

iDeans teleconference meeting minutes
July 28, 2011
11:00 Pacific Daylight Time

Agenda

11:00-11:20: Membership Committee Report (Michael Seadle)

11:20-11:35: iConference 2012 – Update and report from the Deans iConference subcommittee (Clark Heideger)

11:35-11:50: iSchools Benchmarking (Ron Larsen)

11:50-12:00: Local Challenges (Harry)

If time--Updates

Update on enhancing the doctoral experience at iSchools (Harry/Liz Liddy)

Microsoft Faculty Summit: Next Steps (Clark/Harry)

iConference 2012 – Update and report from the Deans iConference subcommittee (Clark Heideger)

Major milestone – we are accepting submissions beginning tomorrow. Please forward call for participation to your listservs. We're ramping up our solicitations, and using staggering deadlines throughout September. The Chair, Jens-Erik Mai, asked deans to nominate people within their schools to review. We're getting ahead of where we were last year, and getting ahead of the issue we had last year with regard to reviews. The documentation project is paying off in this way. Meanwhile, Linda Schamber is taking the lead to finding venues for iConference 2013, and the committee for 2014 in Berlin is being formed.

iConference Subcommittee of iDeans– this group includes John Unsworth, Linda Schamber, Aimee Dorr, and Jorge Reina Schement, and we are now adding Michael Seadle, & Seamus Ross. There are seven goals and objectives that are visionary in what we're looking for in future conferences. I did some follow up in some of these goals. We hope to have a document to share with all the iDeans for your collective input.

Any questions about either the conf. or committee?

- Seamus – heard today that NSF has come through again to sponsor the Doctoral Colloquium.

Anything further to add? Everything is going smoothly according to plan.

iSchools Benchmarking:

Ron Larsen sent out a draft of a survey that we could put together of our preferences of what benchmarking data would be most useful. Broken up into faculty composition, students, curricula, finance, and research portfolio. These are items we could collect, and he is looking for feedback on these -- a range of votes on from "must do," to "don't care about it." The list is all inclusive, down to particular datum, and assembled to make it easier to read. I hope you've had a chance to look at that. Any questions or comments? This is not about collecting the data, but to be a survey of what data would be best to collect. Once we settle on that, Ron is happy to put together a poll or survey online for people to respond to.

- David Fenske: the faculty rank composition is fine, except that where you have only one to report, it would be a little awkward to put too much information in there. Just doing the number would be okay, but not salary?

Ron – no, not salary, just numbers of each person

- Anno – there is some of this data being reported elsewhere – we won't want to be adding to our staff time for this.

Ron – we do have the Taulbee survey and others, so we're wondering if that is of value. If so, we'd grab it from whatever source we have.

- Aimee – so all the data you’re asking for would come from ALISE, ALA & Taulbee, etc.?
Ron – I’ve not scrubbed it, but I think it could be pretty close. I don’t think the areas are reported other places, but I think we can figure it out.
- Aimee- I share Anno’s concern about staff time; and I like the PhD received.
- Anno—the scholarly by output would be huge! But to get the details would be onerous.
- Seamus—I think it might be very interesting to have that information; in particular to differentiate the caliber of the journal, so we can see metrics about where faculty tend to publish.
- Anno- I’d love to see this, broken down by ranking, but this would only be achieved by entering it ourselves.
- Ron- are these the right things that we want to collect? Are they of value? If so, perhaps we can check the box, but also that it is not doable.
- Where are students going after they leave?
Ron-I have it for PhD, not masters or undergrads.
- Jeff- under scholarly output by venue – do we put a number, or where we placed them? Do you want us to understand what they are and if not, let you know?
Ron –I would like to get just broad, general ideas at this point, and we might want to go through a few iterations to get it right.
- Jeff – when it goes out, it might be good to make it clear that when we’re talking about data, we need to be specific about where it is already collected and how it is defined. We need to pick definitions from one or the other (ALISE or Taulbee).
Ron – I’d like to do that – I’ll add where the data is already collected.
- David – the last time I looked at the Taulbee there were only 11 iSchools in the survey. I’m concerned about that (separate issue). I think we should not go beyond what is required in either ALISE or Taulbee. When it comes down to it, we already have a hard time getting folks to participate.
- Anno – how many iSchools are members of ARA, who would then be questioned by Taulbee? (We don’t know.)
- Harry—Think about the answer this question: If we could use this data as iSchools, keeping it as simple as possible, what would be the dimensions that we’d want to have data on? Ron’s done a superb job, but we were also thinking of paring down the list.
- Diane – one that would be helpful in my context is the number of staff in the roles and the responsibilities that they have. If that would be something that would be easily provided by others, that would be helpful.
- David- ALISE data includes this, at least for the North American schools; that should be easy to report (Ron agreed).
- Ron – is there interest in broadening the placement question? For masters, with a certain time frame?
David—it’s a great idea, but realistically PhD data is easy, because it’s relatively small ‘n’, but masters students is a huge ‘n’, and isn’t hard data to start with. What veracity to record data – I don’t have much faith in that data. The workforce data from NC, for instance, was not reliable enough (too small and ‘n’).
- Ron – I’ll add the staff data and redraft this as a benchmarking survey given this feedback.
- Harry – what is the timeline for responses to refine the list for data elements, then have a process for seeking data from iSchools?

