University of Toronto – Faculty of Information
Master of Information Student Council
December 11th, 2012; 4:00-6:00pm
Student Lounge, 7th Floor, Claude Bissell Building

Agenda

Present: Mari Vihuri, Alexandra Kwan, Allison Moore, Pam Murray, Ramona Sansait, Wendy Traas, Sarah Anne de Groot, Brooke Gardhouse, Ashley Bodiguel, Katrina Cohen-Palacios, Ned Struthers, Emily Porta, Kate Restivo, Darrell Joyce, Jessica Gallinger, Daniela Cancilla, Sanjin Kuduzovic, Octavio Escalante Menchaca, David Jorjani, Laura Chuang

Official Regrets: Nonna Volodina, Simren Singh, Laura Sorbara, Gillian Eguaras, Melody Tacit
Absent: Kim Pham

Recorder: Alexandra Kwan

The meeting was called to order at 4:04pm with quorum established.

1. Approval of Agenda
   Motion to approve agenda: Allison
   Seconded: Mari
   Vote: Passed—Unanimous.

2. Reading and Approval of the Minutes:
   Motion to approve the agenda: Darrell
   Seconded: Mari
   Vote: Passed—Unanimous.

3. Business Arising from the Minutes:

4. Reports by Executives:
   a. President (Jessica)
      i. RF proposal: Artwork for the lounge: In an earlier meeting, Jessica proposed using some of the MISC's reserve funds to fund special projects; this proposal was passed a few months ago. Currently there is no artwork in the student lounge. Last year, the Tech Fund intended to hold a photography contest, and they bought frames for this purpose. This year, Jessica proposes a call-out for original artwork (photographs/paintings/etc.). The frames purchased by the Tech Fund last year could be used if convenient. Selecting and pricing art is very subjective. Jessica wants to create a committee to procure artwork for student lounge and have a report ready by February's meeting. The report would include recommendations to council on whether to accept proposals and what compensation values might be appropriate. If council approves the report's recommendations, the Reserve Funds would fund the artwork accordingly. Having a committee would be better than arbitrarily deciding how much money

MISC should spend right now. MISC would let the committee have authority to select the art, and then MISC would vote on their final recommendations. Darrell: What if on the flipside, the artist already has an idea of what they want for it? Emily agreed with Darrell to have a payment amount upfront. Darrell and Kate indicate their interest in being on this committee. Mari suggested adding Faculty Council Representative Laura Sorbara to be on this committee as well. Emily indicated her interest to be on the committee if Laura S. was not interested. Jessica agreed to this. Brooke inquired about MMSt students' roles in this. Jessica noted that MMSt students use the lounge too. TF's idea was to give MMSt students hands-on experience by letting them mount the frames and present the artwork. Darrell asked whether MISC members submitting art would be a conflict of interest. Jessica replied that it was okay as long as the MISC member recuses themselves from the committee's and the council's votes regarding their artwork.

MOTION: Jessica motioned to strike a committee for artwork in the lounge.
Second: Mari
Vote: Passed—Unanimous.

ii. Announcements to faculty: Jessica reminded all members that she has access to the faculty listserv. Anyone who wishes to send a message to faculty should contact her.

iii. Invitation: End of semester meetings with MISC members: Committee chairs met with Jessica over the summer. She feels it would now be worthwhile to evaluate what's been done and what's planned for next semester. Also, she would like to meet with council members elected this semester if they feel this would be valuable. Members interested in meeting with Jessica, please send her an email.

b. Vice President (Laura)

i. Faculty/staff donations to mental health iTea: Laura C. has put together a solicitation letter and sent it to faculty and staff via the list-servs. Pamphlets have been placed in mailboxes. Some donations have already been received and are enough to begin procuring something awesome TBD. Laura will email Kimberly Silk (FIAA Rep on Faculty Council) because Kimberly had suggested that people would be more willing to donate to a cause if they know that it will directly benefit students. Laura asked for suggestions on what to do with the proceeds from the Mental Health iTea. The Facebook page is ready to go live. The Mental Health iTea will be January 16th, 2013. Kathleen O'Brien has requested information to post on the iTea page on the iSchool website. CAPS will be coming to the iTea, as well as the Gerstein centre, which is working on a roundtable presentation format.

