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RESEARCH

Provide full publication details for all categories. For items under review, include date and status of submission.

1. Refereed journal articles published:
2. Other refereed publications:
3. Book published, author:
4. Book published, editor:
5. Book chapter published:
6. Invited articles published:
7. Non-refereed journal articles:
8. Other publications:
9. Software produced:
10. Formal paper presented at professional meetings:
11. Research grants awarded for any portion of calendar year:
12. Other research related grants received:
13. Refereed articles in press:


"Faculty Opinions on the Use of Master’s Degree End of Program Assessments" Journal of Education for Library & Information Science. Co-author John T. Snead. Accepted with revisions.

14. Refereed articles under review:
15. Other refereed publications in press:
16. Book in press:
In 2012 I wrote the two papers listed above, one with the co-author Jay Shorten and one with the co-author John T. Snead. As a point of clarification concerning the distribution of work on these two papers, I wrote the entirely of both papers including doing all of the data analysis work. The co-authors were active during data collection only. The paper with Jay Shorten is already pre-published on the journal website. The paper with John T. Snead was accepted with minor revisions and will be published later in 2013.

In 2012 I began the analysis of the Public Library Survey data by NCES/IMLS from 1994 to 2010 on the emergence of Tribal Libraries as Public Libraries. Rhonda Taylor has been an advisor on this project but did not wish to be a co-author. This project is still in process. In 2012, Dr. Van Fleet and I conducted a study of end of public library websites. Data have been collected but at this time they have not yet been analyzed.

During my sabbatical in Spring 2012 I collected a large amount of qualitative data concerning crowd source moderation on Craigslist. These data still await analysis.

I was interested to see that in 2012 a lengthy review was publish in Evidence Based Library and Information Practice of my 2010 article “Social tolerance and racist materials in public libraries.”
In summary of research and writing work in 2012, I completed data analysis and writing of two studies that had been started in previous years. These papers have been accepted for publication in peer-reviewed journals. I began data analysis on a third set of data, and collected two additional sets of data to be analyzed in 2013.
TEACHING

1. Courses taught (including summer)    Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Course Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>LIS 5960.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>LIS 5823.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>LIS 5713.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LIS 5043.996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LIS 5823.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Number of differently titled courses: 2

3. Number of courses delivered to sites other than Norman:
   a. Number of courses delivered to Tulsa:
   b. Number of courses delivered to other than Tulsa:

4. New courses:
   a. New courses developed for the curriculum:
   b. Courses taught for 1st time by this instructor:

5. Major course revision:

   Credit hours: 3
   Student: Van Herd
   Topic: CAMBRIDGE PLATONISM AND THE TRANSMISSION OF TORRICELLEAN VACUISM TO ANGLOPHONE PURITANISM: THE CASE OF SIR ROBERT BOYLE (1627-1691)

8. Internships:
   Summer 2012. Ann Marie Schneider. Loyola University Archives. Chicago, IL.
   Fall 2012. Adoracion Thomas. Fort Sill Base Library. Lawton, OK

9. Thesis committees

10. Ph.D. committees
    Student: 
    Topic: 
    Chair/Member

11. 6th year committees
    Student
    Chair/Member
12. **Number of advisees as of December 15 of calendar year reported:** 18 graduate, 2 undergraduate
13. Teaching/training grants awarded
14. Teaching/training grant proposals submitted
15. Advanced programs/other OCCE/Liberal Studies courses
   - Course number and title
   - Semester
   - Number of students
   - Total number of students for all courses
16. Seminars/workshops presented:

17. **Seminars/workshops attended:**
    **Teaching Scholars Initiative**

18. Awards and recognition
    a. Teaching awards
    b. Other recognition

19. Textbooks published
20. Textbooks in press
21. Teaching software created
22. Other educational/instructional material developed:
23. Invited lectures:
24. Other teaching activities

