Report of the Information School Program Review Committee
University of Washington
February 27-28, 2006

Review Committee

Fredric M. Wolf, Professor and Chair, Department of Medical Education and Biomedical
    Informatics (Committee Chair)
Beth E. Kolko, Associate Professor, Department of Technical Communication
Steven B. Sawyer, Associate Professor, School of Information Sciences and Technology,
    The Pennsylvania State University
Linda C. Smith, Professor and Associate Dean, Graduate School of Library and Information
    Science, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Craig ZumBrunnen, Professor, Department of Geography

Executive Summary

1. The committee recommends continuation of all degree programs of the Information School
    with review in 10 years. These include the Bachelor of Science (B.S.) in Informatics, Master
    of Library and Information Science (MLIS), Master of Science in Information Management
    (MSIM), and the Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) in Information Science. While the Review
    Committee enthusiastically endorses 10 year continuing status for the Ph.D. program, we
    suggest that the Information School (*i*School) prepare a comprehensive 5-year update report
    of the progress of the program and its graduates. We believe this would provide additional
    and helpful strategic planning information given the newness of the program, the length of
    time to completion, and the small number of graduates to date.
    `

2. We congratulate the *i*School for its successful rapid growth and peer recognition, reflected in
    enrollments and graduates of its programs, and in recent 2006 national peer rankings in
    which the school was rated #4 overall, #1 in Law Librarianship, in the top 5 in Digital
    Librarianship, Health Librarianship, and Information Systems, and in the top 10 in School
    Library Media and Services for Children and Youth.

3. We believe the *i*School ought to continue to develop and refine its strategic plan as it moves
    from "startup to sustainability," including its successful distance education and self-
    sustaining programs and increasing its development efforts to support teaching and research,
    as well as peer reviewed research support.

4. The *i*School has effectively developed a "School of One" philosophy, ambience, and
    atmosphere in which everyone appears included and valued. This philosophy was
    enthusiastically expressed and endorsed by faculty, staff, and students alike, and appears to
    have generated a great sense of community involvement, commitment, and collegiality.
    Every effort should be made to sustain and enhance this sense of community as the school
    and its programs grow and evolve.

5. There are a number of specific maintenance activities, growth issues and needs summarized in the Recommendations Section. These include defining the appropriate balance between larger service course offerings and more specific smaller program or faculty interest course/seminars; needed increases in resources, including critical increases in staff support to keep pace with the rapid growth of programs; and teaching and research space needs that have grown beyond current capacity.

1. Summary of the Process

In a letter dated January 9, 2006 from the Graduate School's Dean and Vice Provost Suzanne T. Ortega and Associate Dean for Academic Programs Melissa Austin, we received an initial invitation to serve as members on the committee to review all the degree programs offered by the UW Information School (*i*School). This invitation was accompanied by a detailed and extensive self-study prepared by the Information School, a set of guidelines for conducting the review, the Graduate School Exit Questionnaire Summaries for recipients of the MLIS, MSIM, and PhD degrees, and documents from previous reviews of the MLIS, MSIM, and PhD programs. Members of the committee met on February 14, 2006 with Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School Suzanne Ortega, Associate Dean of the Graduate School Austin, Executive Vice Provost Ana Mari Cauce, Acting Dean and Vice Provost of the Office of Undergraduate Education Christine Ingebritsen, and Acting Associate Dean of the Office of Undergraduate Education Janice DeCosmo to discuss the Committee's charge for the review, which was summarized in a letter of the same date. Internal members of the Committee met with *i*School Dean Harry Bruce and Associate Dean for Academics Joseph Janes in advance of the February 27-28, 2006 site visit to briefly review the charge.

During the two day site visit, the Committee met individually with a pre-arranged series of small groups of *i*School program chairs, students, and staff in each of the degree programs, as well as with groups of faculty by rank (Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, and Lecturers/Senior Lecturers), faculty in the Law Librarianship Program, and the Coordinator and staff of the Distance Education Program. The site visit ended with exit interviews of the Program Chairs and Deans that included Administrative Faculty (Graduate School Deans, Undergraduate Dean, etc.). The committee appreciates the critical, thoughtful, and enthusiastic comments offered by participants during these interviews. The full agenda for the February 27-28, 2006 site visit is included in Appendix A.

2. Findings: School and Faculty

2.1 School

2.1.1 Structure

As the *i*School has grown rather dramatically over the past seven or so years its structure has also grown and evolved. These changes have been intimately associated with the recruitment of Dr. Michael Eisenberg from Syracuse University and his arrival at the University of Washington in August 1998. At the time of his arrival, the former Graduate School of Library and Information Science was physically housed with Suzzallo Library and was administratively housed directly

within the UW Graduate School with a Director as its head reporting directly to the Dean of the Graduate School. Since then the original Graduate School of Library and Information Science has been quite profoundly transformed into the now free standing Information School (or *i*School) unit with Dr. Eisenberg serving as its first Dean until he stepped down to become Dean Emeritus in 2006 and after a job search Dr. Harry Bruce became the new Dean at the beginning of 2006.

While not discarding its traditional role and function of being a major center of academically solid training for professional librarians, the transformed *i*School now truly does justice to the information science component of its old name. From this firm foundation of being the first school for training librarians in the western states and being only one of six such schools in the entire United States to have been continuously accredited by the American Library Association for the past 80 years, the *i*School has effectively rode the wave of the information age. From a graduate only program of some 150 students the school has grown to over 600 students with three new degree programs: an undergraduate degree in information science, a new MSIM (M.S. in Information Sciences), and a new Ph.D. degree in Information Science. A faculty of six has grown to nearly 40 (including lectures and senior lecturers). And, the *i*School's staff has gown from 2 to over 20. Both of these expansions have been intimately associated with a major change in research funding and productivity of the Information School faculty.

From being mainly a school for training professional librarians, the school and its faculty and staff now perform at a high level in the areas of cutting edge funded and unfunded research and publication. From essentially having no outside research funding (~$40k per year) and only modest rates of faculty research publications, research expenditures have grown to about $2.5 million annually in the past five years and the trajectory has been monotonically upward. Not surprisingly, the school rather quickly out grew space available in Suzzallo Library and subsequently has already significantly outgrown its new, excellent, modern space in Mary Gates Hall.

While not at all uncommon with nearly all UW units, space has become a STRANGLING ISSUE for the Information School with the most critical space issues being with regard to office space for advising, for lecturers, for staff, and for research labs and offices. Already, the *i*School has had to rent space outside of their home in Mary Gates Hall, especially for research. Even in the information science age, the *i*School is increasingly experiencing logistically challenges as more academic offices and research offices are being forced to no longer be co-located.

For the past seven or eight years the *i*School's rise to national prominence (ranked fourth in Spring 2006) has been fundamentally associated with both the dynamism and vision of its leadership, hard work and dedication, serial opportunism, internal University support for increases in state-funded programs and resources (~60% of *i*School's annual academic budget), a fast increase in fee-based or self-sustaining programs and resources (~40% of academic or instructional budget), and the increased levels of extra mural research funding. All of these positive changes have led concomitantly to needed and appropriate changes in the structure of the school.

