

MLIS Program Committee Agenda

Thursday, October 5, 2017

Room 2116

Paul called the meeting at 11:30am.

Voting members in attendance:

- Erin Zerhusen
- Beth St. Jean
- Jeff Waters
- Ken Heger
- Paul Jaeger (phoned in)
- Renee Hill (phoned in)
- Kelsey Diemand (arrived at 12:30)

Non-voting members/individuals in attendance:

- Lindsay Sarin
- Suzy Wilson
- Mega Subramaniam (phoned in at 11:40am)
- Jen Golbeck (presented 11:30-11:40)
- Eun Kyoung Choe (presented 11:40-11:50)

1. INST 728XXX: Practicum for Designing for Tourist Information Needs (Jen Golbeck)
 - a. *Beth*: Confirmed that small, typos, and inconsistencies are fixed.
 - b. *Renee*: Is this a course that students have been asking for or is it something that they need?
 - c. *Jen*: Neither, students have been talking about engaging with new user groups and communities, tourism is just a new user group for them to explore. Costs will vary, approximately \$275 for airfare and accommodations are in flux due to the hurricane. She doesn't think that the costs are an insurmountable burden.
 - d. *Paul*: Notes that this is HCI centric and asks for more elaboration on how this fits into HCI curriculum.
 - e. *Jen*: This course will provide more opportunities to develop skills within the curriculum and adapt them to a new situation, there is potential interest for MIM and MLIS students. They were hoping to do a partnership with the Hemingway Museum, which could be appealing for MLIS students. Since things are in flux she wants to wait a couple weeks to reach out to potential partners. Mentioned this at PCC and Reykjavik people were very excited and if the class goes well, it could potentially be offered there over the summer
 - f. *Erin*: Is this something that we would need to consult study abroad?
 - g. *Lindsay*: If it is international yes, but for the domestic trip, its unnecessary

- h. *Ken*: Is there a fallback? If people don't want to do the Key West, is there an alternate destination besides Reykjavik?
- i. *Jen*: We could do the class locally in DC or Baltimore over the semester.

Erin calls for a vote: passes unanimously

2. INST 728XXX: Personal Health Informatics & Visualization (Eun Kyoung Choe)

- a. *Beth*: Brings up small typos/template related -DSS-ADS, course participation statement, course evaluation statement
- b. *Erin*: Doesn't expect a ton of MLIS student interest but that's ok
- c. *Lindsay*: This fits into our strategic direction, health informatics initiatives for undergrad program
- d. *Eun*: Did not try to create this to be a tech-heavy class, students can take a qualitative approach
- e. *Lindsay*: Asks if Eun envisioned this as a 60 or a 700? 700s normally have requisites.
- f. *Eun*: Wants to make it as open as possible, so 600. Asks about potentially cross listing it with other departments.
- g. *Lindsay*: We reach out to other departments that might be interested and put it through VPAC. That process can be done now or later down the road.
- h. *Paul*: What are the motivations for cross listing it?
- i. *Eun*: When teaching a similar course at Penn State, people from different disciplines collaborate and learn from each other. Appreciates the synergy between people from different backgrounds.
- j. *Paul*: That makes sense pedagogically, but if the concern was that there will not be enough interest, that won't be the case. There should be plenty of interest within the iSchool.
- k. *Mega*: Wants to entice MLIS students to take the class. Suggests including readings that take a broader approach, suggests talking to Beth for ideas about readings that may be more applicable to MLIS students. Brings up public library students as a potential interest group with a need for familiarity with health information. Doesn't think that the course design needs to be altered, but including broader readings will entice them to take the class.
- l. *Erin*: Doesn't think that the content is too technical for MLIS students, rather they might shy away from some of the technical language. Obviously that is a bigger issue and not a problem with this course specifically.
- m. *Mega*: The learning outcome that says discuss the HCI literature, maybe expand that outcome specifically

- n. *Beth*: Doesn't want to make Consumer Health Informatics a requisite because that may decrease the pool of interested students. She thinks that the two courses will complement each other very well, one focusing on the information behavior and the other on the design and application of those behaviors.
- o. *Ken*: Suggests thinking about the Department of Veteran Affairs, thinks they will be interested in a partnership. Maybe get someone from there to come talk about how they apply these concepts in a real world context
- p. *Eun*: Do you think that they would be interested in student projects?
- q. *Ken*: Absolutely

Erin calls for a vote, vote passes unanimously

- 3. INST 728B: Digitization of Legacy Holdings to permanent number (Ken Heger)
 - a. *Ken*: Brings up the typo analogy holdings, needs to be analog, People love the class and practitioners think it is very practical. Allows students to design their own workflow and tools and they get the opportunity to present their projects professionally