ii. GSU UA Committee: Laura is also on the GSU's committee on University Affairs and noted that they have been meeting sporadically after Open Access week.

c. Secretary (Alexandra)
    i. MISC archival project update: Alexandra advertised the position for a week and a half, until November 30, but no eligible applicants came forward. Ned has volunteered and has been given access to MISC's office by Glen Menzies. Allison asked where the position was advertised. Alexandra replied that she had posted the information on the iSchool jobs site, the MISC digest, and through the ACA Student Chapter's mailing list. Brooke asked if FIAA contacted Alexandra, but she has not yet been contacted. Jessica suggested that Ned attend next Tuesday's FIAA meeting with Brooke. Mari noted that she is cleaning up the old website (e.g. earlier versions of the constitution). Although she will not delete anything, she would like to put them somewhere. Jessica added that there are some typewritten documents, and these could be used in a potential display for the project. Sanjin agreed there are some interesting papers and said he found an old document regarding the lounge fridge in the older council minutes.

d. Treasurer (Sanjin)
    i. Proposals for new Student Sponsored Initiatives (SSI): Association of Information Systems (AIS) + Stitch & Bitch: Sanjin reminded MISC that as of the last meeting, there were two proposals (CYA and the Student Conference) for the SSI funds. There are two new SSI proposals from: Stitch 'n' Bitch and the AIS group. Sanjin asked representatives of each club to describe their groups. Darrell (for Stitch 'n' Bitch): Stitch 'n' Bitch is a student club that gets together to stitch (knitting and other crafts) and chat informally. They are planning a fundraiser with CYA to produce a cookbook (cooking or baking). They would collect recipes from students and staff to raise money for the local non-profit/charity, Children's Book Bank. The proposal is for obtaining funds to produce the cookbook. Octavio (for AIS): The AIS chapter at the iSchool is made up of a group of MI students, but students from other faculties (e.g. computer science) are welcome to join. AIS is a space for Information Systems students to get together and organize events, e.g. the Steve Kruug and Usability event held a couple weeks ago. They would like to have more events for ISD students. AIS is the Association of Information Systems, an organization based in the USA with chapters at many other universities. The iSchool's chapter is the first Ontario student chapter. Mari noted that members of the Faculty Council praised AIS at their last meeting. Octavio reiterated that anyone is welcome to join AIS. Sanjin inquired how many people attended their event? Octavio: About a hundred guests. Kim Pham sent Steve Kruug an email when she learned that he was coming to Toronto to give another workshop. She asked him if he could come to U of T as well.
    Sanjin stated that if there are other initiatives, clubs should contact him because there is still funding available. Jessica asked Brooke if Librarians Without Borders has submitted a proposal. Brooke noted that LWB is still selling calendars. Jessica invited LWB to ask for funding.
e. Webmaster (Mari)
    i. Website demo, steps remaining til launch: On Friday, Mari got FTP credentials for the website. Mari was originally planning to use a free theme, but the paid

version was much easier to implement. Mari purchased the new version for $40. Currently, she has been transferring documents over to the new site. She has not set up individual pages yet, but will get these up soon. Mari is hoping to finish this and launch the new website before the end of the year. It seems possible, but this depends on her and Alex Dvornyak (Web Developer) timing. Mari presented the demo to council, who were appreciative of it and her work. Jessica asked Mari if office hour chat will be included in the new website, noting that few people come to visit her during office hours. Mari: Yes. Sanjin asked how long would the implementation take. Mari replied that it does not take very long to implement. She has worked with Drupal before, and can do it easily because it's a paid template (which saves a lot of work). Mari has changed the architecture of the website. For a preview of the demo: please visit: miscdev.ischool.utoronto.ca.

