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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Library and Information Science Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Degree**                            | Master of Library and Information Science (MLISc)  
The MLISc is a 39-credit hour graduate program consisting of six flexible core courses, an entering/exiting seminar sequence, and six approved electives, culminating in an ePortfolio or thesis demonstrating mastery of six student learning outcomes. Students select courses from six professional pathways and work closely with faculty advisors to craft an individualized program of study to prepare them to become reflective, compassionate professionals. |
| **Dean**                              | Denise Eby Konan, College of Social Sciences |
| **Chair**                             | Hye-Ryeon Lee, School of Communication and Information |
| **Director**                          | Rich Gazan, Library & Information Science Program |
| **Institution**                       | University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa |
| **President**                         | David Lassner, University of Hawai‘i System |
| **Provost**                           | Michael Bruno, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa |
| **Accrediting Agency**                | Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC). Accreditation reaffirmed February 25, 2022 for ten years. |
| **Standards Addressed**               | *Standards for Accreditation of Master’s Programs in Library and Information Studies, 2015* |
## Glossary of Terminology and Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AASL</td>
<td>American Association of School Librarians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABD</td>
<td>All but dissertation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACRL</td>
<td>Association of College and Research Libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACSC</td>
<td>Assessment and Curriculum Support Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHA</td>
<td>Association of Hawai‘i Archivists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALA</td>
<td>American Library Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALA Sc</td>
<td>ALA Student Chapter at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALA IFC</td>
<td>ALA Intellectual Freedom Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALA NMRT</td>
<td>ALA New Members Round Table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-LIEP</td>
<td>Asia-Pacific Library and Information Education and Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALISE</td>
<td>Association for Library and Information Science Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APT</td>
<td>Administrative, Professional and Technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASIS&amp;T</td>
<td>Association for Information Science &amp; Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATALM</td>
<td>Association of Tribal Archives, Libraries, and Museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY</td>
<td>Academic Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIPOC</td>
<td>Black, Indigenous, and People of Color</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAEP</td>
<td>Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Curriculum Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIS</td>
<td>Communication and Information Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNS</td>
<td>College of Natural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSDC</td>
<td>Counseling and Student Development Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>College of Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAS</td>
<td>Digital Archives Specialist Certificate Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPC</td>
<td>Departmental Personnel Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSS</td>
<td>First Semester Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSLIMS</td>
<td>Graduate School of Library, Information and Media Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSO</td>
<td>Graduate Student Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HASL</td>
<td>Hawai‘i Association of School Librarians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIDOE</td>
<td>Hawai‘i State Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLA</td>
<td>Hawai‘i Library Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSPLS</td>
<td>Hawai‘i State Public Library System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICS</td>
<td>Information and Computer Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>Information and Communications Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMLS</td>
<td>Institute of Museum and Library Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>Information and Technology Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQIA+</td>
<td>Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer or Questioning, Intersex, Asexual, and More</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Standard I: Systematic Planning

When you think of Hawai‘i, what images come to your mind?

The context in which we educate information professionals is shaped by the tension between people’s images of these islands and the day-to-day experiences of the people who live here.

Generations of people have come to Hawai‘i—to work, escape, dream—each bringing images of this place with them. Many of their images were formed at a distance, shaped by media offering selectively edited glimpses of smiling people, swaying palms, perfect waves and an endless summer. Maybe those are some of the images of Hawai‘i that come to your mind. But as you might expect, the reality of Hawai‘i is much more complex. Information flows differently here.

Native Hawaiian identity is rooted in these islands in connections to family and ancestors, the land, sky and ocean, and traditional practices. But since the overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom on January 17, 1893, Native Hawaiians have seen their lands stolen and their culture appropriated for profit, while suffering disparities in health, housing, and economic opportunity among many others. Native Hawaiians have their own information collection, description, and sharing practices that are not always in alignment with Western standards.

Members of every generation and ethnicity who arrive on these islands add their own unique layers to the hybrid of cultures that exists here, while also maintaining their own parallel, immiscible social and informational practices. Outwardly, you might see a community of people, diverse by mainland standards, laughing and relaxing together at parks and beaches, having barbecues and beverages under tents and portable canopies. Success here doesn’t tend to be measured in income or possessions or outcompeting others. It’s in how you appreciate this place, how you connect with those who came before, how you give to others, and live with aloha.