25. **Faculty member's personal statement**

   I was on sabbatical in Spring 2012 so only taught courses in Fall. However, I did
   supervise a directed readings course in Spring 2012 and an internship in Summer 2012. I
   additionally gave a guest lecture in a Psychology department graduate seminar on online
   teaching. The Provost’s summary on my sabbatical leave report stated, “Supervising a directed
   reading in Spring 2012 and guest lecturing for the graduate class in Psychology are both strong
   indications of your commitment to your students.”
In Fall 2012 I taught two courses and supervised an internship for a total of 43 graduate students. I continue to struggle with my student evaluations in my online courses. In Fall 2011 I completely revised my Research Methods class and brought my scores up in some areas. In Fall 2012 I continued this organization and additionally added recorded lectures. I raised my scores in a few areas on the student evaluations as can be seen in the following table. They have showed particular improvement in my returning assignments in a timely manner. In general, however, my student evaluations remain middle-of-the-road, and fairly consistently so. The student approval of the readings continues to decline so even though I used a new textbook this fall, I need to continue looking for something that they can connect with better.

Table 1. Student Evaluation Scores for LIS 5713, 2010 to 2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIS 5713 Research Methods</th>
<th>2010 N=12</th>
<th>2011 N=12</th>
<th>2012 N=18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Extent to which the instructor contributed to your learning</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ability of the instructor to respond to a wide range of questions about the material in this course</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Instructor's promptness in returning exams and assignments so they could be useful for learning</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Instructor's ability to encourage critical and independent thinking</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Instructor's ability to stimulate continuing interest in the subject matter</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Overall instructor's teaching effectiveness was</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Instructor's management of the course was</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Amount you learned in this class</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Workload of this course compared to others a similar level</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Quality of readings and/or assigned course materials</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Overall, this course was</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. This course was graded fairly</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>4.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to collect additional data to help me improve the Research Methods class, I developed a satisfaction survey and posted it to Survey Monkey where the students could respond completely anonymously. The survey was posted after Thanksgiving and asked the
students to evaluate aspects of the course as they experienced it, and asked them their opinions on various proposed changes. The results are in the tables below.

Table 2. Survey Responses Concerning the D2L Discussion Board. N=16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestion</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formalize the discussion board with specific discussion questions</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create small groups and require discussion in groups</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make the discussion board worth 10% of the grade</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assign discussion leaders for each week of the term</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make the discussion board worth more than 10% of the grade</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer real-time chat discussions</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer optional on-campus class meet-ups for discussion</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer Adobe Connect Pro real-time discussions</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not change it, the discussion was fine the way it was</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reflected in this table and in the open-ended survey responses is a clear message that students felt the discussion board portion of the class was disorganized. Their suggestions for future classes include formalizing the discussion board with specific questions and using more small group discussion. They were against other changes such as assigning discussion leaders, and overwhelmingly against offering real-time discussions of various sorts. I have used these results to change the structure of my Spring 2013 online course discussion area.

Table 3. Survey Responses Concerning Class Assignments. N=16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Survey Assignment was useful</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quizzes were a useful tool for learning research vocabulary</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Focus Group Assignment was useful</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Experimental Design Assignment was useful</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Content Analysis Assignment was useful</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Topic Assignment was useful</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The CITI course was a useful learning tool</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Journal Assignment was useful</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Proposal Assignment was useful</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were too many assignments in the class</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some of the assignments should be in groups</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students overwhelmingly liked the class assignments, particularly the hands-on practical project design assignments. They were less positive concerning the final proposal. From the open-ended responses, they felt the proposal was too difficult and they were not prepared for it. The results indicate that it would be appropriate for me to keep most of the assignments as they are, but do more interaction with them concerning the purpose for and execution of the proposal.

Table 4. Survey Responses Concerning Course Materials. N=16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I liked the outline handouts</td>
<td>87.6%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I liked the audio clips</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The textbook was useful</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like more assigned external readings (articles)</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like more audio clips</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like PowerPoints (no voice over)</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like video clips</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like PowerPoints with voice over</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concerning course materials, students were more neutral. They very much liked the class handouts, but their preferences concerning additional course materials were unclear. In summary, the results of this small in-class survey suggest to me that in the future when I teach this class or other online classes, I need to upgrade my use of the discussion board, use more small groups, and explore other readings and textbooks to try to find a better fit. In both the student evaluation comments and the survey monkey comments, students suggested utilizing the “announcements” page of D2L to keep in better touch and help guide the students concerning deadlines and due dates.