After the Webmaster gave her report, council members decided skip forward to the Professional Development Co-Chairs' report and then the Tech Fund's report.

5. Reports by Committees:
   a. Academic Affairs (Allison)
      i. Google form for Winter 2012 rep signup: It looks like the paper form. Allison will put this up for MISC members to view; if we have concerns, Allison will fix the form.
      ii. Class rep reports—will provide feedback on them in January once all are in (expected Dec 21st): The reports are trickling in. One class had a long negative report, but as this was sent at at the last week of classes, there was little Allison could do about their concerns. Jessica asked Allison if the class rep contacted her? Allison said that she got an email on November 22. A council member attending that class also emailed the professor their concerns.
      iii. 26 reps / 38 classes: Just under 70% of classes have class reps. Allison hopes that a digital form will make submitting them easier for reps.
      iv. Clarifying role of class reps: The class rep role seems to be unclear, and there's a need to make their role clearer in the future. Jessica added that some professors/instructors expressed confusion about the role of class reps at the last FC meeting. Some professors/instructors at the FC meeting did not realize that class reps complete end of term reports; upon learning of their existence, they expressed disapproval of the fact that they do not have access to the reports. The reports, in fact, were published online last year. This summer, the reports were taken offline because class representatives are known to the instructors and identified on our MISC site, making confidentiality impossible. Allison is also on the Student Evaluation Committee that is considering how to implement a new student course evaluation system. Currently, there has been agreement on only 3/6 questions due to some faculty members' resistance to evaluation; also, philosophical underpinnings of the potential questions were debated. Sanjin asked who was on the committee. Cara Krmpotich, Patrick Keilty, Andrew Drummond, Jenna Hartel, Wendy Duff, and Allison are on the committee. The committee is aiming to have this ready for the winter term, but professors are

concerned about being judged. This concern coincides withthe class rep role becoming more fraught. Since year end reports are written by one person, Brooke asked if students could fill out a survey which the class rep could summarize in their report. Jessica: the reports are just for MISC. They are used to flag issues that arise during the course, but the reports are written at the end of the semester. Allison noted that these reports were initially posted for students who are considering taking particular classes. Jessica suggested a mid-semester report instead? Darrell added that no one has ever replied to him when he was a class rep.

Ned said that the GSU is considering an "anti-calendar" to collect student opinions about instructors and supervisors. This anti-calendar would be made public so students can have access to the evaluations. An anti-calendar already exists at the undergraduate level. Kate: Some professors encourage the use of class reps and even communicate through them (e.g. Keren Dali, during the summer term). Faculty are allowed to use class reps for contentious communications. Allison said she will encourage faculty to talk to student reps. Ashley pointed out that MISC should not strive to solicit feedback at the same time as the faculty's course evaluations. Class reps should explain the difference between the student rep's report and the course evaluations to the class. Wendy suggested that mid-term check-in from MISC would be an opportunity for MISC to reach out to students. Mari stated that the summer evaluations were sent out along with the Fall term evaluations. Sanjin inquired whether tenure-status affected the attitudes towards evaluation. Allison: Some faculty are concerned about privacy; others have philosophical issues with being evaluated and whether this will affect their future professional lives. Darrell asked whether the members were elected to serve on the committee? Allison: No, they are appointed. The new evaluations need to evaluate courses and contribute to professors' files. They will be used for ALA accreditation and gauging student learning outcomes, etc.

b. Professional Development (Pam)
    i.   Recap last event: Pam asked Kimberly Silk to present a workshop on professional strategies; she typically runs a course through the iSchool Institute on this topic every year. However, Kim did not discuss professional strategies at the iTea. Instead, she outlined her ISI course and then explained that she did not intend to run it this year. Kim and Careers Officer Isidora Petrovic (who was present at the workshop) want to know why there is low student attendance at professional development events. Kim suggested that MISC or Isidora should run a survey to determine why attendance is low. Pam added that the survey is forthcoming. Jessica pointed out that workshops should be run during the summer terms (this would be good timing for recent grads). Another factor may be student priorities; students may want hard skills (i.e. tech skills). Some students do not feel they get much out of soft skills workshops; perhaps workshops that included more hard-skills would have better attendance. A council member felt that the techniques presented in the iSchool's career workshops are old-fashioned. Others felt that the timing of the workshops did