These changes in the school's structure are reflected in the *i*School's Organizational Chart attached below. Transformation has brought with it new challenges, opportunities, and new administrative and professional needs. It appears to this review committee that the *i*School has created a set of new, appropriate, and proactive administrative positions and structure to guide this growth and sustain it into the future. More specifically here in addition to the core position of Assistant to the Dean, we call attention to five new positions of responsibility. First, on the academic/teaching side we note the new position of Associate Dean of Academics and supporting staff needed to manage the growth in the number and size of the degree programs. Second, the school's newly invigorated research effort and productivity has led to the need for an Associate Dean for Research and staff to coordinate these often interdisciplinary and team research projects. The expanded, and cumulative, IT needs of both the academic and research functions of the *i*School created a strong need for a Director of IT and staff. The greatly expanded faculty, staff, and budget rationally led to creation of an Assistant Dean for Planning & Administration. For the past several years the *i*School's success has been aided by substantial increases of state funding. However, sensing that increased levels of state funding are unlikely to be forthcoming the *i*School has created an internal development program with a Director of Development and small staff proactively looking forward to ensure program sustainability, to expand self-supporting programs, and to seek increases in non-state sources of private and corporate funding. Fundraising thus is increasingly seen as a priority. In this regard they have been very active and effective in engaging their relatively large alumni base. Overall the structure and approaches taken by the *i*School appear to be appropriate, proactive, and successful.

2.1.2 Staff

The *i*School has a truly amazing professional support staff. Nearly everyone we interviewed from undergraduate students, master degree students, doctoral students, faculty and the staff personnel themselves regarding their peers noted and emphasized the high levels of education of the support staff, their consistently high quality of professionalism, performance, and dedication to the vision and missions of the *i*School. All of those interviewed seemed well informed and aware of the individual and collective strengths of the professional support staff and the enormous importance of the staff towards the overall excellence of the *i*School and its successful operation. But there are significant challenges to these strengths. Many of the staff are operating at over-capacity that if not addressed could lead to a high potential for professional burnout of the staff. It needs to be noted here that, while the *i*School's staff has grown greatly numerically since the school has reinvented itself, it still is insufficient to meet the current and future likely needs of the school. It is only due to the high efficiency and dedication of the staff to the school's vision and missions that has allowed the school to perform so successfully and manage the numerous pains associated with the school's prodigious growth.

The *i*School staff is highly efficient and performs with far fewer staff and resources compared to those at peer information school institutions such as Illinois, Michigan, Syracuse, and Penn State. Some staff positions were vacant at the time of the site interview, but the most strongly felt need expressed seems to be in the area of academic advising staff, resources, and space. While we heard nothing but praise of the highest order for the innovative, creative, and comprehensive

work of the advising staff, clearly this seems to be the area in which personnel are at greatest risk of over capacity burnout.

2.1.3 Budget and Resources

The *i*School has experienced very fast and substantial increases in state-funded programs and resources, along with an equally fast increase in fee-based programs and resources and rapid growth in research. Course and program budgets are supported about 60% through state-funded resources and 40% through self-sustaining programs. Fees for the self -sustaining programs are set close to instate tuition, allowing flexibility in the curriculum. The School is rightfully proud of the substantial increase in extra-mural funding, which has grown from approximately $40,000 to $2.5 million in 5 years. Sustaining and growing this effort is clearly a high priority for the School. Fundraising through development efforts is also increasingly seen as a high priority, and is spearheaded by the Dean and the Director of Development.

While increases in the State budget may be difficult to obtain, it seems reasonable for the School to seek and receive increased resources concomitant with increased enrollments and any new service courses that that may be offered that contribute to the general University community. Otherwise, the School will have to increasingly rely on fee-based self-sustaining programs, including those delivered online.

Not surprisingly, and as noted above, the *i*School has outgrown its current space, both for teaching and research, and needs to work with the University Administration to identify appropriate teaching and research space that will not destroy its "School of One" spirit. Space is in short supply to meet current needs for advising, holding faculty office hours, and for staff. For example, office space needed by Lecturers and Senior Lecturers to hold office hours and meet with their students, is scarce. These faculty are integral members of the *i*School , their dedication and contributions are ongoing and substantial. They engage in a large and critical amount of the teaching effort and time for required courses. The School is very dependent on their teaching effort, without which many, if not all programs, could not succeed. Additional office space is also critical for the continuing success of the expanding extramurally funded research efforts, which need to be encouraged, nurtured, and supported appropriately. Co-location is critical to maintaining and enhancing synergies, creativity, and the "School of One" spirit.

2.1.4 Governance

As a result of the interviews and reading of the submitted self-study and supplement materials, our overwhelming conclusion is that governance and governance processes have consistently received the very highest priority in the transformed *i*School. Dean Eisenberg seems to have brought to his position a fairly unique combination of strong leadership talents, an equally strong commitment to transparency and demonstrated ability to engage the faculty, staff, and students in governance and decision making. One of the most common statements we heard across the spectrum of interviewees is that the *i*School was a "school of one." Consensus decision-making is the rule involving inputs from all levels of the school's personnel. The school has developed a strong sense of community with a culture based on trust, engagement, vitality, consensus, and

transparency. One of the strengths of the *i*School has been both its deliberate and opportunistic efforts to connect and collaborate to very numerous and diverse other academic and research units across the campus and beyond. On the one hand, the school's governance style has been very effective in engendering a shared vision and sense of purpose; on the other hand, this shared sense of purpose has allowed consensus governance to continue even as the unit has grown by leaps and bounds. At the same time, this has not always been easy and, as admitted in the self-study documents, the decision-making process has been chaotic and somewhat happenstance at times as the school responded positively to "serial opportunism." Governance is clearly perceived to be one of the strengths of the *i*School.

The first potential hurdle to possible governance challenges seems to have been cleared quite smoothly at the beginning of the year as Dean Eisenberg retired and Dr. Harry Bruce assumed the Deanship. The most difficult governance issues now will be related to a new type of transition from the school's recent growth environment phase to a phase of consolidation, sustainability, and more strategic planning. One of the other challenges, well recognized throughout the school is the high service workload, especially of junior faculty. There is concern across the ranks about unequal teaching loads as some of the school's most gifted researchers, who often are gifted teachers as well, have reduced teaching coarse loads while more junior faculty and lecturers have heavier teaching loads. The school's strong sense of commitment of mentorship to faculty has assuaged this problem, but by no means solved it. In essence, dramatic success with new programs and research grants has reverberated through the school with understandably differential impacts. With the growth in the overall school and its personnel has come a concomitant proliferation of committees, increasing the workloads of many faculty members. The school is cognizant of this problem and is seeking avenues to increase efficiency without loosing consensus governance.

2.1.5 Strategic Planning

There clearly appears to be widespread awareness and agreement within the *i*School that strategic planning needs to receive a renewed and greater priority. Dean Bruce and his administrative staff consider this to be a major new emphasis of the school as it moves from a ramp-up or start-up phase toward sustainability and longevity of the school. We believe that Dean Harry Bruce sees leading and managing this move from start-up to sustainability to be his core mission. The *i*School faculty and leadership have been engaged in what they call "serial opportunism" that has accompanied their growth, which has been both exhilarating and stressful. By consensus they have clearly decided to move toward a more deliberate strategic planning process and multi-year perspective. They already have made great strides by the mere fact of identifying three overarching priorities:

1) maintaining a healthy, supportive, dynamic, and intellectually stimulating culture of possibilities,

2) continuing to perform at a high level its three core missions of teaching, research and service

3) discovering ways for ensuring that the three major groups – students, faculty and staff, mutually understand, recognize, and address the needs and unique situations each face in their daily professional lives.