Erin calls for a vote, passes unanimously

- 4. Admissions Conversation
 - a. *Erin*: There is not really a time for everyone to go over the AppReview, so schedule a meeting individually with her.
 - b. *Beth*: Is it different than the doc program?
 - c. *Lindsay*: Yes
 - d. *Jeff*: For faculty that just need a refresher, he can work with them and take that off Erin's plate
 - e. *Erin*: We have 60 applications for Spring 2017 admissions up from 48 in 2016 up from 30 in 2015. A few applications are people who have deferred previously so there are 57 applications to review. Grad School doesn't technically close the application on the due date, so the application won't close until October 14th. There is a slight chance that more applications come through so there is a chance this number could change. There are three rounds of review. 1st round: looks at whether the application was actually completed. Two letters of recommendation has been deemed sufficient for review. Round 2 is the substantive review Prioritize the people who have complete applications.
ACTION ITEM (Erin): Erin will send a list of the students that each individual is responsible for reviewing. She or Jeff will go through that process during

meetings. We need to set a deadline for ourselves and work backwards from when we would like the students to be hearing decisions.

- f. *Jeff*: Grad School hires additional staff help to help with the busy season, those temporary workers are not there for Spring admissions, so the process can be slower than anticipated. As you work backwards, I would plan for a week and a half for the applications to pass through the Grad School.
- g. *Erin*: Suggests two weeks. Ideally, people will have their notices in mid-November. Which means, they must get to the grad school Nov. 1 so we have one month for review.
- h. *Paul*: Three weeks from today is the 26th. If that is our goal, applications will get to the grad school quicker, and potentially will send results to students faster.
- i. *Beth*: For the review, it is just a yes or no decision right?
- j. *Erin*: Yeah historically, we do not have a waitlist and there is no minimum or maximum quota for acceptance
- k. *Jeff*: Yield for Spring tends to be higher than the year for Fall. Spring applicants tend to be more earnest and set on coming to Maryland
- l. **ACTION ITEM (Erin)**: Erin will reach out to reviewers to set up a meeting to go over review process. We can have a pseudo meeting in mid-October if there are applications that we were unsure of.
- m. *Renee*: When we submit our decision, are you automatically alerted or do we need to reach out?
- n. *Erin*: She will see, but she is happy for people to send confirmation emails as well. Erin is listed as the head reviewer because it is easy to approve and send things on to the grad school prematurely. You can write notes that all reviewers can see, it is collaborative, but we can also collaborate outside of the system over email.
- o. *Beth*: Is there any criteria that automatically discounts applicants?
- p. *Erin*: The Grad School has a minimum undergrad GPA of 3.0. That is flexible-ish. We can write a letter of justification asking them to admit them despite the GPA requirement. Tends to work for people that have worked for a while or have other advanced degrees. Rare to see justification below 2.8/2.7. We can always try but the Grad School has the final say.
- q. *Lindsay*: International language scores are also difficult to negotiate.
- r. *Erin*: We as a program no longer required the GRE. Some applicants submitted scores anyway. Do we take that into consideration if they provide them? They are not always going to help the application.
- s. *Mega*: Do we want to decide as a committee to ensure consistency? Do you have to look at them?

- t. *Erin*: Scores are in the system so you will still see it, but you could choose to ignore it.
- u. *Jeff*: If we are not requiring them, using them as evaluative criteria is not ok. We shouldn't hold someone accountable when other applicants are not held accountable for the same thing.
- v. *Erin*: But what if it will help their application and fill gaps within GPA, essay, or work experience?
- w. *Jeff*: The reason we are not using it is because it is not a holistic evaluating tool, the essays serve that purpose. Not taking the GRE scores into consideration is more equitable.
- x. *Mega*: Agrees with Erin's point, also argues that the GRE scores could help in a debate over acceptance with the Grad School
- y. *Jeff*: Thinks we can do the justification without it. If the GRE is questionable, we can't use questionable data
- z. *Beth*: What if we agree to not use them and if there are people on the fence or disagreement, the GRE can be a decision factor?
- aa. *Erin*: Thinks everything that they provide within the application is fair game to review.
- bb. *Paul*: If someone sends an extra letter of recommendation, they willfully agreed to add it to the packet, so it is taken into consideration for review.
- cc. *Jeff*: But the scores are not reflective of ability, you can have a great student with bad GRE scores
- dd. *Lindsay*: What if GRE scores can only positively affect the review and not negatively
- ee. *Suzy*: Prospective students don't always understand that it is not required and will just submit them because there is a space on the application.
- ff. *Erin*: Our messaging is also to go ahead and submit them, they are not required but inclusion is up the applicant.
- gg. *Renee*: Doesn't think that they should be reviewed at all
- hh. *Erin*: Would you consider a fourth letter of recommendation? Is that extra information different than GRE scores?
- ii. *Jeff*: The GREs are inherently questionable, a writing sample or additional letter is not questionable necessarily. Maybe, shift next review processes next semester since our messaging this admissions cycle has been ambiguous
- jj. *Paul*: We will need a discussion about future messaging. If we do not want to see GRE scores, we need to explicitly tell applicants not to include them.
- kk. *Erin*: We have different reviewers to have different perspectives, people value certain components more, and that's not a bad thing