not work with their schedules; they are usually on Friday (a day when MI students do not have classes and may not be on campus) or at midday. Also, some workshops are scheduled too late in the semesters. Allison said that she does not go to workshops because they seem too library-focused. Mari added that reputation of events may affect attendance. There are so many events to attend at the iSchool, and students have to pick and choose. Ulla De Stricker's workshops have a reputation, so people always attend. Also, negative feedback can affect attendance. Ned pointed out that students may not attend workshops with Isidora because they could easily book one-on-one appointments with her. Wendy asked if attendance was going down. Pam said she is not sure how many people attend, noting that she already attended workshops last year but does not attend them now. Isidora offers two each term and sometimes there is overlap in programming. Brooke pointed out that networking events are more of an issue than the smaller workshops, because Isidora invites professionals to come to the iSchool on our behalf. A council member raised the point that people should play to their strengths, suggesting that Isidora should continue to offer one-on-one career counseling, which is one of her strengths.

    ii. Employer Showcase Volunteer Sign-up: The showcase will be in January. Pam is asking everyone to sign up to volunteer for an hour. She noted that the tasks are simple and volunteers will get pizza as well as leftover catering. Although Pam had a paper sign-up sheet ready for the meeting, Jessica suggested that she set up a Google form so council members could check their calendars prior to making a commitment to PD.

  c. Social (Ashley & Darrell):
    i. End of semester party: The End-of-the-World party is happening on Thursday. The theme is 1940s meets the 2012 apocalypse. The Co-chairs invite students to dress up. The event is only for MI students. Social could not work with MSGSA this time due to budgetary concerns and MSGSA had already planned their year-end party independently. The Social Committee's budget is also limited—minimal refreshments, but maximum enjoyment. Sammy Jackson will be performing at the event. The co-chairs were not sure to what extent they reached the MI student body.

Due to council members leaving, quorum was lost at 6pm. No votes were held after this point.

    ii. Hot Skate event: There will be hot cocoa and skating on Saturday from 1-3pm at Nathan Phillips Square. Skate rentals will only be provided for children (or siblings, cousins) of MI students. .
    iii. Mental Health Bagel Bomb: Laura C. contributed to this mental health themed bagel bomb in preparation for January's iTea. Attendance was high at an estimated 30 attendees.
    iv. End of year collaboration with MMSt: Social wants to collaborate with MSGSA for the party at the end of the year. Social is asking students what they would like to see at the end of the year's party. If you have ideas, let the Social Co-chairs know.

d. Merchandise (Nonna) – NO REPORT. Jessica reminded council members that they can buy one at-cost t-shirt.

6. Reports by Representatives:
a. Alumni Association (Brooke) – NO REPORT

b. MISC-MSGSA Liaison (Katrina)
    i. Re-evaluate the role of MISC-MSGSA liaison: Katrina will speak to Jessica about this. Katrina pointed out that main role of the Liaison is to coordinate social events with MSGSA, but the Social Committee is already doing this well. She is looking over the minutes from last year. It was noted by another council member that there was some political strife between MISC and MSGSA last year, but our current relationship with MSGSA has been really positive this year. Jessica has some ideas for Katrina's position. Katrina also raised the point that Concurrent Registration Option (CRO, in which students complete requirements for both MI and MMSt programs) students have fallen through the cracks. CRO students were left out of the recent program change proposal to abolish the core courses. Wendy Duff and Heather MacNeil have instructed these students that they need to follow an MI path, but SGS is not happy with this solution. CRO is not a collaborative program, unlike the other programs that were passed in the same proposal. Also, MSGSA is looking to rename themselves. CRO students have not been receiving MSGSA's emails, but they are invited to MMSt's events. Sanjin: I would like to know what happened—we need the MISC-MSGSA Liaison more than they need us, i.e. we would like to be informed about MSGSA's activities. Darrell argued that the role is so much more important now because we have an opening between the associations. Jessica told Katrina that the Liaison role is not redundant; because it's a changing position, it's currently undefined and this will be resolved in time.