Thus far they have enumerated several concrete ways of responding to these priorities related to the following broad conceptual and programmatic areas and needs:
1) strengthening and growing the academic programs (e.g., sustainable funding for Ph.D. students,
2) building the research culture (space and grant writing support),
3) expanding collaborative relationships with both private and public sector institutions,
4) creating a vision for public advocacy,
5) undergoing a branding or image marketing exercise and plan,
6) increasing fund raising and expanding the school's revenue base for both students and programs,
7) engaging in more formal and ongoing evaluation, renewal and improvement processes.

We judge all of these to be highly appropriate strategic planning priorities and goals. These efforts will indeed require the focused, innovative, and determined energy and resources of Dean Bruce, his core administrative staff, and the involvement of the entire unit.

It seems that the major conversation and challenges will revolve around the overall future direction, vision, and mission of the school as it moves forward toward a period of consolidation and sustainability. Quite an interesting and intriguing twist to these initial strategic planning discussions has revolved around ways to perpetually renew the school, its vision, its mission, and its programs to keep at the cutting edge and to keep from "calcifying."

Here we would like to note one specific recommendation that differs from our initial thoughts at the time of the site visit. Based on the information we received in both the written documents and in the interviews, our understanding was/is that the *i*School was rather disinclined to expand its course offerings in the area of large service courses, preferring to mount small, more intense courses. Given the widely expressed and reputed general concern with faculty being over-capacity already, led us to agree with the school's seeming reluctance to embrace large enrollment service course offerings. Upon further reflection and clarification with the *i*School's administration, we are altering our recommendation here and would encourage the *i*School to consider expanding its offerings and delivery of such courses. It seems to us that this could reduce course loads, expand funding for graduate student TA funding, lead to IT innovations in the delivery of such course, and expand the impact and awareness of the *i*School across campus, generating cross-campus goodwill. This recommendation, however, does not mean a complete refocusing on large service courses and away from the multiple, focused, seminars currently offered. We are suggesting only that careful curricular planning involving inspection of the syllabi of the current courses could well reveal opportunities for rationalizing and consolidating some of these offerings and free up some faculty time for offering more large lecture service courses to the campus community.

2.2 Faculty

2.2.1 A Vibrant Faculty Community

Simply stated, the *i*School has an excellent and highly productive faculty. As stated elsewhere the rapid transformation and growth of the school under Director Eisenberg's leadership has been achieved by an infusion of new state monies that have been very used very strategically and effectively to hire a number of new first-rate scholars, teachers, and researchers. In other words, the *i*School has proven itself to be highly worthy of the trust and resources given to it during the past approximately 7 years. From a faculty of 6 the school's faculty has grown to over 35 including regular faculty, full-time lecturers, part-time lecturers, joint-appointments, and adjunct lecturers and faculty. Currently, the faculty represent a healthy distribution across the ranks:

3 Lecturers,	10 Assistant Professors,
2 Part-time Lecturers,	9 Associate Professors (1 without tenure),
4 Senior Lecturers,	5 Professors and
1 Adjunct Senior Lecturer,	1 Adjunct Professor.

This faculty growth represents, indeed, a solid base that should carry the school long and productively into the future as the school now undergoes a new transition from growth to one of strategic consolidation and sustainability. Without exception the entire faculty interviewed regardless of rank expressed a strong sense of community and a shared sense of purpose. All the faculty have been actively involved in the school's governance and consensus-style decision-making. All faculty interviewed expressed a great deal of enthusiasm for and commitment to the school and a strong sense that their respective contributions and achievements to date have been and are valued. Junior faculty seemed quite appreciative of the feedback and support given them by the Faculty Development Committee. There clearly seems to be a strong commitment to faculty mentorship. Nonetheless, and not surprisingly, a few growth pains and concerns have emerged and interestingly enough they seem to be shared concerns acknowledged across faculty ranks, staff, and graduate students that we comment on below.

2.2.2 Teaching, Including Workload and Pace

By no means unique to any UW unit, the apparent major concerns all revolve around the high workload, work pace, and questions of equitable distribution of work. The normal teaching load for tenured and tenure track faculty is four courses per year. Typically, but not always these involve four different preparations. However, the teaching course load for the lecturer track is higher, typically six courses per year and again commonly six different preparations. While the research productivity demands for the tenured and tenure track faculty are high, several of the lecturers are actively engaged in research as well. The question of the equitable distribution of workload is not focused on the number of courses taught nearly as much as on the specific size and nature of the courses taught. Some faculty, and especially lecturers, tend to be teaching multiple large-enrollment classes while other faculty tend to have their teaching requirements satisfied by giving small seminars in their own research specialties. Also, some of the most successful and talented researchers also are rewarded with reduced teaching loads. Actually, teaching loads and courses are determined by negotiations between individual faculty members

and the school's academic administrators. On the one hand, all faculty seems to be appreciative of the fact that these negotiations need to be framed by the school's specific and increasingly demanding programmatic needs. One the other hand, there is a faculty desire to see the school's administration develop a less idiosyncratic and more transparent negotiation process.

These understandable concerns about teaching load distribution needs also to be placed in the context of the quite heavy faculty involvement in creating news courses, new preparations, new programs, etc. during the new start-up growth phase. These teaching related demands have also been set against other workloads such as new faculty and graduate student recruiting, staff job searches, heavy committee and service loads, and what some referred to as the general "start-up rush." Many of these workloads are now subsiding and efforts to rationalize, consolidate, and standardize committee work is well underway.

The underlying concern has become one of potential burnout. Several of the more junior faculty and some of the lecturers expressed concern with pace and demands of work, the issues with work/life crossovers and their struggles with trying to achieve a work/life balance. In this context, it is very important to highlight the fact that the new Dean Harry Bruce and his academic administrative faculty and staff are well aware of these concerns and are being proactive in trying to find equitable workload solutions. They are rethinking new roles for the iSchool's elected Faculty Council in an effort to move more toward a community governance model.

2.2.3 Research Orientation

Perhaps the most outstandingly positive signature feature of the iSchool over the past seven or so years has been its development of a strong research orientation and culture. From the interviews it seems that all faculty are now engaged in productive research, but a number of the new hires have become true rising stars in their respective information science fields. Prior to 1999 the school had very little external research funding and that small amount was from the NSF only. Since then external funding has grown dramatically in three ways. First, the dollar amount has grown from a long-term flat annual rate of just a few tens of thousands of dollars to approximately $2.25 million annually. Second, the number of funded research projects per year has grown essentially monotonically from a long-term annual average of just 2 or 3 in 1999, to 35 in 2005. Third, the iSchool has been very effective in diversifying the type and sources of funding. While successful awards of highly prestigious and competitive NSF grants have accounted for slightly over 50% of the iSchool's research funding since 1999, the school now has a large variety of other sources. Since 1999 at least 20 other prestigious public, private, and non-profit agencies, organizations, companies, and foundations have been successfully added to the school's diverse portfolio of research sponsorship. It is very important to note two other signature features of this unfolding research orientation. First, and admitted by the iSchool, some of the diversity of the types of funded projects and sources have been driven more by a culture of sequential opportunism than strategic design. Fortuitously, this flourishing of research has resulted in the iSchool becoming a major player in not only cross-campus, interdisciplinary research collaborations, but also in the process the School has forged quite a significant number of wider, local, regional, national, and international multidisciplinary partnerships and with a variety of constituencies. Second, the School's faculty has contributed to research in a huge

number of areas from ones highly practical and applied to those framing the cutting edge of important problems in the information field. There is active unfunded research being conducted as well. Finally, this research activity has resulted in at least nineteen books, a much larger numbers of book chapters, prestigious peer-reviewed journal articles, and written research reports. This productive output has included publications on a diverse range of subject matter, including, for example, rigorous library services administration and management, theories of information science, IT design, information seeking and searching, digital documents and archives, Internet user behavior, content management, electronic business, and digital government.

