

MLIS Program Committee Agenda
Thursday, September 21, 2017
Room 2116

In attendance:

- Voting members
 - Erin Zerhusen
 - Kelsey Diemand
 - Jeff Waters
 - Beth St. Jean
 - Renee Hill
 - Paul Jaeger
 - Ken Heger
- Non-voting
 - Mega Subramaniam
 - Suzy Wilson
 - Lindsay Sarin

Paul and Erin called the meeting at 11:34am.

Members gave brief introductions.

1. Specialization Proposals (Paul Jaeger)
 - a. Legal Informatics
 - i. Taps into location-based area of interest
 - b. Intelligence and Analytics
 - i. Connected to broader cyber security initiatives in the College, also a career path that many graduates wind up taking
 - c. *Paul calls for questions*
 - i. *Lindsay:* In the curriculum and learning outcomes, we talked about having learning outcomes mapped to courses, these should be added to the proposals. She also suggested a review of the impact section
 - a. Is there potential for additional impact. Even if its not needed right now, having it documented from the beginning will bolster cases for need later
 - b. Administration will ask what do we anticipate the size of the interest groups to be
 - c. They will also want to know where is the market for this, although this is in the proposal tangentially, it would be better make it more apparent/explicit
 - ii. *Beth:*

1. Why are we calling it Intelligence and Analytics except Cybersecurity or Information security?
 - a. *Paul*: This is not intended to be cyber security, this is more geared towards support roles for cyber security. The terms used closely resemble the actual job titles of graduates.
2. On page four, when it says collect and operate, what does operate mean?
 - a. *Erin*: That language came from NICE framework
3. Why is it called an informal specialization?
 - a. *Paul*: That is a university term
 - b. *Lindsay*: For it to be a formal specialization, it has to go up through the college bureaucracy. For the sake of efficiency, this will be an informal specialization
 - c. *Paul*: Keith has expressed interest in making it a formal specialization once it gets off the ground
 - d. *Paul suggests voting pending changes, members agree*
 - i. *Vote passes unanimously*
2. Specialization checklist revisions (Erin Zerhusen)
 - a. *Erin goes over the changes (see appendix) asks for questions*
 - i. *No questions*
 - b. *Erin calls for mass vote*
 - i. *Vote passes unanimously*
3. Admissions Process (Paul Jaeger)
 - a. Discussion about what the admission review process will look like this year. How is the committee involved? Who reviews what, and when?
 - b. Spring application deadline approaching and we've had multiple ways of reviewing these
 - c. How can the committee be involved- previously tried to split them up by subject expertise but that leaves unequal distribution of labor
 - d. *Paul calls for thoughts and suggestions*
 - i. *Erin*: Suggests continuing the specialized approach, but add additional help, reaching out to other faculty members not on the committee. Might be worthwhile not splitting it up by specialization type for a holistic review approach, prefers the latter approach
 - ii. *Beth*: Would admissions decisions be up to the two faculty members and Erin or would it come back to the committee?
 - iii. *Jeff/Erin*: It doesn't necessarily have to come back to the committee

- iv. *Erin*: Asks Renee her thoughts on, for example, Ken and Paul reviewing a school library applicant
- v. *Renee*: Asks if she does not want to go that route, would she be reviewing School Library applicants alone
- vi. *Erin*: Regardless of who reviews the applications, there will always be two reviewers
- vii. *Renee*: Wants to be sure that she will see them all she doesn't necessarily want to do it on her own. She expresses concerns over inconsistency of judgement
- viii. *Paul*: Suggests taking the largest specializations (IPP/ADC) and sending those to applications to general reviewers and send smaller specialization applications (YX/SL) to the Specialization Directors for review
- ix. *Erin*: Fine with that plan, as long as there are still two reviewers. She expresses interest in holding a Hobsons training for faculty reviewers, since its not intuitively easy to use
- x. *Mega*: Asks the number of applicants we have for Spring
- xi. *Erin*: 19 so far, will send a personal note to those who have applications in progress
- xii. *Lindsay*: Spring applications tend to be more serious obvious admits, yield tends to be close to 100%
- xiii. *Erin*: New recruitment and marketing coordinator will be able to help with Spring numbers in future

4. Application Update (Erin Zerhusen)

- a. We opted into the Holistic Admission Additional Section
 - i. *Erin introduces the language designed to give a more holistic approach for academic admissions*
 - ii. *Lindsay*: The questions are designed to give opportunity to demonstrate future potential beyond academic numbers and classroom performance, "the grit" they have
- b. We opted into including the Diversity Statement
 - i. *Erin*: Application does not have space for gender-neutral option. Could not code in non-binary option at this point, just a way to recognize that there are flaws in our system, sort of a place holder.
 - ii. *Ken*: Who wrote this?
 - iii. *Lindsay*: Music wrote it and then the Graduate School adopted it
 - iv. *Jeff*: In future iterations, would like to remove the word preferred, implies that these are optional and not proper pronouns