c. Admissions Committee (Wendy) – NO REPORT

d. Faculty Council (Jessica et al.)
    i. Recap of November meeting: Mari commented on the negativity that erupted during the Faculty Council meeting and thanked Jessica for holding her ground on behalf of MISC. At the FC meeting, MISC requested an open forum for students to have a conversation with faculty about perceived disparities between program curriculum and skills needed post-graduation. In response, Siobhan Stevenson commented on the sense of entitlement among MI students, and opined that "student participation is a privilege, not a right". She also remarked that the faculty had been studying the industry's labour market for years, and that MISC should trust the faculty to craft an appropriate curriculum. Wendy Duff was sympathetic to the Faculty's perspective that they do not need to respond to tech skills questions. Perikles Andritsos questioned the need for an open meeting to address these issues. The MISC Faculty Council reps were also advised to relay any tech skill concerns to the individual tech professors who

were present at the meeting. It was ultimately implied that students do not actually know what skills are needed to qualify for employment in the information industry and a professor suggested setting up (more conciliatory) meetings to explain to students why faculty is doing things 'right'. Jessica reiterated that since many faculty members believe this to be a 'vocal minority' issue, MISC was only trying to convince faculty that they need an open meeting with all students to discuss the subject in a democratic manner; she wasn't asking faculty to address the issue at the FC meeting itself. Unfortunately, this is what transpired at the FC meeting. Jessica noted that she has never seen this kind of eruption before during her time on Faculty Council.   At the previous exec meeting, the Dean advised lobbying Patrick Keilty, and VP Laura Chuang has met with him individually, but there should be an additional open meeting. Jessica reported that executive members have received negative feedback from students who have been informed by Patrick that he has been refused meetings with council. (MISC had decided to postpone meeting with him until after the FC meeting). Kate said she would like to see the list of tech skills that Isidora developed. Jessica said she initially requested the creation of this document. Jessica twice approached Dean Ross about the problem of the document not being released, but there has been a considerable delay. David suggested that a column (a checklist of courses) should be added to the document to determine if we are getting these skills. It was also pointed out that if the solution involves workshops (either Inforum-based or external), then there needs to be sufficient funding for them.
- ii. Correspondence with Patrick Keilty [See 6.d.i. above.]
- iii. Proposal to expand role of Faculty Council Representatives to serve as community outreach liaisons: Mari said that FC Reps are underused and would serve well as community outreach liaisons to go between the student body and Faculty Council meetings. Jessica suggested clarifying this role in our position blurbs. Laura C. said that the Faculty already knows second year students, but first year students should also be able to provide feedback.
- iv. Proposal to have pre-FC strategy sessions and post-FC debriefs: It was suggested that FC reps should have a strategy and debrief before and after FC meetings. Jessica: FC meetings have never been this contentious before. She reminded FC Reps that she did email them the night before the meeting, but could not forsee what happened. Mari suggested having an email conversation. Ned proposed that this could be done after particularly negative meetings.
- e. Graduate Students' Union (Jessica, Laura, Ned)
  - i. Anti-corporatization GSU motions: This was a part of the Social Justice Subcommittee's legislative programme. It demanded academic freedom and corporate non-interference in academic research.
  - ii. Canadian Federation of Students (CFS) AGM: At the annual outreach meeting, 15 different motions were presented. Only 2 motions passed regarding transparency. There are lawsuits between CFS and university unions that try to defederate. The CFS has no minutes of meetings, which becomes an issue for transparency.

iii. Access Copyright initiatives: U of T is a leader in Access Copyright reform, and is leaving in June 2013 when the agreement expires. Laura C.: not re-signing the agreement means we end our participation in June 2013. Jessica: Last year, an additional $30/student fee was added to the existing Access Copyright/University of Toronto agreement. Jessica: if anyone is interested, ask her and our funding commissioner who is heavily involved in the access copyright debate.

