to enroll in classes was he enrolled as an undergrad (which lifts the enrollment stops for individuals). The SLIS Office will be checking on procedures for student permissions for enrollment.

9. **Move forward regarding the revision of the comprehensive exam:**

- Started last year having Grad Studies Committee doing a prior step before the faculty discussion/vote on comps questions. June Abbas did a lot of work on that. Ask faculty to send 5 questions, committee compile, send out, and then faculty vote is how it was done last fall.

- We may not have to have KM questions this time; Kathy will find out.

- Plus we need to find out if we have any retakes (Kathy will find out).

- Rhonda will e-mail the fall process for faculty committee members to review.

- **Comprehensive Exam process revision:**
  - To move forward with comps revision (future), the Committee is responsible for creation of a draft policy/handbook and presenting it to the faculty for approval.
  - Kathy will go through comprehensive exam handbook and delete what is no longer relevant and add in our new suggestions.

- Cecy consulted with the Grad College:
  - Dean Ray is preparing a revision of the current Graduate College Bulletin, which states that comprehensive exam orals have to be face to face, which affects Tulsa campus students.
  - Right now we can continue to do video link orals with Tulsa-based students.
  - Betsy or Yong-Mi will be the faculty members who will sit with the Tulsa student (if there is not a Norman faculty member on-site in Tulsa) during orals if we have any Tulsa orals.
• As far as the SLIS changes to the comps process, we are cleared to move forward. As with all exam policies, policy cannot be capricious or prejudiced, which can be achieved with transparency and clear boundaries.

10. **Attended to the spring comprehensive exam (schedule activities).**

    Ask faculty at next regular faculty meeting when they want to meet to select the in-person comps questions (Kathy).

11. The next GSC meeting is scheduled for February 28, 2011 from 11:30-12:30.
Graduate Studies Committee

Meeting Minutes for
Monday, February 28, 11:30-12:30 Meeting

Minutes by Kathy Latrobe

Present:

Faculty: K. Latrobe (chair, spring 2011); S. Burke; T. Snead; R. Taylor; and C. Brown (ex officio).

Item: Plans for the March 2011 administration of the comprehensive examination were reviewed by the committee (without student members present).

Item: Development of a draft for revision of the comprehensive examination was initiated.
School of Library and Information Studies
Graduate Studies Committee

Minutes:
March 21, 2010 (2:00-3:00)

Attending: Susan Burke, Kathy Latrobe, Rhonda Taylor, Tommy Snead

Minutes for March 25, 2011:

Revision of the Comprehensive Examination
Progress was made with the intention of a final decision within the Committee by April 25 and within the School by May 2, 2011.

Revision of the Thesis Guidelines
Progress is being made and will be assessed at the April 25th meeting.
Graduate Studies Committee

Meeting Minutes for
Monday, April 25, 11:30-12:30 Meeting

By Susan Burke with edits/additions by T. Snead and R. Taylor

Present:

Faculty: K. Latrobe (chair, spring 2011); S. Burke; T. Snead; R. Taylor; and C. Brown (ex officio).

Students: S. Vaughn; J. Tatum

Attending: Kathy Latrobe, Rhonda Taylor, Susan Burke, Tommy Snead, Jennifer Tatum, & Sara Vaughn

The committee faculty members would like to take this opportunity to thank Sara Vaughn and Jennifer Tatum for their work and input to the committee this year and to wish Sara Vaughn best of luck in her future endeavors as she is graduating this summer from our program.

1. Members reviewed and approved the March meeting minutes
2. Reviewed the April meeting agenda
3. Rhonda Taylor will continue work on the Thesis guideline revisions
4. Tracking Data – discussed the ongoing SLIS process of collecting graduate student program feedback.
5. Revisions to the Comprehensive Exam guidelines – committee members reviewed recent revisions and discussed additional needed revisions. Kathy Latrobe will make additional edits and forward to Cecy Brown for inclusion in the May 2 faculty meeting. The target goal for implementing the new guidelines is SP12. Students S. Vaughn and J. Tatum provided input from student perspectives.
6. Jennifer Tatum would like to remain on the GSC for the 2011-12 academic year as a student representative.
7. Student appeal (Rhonda Taylor and the GSC student members recused themselves from this discussion) – remaining members discussed student’s appeal to waive the required 24 hour credit completion before registering for a directed research project (student has completed 14 hours). Members approved the appeal.
8. Meeting was adjourned.