

MLIS Program Committee Agenda

Thursday, December 7, 2017

Room 2116

In attendance:

- Paul Jaeger (phoned in)
- Erin Zerhusen
- Kelsey Diemand
- Beth St. Jean
- Lindsay Sarin (non-voting)
- Suzy Wilson (non-voting)
- Ken Heger
- Renee Hill

Erin called the meeting at 11:36.

Erin: Will send out a Doodle poll to pick the Spring semester meeting dates.

1. *Archives and Digital Curation online specialization (Ken Heger)*

- a. *Ken:* Not much new to report about the proposal.
- b. *Erin:* We talked about the comments made last meeting and implemented the changes requested. There was one piece Brian sent over email to add to the resource section. He wants more information about the source of funds. Erin emailed Brian and Erin or Lindsay will add that in before it goes to PCC. We will call for comments then vote on this draft as if that forthcoming change is included.
- c. *Renee:* Love it.
- d. *Beth:* On page 24, it says 5 courses that need to be developed but it then says no new courses will be created.
- e. *Erin:* And there are places that might say 7 courses while that says 5. They are not actually new, they are being put into the online format, so they are not new courses on the books. The reason there is confusion between 5 and 7 is since we've been writing this proposal some of those courses have already been migrated to the online format. Adam switched INST640 [Policy & Ethics in Dig. Curation] to online and INST742 [Implementing Dig. Curation] is in online format from the certificate.
- f. *Beth:* I also found tiny typos I will send to Erin for correction.
- g. *Everyone:* Collective appreciation for Beth.
- h. *Erin:* Calls for other comments
- i. *Kelsey:* Will the new online courses also be taught in person?

- j. *Erin*: The idea is the growth of the online specialization will prompt the addition of new faculty but until then we will alternate offering courses in-person and online. Our intent is certainly not to get rid of the in-person specialization in favor of online.
- k. *Erin*: Paul?
- l. *Paul*: Nothing to add
- m. *Erin*: Lindsay?
- n. *Lindsay*: I'm good

Erin calls for vote. Vote passes unanimously.

Erin announced that Intelligence & Analytics and Legal Informatics specializations made it through PCC.

Ken: Did INST728L [Adv. Digital Curation] go through?

Lindsay: Will go through VPAC in January 2018.

2. *Spring 2018 Admissions Update (Erin Zerhusen)*

- a. *Erin*: 61 people considered for Spring Admissions. Said no to 11 students. 33 people accepted enrollment. 8 more than spring last year. Only 4 people have rejected. We have 3 deferments from last semester. We have two who were offered Spring admission that deferred to Fall and 8 that have not responded. Over half of those accepted enrollment have already registered for classes. Since we won't have a committee meeting in January. If you want updates on admissions, just ask. Calls for questions.
Everyone: No questions or comments.

3. *Field Study (Erin)*

- a. *Erin*: We need to decide on the policy, can a student take LBSC 707 *and* LBSC 703. We have a student who has already taken a field study but would like to take a second field study.
- b. *Lindsay*: People have done it before.
- c. *Renee*: In place of an elective?
- d. *Erin*: Yes
- e. *Kelsey*: Would it be for two different internships? Or an extension of the same internship?
- f. *Erin*: We have to decide, but in this case it is two different ones.
- g. *Ken*: What is the situation?

- h. *Erin*: The student wants to do preservation and we do not a ton of relevant courses. They feel it would be more valuable to have that experience directly related to their future career goals than to just take a random course.
 - i. *Ken*: So they'd both be focused on analog preservation?
 - j. *Erin*: I believe so. We could have them write a proposal about why they feel doing two field studies will benefit their future careers, same as when students apply for any waiver.
 - k. *Ken*: I was expecting two different skill sets.
 - l. *Erin*: But we don't have classes about this and there are not a ton of consortia classes so they have had trouble finding those opportunities.
 - m. *Renee*: I don't think I have a problem with it, even if it was just an extended field study in one location. If they're passionate about it and want to be prepared for their career and they can provide justification, I take no issue with it.
 - n. *Ken*: Also has no problems with it. I would like to hear from them about what they plan to learn.
 - o. *Kelsey/Beth*: No problems.
 - p. *Erin*: I have no problems. I think we try to provide a lot of flexibility as a program and this seems like something we should accommodate within reason if they want more hands-on experience.
 - q. *Ken*: If it's an administrative issue, I'd be happy to do an independent study.
 - r. *Renee*: Would that still be an option?
 - s. *Erin*: I think so, I think that is up to the instructor.
 - t. *Paul*: Agrees.
 - u. *Erin*: Will write up a very basic policy/temporary rule [temporary because the classes are going to be combined in the near future]. Will respond to the student saying we talked about it we are fine conceptually but we would like a brief write-up about what you plan to learn from both institutions.
4. *Policy on B-or-higher grades in "core or required" courses – Discussion on which courses are "required" within each specialization (Erin Zerhusen and Jeff Waters)*
- a. *Erin*: Does the core include the field study or the thesis classes? Are specialization requirements "required?" Are the school library courses considered "required"?
 - b. *Beth*: So, if they get a B-, they have to retake the class?
 - c. *Erin*: Yes.
 - d. *Beth*: Has a timely situation in her 602 class.
 - e. *Erin*: Core classes have never been a discussion. You have to get above a B in those four classes regardless of what we decide today.