f. Student Tech Fund (Emily, David, Octavio)
   i. Content development payment update: Emily asked HY for a rundown of the 40h of curriculum development for the customized design workshop. MISC was charged for tasks including: meeting and requirements gathering, research and discovery for best practices, ideation, content creation, execution, curriculum delivery, etc. The Tech Fund has not had their meeting yet but members are not satisfied with the explanation of 40h development. HY/LLC is the only organization(s) that TF knows which offers these types of workshops, using a model that really works. If TF cuts business ties with them, the Tech Fund cannot provide high-quality tech-related workshops offered jointly with this business partner. Allison noted that the pricing is fairly standard for curriculum development. Emily felt the amount charged per hour was excessive. Allison suggested that is not too difficult to find an expert on the subject matter. Jessica asked if TF signed an agreement with HY. Emily: No, it was a verbal agreement. Moving forward, TF needs to have only written agreements. Jessica pointed out that the entire TF membership misunderstood the verbal agreement. She emphasized that TF needs a formal financial policy for contract and payment protocol. Emily said TF was presented with paper documents outlining two options for the workshops. Emily: this suggested financial policy belongs in TF's constitution. Ned: Why didn't HY ask for a contract either? Aren't they just as responsible? Sanjin: they want return customers—they should be motivated to resolve the problem amicably. Emily: TF would get a $500 discount if we moved forward with them for the HTML workshops. Wendy: do they know how confused and upset we are? Emily: they have a general idea. TF expressed to HY that they were not satisfied with the curriculum development charge and wanted a breakdown. A council member asked about possible discounts from LLC to resolve the dispute. Emily: No, we would have to stay with HY. Jessica said that HY's actions were not necessarily unethical. Emily responded: the return on investment is not good. Allison: but you will get ROI the more workshops you take. Jessica does not know if HY is totally responsible. Emily replied that TF did not ask for HY in the first place. There was bad communication on HY's part; TF could not get in touch with the person running the workshop. Ned feels that the delay in communications (i.e., it took over two weeks to respond with an itemized breakdown) shows that the company has some customer relations problems.
   ii. Planned purchases for 2013: Raspberry Pi, etc.: TF has obtained the balance sheets to their account and the total carried is $117,460 as of October 18th 2012. This does not count the things spent between then and now. About $3,000 of

that amount has already been spent—or even $6,000 or more.   Ashley asked why TF is buying more computers, when they could be buying more unique items. TF: Computers were purchased already to replace the laptops we have already in the Inforum. TF is pursuing a mandate to buy new, innovative items (e.g., Raspberry Pis, Surfaces, and other novel technologies). However, these items had to wait because TF wanted to purchase the laptops first, which was high-priority. They will pursue unique items next.

iii. Faculty advisor to the TF, impact of membership: Jessica asked if Periklis Andritsos has been attending. Emily: Yes, and everything is going great.

iv. Bank account:
- Balance to date (see 6.f.ii)
- Revenue for 2012-2013 year vs. previous years
- Robin Kester's offer to find IT partners

TF is losing 1/3 of the revenue that the school provides. Allison asked why TF is losing the money. Octavio replied that the university matched students' funds in the TF, but they are no longer paying for this. The policy is retroactive, and last year's funding was not deposited to the account. Mari said that faculty members at the FC meeting said TF could get IT companies to fund us (e.g., sponsorships). Jessica spoke to the Development Officer filling in for Robin Kester (FI's Sr. Development Officer, who is on maternity leave) to discuss potential sources of revenue, or organizations that can help purchase items for TF.

