Report of the Information School Program Review Committee
University of Washington
October 26-27, 2015

Review Committee

Ann Bostrom, Weyerhaeuser Endowed Professor in Environmental Policy, Daniel J. Evans
      School of Public Policy & Governance (Chair)
Randall J. LeVeque, Professor, Department of Applied Mathematics
William Aspray, Bill and Lewis Suit Professor of Information Technologies, School of
      Information, University of Texas at Austin
Gary Olson, Bren Professor of Information & Computer Sciences, Department of Informatics,
      School of Information and Computer Sciences, University of California, Irvine

Executive Summary

1. The committee recommends the continuation of all degree programs of the Information School with review in 10 years. These include the Bachelor of Science (B.S.) in Informatics, the Master of Library and Information Science (MLIS), the Master of Science in Information Management (MSIM), the Master of Science in Information Science (MSIS), and the Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) in Information Science.
2. We congratulate the iSchool for its continued growth and peer recognition, reflected in enrollments and graduates of its programs, the ranking of its MLIS degree as #3 in the nation by US News & World Report and the law librarianship specialty within that degree as #1 in the nation, and the continuous accreditation of the MLIS by the American Library Association since 1926.
3. We commend the iSchool for demonstrating commitment to shared governance, for its continuing successes in distance education and self-sustaining programs, and for its use of strategic planning, new hires, strategic staffing and faculty development to continue strengthening teaching and research.
4. The iSchool has effectively maintained and strengthened its "School of One" philosophy, values and culture, the development of which was noted in the prior program review. This success stems from widespread commitment, but also from the diligence and integrity of key leaders in the School, including Dean Harry Bruce and Associate Dean for Academics Matthew Saxton, but also many other faculty and staff leaders. Space issues have made this an increasing challenge. Although the iSchool has continued to rise to this challenge, the space issues have worsened as programs have grown. The committee highlights this as an area in which the University may be able to work effectively with the School to enable it to continue to flourish.
5. The committee identified a small number of other issues, which are discussed in the Findings and summarized in the Recommendations Section.

1. Summary of the Process

In an email dated April 7, 2015 David Canfield-Budde, Director of Academic Affairs and Interdisciplinary Programs at the Graduate School of the University of Washington (UW), confirmed the composition of this Review Committee for the 2015 Information School program review. On May 4th, the Graduate School provided access to the draft charge and background materials for the program review, including copies of the prior program review in 2005-6. The Graduate School convened a charge meeting, which took place May 11th 1-2pm in room 310 of Loew Hall. External members of the Review Committee participated by teleconference. In a letter with the same date, Vice Provost and Graduate School Dean David Eaton and Graduate School Associate Dean for Academic Affairs Rebecca Aanerud thanked the Review Committee members for agreeing to participate in the review of the Information School at the UW, and charged the Committee to assess the quality of the undergraduate and graduate degree programs in the school, and to provide its faculty with constructive suggestions for strengthening those programs. The charge included the following programs: Bachelor of Science (B.S.) in Informatics, the Master of Library and Information Science (MLIS), the Master of Science in Information Management (MSIM), the Master of Science in Information Science (MSIS), and the Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) in Information Science. The review was conducted in accordance with state legislative mandate and under direction of the Office of Academic Affairs and Planning in the Graduate School. It was conducted in coordination with the Office of Undergraduate Academic Affairs, Information School Dean's Office, and the Office of the Provost.

On October 5, 2015, the Graduate School provided the Review Committee with access to a draft of the agenda for the site visit October 26-27, 2015, and the self-study from the Information School. The site visit took place October 26-27, 2015, and included pre-arranged meetings with small groups of iSchool faculty, students and staff, followed by an informal lunch conversation with the Dean and the pre-arranged exit interview meeting, as specified in the agenda (Appendix A).

The committee appreciates the insightful and enthusiastic comments offered by all of the participants in the interviews, and the attentiveness and effectiveness of Associate Dean for Academics Matt Saxton, who with the assistance of his colleagues and staff prepared the iSchool self-study, provided extensive supplemental information, and responded to the committee's questions with unflagging good cheer.

2. Findings

Following brief discussion of general school issues (General Part A issues), the Committee's remarks focus on the self-study questions identified by the iSchool.

