MLIS Program Committee Minutes
Thursday, February 1, 2018
Room 2116

In attendance:
- Erin Zerhusen
- Jeff Waters
- Beth St. Jean
- Paul Jaeger
- Renee Hill (conference call)
- Mega Subramanian (conference call—non-voting)
- Lindsay Sarin (non-voting)
- Suzy Wilson (non-voting)

1. Specializations Update (Erin Zerhusen)
   a. *Erin*: Both the Intelligence & Analytics and the Legal Informatics specializations have been approved by the grad PCC to go forward to Senate PCC, which meets tomorrow.
2. Core Course Review Update (Beth St. Jean & Paul Jaeger)
   a. *Paul*: Update will be brief because they are still working with the data. The dataset ended up being larger and more complicated than originally anticipated. Anticipates a formal update before the end of the Spring 2018.
   b. *Erin*: Notes that Renee and Erin will be at the ALISE conference the week of Feb. 4, 2018 focusing on LIS education. Hopefully they will come back with good ideas. Maggie Dull who teaches 671 online is interested in giving us feedback about her course. She's asked for us to provide her with information about the other core courses, so she can better understand how her class fits in and can also give us suggestions about improvement.
3. Admissions Update (Erin Zerhusen)
   a. *Erin*: HiLS applications are in. If you have questions about application reviews, let her know. If you are still reviewing HiLS applications, you may notice that there are two things on the review sheet that have changed, not in essence just in name. Notes is now Faculty Review and in the Stars section History wanted to change the language to keep consistent with their Star system.
   b. *Jeff*: For MLIS applications, there have been 100 submitted MLIS applications: 9 online, 32 HiLS, 59 in-person. 162 applications are still in progress: 58 online; 104 in-person. There is normally a spike the day or two before the deadline.
   c. *Beth*: Are those numbers on par?

d. *Jeff*: I think so, even if they are a little low the Spring admissions is still drawing students and there is still time until the deadline.
e. *Renee*: When is the deadline?
f. *Jeff*: Feb. 15, 2018.
g. *Paul*: HiLS has more applications than usual and they are very strong.
h. *Lindsay*: Are we keeping HiLS at 11-12 students?
i. *Erin*: We are evaluating on the basis of whether the student would make a good candidate and not necessarily by quota. We're open to growing the program. History is on the same page.
j. *Erin*: If you have any questions about admissions let Erin know. Will be in touch about reviews. Mega, I will be in touch specifically about the YX review.
k. *Beth*: Are we supposed to consider logistical reasons (GPA, missing materials) for HiLS admissions recommendations?
l. *Erin*: I think History is stricter about those requirements, so if there were logistical hang-ups, we would have to be able to make a good case for admission. We make our decisions on our own and they make their decisions and then we talk about any discrepancies. We need to have our decisions done before our meeting in late February (around the 27th).
m. *Paul*: And we can offer just MLIS Admission if History doesn't want to offer HiLS. Historically, they care more about the GPA and scores, but with the new Director we will see.

4. Accreditation Update (Erin Zerhusen)
    a. *Erin*: We have several projects due in the next month. Annual statistics for accreditation are due on Feb. 15, 2018. The Biennial Narrative Review is also due Feb. 15, 2018. ALISE statistics are due March 15, 2018. We will send a Biennial Narrative draft for review. Things to keep in mind: it is a maximum of 10 pages and we have to report on the whole iSchool. A lot has happened in the last year, so we will have a lot to write. You can get around this by adding appendices (ex. Specialization Proposals, survey questions, etc.) If you can review them it would be helpful.
    b. *Mega*: Diane was running the committee for documentation. Is this Committee going to take care of the documentation for the 2019 Accreditation Review?
    c. *Lindsay*: I will probably be taking the lead.
    d. *Paul:* But we will all be helping Lindsay.
    e. *Mega*: It is 2019?
    f. *Lindsay and Paul*: Yes.

g. *Mega*: I remember last time she kept all of us in the loop and gave us advance documentation. That would be helpful for the upcoming 2019 Review, but we still have one more year.

h. *Lindsay*: Erin and I went to the accreditation training last Spring. Erin has done a very good job of keeping thorough documentation and I have documentation about other programs to add.

i. *Erin*: We have records of our past reports and statistics. Hopefully writing the bigger narrative will be easier than in 2012-2013.

j. *Lindsay*: I can tell you it will be.

5. Course Proposals

    a. INST 638: HCI Professional Preparation Seminar

        i. *Lindsay*: 1 credit course offered Fall and Spring terms for HCI students. Meant to develop skills for first year students that faculty realized were missing when students pursued their capstone. It will be repeatable; content will change.

    b. INST 639: Practical Skills in HCI

        i. *Lindsay*: This is very similar to 638. Again a 1-credit fills in missing skill gaps. This will also be repeatable.

    c. INST 710: UX Research Methods

        i. *Lindsay*: This is to differentiate the standard research methods course and to create one specifically towards HCIM students. That will be restricted to HCIM students unless there is room for others.

        ii. *Call for comments*

        iii. *Beth*: They all sound great, I'm excited. On 710, there is some stuff that refers to undergraduate policies and there is some boiler plate language.

        iv. *Lindsay*: I will let Bill know. The one credit syllabi are pretty bare-boned but it is essentially supposed to be a special topics course.

        v. *Erin*: Can an HCI student register for both courses and repeat them to get like 12 credits?

        vi. *Lindsay*: I brought up the credit limit and they are not concerned. They are expecting for students to take these around 3 times. They may get up to 6 credits.

        vii. *Erin*: I think we should suggest a strong recommendation that there be a credit limit. They should decide whether that is a problem to them and if they are going to implement any policy

        viii. *Lindsay*: At this point we are not changing to much language around it but very valid point

Paul calls for a batch vote for all three course proposals. Vote passes anonymously. Kelsey Diemand submitted her affirmative vote for the course approvals via email prior to the meeting.

Paul called the meeting at 12:15pm.