Outside of the classroom my major contribution to teaching was chairing the Teaching Scholar’s Initiative Steering Committee. This year’s TSI colloquium in October 2012 was highly
successful boasting more attendees than ever before and presenting a wide variety of innovative
teaching ideas in presentations and round tables.

In summary of my teaching, I am aware that my student evaluation scores are lower than
many of my colleagues in the department. I am gathering information and taking active steps to
improve these scores. I am involved in external teaching groups such as the Teaching Scholar’s
Initiative Steering Committee and the Oklahoma Library Association Library Education Division
which I chaired in 2011-2012.
SERVICE

School
1. Committee member/liaison: Admissions and Scholarships Committee, Committee A
2. Committee chair: Admissions and Scholarships Committee
3. Administrative assignment:
4. Contribution to assets
5. Workshops/programs organized
6. Other (including mentor assignments):

University/College
1. Committee member/liaison:
2. Committee chair Teaching Scholars Initiative Steering Committee Chair
3. Representative
4. Administrative assignment
5. Presentations/speeches
6. Workshops/programs organized
7. Other:

Professional - Indicate level of service as international, national, regional, or state.
1. Elected office: OLA Education Division Chair (state)
2. Committee chair:
3. Committee member/liaison
4. Presentation to professional group
5. Workshop/program organizer
6. Grant for workshop, institute, etc., for professional organization
7. Editor of journal
8. Journal editorial board: On Editorial Board of Library Quarterly
9. Newsletter editor
10. Column editor/writer
11. Other professional publication:
12. Reviewing/refereeing items (numbers of separate items)
   two article for Library Quarterly
   two articles for Reference and User Services Quarterly
   one book review for Library Quarterly
   one book review for Information & Culture: A Journal of History
Reviewed grant application for Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (international)

13. Tenure and promotion evaluation: For OSU Librarian Misty Smith
14. Accreditation team membership
15. Consulting
16. Awards and recognition
17. Professional meetings attended: **Oklahoma Library Association, Norman, OK**

18. Workshops attended:

19. Other:

20. **Faculty member's personal statement**

For 2012 I had fewer overall committee-type service commitments than in 2011 but more involvement in other types of service. While this was the second year of chairing the Teaching Scholar’s Initiative Steering Committee, I did not have Dr. Eodice’s assistant as I did the previous year so the amount of work it took to plan and execute the colloquium was double the 2011 workload. This took a great deal of time from June through October. In the spring I chaired the OLA LED which included organizing the student paper lightening rounds session at the OLA annual conference.

I did more professional reviewing in 2012 than I have before. This included the peer review of several articles, the review of two books, review of a grant proposal, and being an outside reviewer for a tenure dossier.

Within the department I did not have committee responsibilities in the spring due to my Sabbatical. In the fall I joined Committee A for the first time. I was also a member of the Admissions and Scholarships Committee, then became the chair when Dr. Van Fleet fell ill.

**SUMMARY**

While no new publications of mine came out in 2012, two were accepted and will be published in 2013. Work was begun on three additional studies to be continued into 2013. Overall it was a fairly productive research year.

I continued to strive to improve my online teaching in 2012 during the one semester I taught. I did see some improvement in Research Methods, but more improvement is needed. The
student satisfaction survey that I conducted towards the end of the Research Methods class gave me very useful suggestions for making my online teaching better.

I am satisfied with my service commitments in 2012 and feel that I am in line with where I should be at this stage of my career. While I engaged in fewer service commitments in 2012, the magnitude of my involvement with Teaching Scholar’s Initiative (TSI) increased significantly, taking up a great deal of my time. Next year, 2013, will be even more labor intensive for TSI.

In summary for 2012, I am pleased with my research and service. For 2013 I would like to improve my teaching performance.