Words like aloha can be used inauthentically—ask any service industry worker who’s compelled to use them with every transaction. But central to the many dimensions and meanings of aloha is relationships: recognizing that we’re essential to each other. We live on a group of islands in the middle of the Pacific Ocean, uniquely vulnerable to environmental conditions, shipping disruptions, and many other hazards. Aloha genuinely connects us. Far less well known outside these islands, but just as vibrant, ‘a’ole—refusal and resistance—connects us too1.

Hawai‘i is a welcoming yet contested information environment where stories told and untold are often at odds with each other. Libraries and archives are lifelines: to cultures, to histories, to social services, to stories, to records of the real and imagined past. That’s true everywhere. Most of our students are from Hawai‘i and our graduates constitute roughly two thirds of the information professionals in the state—in some subfields, the percentage is much higher. Understanding and navigating the tapestry of cultures, traditions and relationships that exists here is often the more effective path to providing sustainable information services. Relationships and credibility within the community are more important here than rote adherence to abstract professional standards, or algorithmically optimized paths to information designed for generic users.

Imposing culturally inappropriate standards and metrics can cause harm. As a program we value assessment, but we do as we invite our students to do: question the motivations and implications of

---

impersonal metrics. When they conflict with the needs of the community, push back. Advocate. Propose alternatives.

It is within this environment that we educate and work alongside reflective, compassionate leaders in the information professions, and present our 2023 self-study. As we address the Standards, we highlight larger-scale storylines of what we learned and accomplished during the review period, although it is our day-to-day interactions, relationships, and practices that make us what we are. Welcome!

Systematic Program Planning

I.1 The program’s mission and goals, both administrative and educational, are pursued, and its program objectives achieved, through implementation of an ongoing, broad-based, systematic planning process that involves the constituencies that the program seeks to serve.

The Library and Information Science (LIS) program’s mission, vision and goals are fundamentally connected to our community. They grow from and help support the concentric goals of the University of Hawai‘i (UH) System, flagship UH Mānoa (UHM) campus, College of Social Sciences (CSS), School of Communication and Information (SCI), and, most importantly, the information practices of the people of Hawai‘i and beyond. At the center of our goals and identity is aloha ‘āina.

Figure 1-1: Four Pillars of Aloha ‘Āina

The Native Hawaiian Place of Learning Advancement Office offers thoughtful definitions of and connections between a Native Hawaiian place of learning and aloha ‘āina.

A Native Hawaiian place of learning is responsive to the needs and assets of Native Hawaiian communities and is reflective of Indigenous Hawai‘i... We listened to our
on-campus and off-campus communities and what we heard repeatedly is that at the heart of every Native Hawaiian place of learning is aloha ‘āina.

...we describe aloha ‘āina as a recognition, commitment, and practice sustaining the ea—or life breath—between people and our natural environments that resulted in nearly 100 generations of sustainable care for Hawai‘i. We recognize that it is because of the aloha ‘āina practiced by Native Hawaiians over many centuries that we can enjoy the Hawai‘i we have today.

LIS Mission

We educate leaders in the information professions. Through research, teaching and service, we contribute to knowledge, solve problems, and prepare individuals to thrive in diverse information environments, with an emphasis on Hawai‘i and the Asia-Pacific region.

LIS Vision

Our ‘ohana (family) will be compassionate leaders in a world where information connects, supports, and respects diverse populations.