This new and prodigious growth in research has required creation of new infrastructure and support. As noted previously, the *i*School has created a new Director of Research with a small support staff. While faculty were unanimous in their praise for the *i*School's concrete efforts and record of success in responding to the rapid growth in research infrastructure needs and support, serious concerns were voiced. The major concern appears to be research space, probably the most common research concern across all UW units! Despite excellent new facilities and space in Mary Gates Hall, the *i*School has already outgrown its space in Mary Gates Hall which has led to the problem of a number of faculty having non-proximate locations for teaching and office hours and research space and labs. Perhaps, ironically, for an information school faculty in the information age, a number of the faculty expressed concern over a variety of stressor problems associated with multiple workspace locations and now clearly inadequate office space in Mary Gates Hall, as both the faculty and staff have growth dramatically in number. Other common research concerns focused more on the lack of general university infrastructure support for grant writing, fiscal and accounting issues, intellectual property rights issues, other legal issues, and the effort required and slow pace of the human subjects review process.

In summary, the *i*School has achieved a number of truly remarkable successes in creating a vibrant, collegial, contagious, creative, innovative, collaborative, cohesive, multidisciplinary, and transdisciplinary high quality and highly productive research culture. This new research orientation played a major role in the *i*School's new national rating this past spring as being the fourth best library and information school in the United States.

3. Findings and Accomplishments: Programs

3.1 Student Experience

Here we report findings across all academic programs, which we label here the generic "student experience." Specific-to-program findings are reported on below. We note that these findings typically transcend particular programs and are espoused by faculty, staff, students or administrators independent of any one programmatic discussion.

A central finding is that students indicate a strong and overwhelmingly positive engagement in the intellectual life of the school and the programs in which students are enrolled. Students are happy they came and proud to be part of the program. Graduates are remarkable ambassadors for the school and the University. They stay very connected to their program and the school, and these alumni often engage their employers in the school.

Across all the academic programs, we note that each has a large number of required courses. This large number of required courses limits flexibility in scheduling courses and taking courses. This large number of required courses also limits the possibility of faculty introducing specialty courses that leverage their particular expertise.

We further note that faculty typically teach courses across multiple programs, leading to substantial intellectual overlap and commitment to all programs. We see this as a strength.

3.2 Ph.D. Program

Our primary finding relative to the Ph.D. program is that it is developing well and should be allowed to continue. The current program appears to have great interest from the faculty, students, staff, and administrators. There also appears to be reasonable resources to support its operation and interest by faculty and administrators to expand the research funding and increase fellowship support. There is a program director, a Ph.D. program committee (chaired by the program director), and a Ph.D. admissions committee. This means a large number of the faculty are involved in the Ph.D. program policy-making and student recruiting processes.

The Ph.D. program had 30 students enrolled during the 2005-06 academic year. About four new students have been admitted to the program per year, ranging from nine in 2003 to two in 2006. The applicant pool has ranged between 35 in 2001 to 77 in 2004. Over the seven years the Ph.D. Program has existed, a total of 371 students have applied, 64 were accepted, and 38 accepted their offers. As noted in the self-study report, since inception, one student has graduated and found employment as an Assistant Professor at the University of British Columbia's School of Library and Information Science. Another two students just graduated in Spring 2006.

It appears from discussions with the program director and students that there is increased attention to ensure that current Ph.D. students are being encouraged to move more quickly through the program. It appears that one means to make this emphasis clear has been a series of "warning letters" that have been sent from the Ph.D. program committee (chaired by the Ph.D. program director) to some students who were surprised to received these (this is part of the program's procedures, but had not been used until 2005/2006). In addition these seem to have surprised some of the Ph.D. students' supervisors.

Current Ph.D. students demonstrate an incredibly high level of enthusiasm for the openness, collegiality, and intellectual richness of the school, its faculty, and the opportunities they are provided. Perhaps this is partly a reflection of the careful student recruitment (where all recruited Ph.D. students are brought in to visit the school). The recruiting process is the charge of the Ph.D. admissions committee. The new student recruiting process is a strength of the Ph.D. program.

As noted, there is great interest in expanding funding and support for Ph.D. students. Currently Ph.D. students are supported by a mix of teaching assistantships, graduate research assistantships, and very few fellowships. The Ph.D. program director notes that there is interest in expanding the program to admit from six to even ten new students per year. This is partly

dependent on graduation rates (a point raised above). It is even more dependent on growing funding. To help address this, the development officer has been charged to pursue support for more graduate fellowships and there is enthusiasm from faculty and administration to also pursue more extramural funding to support graduate students.

We note that the research and teaching practicum serve as an interesting vehicle to engage faculty with students in one-to-one interactions. Four of these are required (two are to focus on research and two are to focus on teaching). These practica have also helped Ph.D. students develop a range of teaching and research skills while working with particular faculty.

We further note that the recent changes in policy regarding identifying and securing GSR to be part of the student's Ph.D. committee reflect university-wide pressures. This will be less of a concern for students over time as faculty newer to the University of Washington become increasingly acculturated in the UW environment and get to know faculty from other units.

3.3 MLIS, dMLIS, and MLIS in Law Librarianship

Our primary finding is that all variants of the MLIS (on-campus, distance – dMLIS, and the specialty in law librarianship) are doing well and should continue to operate. As the oldest and largest enrollment program in the *i*School and the one accredited by an external agency (the American Library Association Committee on Accreditation), this program continues to merit special attention from faculty, staff, and administrators. There is an MLIS Admissions Committee that includes both faculty and staff who work closely with the program, as well as an MLIS Program Committee involving other faculty. The same faculty member chairs both the MLIS Admissions and MLIS Program committees.

Through a combination of factors over the last decade, the MLIS program has grown from a respectable library science program serving the Pacific Northwest region to become a national leader in LIS education. The strong faculty, redesigned curriculum, and expansion of access through the distance option are all significant in this regard. The University of Washington has a long history of national leadership in the education of law librarians in particular and that continues to the present. Recent 2006 national peer rankings reported in US News and World Report rated the school #4 overall, #1 in Law Librarianship, in the top 5 in Digital Librarianship, Health Librarianship, and Information Systems, and in the top 10 in School Library Media and Services for Children and Youth.

Enrollment in the MLIS program has grown substantially over the past four years with the introduction of the online (dMLIS) option. Reductions in enrollments with the phasing out of the evening option for the MLIS have more than been compensated for with the increased online enrollments. This increase in enrollment places more demands on course scheduling and student advising. Because the growth has come through online enrollments, there are substantial new demands for faculty support (to redesign courses for online delivery), student support (enabling them to function effectively as online students), and logistical support (to manage residencies for online students each fall, winter, and spring quarter). The distance education coordinator, information technology staff, and MLIS Academic Advisor are all committed to providing

excellent support for faculty and students, but the rapid growth in the dMLIS option has placed some strains on their ability to provide the needed support for all faculty and students.