2.1 General Part A issues

Leadership at the iSchool is shared by Dean Harry Bruce (who became Dean in 2006), the Elected Faculty Council (EFC) and the Leadership Cabinet. The EFC is represented on the Leadership Cabinet through its chair. The Leadership Cabinet includes both staff and faculty leaders from across the iSchool, and conducts activities such as budget review. The Dean's belief in shared governance is manifest in the roles the Leadership Cabinet and EFC play in the iSchool, but also in the considerable amount of operational responsibility assumed by the Associate Dean for Academics, Matthew Saxton.

Currently there is only one full professor on the Elected Faculty Council, chair-elect Batya Friedman. Further, Program leadership includes two senior lecturers (Informatics and MSIM), one Assistant Professor (MLIS), and one Associate Professor (PhD Program). While this speaks well of the integration of and respect for senior lecturers in the School, and the development and active involvement of junior faculty, the committee wondered about the absence of full professors in leadership roles. An exception to this is Professor Carole Palmer, who moved to the UW recently and assumed the position of Associate Dean for Research in July, 2015. She is ably assisted by Research Development Manager Courtney, who has been in her position three years. Together they are strategizing to engage more students in research, to create a culture supportive of postdocs, to help faculty find research funding and better understand both their research impact and available research opportunities, and more generally to increase research administration transparency, for example by developing financial dashboards for faculty and indicators of research impacts.

The need for additional administrative transparency to support faculty development became somewhat apparent in the Committee's meetings with junior faculty. There is now a large contingent of excellent new faculty hires in the iSchool, coming from diverse fields. In general there is a very positive and supportive atmosphere where junior faculty work well together and don't feel they are competing for tenure. While different startup packages are inevitable, finding more ways to ensure they all feel equally valued could help. Not all faculty were sure support what they could request, or what the expectations are for promotion, for example with regard to grants. While senior faculty are supportive and open to new ways of evaluating junior faculty coming from diverse fields, here there may be a need for standardizing some procedures, and for more mentoring. Lecturers and Senior Lecturers are often mentors, but can't participate directly in faculty review discussions that are restricted to faculty of higher rank.

The review committee witnessed a strong sense of community in the meetings, strong programs, very strong staff support and financial structure, positive financial outlook--attributable in part to the School's fee-based Masters programs, flourishing research endeavors, and excellent recent hires. In general the iSchool seems healthy. While there is some tension between research and professional program goals, that seems normal and the School is working to address them. We believe that there is even more that could be done for these two to reinforce each other.

In autumn 2014 the iSchool conducted strategic planning, culminating in a vision for the iSchool in 2018 (dated August 2015). The plan reinforces the values and mission of the iSchool, including being inspired by information, seeing "a world where more effective use of information helps everyone discover, learn, innovate, solve problems, have fun and make a better world" and the mission of preparing information leaders and "making information work." It also places new emphasis on diversity and inclusion, trust, transparency and mutual respect. Four focal themes for iSchool development are articulated in the plan: the future of libraries, data for social good, Native North American Indigenous Knowledge (developing and implementing an information science program that studies and celebrates the intersection of information, technology, and Native communities), and human-computer interaction for the social good. The plan describes nine strategic initiatives to support these four areas of strategic visibility. Among other elements, these initiatives include efforts to hire new faculty, to better support and develop current faculty, to expand research productivity and impact (partly through improved administrative systems), to create a new undergraduate information sciences minor, to grow the MSIM program, to revitalize the MLIS program, to better support staff, and to grow the iAffiliates program (corporate iSchool partners).

The committee commends the iSchool for its continued use of strategic planning. The proposed initiatives appear consistent with the challenges and opportunities observed during the review, as detailed in the remainder of the report, although the rationale for the four resulting themes was not entirely clear to the review committee. The strategic plan does suggests that a few of the opportunities that became apparent during the review should be prioritized by the iSchool, including research and program development efforts already underway under the leadership of the new Associate Dean for Research (Palmer) and the new iAffiliates Director (McGann), as well as: (a) addressing diversity more effectively and consistently in the core MLIS curriculum, (b) tackling the issues identified below regarding the disparate experiences of online and residential MLIS students, and (c) taking various factors into account when considering possible gains from growing programs (e.g., the information sciences minor or the MSIM mid-career program). These factors include: space constraints, appreciation of smaller core courses as a competitive advantage of the iSchool Masters programs over peer programs elsewhere, and students' desire for more instructional consistency and complementarity (i.e., less overlap) in core classes.