LIS Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIS Program Goals</th>
<th>UHM Goals</th>
<th>UH System Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nurture a professional Library and Information Science (LIS) community where Native Hawaiian concepts and values support well-being and knowledge building among all members.</td>
<td>Becoming a Native Hawaiian place of learning.</td>
<td>Model what it means to be an Indigenous-serving and Indigenous-centered institution: Native Hawaiians thrive; traditional Hawaiian values and knowledge are embraced; and UH scholarship and service advance all Native Hawaiians and Hawai‘i.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, students, and staff collaborate to enhance the overall student experience by evolving a program that prepares students to thrive in the present and future workplace.</td>
<td>Enhancing student success.</td>
<td>Eliminate workforce shortages in Hawai‘i while preparing students for a future different than the present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broaden outreach and increase community engagement and advocacy in addressing community information needs and challenges.</td>
<td>Outreach and engagement with the community.</td>
<td>Educate more students, empowering them to achieve their goals and contribute to a civil society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undertake, document and share research, and creative activities with social impact.</td>
<td>Excellence in research: advancing the research and creative work enterprise.</td>
<td>Build and sustain a thriving UH research and innovation enterprise, which addresses local and global challenges by linking fundamental scientific discovery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The goal of CSS, our home since July 2022, is to create the next generation of global game-changers who address fundamental questions about human behavior and improve the human condition by powering science into social action. As one of five founding units within SCI, established in July 2022 [Appendix 1-1], we are in the process of developing formal statements of our shared mission and goals via regular meetings and faculty retreats in this first formative academic year, but a working summary of what we have in common is how information flows: among people and communities, through media and technologies, and across time and cultures. In April 2023, the SCI faculty formally approved the following statement about our joint mission.

*The School of Communication and Information is a community of learners committed to advancing scholarship for communication, information and media; building and sustaining relationships; and contributing to a more peaceful, just, and informed society.*
As the above examples indicate, the LIS program exists within a culture where planning is regular, inclusive, and participative. At the campus level, the Mānoa 2025 strategic plan was developed via a series of campus conversations with stakeholders starting in 2018. At the UH System level, the 2023-2029 Strategic Plan resulted from an iterative combination of: internal surveys; town hall meetings; external surveys conducted by a market research firm; multiple drafts shared and circulated for comments; and key informant interviews with elected officials, business and other community leaders.

UHM’s planning process is systematic but also responsive to changing conditions. Like the rest of the world, realities and priorities shifted radically during the COVID-19 pandemic, and the broader campus community was guided by UH Mānoa Planning for Post-Pandemic Hawai‘i: an evolving compilation of updates, metrics, priorities, and stakeholder input on how UHM should respond, would respond, and has responded to pandemic-related challenges.

As we’ll detail throughout this Standard and self-study, the LIS program planning process is also flexible and inclusive. We’re receptive and responsive to changing conditions and opportunities, and value participation and feedback from our stakeholders and community to collaboratively create our own path.

Elements of systematic planning include...

I.1.1 Continuous review and revision of the program’s vision, mission, goals, objectives, and student learning outcomes;

While we continually review our program throughout the year, we begin each academic year with a planning meeting. This is the primary venue at which we review our vision, mission, and values, our progress on our goals and objectives, and where we propose, prioritize and assign tasks in alignment with our Strategic Plan.

Figure 1-3: Ongoing, Systematic Planning Cycle
Input to these planning meetings includes evidence such as faculty members’ year-end reflections from the previous year, survey results and/or informal input from various stakeholder groups, and student outcomes from coursework or the culminating experience. Figure 1-4 illustrates our major internal and external stakeholders. If policy revisions are indicated, we create a draft to share with stakeholders and integrate their feedback as input to a formal faculty vote. While stakeholder representatives are systematically invited to participate in program planning, their actual participation naturally varies from year to year with the individuals involved. See Table 1-6 for a list of major stakeholder meetings and participants during the review period. We distill and connect our goals, activities, and metrics for the coming year into a table that we publish on our strategic planning page. This page includes a repository of previous plans to provide a compact summary of how our planning and goals have evolved.

![Figure 1-4: Stakeholder Groups](image)

For example, after our previous 2015 self-study, we undertook a curriculum review that included revising our Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), degree requirements, professional pathways, a required entering/exiting seminar sequence, and the culminating experience. An overview and timeline of major program changes can be found in Appendix 1-2, and is discussed in detail in the Curriculum Standard. This process exemplifies our inclusive planning practice. Students and faculty on the LIS Curriculum Committee provided curriculum recommendations to the full faculty in November 2016 [Appendix 1-3], which informed an LIS community curriculum meeting in February 2017 [Appendix 1-4]. We integrated stakeholder feedback into curriculum changes in SLOs, the ePortfolio culminating experience [Appendix 1-5], and a required seminar sequence, which were further discussed in faculty meetings and planning sessions, then formally proposed through university channels, to take effect the following year.