The MLIS program consists of 63 quarter credits, consisting of nine core courses (totaling 34 credits, more than 50% of required credit toward the degree) and 29 elective credits. The nine core courses are organized around the life cycle of information, introduced in a 2-credit course with the remaining eight courses exploring facets of this overall conceptual structure. Students come to the MLIS program with varied backgrounds and career goals; the core curriculum gives students a common understanding of key concepts and theories underlying the field. MLIS students expressed general satisfaction with the core courses as currently structured. Because less than 50% of the coursework is elective, advising is important to ensure that students make appropriate selections from the range of available electives in relation to their career goals. Some students felt that their assigned faculty advisor was not a good match for their interests but had not taken the initiative to change advisors.

Some MLIS students identified perceived gaps in the curriculum in relation to positions that they might like to pursue upon graduation (examples given included digitization, metadata, and international librarianship). More generally, in comparing our meeting with the MLIS students with meetings held with BS, MSIM, and PhD students, we had the impression that MLIS students were less likely to see themselves as in the forefront of developments in their area of study. From our vantage point reviewing the *i*School as a whole, it is clear that there is material taught in other curricula that addresses a number of the areas identified as gaps by MLIS students.

The *i*School is a pioneer on the UW campus in online degree program delivery. As a result, they have had to develop many aspects of the program without an existing model to follow. In particular, the dMLIS program has adopted a standard pedagogical model for all online courses. Courses are divided into a series of modules; faculty use Microsoft Producer to create online presentations that can be viewed by students asynchronously. Some, but not all, courses require a residency. While the program has been in place since fall 2002, some faculty are now teaching courses online for the first time, so there has not been a broadly shared basis of experience for evaluating the effectiveness of this pedagogical model.

Students expressed great enthusiasm for their directed fieldwork experiences as valuable complements to what they learned through regularly-scheduled courses. They would be interested in having ways to learn more easily about the full range of opportunities—potential sites and types of experiences one could gain at those sites.

As a culminating experience MLIS students must complete either a portfolio (non-credit) or thesis (credit) in order to graduate. Most students choose to complete the portfolio; some MLIS students reported that advisors actively discouraged completion of a thesis. MLIS students expressed some ambivalence about the portfolio requirement and felt that faculty do not necessarily have a consistent view of what experiences qualify as "significant" and therefore eligible for inclusion in the portfolio. In particular some students felt that they could only include experiences going beyond projects completed as part of coursework, thus potentially increasing time to degree to satisfy the portfolio requirement. While some felt the time invested

in preparing the portfolio merited academic credit toward the degree (like the thesis), one student expressed concern that this could add to the cost of the degree if such credit were not eligible for tuition reimbursement.

Lecturers, with their course load of 5-6 courses per year and heavy advising loads of 30-35 students, are integral to the success of the MLIS and dMLIS program. They expressed great commitment to and enthusiasm for their work, despite limited office space that constrains time spent in the building and interacting with other faculty. The designation of one lecturer, formerly an extended faculty member herself, as a liaison to extended faculty members ensures an important point of connection for faculty who otherwise may have limited contact with the school.

Penny Hazelton and Mary Hotchkiss, who coordinate and teach in the MLIS in Law Librarianship program, express justifiable pride in its content and placement record. This program allows those holding the JD to earn the MLIS after successful completion of 44 quarter credits in 12 months. It is an on-campus option only and includes an internship rotation providing hands-on experience in cooperating law libraries in the Seattle area. Courses specific to law librarianship are open as electives to other MLIS students who do not hold the JD. The target enrollment is small to ensure that all those enrolled in the program can be accommodated in internships, but there is not currently close cooperation with the MLIS admissions process to ensure that the quota is filled each year.

3.4 MS in Information Management

Our primary finding relative to the MS in Information Management is that it is developing well and should continue to operate. The current program appears to have great interest from the faculty, staff, students, and administrators. Established in 2001 as an executive program, in 2005 a new day option was added. Several faculty serve on either the MSIM Admissions Committee or the MSIM Program Committee. Both committees are chaired by the Program Director.

The Executive MSIM program is a part-time option (47 credit hours to earn the degree) specifically for working professionals. Several cohorts have successfully completed the program and students express enthusiasm for the close working relationships they develop with fellow students in the program. The Day MSIM program is a full-time option (65 credit hours to earn the degree) geared toward traditional students who are interested in opening new doors for career possibilities in many information fields. At the time of this review, the Day program was in the second quarter with its first cohort. While both programs have required capstone experiences, the day program also has a required two-quarter internship. Students in both programs expressed high praise for Michael Crandall's leadership and responsiveness in his role as program director. With the introduction of the Day MSIM program, the role of the MSIM Academic Advisor has increased in importance as she also serves as employer relations/internship coordinator. The first Day MSIM cohort will need to be placed in internships in the 2006-2007 academic year.

The curriculum has a distinctive "signature", reflecting the *i*School perspective on information management. The 1-credit Information Management Framework course provides a foundation for the Information Core Courses (the information perspective and the skills needed to analyze

and organize information), the Technology Core Courses (background and skills in the use of technology necessary to harness information in organizations), the Management Core Courses (background and skills in using information as a management tool in organizations), and integrating courses (Emerging Trends in Information Management and Technology and the Capstone). Students enrolled in the Executive MSIM expressed considerable satisfaction with the program, noting that the courses effectively integrated students with information technology backgrounds seeking a stronger management perspective and students with management backgrounds seeking a stronger information technology perspective. They noted that several members of their cohort had already experienced benefits through professional advancements and job promotions in their work settings. The Day MSIM students expressed more ambivalence about their experience to date, but noted that the program director was in close communication with them and responsive to their needs. They acknowledged that the program faces challenges because of the heterogeneous educational, work experience, and cultural backgrounds that newly enrolled students bring to their studies.

The cohort-based Executive MSIM program has operated with a largely prescribed curriculum, with few electives. The Day MSIM program, requiring completion of more credit hours, allows a greater number of electives.

The Executive MSIM program is clearly responding to a market need in the greater Seattle area. Sustainability of the Executive MSIM program depends on a continuing pool of prospective students seeking the knowledge and skill set provided by this program. The Day MSIM program can (and already does) draw students internationally.

3.5 BS in Informatics

Our primary finding relative to the BS in Informatics program is that it is developing well and should continue to operate. The current program appears to have great interest from the faculty, staff, students, and administrators. There are some resource constraints that seem to be impinging on its operation.

The BS in Informatics is making steady progress as a coherent major. The BS in Informatics is a controlled entry major, admitting 70 students per year. This reflects a doubling (from 35) based on planned growth. There is no intention to continue growing the program's enrollment from 70. A BS program director chairs the BS program committee and the BS admissions committee. These committees provide opportunities for a large number of faculty and staff to participate in BS policy-making and recruiting operations. There is also an extremely competent staff supporting admissions, advising, and other student services. The range of programs, services, and student-centered attention that this office and these people provide is a source of great pride by the staff, students, faculty, and the administration of the school. As an aside, the members of the review team note with great respect the level of energy, competence, and success this small staff exhibits.