- v. *Renee*: You cannot skip that identifying question?
 - vi. *Lindsay*: Gender/sex is something that we are required by law to report
5. Course proposal for INST 728xxx: Practicum for Designing for Tourist Information Needs (Paul Jaeger)
- a. *Lindsay*: Being proposed by Jen Golbeck, who teaches a lot of winter/summer courses. This class will be off-semester, three weeks in length, two weeks online of intensive work, a week is designed to be at a specific destination. This is not a study abroad course per se. She would like to do it over the winter term with Key West/Hemingway museum as the destination. This course is more suited to HCI or MIM students and will be a special topics course.
 - b. *Beth*: Points out un-updated errors in the proposal (DSS not changed to ADS, still says proposed for Summer 2016)
 - c. *Mega*: Is it one-credit?
 - d. *Lindsay*: Three
 - e. *Kelsey*: Will it still be three weeks in the summer even though there are set terms?
 - f. *Lindsay*: Yes, there are 12 different lengths that a summer course can run
 - g. *Mega*: If the trip is a required component of the course and that needs to be more explicit, it should be added to course notes
 - h. *Erin*: It would be valuable to know where they're going each time and provide estimate cost. It has the potential to get super expensive super fast.
 - i. *Mega*: I didn't realize that this would be a different destination each time
 - j. *Paul*: Mentions that although not a deal breaker, but this course reeks of privilege
 - k. *Erin*: I don't think that the title reflects that actual course content. The concept for the course is more interesting than the title and it could stop people from taking it
 - l. *Renee*: Do we send this back to Jen saying we need a new title?
 - m. *Lindsay*: If a committee discusses a course and has recommendations for changes we can send that back to them, we can approve it with pending changes, or we can choose to not approve it.
 - n. *Erin*: Including the destination and the cost in advance is pivotal for her vote. Unsure how to proceed for committee vote.
 - o. *Beth*: Suggests for title Designing Digital Tools for Tourists/Designing Online Tools for Tourists
 - p. *Renee*: Suggests for title distance practicum, something that can indicate that it is not a local course

- q. *Lindsay*: Reminds committee that she is not the creator of this course, comments from committees are sent directly to the instructor
- r. *Mega*: This course sounds like the instructor wants to go on a trip and make a class out of it. It needs to have a little bit more concrete description of the assignment involved. What is the final product? Why tourist information needs? What is the demand? What sets that population apart and makes it important for our students?
- s. *Lindsay*: Kathy and Jen were looking for a MIM/HCIM elective that provides hands on opportunity with a new organization or economic sector. HCI is trying to migrate into a practice degree. Key West is a site where the entire economy is based on tourism and presents specific needs and tools. This provides practice, experience, working with a different user group, and hands-on experience. The course proposal is not the best communication tool. Committees can request the proposing instructor to attend the meeting.
- t. *Paul*: Options: improve and send suggestions and hold back until there is a new version or invite Jen to come and talk to us. Asks for suggestions?
- u. *Kelsey*: Cost is the most pressing concern as a student
- v. *Renee*: Wants Jen to come to the next meeting, other members agree
- w. *Erin*: Do we want to send her suggestions before? Should we ask for a beefed up syllabus?
- x. *Lindsay*: This may be that the actual project is designed during the course
- y. *Erin*: Lets send Jen an email with suggestions and an invitation to come to the October meeting
- z. *Renee*: Why does it say 5 weeks of instruction? This is laid out like a whole semester
- aa. *Jeff*: Probably left over from when this was a summer course
- bb. *Erin*: **Action Item (Suzy)**: will go through and email committee with aggregated list of questions
- cc. *Ken*: Is it tactless to ask why Key West instead of something local, brings up Mega's earlier point
- dd. *Jeff*: Also concerned with cost
- ee. *Paul*: Problems:
 - i. Transparency of the cost,
 - ii. Prohibitiveness of the cost,
 - iii. There are a lot closer tourist places
 - iv. Lindsay's explanation contradicts what is in the proposal
 - v. There needs to be concrete and clear justification for this course
- ff. *Erin*: Also, clarification on the class project

gg. *No vote taken*

6. Course update for INFM 743 (Paul Jaeger)
 - a. Update course and convert to INST
 - b. *Paul calls for questions*
 - c. *Renee*: Requests explanation of program codes and the differences
 - d. *Lindsay*: INFM is the program code for MIM, program codes allow us to control who registers for the classes, LBSC was the original program code, INST is the hybrid. Intended to be inclusive of iSchool content, indicates broader Information Studies focus
 - e. *Renee*: Is there push to migrate everything to INST
 - f. *Lindsay*: We are very close after this past course audit, there is still value in keeping the old program codes and it is good to have program specific classes. Course was designed several years ago, previous iterations have focused on just building apps, since then has expanded to how to you design and build systems that are websites. They are adapting it to be intermediate level programming course, anticipating that they are coming in with some programming knowledge but will include some review. MIM wanted it to become more intermediate they were concerned that it would be too basic also curious how it fits into the overall skillset that students are leaving with and mapping those skills to avoid overlap. MIM approved it, but will be sending recommendations to Jen.
 - g. *Paul calls for questions, keeping in mind MLIS students may not be the target audience*
 - h. *Lindsay*: LBSC671 is not enough to prepare them for this course, suggests adding prerequisites for MLIS students, suggested adding INST630 OR INST733
 - i. *Paul calls for vote with the adjusted prerequisites for MLIS students*
 - i. *Vote passes unanimously*
7. Discussion about changing School Library specialization internship requirements (Renee Hill)
 - a. Discuss merits and drawbacks for changing the requirements to a minimum of three consecutive, full school days per week (until the total 15 days is reached) vs the current requirement of 15 consecutive school days.
 - b. *Renee*: Wants committee to think about field study requirement as it stands asks students to do 15 consecutive days at an elementary school and 15 consecutive days in a secondary one, sees the value of for full days, but it is difficult for working students to schedule. Can we brainstorm an alternative to the 15 consecutive days, does not want it to be sporadic but wants to explore other options to make it less difficult for students