At our 2018 planning session, we discussed how to respond to employer and student requests to provide both more flexible and focused degree options, allowing students to create more individualized programs of study to prepare them for particular information environments. Activities included revising and/or piloting specialization areas in archives, Asian Studies librarianship, Hawaiian/Indigenous librarianship, and informatics, with a goal of 10 students as an indicator of which specialization areas should be pursued. We also piloted more modular curriculum options where students could meet...
degree requirements with a wider variety of courses addressing each of our SLOs. At that time, LIS was a program within the Department of Information and Computer Sciences (ICS), which explicitly valued quantitative metrics of teaching and research achievement such as course evaluation data and external funding, so those values and metrics are inscribed within our 2018 plan.

In our 2019 plan, we moved from piloting to implementing the specializations (now called pathways), although feedback from the Native Hawaiian LIS community made us aware that while a Hawaiian/Indigenous Librarianship pathway was a shared aspirational goal, it would be inappropriate to claim to offer one without having any full-time LIS faculty members from either group. Therefore, we renamed this pilot area Cultures/Communities. We added a new Public Librarianship pathway aligned with the needs of the Hawai‘i State Public Library System (HSPLS) and expertise of faculty member Vanessa Irvin, and expanded the Archives pathway based on the expertise of faculty members Tonia Sutherland and Andrew Wertheimer. Based on a growing disconnect between the social nature of LIS research and practice and that of our previous administrative home in the ICS department within the College of Natural Sciences (CNS), we also proactively planned to explore options to reorganize, contacted the provost, and began informal discussions with other units about possible partnerships [Appendix 1-6].

An essential part of how we review and revise our program is by reflecting on our own process. To that end, inspired by Tonia Sutherland, we developed and continuously revised an assessment philosophy and process document, where we centered relationships, lived experience, and critical refusal of harmful data regimes over purely quantitative metrics such as course evaluation scores. We listened to the voices of our stakeholders via graduating student, alumni, and employer surveys, and in informal discussions with members of the LIS community about how we might do things differently.

We took our 2020 planning session as an opportunity to decide how we would respond to the pandemic. In our 2020 plan, we identified and formally adopted the overarching goal to take care of each other and ourselves, and stay connected. For example, we removed specific enrollment goals as a metric of pathway success in favor of a metric of engagement: that pathways evolve with stakeholder input. Enacting the principles of our assessment philosophy and process, we removed references to quantitative course evaluation metrics and instead focused on learning and sharing best practices in the new-to-us fully virtual learning environment. And we removed explicit reference to quantitative metrics of research as well, instead giving faculty members agency to define their own relevant metrics and altmetrics. We continued our advocacy for self-determination in an academic landscape that had suddenly become more open to reorganization than it had been before the pandemic, and developed LIS-specific tenure, promotion and contract renewal criteria by which LIS faculty would be evaluated, regardless of our organizational context.

In 2021, the pandemic and corresponding changes to the university experience persisted, so we retained our plan and goals from the previous year. The opportunity to help design and join a new school within CSS became reality, and we continued to adjust and assess our hybrid learning environment while trying to maintain our uniqueness as a primarily face-to-face program. Here as well, our planning process of stakeholder input, policy proposals, implementation, and iterative reflection resulted in a review of our strategic plan and values statements.

Vanessa Irvin initiated a program culture survey during fall 2021 [Appendix 1-7], which was discussed at the December 2021 and January 2022 faculty meetings [Appendix 1-8], resulting in proposed changes in our program goals and reconsidering the appropriateness of using the Hawaiian words aloha, ‘ohana and kuleana to describe our values [Appendix 1-9]. At our April 2022 LIS Strategic Planning Summit, our community strongly disagreed with removing Hawaiian words from our values statement, as long as we
live and practice them [Appendix 1-10]. They cited the UHM Strategic Plan and its explicit connections with aloha ʻāina and other Hawaiian words and values. Subsequent presentations at the Hawaiʻi Library Association (HLA) spring meeting (June 4, 2022) and the Hoʻokele Naʻauao Hawaiian Librarianship Symposium (June 15, 2022) underscored the importance of deepening our understanding of Hawaiian words and practice of Hawaiian values, knowing their multiple meanings, uses, intentions, and protocols.