2.2 Space

Space is clearly one of the most critical matters facing the School. The issue of space, both amount, relationships, and kind, came up in every meeting we had. There is simply not adequate space to pursue the School's goals, especially in view of rising enrollments and growing external funding. This adversely affects the School in many ways. The ability to recruit the very best graduate students is hampered. Lots of lecturers, who are helping meet the demands of growing enrollments, do not have offices, which damages both instructor and student experiences. Opportunities for new programs with regional corporate sponsors are missed.

The space issues are not solely about amount. Current space is scattered, hindering interactions among students and faculty, and making it hard to carry out integrated programs. Many classrooms do not have moveable chairs, hampering the new styles of highly interactive instruction, such as classes with group projects. Classrooms lack good broadcast capabilities; the deficiencies impede online interactions and attempts to create engaging distance learning opportunities.

There were some bright spots. We saw some examples of new or renewed spaces that had been well designed to allow for productive interactions among people working on projects (e.g., in Mary Gates Hall). Clearly members of the School have a good sense of how to design excellent spaces, and need to be consulted as space needs are accommodated. Flexibility is the key to space needs in the 21st century.

2.3 Engaging students in research

Undergraduate students who spoke with the review committee noted that faculty welcome student interest in research. At the undergraduate level, the iSchool had historically been well represented in the UW undergraduate research symposium, as was noted in the prior program review. The iSchool is now working to bring that high level of visibility and representation back, as discussed in more detail below. Masters students also expressed interest in being more involved in research, especially in data science.

Interest and efforts to include students in research were evident for all iSchool programs, and in many of the review meetings. Particularly noteworthy and commendable are the new efforts highlighted by the Associate Dean for Research (Carole Palmer), which target new mechanisms to bring more students into research. Creating directed research groups (for course credit) as a way of involving Masters students in research seems very promising; the committee supports and encourages this development, recognizing that the costs of involving fee-based students in research may otherwise exceed the research budgets available to many faculty. While the iSchool's creative use of space for research labs is promoting research in some areas, space constraints create numerous obstacles to engaging more students in research, as noted elsewhere in this report.

2.4 Online learning

The iSchool has an online component to the MLIS Program, with around 200 students enrolled. The faculty has clearly put considerable effort into thinking about how best to support these students, and has been pursuing some innovative approaches. Some classes are taught synchronously, with online students watching the lectures in real-time and able to ask questions. The school is also experimenting with hybrid courses containing both on-campus and online students, in which the students are actively working in groups during the class time and the online students participate in these groups. The faculty have been experimenting with Kubi

telepresence robots that hold an iPad that can be controlled remotely as a way for faculty to participate in meetings remotely. Based on the success of this, they have recently purchased more Kubis to experiment with in hybrid classes.

The iSchool recently appointed a full-time Online Learning Coordinator who holds workshops and encourages faculty to share experiences and best practices, and who works individually with faculty. They are also working toward ensuring that faculty approaches to online courses are more consistent, and acknowledge that not all faculty have uniformly high skill at using these tools. This is undoubtedly a problem in most departments with online programs, and the iSchool is probably ahead of the curve in terms of willingness of faculty to adopt new technology and availability of resources to assist.

2.5 Diversity

We heard many good things about diversity during our visit. The School is one of the few academic units at the UW - perhaps the only academic unit - to have its own diversity officer. The comments made to us by the diversity officer suggest that she has an active program and is getting students, faculty, and staff actively engaged in diversity efforts. The associate dean has shown a strong commitment to diversity, not only supporting activities within the school but also serving on the advisory body for some of the campus-wide diversity efforts. With the presence of the School in Mary Gates Hall, there is ample opportunity to take advantage of campus-wide diversity activities, given the presence there of the accessibility center, the LSAMP program, and the administrative office for diversity affairs; and there does seem to be healthy interaction with these offices.

There is substantial evidence from across the nation that when units hire dedicated staff members to take care of diversity work, there is sometimes a feeling among faculty members and other senior administrators that they can relax their own personal efforts and leave the diversity work to the dedicated staff. However, this national evidence shows that when diversity work is left in the hands of the dedicated staff, diversity efforts suffer. So it is important that there continue to be active support and engagement for diversity among both administration and faculty. This requires continued vigilance.