The BS in Informatics program is founded on a principle of retention and with the explicit goal of supporting students who have enrolled to succeed and graduate. This principle has been made visible in the growth from cohorts of 35 to cohorts of 70. Due in part to this growth there is an

increased variation in the technical preparation of the students. This has led to instances where some of the new students have needed tutoring to help reduce the technical differences. This tutoring has been supported from internal (TA) funds and is seen as important to the success of students in the program, and particularly useful for recruiting and retaining women and other under-represented populations (more on this below).

Current BS in Informatics students are enthusiastic about the major and their professional opportunities. They report strong and positive associations with the school, the major, the faculty and administrative staff support, connection to industry and to alumni, and are extremely proud of what they are doing. The development officer seconds this, noting that the graduates – while young – are deeply engaged with the current students and school. They connect students to employers, participate in classes and site visits, and are vocal ambassadors for the school and the BS. It is also clear that the school's administration is fostering and supporting this loyalty and enthusiasm.

Three findings reflect the strain placed on the school by the doubling of the BS in Informatics program:

1. The recent increase in student enrollment has not been matched by a corresponding increase in needed resources. For example, marketing material, software licenses, TA money, and student services have been severely strained. Students, staff, faculty, and school administrators are aware that this shortage of resources is increasingly constraining the high quality of this program. In particular, the student services office is beyond capacity, demanding more from staff than should rightly be expected to maintain this level of quality. In saying this we note that this extra-ordinary effort is not being demanded of the staff: they are willingly putting in very long hours and working over-capacity. Their pride in the program and the school, their professional expectations and loyalty to each other and to what they have developed leads them to this non-sustainable level of over-commitment.

2. Within the current required offerings, the content and order of presentation across some course sequences continues to be evolving. In particular, the set of courses which focus on human and people-centric issues (such as human information processing, human-computer interaction, and organizational needs for information and information systems) seems to have overlapping topics, readings, and concepts. And, these courses are perceived as having less immediate value for the students. However, the students note that the team-working, communication, and other work practices skills gained via these courses are very valuable.

3. The growth of the program is exacerbating the diversity imbalance of the student population enrolled in the major. This is particularly the case for the reduced number of women and under-represented populations entering the major. The limited marketing and student services resources are unable to mount the level of effort it seems to take to reach out and successfully engage these populations.

Beyond these immediate issues, the program director, administrators, and members of the faculty report that they are struggling to find the time and resources to partner with other units on campus who desire an informatics-like course. They estimate that this interest across campus is

at the level of about four courses per year. Moreover, some programs are beginning to independently hire informatics-like faculty to staff up on their own informatics-like programs.

Furthermore, there seems to be a desire to expand the undergraduate course offerings to provide a service course in Cybersecurity to the University as a General Education course. Such a course would leverage the existing Center of Information Assurance and Cybersecurity (CIAC) and the school's desire to be an excellent citizen to the University.

4. Recommendations

4.1 Recommendations: School

4.1.1 Structure

Building on the findings from Section 2.1.1, above, we offer two recommendations.

1. Continue the School's current organizational structure as it has evolved to meet current needs stemming from the School's rapid growth, while maintaining flexibility to make appropriate changes as the School continues to move from it's start-up to sustainability phase.

2. Reduce service obligations of the faculty, perhaps by reducing the number of committees and/or the number of people assigned to each committee.

4.1.2 Recommendations: Staff

Building on the findings from Section 2.2.1 above, we offer five recommendations.

1. Current staff are outstanding and every effort should be made to retain them and to provide them with professional growth opportunities and training to advance their skills and job satisfaction.

2. Staff support should grow commensurate with program growth, and some backfilling is necessary, as current staff are stretched too thin to meet current needs. The addition of new additional staff is needed in order to prevent burnout of over-extended current staff. Current undergraduate support, particularly for advising, is outstanding, but beyond the long-term capacity of just one person, given the size of the program. Thus expanding support for undergraduate program (advising) is strongly recommended.

3. Appropriate space needs to be found for staff, particularly student services.

4. Provide space for lecturers commensurate with their status and teaching contributions and role in the school.

5. The IT group may need more help, as they are succeeding through leveraging personnel activities, e.g., by faculty who are spending time teaching as well as providing (part-time) IT

support. It is likely that at least one additional FTE is needed to sustain and grow online course activities.

4.1.3 Recommendations: Budget and Resources

Building on the findings from Section 2.1.2, above, here we offer three recommendations.

1. The *i*School needs to think carefully and a develop plans for when course and/or program demand flattens out or declines. This may be of particular import for the self-sustaining, fee-based programs.

2. Grow research funding. However, care needs to be taken that the resources to do this should not come at the expense of retaining faculty.

3. Continue to emphasize development and community partnerships, building upon the great start made in early efforts.

4.1.4 Recommendations: Governance

Building on the findings from Section 2.1.4 above, we offer three recommendations.

1. Preserve the spirit of the *i*School as a "school of one."

2. Consider delegating some decision-making to trusted bodies, e.g., perhaps elected faculty committees.

3. Put in place policies and procedures for some shared governance and deliberation.

4.1.5 Recommendation: Strategic planning

Building on the findings from Section 2.1.5 above, we offer one recommendation, which is to continue and enhance strategic planning under way around the move forward from start-up to longer term sustainability.

4.2 Recommendations: Faculty

4.2.1 Teaching, Including Workload and Pace

Building on the findings from Section 2.2.2 above, we offer four recommendations.

1. Ideally, the overall workload for faculty should not be based on individual negotiations. For example, it would be best to have uniform teaching expectations for faculty in similar ranks in order to create more equitable teaching assignments and loads. This recommendation is made in light of the fact that this is in many ways difficult to obtain, as exceptions often are made as part of faculty recruitment and retention efforts. It would still likely enhance equity and morale to create some common standards and expectations, even if exceptions are made.

2. The role and expectations of the elected faculty council needs to be more clearly defined.

3. If possible, efforts should be made to reduce and more equitably distribute course loads. This might be accomplished by considering weighting assignment by size, credits, enrollments and centrality to curriculum/research. A more equitable course distribution could have favorable effects by reducing course preps, particularly for untenured faculty, and lead to more balanced class size/numbers.

4. If distance instruction is appropriate for a particular course or program, the School needs to ensure that adequate support is provided before asking faculty to deliver the course or program online.

4.2.2 Help to Grow Research

Building on the findings from Section 2.2.3 above, we offer four recommendations.

1. Engage private industry funding, capitalizing on local opportunities.

2. Continue successful partnering with UW friends in pursuing funding opportunities, specifically the Biomedical and Health Informatics (BHI) Program in the Department of Medical Education and Biomedical Informatics, Computer Science and Engineering (CSE), Technical Communications (TC), and others.

3. Consider pursuing other new opportunities, such as GIS, Human Computer Interaction, Gaming/Interactive multi-media, and other areas.

4. There is a need to rapidly build out research infrastructure, some of which is generic to UW as a whole, with specific import for the *i*School). This includes expanding a) current staff support with expertise in grant writing and b) resources to support the time it takes to write grants. At a University level, streamlining the process and speed of both human subjects approval and intellectual property agreements would be of immense help. University efforts to ease the inter-unit collaborative research/grant process is also critical, as these relationships are central to *i*School scholarship.

4.3 Recommendations: Programs

4.3.1 The Student Experience

Building on the findings laid out in section 3.1, above, here we offer three recommendations regarding the student experience while part of the Information School's programmatic offerings. These recommendations reflect the school's attention to making students' experiences positive while part of the program, to offer high-quality educational programs, and to take seriously their role in supporting students' progress to completion of their chosen degree.