Ron – I need to get someone on the ALISE & Taulbee stuff and do those annotations, and I'd like to do this online.

- Harry – when do we do the Taulbee and ALISE surveys? (Fall) Okay, so maybe the end of this calendar year would be a deadline for collecting data.
David – or use their deadlines and set ours shortly after that.
- Harry – Ron will send out a follow-up survey.
- Aimee- suggestion: if we know what ours will ask, and how it maps to Taulbee & ALISE, then when we do those, we can just fill it out at the same time, without any extra work.
- David – keep in mind the definitions issues and how they map (some of us are on ALISE & Taulbee

Membership Committee Report (without Michael Seadle): Anno asked Harry to summarize.

- We have an application from Nanjing in China – the membership committee has researched this proposal (Chen and Wuhan and Miller at SMU) and both speak very highly. The membership committee will recommend that they become iSchool members.
- San Jose State – they don't have a PhD program on site, so we'll be declining their membership as an iSchool.
- Possible European Schools – membership committee has been looking at schools in Finland, Norway, Holland, Poland – looking at those schools to see whether or not it would be a good idea to contact them for membership. Interestingly we've just received a membership application from Tampere, Finland, and we've been very enthusiastic about their becoming members in the past.
- Anno –I'd like to clarify that we're making recommendations, not the final decisions. Vote for final decisions will go to iDeans later.
- Ron--we may want to be thinking of the University of Trondheim, Norway (Norwegian university of science and technology).
- Seamus – Tampere would be really great. I also see tremendous merit in getting San Jose state. They're developing a huge following, and are moving in the right directions.
- Anno – they (SJSU) have great leadership, and I really agree with that. Instead of outright rejecting them, say until you have the kind of research and PhD program, we can't accept you... implying that we really like them and would like them as members.
- Harry – yes, their new leadership is great, and they're moving ahead in the right direction, but at this point... we'll frame our response in such a way as not to reject them outright.
- Jennifer Preece (via email) - I just want to comment that I know Glasgow and Tampere well and very strongly support both but would like to know the names of the Colleges and departments. Our original mission was that all members should have a doctoral program and I believe we have turned down requests in the past from other institutions because they did not meet this requirement ... So San Jose State seems more problematic
- Steve Miller (via email)-- I support the position of NOT allowing San Jose state. If we have a clear requirement that they must have a full, stand-alone PhD programme, don't back off from that.

Local Challenges:

- Gary – my headache has been budget issues and trying to find ways to keep my head above water. As people come up with strategies, it would be nice to hear them. One thing we did was to institute school-

based tuition. Where state support continues to plummet, it seems that we're in this for the long haul, and we need to be more entrepreneurial. Sharing those kinds of ideas would be very helpful to me.