There are multiple components to diversifying a school. One is to diversify the various groups of people who participating in the school, such as students, staff, faculty, administrators, and advisory committees. We noticed two student populations that are not particularly diverse. The MLIS students are 80% female. Librarianship is a significantly gendered profession, and it is not uncommon for LIS school student populations around the country to be heavily female. However, in those schools that have truly broadened their interests to include a wider range of information topics while still embracing library studies, there is evidence of more gender balanced student populations. In the MSIM program, there is a heavy participation of foreign students (more than 70%), especially students from India. Regional diversity in this student population would be a good goal from a diversity perspective. From a gender perspective, the doctoral program and faculty seem to be well balanced. We also commend the school for its sensitivity to and support of LGBT participation in the school.

Another component of the diversity of a school is the courses offered and material taught and read in those courses. We were pleased to see the existence of courses offered on such topics as gender, information, and technology. However, we felt more could be done to increase the amount of material that is consonant with diversity in other courses, e.g. readings by a diverse group of authors and examples and topics that would appeal to a wide range of students. We heard mixed results about these issues. In particular, we were concerned by student reports that several faculty members had either resisted diversifying the content of their courses in this way, or threw the responsibility back to students who asked for these changes. It is the responsibility of every teacher in the school, especially but not only in the core courses, to address diversity in suitable ways in their course offerings.

2.6 Growth of the undergraduate program

The Informatics major is very healthy and has grown dramatically in the past few years as it has become more widely known on campus. In the early years of the program many students selected this major as a second choice if they could not get into highly competitive programs such as CSE. Currently this degree appears to be the first choice for many students (perhaps 70%), including many who came to the UW thinking they wanted to do computer science or engineering and then learned about the Informatics degree. The fact that it is more focused on the human dimension of information and usability aspects of tool building is cited as a reason for feeling this is the right degree choice for many students.

Last year the entering cohort was 156 students and this year it rose to 210. Future growth of the Informatics degree is an area of concern to the school and the Review Committee agrees that this must be carefully considered. The Program Committee stated a desire to better meet the demand in order to better serve both the UW student community and local industry. Fully 90% of Informatics students are from Washington and many want to stay in this area. Currently many highly qualified students are denied admission due to the program cap. Growth of the program is largely limited by teaching capacity and classroom availability, which is already a severe problem. Growing the faculty further to support a larger Informatics program would have other repercussions, such as the need for more PhD students to act as TAs and to support the research programs of additional faculty.

The faculty are considering adding an Informatics minor. There is some internal debate about how much impact this would have on the program due to uncertainty about the potential number of students interested. The Review Committee believes that this would potentially be very popular and would be beneficial to students in many other majors, and so would well serve the UW community. But as a result, it could additionally stress the teaching resources. It might be wise to consider a competitive minor with a limit on the number of students so that growth can be controlled if necessary.

Regarding classroom availability, the iSchool has tried to use all available hours to expand their options, and students remarked (unfavorably) on the high percentage of 8:30 am courses in this

major compared to other programs. There is a lack of suitable classrooms on campus. This is true for many departments but in particular for many of the Informatics classes where group work requires movable seats.

Use of technology in the classroom is quite pervasive and students report that in general the faculty are very proficient at using it well.

The Informatics major attracts many women (40% in most recent entering class), which is much higher than most computer science or engineering majors, for example.

Students do a capstone project. At one time many of these led to posters in the annual UW Undergraduate Research Symposium, but in recent years the focus of capstone projects has shifted much more toward product development and away from research. There is a desire to involve more undergraduates in research and a strategy this year to encourage more participation in the Symposium. Among students there seems to be particular interest in getting involved in data science research.

Some concern was raised by students about the core curriculum. While generally considered valuable, there are some topics that appear in several different courses. Some examples mentioned: "project scope" is discussed repeatedly; the classes 330 and 360 were thought to contain similar material with slightly different emphasis; parts of 450 and 481 seemed redundant after taking 380. The major has 90 credits of requirements, the maximum allowed by UW, so students find it frustrating if some of the required courses are repetitive and reduce their ability to take further electives at a higher level. There may be opportunities to broaden the range of topics students are exposed to by tightening up some of the overlap in the core.

The faculty have been reconsidering what the essential topics are that define Informatics in relation to designing a minor, and this might be a good time to also reconsider the core of the Informatics major as well.

Some interesting electives appear to be available only at the Bothell or Tacoma campuses. For example, game design with an HCI emphasis was mentioned, and students interested in cybersecurity felt that only one of the classes available on the Seattle campus has a technical focus, the others being more policy oriented.

