

DLS Faculty Planning Meeting
August 24, 2011 1:30pm

Attending: Jami Jones, Barbara Marson, Gail Munde, Patrick Valentine, John Harer, Al Jones, Elaine Yontz

Absent: Larry Boyer, Kaye Dotson, Ruth Clark

After announcements and a brief update on the status of the program's COA report, faculty examined and discussed the current MLS program Mission and Goals statements, and their alignment with COE and ECU Mission Statements.

The primary discussion was on the topic of including a focus on research, publication and creative activity in the current DLS Goals Statement, which is:

1. To teach the principles, practices and technologies of library science
2. To prepare professionals to meet the information needs of individuals and groups in a diverse global society
3. To impart the values of service, leadership, and partnership with communities and the profession as a whole

After discussion, faculty agreed upon proposed changes to the Goals Statement, as below. Faculty preferred the term scholarship to specific outcomes of scholarship, i.e., research and publication, and believed all scholarship could be considered a creative activity.

1. To teach the principles, practices and technologies of library science
2. To prepare professionals to meet the information needs of individuals and groups in a diverse global society
3. To engage continuously in scholarship and service
4. To impart the values of service, leadership, and partnership with communities and the profession as a whole.

Because of time and schedule constraints, no external stakeholder representatives were able to join the August 24 Planning meeting, and faculty suggested the following activities to solicit and respond to external opinions and suggestions on proposed changes to the DLS Goals Statement:

Distribute the proposed Goals Statement via the current student listserv and the alumni listserv and solicit comments, suggestions and discussion.

Distribute the proposed Goals Statement to the list of persons who have been suggested as Program Advisory Board members (attached)

Include the proposed Goals Statement for discussion during an ALA Student Chapter meeting.

Post the proposed Goals Statement on the DLS Website with a request for comments.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30.

Faculty Planning Meeting, Standard II: Curriculum

September 27, 2011

Present: Kaye Dotson, John Harer, Patrick Valentine, Barbara Marson, Elaine Yontz, Jami Jones, Al Jones, Gail Munde, Larry Boyer

Absent: Ruth Clark

Harer reported that the curriculum survey was sent on September 21 to current students and alumni, and responses are collecting in Qualtrics. Several students have emailed him to thank him for the opportunity to provide input and comment on courses and the program curriculum. He intends to post the survey on the DLS Web site to extend the response period indefinitely.

The DLS Curriculum Committee has a meeting scheduled for Tuesday, October 4, 2011, and two student members will attend: Tavia Clark, a current student who will graduate in December 2011 and then become an alumni representative to the Committee, and Paula Jean Frick, a current student.

Harer reported that two curriculum proposals are in process. The first, which is now in the Dean's Office, would make corrections to text in the Graduate Catalog describing the MLS program and pathways. The proposal clarifies the tier structure and course pre-requisites. The second describes the elective option for academic pathway students to receive an MLS with a certificate in Community College Instruction, a joint effort between DLS and HACE. This proposal, now in the DLS Curriculum Committee, does not require changes at the course level, but will be reflected in the Graduate Catalog program description and advising checksheets.

DLS students will include artifacts for three HACE courses, **ADED 6450 Community, Junior and Technical Colleges**, **ADED 6453 The Adult Learner**, and **ADED 6240 Effective College Teaching** in their MLS portfolios. HACE instructors will evaluate the artifacts. HACE has agreed to accept any two MLS required courses as certificate electives. The certificate requires 15 sch; DLS will provide six and HACE will provide nine. Munde has asked Ellen Dobson about reporting for the three HACE courses, i.e., would be able to exclude these courses from management reports since they are not taught by DLS faculty and are not listed as LIBS courses.

A discussion opened on the question, "Does the program need to develop or repurpose a course entirely devoted to MLS Program Objective 8," which is: *Instruct individually, and in collaboration with other information professionals/educators, diverse user groups to access effectively and efficiently the resources and services available to them in a variety of library settings.* At present, many courses include an instruction component, including LIBS 6026, 6137, 6042, 6142, 6060, 7050, 6810 and 6991. The sense of the group seemed to be that we did not need to do this, at least until we had a clearer picture of the scope and depth of the treatment of instruction in these courses. This also led to a discussion of the technology and research components in the program courses LIBSS 6042 and LIBS 6012.