- David—one thing we've done, Gary, is to build a proof of contract-based software engineers. The business model for that is that we get to keep the profit.
- Aimee—one of the things I've done is I'm hiring a person for 3 years on contract to develop self-supporting and profit-making programs of some kind, if s/he can do that and support her/his own salary for 3 years, then they get to stay. We are allowed to have self-supporting degree programs; you decide the program, budget for that, charge the students a fee that reps all those costs + overhead, and you can pitch it higher than that (you're allowed to make a profit). This is better than a professional degree fee. We have some professional development programs now that break even. We want to make sure that they're fully costed, and budgeted so that they make some profit. We want to do more, and most of the ones we do are f2f, and not digital, so we'd like to add more online courses.
- Diane – I've been approached by the national library, they'd like for the school to set up a consulting firm that they'd make contacts with and hire grads to come and do short-term work at the national library. They have funds but cannot hire staff due to hiring freeze. We'll be working with them and explore it to see if it works for us. This is a way around the hiring problem, and gets our students badly needed paid experience.
- Aimee—we're up for reaccreditation this coming year. We're a fairly small faculty, and more on the humanistic side. We also have a couple of faculty openings. Trying to find the right structure of faculty with limited positions, and meet ALA accreditation, is a big challenge for us.
- Harry – our last accreditation, the ALA commented that the iSchool membership was an added value – added breadth. We pressed on that quite a lot during the review, and they reviewers picked up on that.
- David – we had a different experience last year. We did fine, but I thought that there was some tension about iSchool vs. LIS. Frankly, several people here felt that it felt like an audit rather than a program review. I'm hearing some of the same complaints in the Directors group of ALISE. We ought to track this as a group.
- Seamus—I had a lot of complaints about the accreditation process, but the thing I found the most unhelpful was the attitude at the main review committee, which was adversarial. There was no friendly atmosphere or warmth – it was us vs. them, and they were completely unhelpful.
- Jeff--we were also reviewed last year. We got along fine with our committee, but the process was miserable. The requirements are getting more and more rigid and further and further from what we do. It would be nice to talk about whether or not we as a group can have any influence on them. The committee seems to feel quite defensive in part about our group. They need us, and will be in trouble if they continue to make it so hard on us. They didn't pick people to review us who were clued in on what an iSchool is about.
- Andy – One way to help solve that is if we could step up to be on these review teams. You can lead that process from the front, and avoid some of that tension.
- David – people need to see the cost of accreditation (it was around \$100,000 for us), and esp. in these hard times. We should do a cost accounting and present that to them. What's necessary here and what's not.
Harry – once you've done that, could you share it?
David—yes, don't expect it momentarily, but I will do that.

Enhancing the doctoral experience:

Thanks to the subcommittee for this initiative -- Liz Liddy, Ron Larsen, Bobby Schnabel & Michael Seadle, who came up with ways we could work together to do this. We started with a list when we were together in February, and last week, we decided on a range of steps. Liz sent those out to the list.

- One initiative is making video-conferencing available for PhD students to share their work and presentations. Michael Seadle will take the lead on this.
 - A second initiative is to share best practices at the iConference. PhD Program Directors / Chairs can get in a room together (sponsored by the iCaucus) to look for ways they might collaborate with one another, and look for ways that they might enhance the PhD students' experiences. Liz & I will work with a small working group to get them started on this first workshop. This group is comprised of Chairs of PhD programs: David Hendry (Washington), Lynne Howarth (Toronto), and Ping Zhang (Syracuse).
- The third initiative is to establish a PhD dissertation award. We have begun some preliminary work with Microsoft to fund a prize. The next step is to hand this off to the PhD program chairs/directors to develop a process for criteria in determining the winner each year at the iConference. Hopefully this will become something that is highly sought after.
- The fourth initiative is travel money to the iConference each year – three \$1,000 scholarships. The iDeans subcommittee will award these this year.
- Lastly, is the initiative we've talked about before –having doctoral students swap academic locations. Liz Liddy will take the next steps on this to work with each of you in the caucus.

Microsoft Faculty Summit: Next Steps (Clark/Harry)

We had 15 iDeans at MSR in Seattle last week, and we had a great meeting of the iDeans sitting around the table. We got a lot done and a lot achieved. We produced our report (thanks to Clark) with steps of things iSchools could do with Microsoft, and Microsoft will add / edit, and send it back. The outcome would be support from Microsoft, especially for the iConference each year.

Harry—We're out of time. We'll be in touch on the agenda items mentioned.

Ron – About the idea to have a student-services workshop at the iConference--I'll have my student-services person write up a paragraph to send around.

Harry – thanks, I'll add this to the agenda for our next telephone meeting, too.