There appears to be a strong student community with various student groups and activities. Many of the Informatics students we talked with are involved in the leadership of these groups and they did mention that perhaps 30% of students don't get involved whatever they do to try to attract them, and in particular international students are less engaged, but if 70% are involved that is very positive.

The students feel like there is a strong support structure that is designed to help them succeed, from both faculty and staff. They do not feel that there are courses designed to weed them out, and this is reflected by the low attrition rate (an estimated 96% graduate).

It appears that the vast majority of Informatics students find paid summer internships and an estimated 50% of these lead to job offers. Students must find these on their own, but report that the career advisors and information provided by the department are very helpful and that many internships are lined up through the annual career fair and information sessions provided by companies throughout the year. Program alumni, particularly in local industry, are good connections. One concern raised was that the industries typically well represented do not fully reflect the diversity of student interests in the program and it is harder for students to find internships that have a focus on gaming, art, or music, for example.

Placement of students after graduation is very good -- 90% are placed within 3 months, typically in highly paid jobs ($50-100K, some higher), in a variety of industries. Few Informatics students go directly to graduate school, although many (estimated at 30%) plan to work for a few years, taking advantage of the good job market, and then return to school for a Masters degree later, perhaps paid for by their employer.

2.7 Professional Graduation education

Master of Science in Information Management (MSIM)

The MSIM degree comes in two forms: a full-time day program and a mid-career program for part-time students, taught primarily in evenings and weekends. Overall, both appear to be highly successful, though each has some issues that will require attention. We discuss each in turn.

Day program. This appears to be a very strong program that has grown rapidly, has selective admission, is highly international, has very strong job placement, and has high student satisfaction. Students especially liked the diversity of the program. This said, we were concerned about the very high reliance on international students, since it seems like a change in international relations or competing alternatives could seriously affect enrollments in this program. We also wondered whether highly qualified international students were driving away very qualified regional students. This could be a serious long-term problem for the program.

We heard reports that much attention has been given to improving the writing skills of international students, and this has met with considerable success. While the program has data on the immediate placements of graduates, they need to track the longer term placements as a way of shaping the nature of recruiting as well as the structuring of the curriculum. We were pleased to hear that a staff person is being hired to track alums, an important need for all of the programs, but especially this one.

Mid-career program. This program caters primarily to relatively local industries, non-profits, and government organizations. It is a highly creative concept, and as with the day program, appears to be quite successful. It employs a mix of online and in-person options, giving the part-time students lots of flexibility in meeting the requirements. We applaud the efforts to build even

stronger ties with local organizations and to shape the offerings to meet the needs, expectations and desires of such students. More work needs to be done on recruiting students to this program. We heard some creative ideas about linking this to the iAffiliates program in order to sponsor groups of students to participate. This seems like a good idea from several different perspectives.

There was some discussion of an online option for the mid-career MSIM program. These students are typically working full time and taking classes on campus, concentrated on Thursday and Friday evenings and Saturdays. An asynchronous online option for at least some of their classes might make it much easier for these students to fit the lectures into their work and home lives, and help this program grow and serve more professionals.

Master of Library and Information Science (MLIS)

The MLIS is the traditional degree of this School from long before it became the current School of Information. It caters to those seeking employment in the library field, though this is changing even at the national level, and is an issue the School needs to work more on. The focus of this program seems to be quite traditional library education, and faculty hires have tended to fit this mold. Some steps have been taken to make the courses more general, but we think the program could benefit a lot by giving more attention to the I (information) and less to the L (Library). We also encourage the School to hire faculty who would teach in this program who have broader interests that would allow them more readily to teach in other programs in the School. This is the kind of thing that is happening more broadly at the national level. Here too the School could benefit from better tracing of the career paths of alums and using this to guide the evolution of the program. The self-study does contain some strategic plans for this program that we feel will address some of these concerns.

We talked with a couple MLIS students who mentioned that the online students feel relatively isolated. This may be impossible to avoid with this sort of program, but perhaps ways could be found to bring them more into the community. One idea mentioned was to have more times during the program when online students are encouraged to spend a few days at UW. This may be logistically challenging with such a large online program, however.

Of all the students we met with, the MLIS ones were the most frustrated. There was tension between the residential and online students in this program, who are often taking the same classes offered at the same time. It would behoove the faculty and leadership of the School to pay attention to the concerns these students have.