The conclusion was that faculty would benefit from having an extended period of time to review the current curriculum on a course-by-course and assignment-by-assignment basis. Harer agreed to identify a date during the week of October 24 to have such a meeting (not a Tuesday or a Thursday and not October 25). Faculty would be asked to bring their current syllabi and course assignments.

At this meeting, faculty would seek to answer four primary questions:

1. Should we reduce the number of required courses in the program?
2. Do we need to re-title and/or update the content of any courses?
3. Do we need to include an information science course, or components of information science in multiple courses?
4. Which courses should be retained, and which might be discontinued?

Faculty Planning Meeting: Standard 2: Curriculum

October 24, 2011

Present: Al Jones, Jami Jones, Kaye Dotson, John Harer, Gail Munde, Patrick Valentine (via Skype), Barbara Marson, Elaine Yontz

Absent: Larry Boyer, Ruth Clark

Harer distributed the following handouts: proposed meeting agenda, a list of proposed changes to the ECU Graduate Catalog, a detailed comparison of core courses taught by 12 ALA-accredited library programs and core courses in our program, and early results of alumni responses to the curriculum survey of September 2011. He opened the meeting by reviewing the four questions proposed at the last faculty planning meeting on curriculum:

Should we reduce the number of required courses in the program?

Do we need to re-title and/or update the content of any courses?

Do we need to include an information science course, or components of information science in multiple courses?

Which courses should be retained, and which might be discontinued?

The consensus of the group was that we were not in a position to answer these questions until we learned more about the present curriculum, i.e., a deep understanding of all courses, their objectives and discrete course assignments.

Jami Jones suggested that such a review might be engineered backwards from the desired outcome; that is, what kind of student do we want the program to produce in terms of capabilities, dispositions and skills? This expanded to issues of balance:

What is the correct balance between theory and practice in our overall program?

How can we incorporate a consistent and clear focus on the importance of librarians becoming integrated into employer organizations, rather than isolated within their employer organizations?

How much change does the content of the curriculum need and how much change does the approach to teaching, or teaching style need to change?

Jami Jones suggested that faculty all obtain and read the R. David Lankes' book, *The Atlas of New Librarianship*, <http://mitpress.mit.edu/catalog/item/default.asp?ttype=2&tid=12560&mode=toc>

Regarding the description of desired student outcomes, Jones further wondered if there weren't dispositional and capability threads that could be embedded into courses throughout the curriculum. If faculty could identify and define these threads, it might be possible to assess their achievement. Perhaps there could be pre and post-program student self-assessments developed

for TaskStream that would replace the initial and final essays. Perhaps there could be key assignments identified at different points in the program sequence and students' performance on these assignments used to assess the threads; or for each course, we would identify the threads and state how each one would be met, e.g., readings, assignments, discussions.

All Jones through the faculty should jointly write a departmental philosophy of librarianship and all agreed this would be useful. This might be a useful beginning to identifying curricular threads. Reading the Lankes book would help us begin from a central point of understanding. Jami Jones suggested that the faculty develop a common list of readings that each student should encounter during the program. The reading list should include what we believe are the seminal documents in librarianship.

Jami Jones also suggested that we look at the dispositions included in AASL's 21st Century Learning Standards for Students, for if our curriculum doesn't embody those dispositions, how are we teaching our students to promote them in their practice of school librarianship?

Munde briefed faculty on charts that were emailed earlier showing the distribution of 65 core course assignments across AASL/NCATE and DPI standards and ALA Core Competences. She noted areas of high coverage, areas of no coverage, and potential problems for further analysis. Two preliminary areas of need were identified: learning theory and instructional strategies, and career/professional development. Faculty were asked to revise Standards Bridge Workforms if necessary, and Munde would revise the charts accordingly.

Munde noted that only alumni responses to the curriculum survey had been compiled, and Harer thought there might have been a software problem in Qualtrics. He will investigate. Marson and Munde offered to send the survey to students as part of the final portfolio review process. This would at least capture current students who have taken all 39 hours.