Jessica asked TF about their annual revenue, but they did not know. Full-time students are charged $100/year, while part-time students are charged $50/year. Without matching funds, the revenue will be much less—members roughly estimated the amount to be $40 000/year. Jessica suggested that TF should start writing budgets in the future. Octavio said TF was delayed purchasing the laptops until the amount of money they had was known.

g. Information Services (Mari and Emily):
i. Report on November 15th meeting, and follow-up e-mail discussion: The Inforum is discussing cuts in service due to funding issues (e.g., can the Inforum remain open on Sundays? What about fob access to the space?) Nothing concrete has been decided yet.

ii. Report on November 30th meeting with Kathleen Scheaffer et al. regarding instructional workshop offerings: IS set up a meeting on November 30th, with Isidora Petrovic, Kathleen Scheaffer, Ivan Sestak, Cara Krmpotich, Perikles Andritsos to discuss instructional workshops. Kathleen compiled a document of workshops offered by the Inforum and the iSchool; the document included workshops delivered by Career Services, SGS, the Inforum, and Semaphore.

h. Life and Times Committee (Daniela) – NO REPORT

i. Programs Committee (Sanjin):
i. Extra Courses not Required for Degree: Students should have received an email by Adriana stating that students taking extra courses would need an add/drop

form. If students are planning on taking a course (above the 16th capacity) in the summer, then they should use the add/drop form to ask for permission; however there is no guarantee it will be approved. This is driven by SGS's policy.

ii. Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Subcommittee Report. The SLOs are based in part on our ALA accreditation. This subcommittee attempts to consolidate learning outcomes and implement them in all course syllabi (in which instructors must clearly outline all the learning objectives). Sanjin brought up that different paths' learning outcomes are different. Defining learning outcomes for paths is still a work in progress because chairs for each path have been only recently appointed to this subcommittee. Council members discussed practical ends and learning outcomes for non-LIS courses. Ned would like to suggest to Dean Ross that the Project Management course should be structured to pass the exam for Project Management certification.

iii. New Course: INF 2302H - Special Topics: Digital Preservation and Curation (Prof. Seamus Ross): The syllabus for this course is in the MISC office. Prior to his term as FI's Dean, Dean Ross was a Digital Preservation professor. Currently he teaches a colloquium course. Registration for the course opens Wednesday morning.

iv. Discussion on Concentrations versus Programs: we have five different concentrations. Sanjin asked the Programs Committee about the possibility of transitioning these concentrations into programs (like MMSt) in order to have more autonomy. Some professors did not like this idea and argued that the strength of FI comes from mixing the paths together. . Some council members liked the flexibility of the current arrangement (i.e., graduates would receive an ALA-accredited degree, regardless of path). David argued that ISD students do not need ALA-accreditation for typical ISD jobs. ISD students are often limited to examples and cases relating to libraries; however, employers are not looking for libraries experience from ISD students. David expressed his discontent with the limited amount of work-relevant knowledge taught in his path; ISD students should not be limited by the focus on libraries. Council members discussed the LIS v. ISD paths/concentrations.

j. Committee on Standing (Simren) – NO REPORT

7. New business
Sparse attendance by the end of the MISC meeting was noted. Merits and drawbacks of less structured and longer meetings were discussed. Jessica scheduled the meetings to be two hours long to allow for discussion. Last year, meetings were shorter (1.5 hours) but there was less discussion. Even with structure, it is still possible to waste time on procedural issues. Council members noted that the current arrangement allows anyone to join in. David suggested that council members should also ask those who left earlier how they feel about longer meetings since the remaining members present are likely biased. David also suggested moving less important items to the end of agenda (e.g., Social can go last because they have other channels to advertise). Sanjin: what if the

Representatives were first on the agenda, with Executives later? Jessica said she would try a different order next time, because she sets the agenda.

Returning to the Programs Committee, Sanjin stated that MISC needs a second representative for this committee to add leverage. Jessica responded that notice has already been given at the last FC meeting and that the motion will be presented at the next meeting. Mari suggested that the rep should be a first-year. David suggested having path representatives on the committee. Jessica acknowledged that this made sense, but MISC must ask for just one additional rep right now.

8. Adjourn
    Motion to adjourn: Jessica
    Seconded: Kate
    Vote: Passed—Unanimous

    Carried at 6.41pm.