2.8 PhD Program

The PhD program is generally healthy as it currently stands. The students seem happy with what they are being offered. We were particularly pleased with what seemed to be the high quality of recent hires - both Carol Palmer at the senior level and the large group of recent junior

hires. Both initial and continuing financial packages are healthy and competitive: Students are currently being supported as long as they are in good standing, and this is likely to continue to be possible so long as undergraduate enrollments (and therefore the need for teaching assistants) remain strong.

The strategic planning document discusses plans to increase the number of doctoral students, at least in part driven by the fact that the growing number of faculty members want to have adequate numbers of students working with them. While it may be appropriate to carry out these growth plans, there are at least two issues that need to be taken into serious consideration. One is the increased space demand caused by bringing in more doctoral students. The students need to have their own space and it needs to be proximate to the faculty and other graduate students. The other is placement. There seems to be a mixed experience at the moment, with some other US information schools having no difficulty in placing their doctorates and others experiencing some difficulty in doing so. Doctoral students graduating from the iSchool in 2014 were placed in a wide variety of positions, from social studies teaching in the Mount Vernon School district, to Lecturer positions at the UW in Seattle and Tacoma, postdoctoral research at University of North Carolina, and placements at Penn State, Syracuse, and Google Research. Perhaps slow growth in the numbers of doctoral admissions and close continued monitoring of the initial and continuing employment of your doctoral alumni would be prudent.

We heard several complaints from the students about the movement to a laboratory model in the assignment of space. These complaints ranged from students having fewer opportunities for easy interaction with a wide range of their peers (who might represent many different fields and hence enhance the interdisciplinary nature of their education), to concerns about how to handle lab assignments when a student has two advisors from the School who happen to be associated with different laboratories, to how well the "miscellaneous laboratory" works and what it should be called.

There was some disagreement among the faculty about the appropriateness of the current exam structure. One idea that has both supporters and detractors involves consolidating two of the exams into one. One factor that the committee believes should be considered is how the exam structure affects length to advancement and completion of the doctoral degree in a time when there is a national push to reduce the time of doctoral completion. An idea generated by our committee is to consider establishing a new qualifying exam at the end of the first year, which covers the material from the required core courses. This is a common practice in many academic disciplines on the University of Washington campus and elsewhere. It has not been so common in information schools because the nature of the content and especially the core content of information studies has been regarded as inchoate; so department instead write customized exams for students. However, as the field matures and the School has more experience with its core courses, it may be possible to introduce a standardized qualifying exam based upon the core courses. This may be one way to ensure that students advance promptly in their degree programs.

Given the large number of assistant professors, the School may wish to pay close attention to the quality of the advising these junior faculty members are providing to students at all levels, but especially at the doctoral level. There are a number of ways to address this issue,

such as dedicated staff for advising or advisor training for the faculty; and we are not advocating any particular solution, simply attention to the issue.

3. Recommendations

The Committee supports and encourages efforts described above that are already underway, including, for example:
- to engage more undergraduate and masters students in research,
- to enrich online students' learning experiences and integrate them better into the iSchool community,
- to grow the iAffiliates program in both numbers and modes of involvement with iSchool, including with the mid-career MSIM program,
- to find ways of improving doctoral student interactions across laboratories and research areas, and
- to increase the transparency of research administration, in order to increase research productivity and impact, and better support junior faculty.

It is at the intersections of the self-study questions identified by the iSchool that the Committee sees the greatest opportunities for improving programs and advancing the vision and mission of the School.
- Continue working with the University administration to try to improve the space issues that challenge the iSchool on multiple fronts.
- Continue to create synergies and address the tensions between research and professional program goals.
- Clarify the structure of the undergraduate informatics core, stabilize instructional staffing of the core to reduce unnecessary overlaps between courses, and assess and strengthen cross-campus complementarities to address the availability of specialized course offerings. Any movement toward the proposed new minor in informatics should balance the possible benefits of such growth with the risks posed by possibly exacerbating current space constraints, the desires to involve more undergraduate students in research, and student preferences for maintaining class sizes and improving class timing. The Committee concurs with the decision by the iSchool to focus in the near term on increasing quality and selectivity rather than enrollments in the undergraduate informatics program. (Note that the prior program review also advised against growing the size of the undergraduate program.)
- Evaluate the international-domestic student balance in the MSIM day program, in light of the considerations raised in the report.
- Consider an overhaul of the MLIS that enhances the recognized strengths of the MLIS, addresses the disconnects noted by online students, and tackles diversity more centrally, in light of the changing social life of information and libraries, and the rapid evolution of possible placements for MLIS graduates.