- f. *Suzy*: It should just apply to required classes for the degree conferred. Specializations do not show up on degrees or transcripts. Doesn't think it's fair to have inconsistent policies. An IPP student shouldn't get to graduate with a B- in the same class that an Archives student was forced to retake. It should be based on the tangible credentials they walk away with.
 - g. *Erin*: True. What about School Library? Are those required since they are proscribed?
 - h. *Suzy*: The policy should be applied to what is printed on the degree. School Library students walk away with a certificate so it should be applied to those classes but no other classes.
 - i. *Erin*: Asks Renee for concerns.
 - j. *Renee*: That makes sense.
 - k. *Erin*: So then it would be applied to the core and field study/thesis. Is that fair since the thesis is two courses and the field study is only one?
 - l. *Lindsay*: They are signing up for more work with a thesis anyway.
 - m. *Paul*: As long as we make expectations known ahead of time, I think it is fine.
 - n. *Erin*: I will add it to the student handbook.
5. *Core course review update (Paul Jaeger and Beth St. Jean)*
- a. *Beth*: Will send out full results of her analysis. These are results from a survey given out to Core Instructors. First question asked them to identify central topics of their course, up to 10. Survey also asks the extent that each topic is covered in the course. Topics covered in depth are in green and topics covered considerably are in yellow. Sorted based on the concepts identified as priorities in the survey Suzy did earlier. The rows that are in pink, nobody said they covered it considerably or in depth. At the bottom, I calculated averages. Ursula's is the lowest which meant that she felt that 602 does not cover the priorities, while Rocco's high score indicated that he felt he covered a breadth of the things on the list in 707. There's quite a bit of variation in instructor feelings. We want to get student input but if there's a ton of disparity that will be hard to deal with.
 - b. *Paul*: It would be wise to follow up with the faculty members that filled this out sharing results. Taking into out self-criticism and personality. Asking them to explain their responses.
 - c. *Beth*: That's true. Ursula put Info Lit as her top topic but then only ranked that she covered in considerably. Maybe because it's a survey course with a lot to cover.

- d. *Erin*: I'm glad that you are doing this. It is clear that we need redesign. For 671, there are two 3s and everything else is low. It seems like things have gotten off track.
- e. *Lindsay*: These are survey courses. So covering something in-depth is going to be hard.
- f. *Erin*: Hopefully students do not see this super differently.
- g. *Beth*: Next semester we would like help running it with the students.
- h. *Suzy*: Is there data for 791?
- i. *Paul*: Felt weird filling it out.
- j. *Erin*: I think we need that data.
- k. *Suzy*: We cover advocacy in 791 and that was one of the missing priorities.

Ken: During my last lecture of the semester, people kept talking about how good Renee is.

Ken: Keith approached him about a University initiative about migration. Keith asked him to be the point person. Got an email about the year of immigration 2018-2019. Will send to committee. There's a meeting next Friday but as I learn more I will keep you informed. I think this has the potential of being very exciting.

Erin: The iSchool is thinking about combining the Research Showcase and the Experiential Learning Expo, into a bigger event maybe with ted-style talks demos etc. We could invite labs to participate maybe faculty, pending discussion. Tentative date May 1. We want to invite external people.

Lindsay: The vision statement that Keith gave out. Brian interpreted it as maybe we should not be pushing all of our projects so aggressively. So let's keep pushing but we can relax a little bit and be more thoughtful, expecting more support.

Erin adjourned the meeting at 12:17pm.