- c. *Jeff*: Do we dictate terms to the schools or vice versa?
 - d. *Renee*: It is up to us, but it is in the school's prerogative to deny a placement
 - e. *Mega*: How will changes affect CAPE requirements?
 - f. *Renee*: Doesn't recall restrictions on consecutive nature of the days, just a minimum hour requirement, it was not a problem under CAPE when she was at Syracuse
 - g. *Mega*: When we ask the school district, we are asking them for a favor. College of Education has an internship fee to incentivize the mentors. We need to be very careful that we don't ask mentor to have to work around sporadic schedules. Suggests setting conditions. We need to have a conversation with the people who place our students. The learning experience from the student's perspective will be impacted if it is disjointed.
 - h. *Renee*: Agrees, you really need to know what it is like to be in a school setting for a full week
 - i. *Paul*: For his internship during his Master's program, you had to be in the school for a set number of hours per week within a certain time frame. You have to accomplish 240 hours over 4 weeks, and you were required to be there a full day, but you had flexibility
 - j. *Mega*: Asks Renee if she goes to the MSDE Instructional Technology meetings, offers to connect Renee,
 - k. *Erin*: If someone is working, can they even do 15 days regardless of its consecutive? If its not going to help, why make the extra work for ourselves
 - l. *Lindsay*: Notes that the requirements are clearly listed when students enroll, raises the value in the existing placements
 - m. *Ken*: Do people know up front that these are the requirements
 - n. *Lindsay*: We say there are two 15 day placements. We used to have people do four day placements and they could work on the Friday
 - o. **Action item (Committee)**: send ideas, thoughts to Renee
8. Core course revision (Paul Jaeger)
- a. *Suzy introduces the findings from the Core Course Survey, notes the disparity between results overall as well as between respondent groups (faculty, alumni, current student, etc)*
 - b. *Mega*: Might be that the faculty are predictive
 - c. *Beth*: Notes that alumni/current student results are similar and can be compared alongside faculty
 - d. *Paul*: This is a very big project for our committee, what are we going to do about this. At least one of our Core classes doesn't work and moving things around will affect all the Core classes. Next meeting we will break things up assign tasks.

- e. **Action Item (Committee):** Consider...
 - i. 1. What are the essential things that have to be in the CORE
 - ii. 2. How do we include them in classes to make them better?
- f. **Action Item (Beth):** Convert highlighted analysis into visualizations
- g. *Lindsay:* Being cognizant of which user group it came from and keeping that in mind in how we view the results. Notes that current student perspective may not be as predictive as faculty
- h. *Ken:* Notes that as we move forward, it would be good to have a common definition of these terms

Paul concluded the meeting at 1:00pm

Appendix: Specialization checklist revisions

- A. Change course numbers/titles to reflect course updates undertaken in 2016-2017 AY
- B. Added Specialization Directors' or other contact information
- C. Changed the credit requirements for both the Field Study and LBSC791 from 24 to 18 credit hours
- D. Added LBSC703 and LBSC707 as a field study option for all checklists (except School Library)
- E. Archives & Digital Curation
 - a. Policy Course requirement
 - i. Removed INST 611 Privacy and Security in a Networked World
 - ii. Replaced with INST 607 Government Information
 - b. Technical Course requirement
 - i. Removed INST 630 Introduction to Programming for the Information Professional and INST 733 Database
 - ii. Replaced with INST 728: Advanced Digital Curation and INFM 700 Information Architecture
 - c. Removed Option 1 vs Option 2 within the pathways section
 - d. Digital Curation & Preservation Pathway
 - i. Removed Approved Elective option
 - ii. Replaced with LBSC 786 Library & Archives Preservation
 - e. Removed Data Management Pathway
 - f. Removed courses from the approved elective list
 - g. Added courses onto the approved elective list

- F. Added specific language clarifying that students cannot double count requirements and approved electives
- G. Youth Experience (YX)
 - a. Removed designation between proscribed Pathways and Individual Pathway
- H. History & Library Science (HiLS)
 - a. Expanded checklist to include Department of History requirements