- ll. *Beth*: For this cycle, we will look at them, but if anyone feels that if the GRE will affect admission, bring it to the committee for consensus
 - mm. *Erin*: I have no idea how many GRE scores were submitted, are we ok with making this a continued discussion
 - nn. *Jeff*: Most cases, this will be a non-issue
 - oo. *Paul*: We do get one or two cases of problem scores
 - pp. *Erin*: I think there is a problem of requiring the GRE, but I don't think it is as big of an issue accepting them
 - qq. *Paul*: This has been a valuable discussion and after this review cycle, we need to formalize our stance on this issue
5. 3-5 Key Initiatives for the MLIS Committee
- a. 1 committee member assigned to lead and report on each initiative as the year goes on
 - i. *Paul*: MLIS Committee is required to undertake a few key initiatives. One of the initiatives have been migrated to a separate Task Force, focusing on the online education issues. Core Review will be one key initiative. We have some other ideas but we need to agree on what we want to work on this semester
 - ii. *Lindsay*: Online Task Force efforts can be considered as a key initiative
 - iii. *Erin*: Task Force already working on getting Archives & Digital Curation online. Michael Kurtz has pulled together a proposal for this it should be ready for next month. Hopefully it will be pushed through this year.
 - iv. *Lindsay*: The provost added a new justification section for the proposal that is actually quite helpful.
 - v. *Erin*: Michael will have to start from scratch with the new justification section but his work with that proposal may be able to be used for future proposals. Calls for other ideas
 - vi. *Lindsay*: Online review, A&DC online, and Core review can count as three
 - vii. *Erin*: Idea for key initiatives: how can we formalize the way that we establish and promote external partnerships?
 - viii. *Ken*: We should start with a list of existing partnerships? Including the DCIC partnerships
 - ix. *Erin*: Paul and I talked about the MLIS Committee taking a role in event ideas and planning. Students have expressed interest in publishing event. Does the committee want to have an active role?
 - x. *Beth*: I think it would be very good, doesn't have time to do it, but suggests a social justice reading group

- xi. *Ken*: Opportunity to look what we are already doing and thinking about ways that we can market those offerings
- xii. *Erin*: Events don't need to be key initiatives. The three main things: Online course review, Archives and Digital Curation online, core course review, and the two new specializations. We need to assign a committee member to take the lead on initiatives. She chairs the online task force so it is logical for that to be hers, Ken is the Archives and Digital Curation director so logic says he should be doing that, Course review seems like it should be led by the program director, specialization proposals also fall onto Paul.
- xiii. *Paul*: Think of one of these that you would like to help with. Beth is already working on Core review. **ACTION ITEM (Committee)**: Reach out to point people to help with a key initiative

6. Knowledge areas

- a. *Paul*: Caused more confusion than help. Students see them as limiting rather than helpful, the KAs are out of date. Does anyone see the need to revive them and are people willing to work on them?
- b. *Erin*: KAs are suggestions for people without specializations (IPP) they are suggested course plans for popular areas. They are just an advising tool, but students are constantly confused by that.
- c. *Paul*: We have an internal advising list for career paths/interests. Perceptionally, people think that we don't care about certain areas of librarianship because there is a KA, not a specialization, and people see them as lesser. The branding has to be deliberate.
- d. *Kelsey*: Maybe not calling them Knowledge Areas, suggests calling them focused electives, course ideas, etc. The word elective is key. Thinks the KAs are a useful advising tool.
- e. *Jeff*: Useful to have, again this is a branding issue. In MIM, they have to list what they are focusing on in the IPP. If this was branded into something specifically for IPP as opposed to everyone, maybe that would decrease confusion about the purpose. This doesn't fix Paul's concern about the perceived legitimacy of those areas.
- f. *Erin*: KAs are off the website because they are not updated. We can put them back, but they need to be current.
- g. *Jeff*: We need to clean up the language
- h. **ACTION ITEM (Committee)**: Think about what knowledge areas should we offer and think about suggested courses.

7. Core Course Review

- a. *Paul:* We have competing visions about what is going on. Working with Beth, we would like to bring several different approaches to what we have now and how it can be sorted across courses and allowing the committee to figure out what makes sense and then split up tasks assigning course redesign. In previous reviews, there hasn't been a very detailed map for the different groups working on the syllabi. Lack of communication and overall vision leaves gaps in the designs. If we come up with three different road maps, it will make the courses flow smoother and promote consistency. We have been consistent in having four classes, other peer programs have fewer courses other have more. Others provide menu options similar to A&DC
- b. *Jeff:* With a menu option how will students know what to pick, students may not know which options are best for them
- c. *Paul:* It is a risk that students will focus too quickly but it also provides more flexibility
- d. *Bath:* Important to have some classes that everyone takes. Students can easily change their field of interest.
- e. *Suzy:* What is the point of 791?
- f. *Paul:* It was originally intended as a capstone with measurable learning outcomes has since functionally evolved past that into a catch all. Outcomes are now measured for the field study.
- g. *Erin:* Interested in seeing various options, what a two or three core program will look like.

Erin concluded the meeting at 1:03pm