1. Continue to make explicit that the value of high-quality education and attention to each student's progress toward completion are central tenets of this school.

2. If group work is to be a central component of class work, no matter the degree program, then the concepts and practices of working in groups need additional formal support. For example, this could take the form of a formal orientation or workshop on group process, group work, and group management for MSIM and MLIS students. It may be worth considering some in-class time for group work in courses with high group-work demands. This provides students a chance to meet and plan without putting the burden solely on them to find convenient out-of-class times. This in-class group time also allows the instructor to meet with and observe the groups. The former may help students to speed up their collective learning; the latter may help the instructor to intercede in or guide poor-performing groups. A third possibility is to consider adding credit to some group-work intensive courses to provide the 'group lab time.' Thus a three-credit group-work-intensive course might be turned into a four-credit course to provide the extra time for group work and for doing some of this work during class time. In the case of dMLIS students, some guidance should be provided in performing group work as members of virtual teams.

3. The school's faculty, staff, students and administrators should continue to explore a variety of mechanisms to bring students together. This academic social time will likely foster more interactions across programs and particularly foster interactions within programs (for instance, between the day and executive students of the MSIM and between the distance and residential MLIS students).

4.3.2 Ph.D. Program

Building on the findings from Section 3.2, above, here we offer seven recommendations, noting that these reflect evolutionary adjustments. Our assessment is that the cumulative effect of these seven recommendations will be substantial and positive improvement to the program's success.

1. Maintain the current size of the Ph.D. program (of four-to-five new admits per year). Any growth (to perhaps six-to-eight (+) admits per year) must follow from increased funding via research appointments, teaching assistantships or fellowship support.

2. Put in place a process that increases the transparency of teaching and research support, so that faculty and students are aware of the opportunities and arrangements.

3. Continue to fund site-visits for Ph.D. recruiting. Having potential Ph.D. students visit the school and university appears to be a contributing factor to high yield rates and high-quality students.

4. Resolve any remaining gaps in communication among the Ph.D. program committee and Ph.D. advisors relative to communicating the status and progress of students through the program. The policy in place regarding student progress through the Ph.D. program is sound; the communication gaps among the Ph.D. program committee and Ph.D. student advisors needs to be resolved so that students (and advisors) are not surprised. This is likely to occur naturally as this newly implemented process becomes more routine, expected, and transparent.

5. The Ph.D. program committee, in consultation with the faculty, are encouraged to develop and share several nominal plans ('roadmaps') regarding different and viable approaches to making successful progress through the Ph.D. program. This will be helpful in reaffirming the espoused desire to recognize the value of allowing different disciplinary paths and time-frames through the Ph.D program.

6. Put in place some form of seminar or series of workshops early in the Ph.D. student's program experience to help the students make better use of their practicum. This would provide more guidance on the value and best uses of these experiences to benefit both students and faculty. It may be useful to delay practicum experiences until the third quarter of the student's first year to provide time to develop such guidance and better leverage these experiences.

7. Take a leadership position on how to help PhD students identify and secure their GSR. This appears to be a university-wide issue reflecting changes in policy. Given the large number of inter-disciplinary projects in which Ph.D. students at the Information School engage, a more robust mechanism to support students in seeking their GSR is likely to be very valuable.

4.3.3 MLIS, dMLIS, and MLIS in Law Librarianship

Building on the findings from Section 3.3, above, here we offer eight recommendations, noting that these reflect evolutionary adjustments. Our assessment is that the cumulative effect of these eight recommendations will be substantial and help ensure these three programs' continued success. Underlying some of these recommendations is the observation that while one can think of the dMLIS as simply a different enrollment option or "flavor" of the MLIS, in fact much attention needs to be paid to ensuring the quality of the experience for these students.

1. Ensure adequate staff support for students and faculty, especially in the dMLIS option. Enrollment should not grow beyond current levels without a careful assessment of the resources needed to sustain a quality program. The planned increase in % time for the distance education coordinator should be implemented as soon as possible. Feedback from faculty and students participating in the dMLIS option should be gathered on a regular basis to be sure that instructional technology, information technology, and advising support is adequate. Certain practices already in place (e.g., having information technology staff involved in teaching LIS 541 Internet Technologies and Applications to the distance students to enhance their ability to be effective online students) are an efficient use of available resources to enhance the experience of dMLIS students. The structure and content of residencies should also be examined to determine how they can support not only the goals of specific courses, but also professional development opportunities for students and opportunities for them to engage in the life of the school.

2. Examine the process of assigning MLIS students to faculty advisors and ensure that students are aware of the options open to them for changing to a faculty advisor better matched to their evolving career goals as they proceed through their program of study.

3. Ongoing review of courses in the MLIS curriculum and the MLIS curriculum as a whole should address emerging roles in libraries that graduates seek to fill and how new knowledge and

skills can be integrated into the curriculum. One possibility is opening up selected day-student MSIM courses as electives to interested MLIS students rather than duplicating content in courses specifically designed for MLIS students. Efforts under way to track placements of graduates through exit surveys and other means should also provide valuable data to inform further development of the curriculum.

4. With nearly four years of experience delivering courses online, faculty and staff could benefit from a review of how well the pedagogical model is working. In particular, questions such as the following could be considered. Is asynchronous delivery using the Microsoft Producer tool effective in presenting course content? What types of assignments work well online? What are the criteria for deciding whether a course should have a required residency? To the extent that on-campus students are enrolling in dMLIS courses, how can they best be prepared to function effectively in this different mode of learning?

5. Given the value placed by students on directed fieldwork, information about available opportunities should be made readily available to students. Advisors may need to provide special assistance to dMLIS students seeking placements in locations where no prior placements have been arranged.

6. Work to ensure that faculty advising students on preparation of their portfolios and evaluating the contents of portfolios have a shared understanding of what qualifies as evidence in each area and the relationship of the portfolio to work completed toward the degree. A 63 quarter course credit requirement already represents a substantial investment of time in earning the degree. If the portfolio is to be in excess of that, then consideration should be given to having projects and experiences completed as part of coursework that could fulfill the goals of portfolio experiences.

7. Because lecturers teach a large number of MLIS courses, they should be given ongoing support for professional development.

8. The MLIS admissions process should involve Penny Hazelton to ensure that the target number of students for the MLIS in Law Librarianship program is achieved each year. More marketing of the program can ensure an adequate pool of prospective students to select from and enhance the visibility of the *i*School's leadership position in education for law librarianship. Funding for students enrolled in the law librarianship program could also be one focus for the *i*School's development efforts.

4.3.4 MS in Information Management

Building on the findings from Section 3.4, above, here we offer 3 recommendations, noting that these reflect evolutionary adjustments. Our assessment is that the cumulative effect of these 3 recommendations will be substantial and positive improvement to the program's success. Underlying some of these recommendations is the observation that while one can think of the executive and day MSIM programs as simply different enrollment options, the difference in student bodies will likely require considerable effort to ensure that the day program achieves the success that the executive program has demonstrated.

1. The introduction of the Day MSIM option will place greater demands on capstone supervision, new demands for internship placement, and new challenges to the curriculum in accommodating students who are likely to lack the technology and management foundations that the Executive MSIM students bring to their studies. It is unlikely that Mike Crandall will be able to supervise all capstones, so some additional qualified faculty need to be allocated to that role. The staffing levels required to support internship placement and oversight need to be monitored. While the curriculum for the Day MSIM program has already been expanded beyond the Executive MSIM to provide selected "pre-core" courses, the need for additional modifications should be monitored as experience is gained.

2. The appropriate balance between required and elective courses in both the Executive and Day MSIM programs should continue to be monitored based on feedback from both students and employers. There is a tradeoff between preserving a cohort and allowing some individualization of curriculum to accommodate student background and career goals. Another area to monitor as the Day MSIM program matures will be the relationship between this degree program and both the BS in Informatics and the PhD in Information Science.

3. To ensure the continuing viability of the Executive MSIM, ongoing recruitment efforts are needed. Involvement of the Advisory Board and program graduates in that effort may be helpful. Support for post-graduation placement of Day MSIM students will also need to be developed, as internships will not necessarily lead to permanent jobs and graduates may seek placements outside the Seattle area.

4.3.5 BS in Informatics

Building on the findings from Section 3.5, above, here we offer six recommendations. Four of these (#s 1, 2, 3 and 5) reflect appropriate evolutionary adjustments. Two recommendations (#s 4 and 6) reflect needs central to – or impinging directly on – the viability of the program based on the resources currently available to the school. Our assessment is that the cumulative effect of these six recommendations will be substantial and a positive improvement to the program's continued success. We further note that recommendations #4 and 6 are critical to the vitality and quality of this program.

1. Continue to focus on improving quality of admits and not growing the number. This demands additional resources be put into marketing and recruiting.

2. In pursuit of recommendation #1, continue to expand the resources engaged in redressing diversity imbalance (e.g. under-representation of women and other populations). This is a significant problem across many IT-oriented undergraduate programs, and only significant attention to thoughtful marketing practices, focused (and often 'high-touch') recruiting activities will lead to significant results.

3. Continue providing tutoring to redress the differential levels of preparation regarding key technological skills for incoming students. This is particularly important for classes in the first part of the junior year and for many of the students from under-represented populations. Doing this also reaffirms the "graduate all" philosophy that underlies this program.

4. Increase staff resources for student advising and marketing the program. This is important to meet the recommendations laid out above. Moreover, the current staff is over-committed and the successful operations of the program cannot continue to be based on the idiosyncratic hyper-performances of the exemplary staff. As additional resources are provided, there should be attention from administration to develop career path opportunities to support staff professional growth and support staff retention.

5. Improve coordination of material across the sequence of "people" courses to improve relevance, coherence, and coverage, while removing or limiting repetition of topics and material. This is an important evolutionary step and appears to require more communication and coordination among the faculty teaching in this area.

6. Be prudent regarding expanding undergraduate offerings to support both other students and any general education courses. This should not be considered until after extensive analysis regarding potential impacts to the school, demands from the university, and resource needs. If there is a multilateral decision to proceed on one or both of these expansion activities, the expansion should come after the resources have been provided.

Appendix A

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
The Graduate School
Information School Review Site Visit
February 27 – February 28, 2006

Sunday, February 26

5:30 pm Review Committee Dinner & Executive Session
Ponti Seafood Grill
3014 3rd Ave N
206-284-3000

Monday, February 27
Mary Gates Hall Conference Room 420

8:30-9:30   **Dean and Associate Deans**
                       Harry Bruce, Dean
                       Mary Clark, Assistant Dean for Planning and Administration
                       Joseph Janes, Associate Dean for Academics
                       Robert Mason, Associate Dean for Research

9:30-10:15   **Program Chairs**
                       Mike Crandall, Master of Information Management Program Chair
                       Joe Janes (for Karen Fisher, Master of Library and Information Science
                       Program Chair)
                       David McDonald, B.S. in Informatics Program Chair
                       Wanda Pratt, PhD in Information Science Program Chair

10:15-10:30   **Break**

10:30-11:20   **Program Staff**
                       Mariko Navin, Director of Undergraduate Services
                       DJ Miller, Director of Graduate Services
                       Marie Potter, Master of Library and Information Science Advisor
                       Whitney Bennett, Master of Information Management Advisor
                       Alisha LaPlante, Human Resources Manager
                       Cris Mesling, Academics Administrator
                       Tiffany Vajda, Director of Development
                       Brandy Carlyle, Finance

11:30-12:30   **Lunch with Informatics Undergraduate Students (Pizza)**

12:30-1:20   **Master of Information Management Students**

1:20-2:15   **Elected Faculty Council**
Jens-Erik Mai, Assistant Professor, Chair EFC
Allyson Carlyle, Associate Professor
David Hendry, Assistant Professor

Not Attending:
Stuart Sutton, Associate Professor (on UWT site visit)

2:15-2:30   **Break**

2:30-3:30   **Assistant Professors**
Hala Annabi
Karine Barzilai-Nahon
Kevin Desouza
David Hendry
Jeff Kim
Jens-Erik Mai
Betty Marcoux
David McDonald
Matt Saxton
Jochen Scholl
Hazel Taylor

Not attending:
Adam Moore (on leave, family)

3:30-4:30   **Associate Professors**
Cheryl Metoyer
Terry Brooks
Allyson Carlyle
Efthi Efthimiadis
Joe Janes
William Jones
Peter Kahn

Not attending:
Stuart Sutton
Karen Fisher
Wanda Pratt

4:30-5:30   **Lecturers and Senior Lecturers**
Cecelia Buchanan
Mike Crandall
Barbara Endicott-Popovsky
Lorraine Bruce
Lisa Fusco
Trent Hill
Bob Larson
Nancy Gershenfeld

6:30   **Review Committee Dinner & Executive Session**
Nell's Restaurant
6804 E Green Lake N
206-524-4044

Tuesday, February 28:
Mary Gates Hall Conference Room 420

8:00-8:30   **Law Librarianship Program**
Penny Hazelton, Adjunct Professor, Law Librarianship Program
Mary Hotchkiss, Adjunct Senior Lecturer, Law Librarianship Program

8:30-9:30   **Professors**
Raya Fidel
Batya Friedman
Bob Mason
Mike Eisenberg
Sherrilynne Fuller

Not Attending:
David Levy

9:30-10:00   **IT Staff & Distance Education Coordinator**
Scott Barker, Director of Information Technology
Joshua Ayson, User Services Administrator
Scott Schramke, Senior Computer Specialist
Grace Whitteaker, Distance Education Coordinator

10:00--10:30   **Break**

10:30-11:30   **Master of Library and Information Science Students (Pizza)**

11:30-12:30   **PhD in Information Science Students**

12:30-1:00   **Research Team**
Alpha Anderson Delap, Research Administrator
Bob Mason, Associate Dean for Research

1:00-3:00   **Review Committee Executive Session**

3:00-4:00   **Exit Interview**
iSchool Program Chairs and Deans
Administrative Faculty (Graduate School Deans, Undergraduate Dean, et al.)
Office of the Provost , Ana Mari Cauce, Executive Vice Provost,
Office of Undergraduate Education, Janice DeCosmo, Acting Associate Dean
Graduate School, Melissa Austin, Associate Dean for Academic Programs
Graduate School, Augustine McCaffery, Senior Academic Program Specialist

4:00-5:00   **Exit Interview**
iSchool Deans
Administrative Faculty