In fall 2022, with the reorganization final but also with the departure of faculty members Vanessa Irvin and Tonia Sutherland, we developed our present strategic plan. As summarized above, we revised and aligned our program goals with those of the Mānoa campus and UH system; sought to provide more courses, internships, and experiences reflecting Native Hawaiian perspectives throughout the curriculum; and requested and received a tenure-track faculty position specifically focused on Hawaiian Librarianship [Appendix 1-11]. In Standard III, we discuss the results of this successful search.

We seek to center the lessons learned about reflection, connection, and community more explicitly in our curriculum, and emphasize them as part of our program identity and the student experience. Through surveys and other feedback avenues, students told us they value our in-person experience but also appreciate more flexible hybrid course delivery options. We are therefore seeking to find a balance that works for everyone. As reflected in our plan, we are excited to explore new possibilities for socially engaged research and course options outside LIS with our partners in SCI.

Elements of systematic planning include...

I.1.2 Assessment of attainment of program goals, program objectives, and student learning outcomes;

For each of the program goals and objectives developed in our year-by-year plans, we propose indicators or metrics of success. As discussed above, based on our assessment philosophy and reflective practice, these indicators sometimes change as conditions warrant, or if they don’t measure what we intend them to measure. Program goals we achieved during the review period and evidence used to determine achievement include:

- Assessment of our evolution of the culminating experience from an oral exam to an ePortfolio was evidenced by an increase in the initial pass rate for every SLO [Appendix 1-12];
- Development and implementation of new professional pathways and specializations through faculty and planning meetings, consultation with employers and professionals, and pathway interest in student applications [Appendix 1-2];
- Faculty research, teaching, and service as evidenced by faculty CVs and awards;
- Support and mentorship of junior faculty, as evidenced by tenure, promotion, and contract renewal outcomes, and faculty year-end reflections; and
- Redesigning the LIS space, as evidenced by planning documents and technology upgrades.

The Mānoa Institutional Research Office (MIRO) serves as the hub for campus data on enrollment, persistence, time to degree, student demographics, financial aid, and other data. We note that MIRO has no direct metrics for some of the Mānoa campus goals, such as community engagement. Graduate Division also serves as a resource for application and student progress, and completion data for all graduate degree programs on the UH Mānoa campus. These and other resources support us in determining not just the extent to which we meet our goals, but also how we compare to other
programs, which helps us justify and receive resource requests. For example, when we were a program within the ICS department, MIRO data confirmed that for several years, with approximately 55 students LIS had the highest master’s degree enrollment in CNS. This helped us advocate for and receive approval to replace faculty and staff positions as they came open during most of the review period, even through a series of college and campus budget challenges.

Even so, being a master’s-only program with a relatively low student to faculty ratio (approximately 8:1 during most of the review period) allows us to get to know students on a more individual level. For example, from 2006–2021 our mean time to degree varied between 1.95 and 2.35 years per MIRO [Appendix 1-13]. We looked at the year to year data and noted that changes in life circumstances were typically the reason for an individual to accelerate or delay graduation during those years, not necessarily any programmatic issue needing to be addressed.

Pathways are recommended groups of courses related to specific professional information environments, and are discussed in more detail throughout Standard II. They are intended to serve as guidelines to support students and faculty advisors in helping students craft an individualized course of study. Pathways are not required, they may be combined and customized, and they do not appear on a student’s transcript. Students indicate their pathway(s) of interest in their applications—some may indicate three, others zero—and with the exception of the School Library Media pathway, students do not formally declare their commitment to follow or depart from a pathway as they progress through the program. Therefore, the exact number of students engaged in each professional pathway has proven fuzzier than expected, making pathways difficult to track and assess. Student interests and career preparation are not always congruent with their pathway declaration—here and elsewhere, we consider both numerical metrics and qualitative indicators to construct a more complete picture of our progress in attaining our goals and objectives.

Elements of systematic planning include...
I.1.3 Improvements to the program based on analysis of assessment data;

Throughout this self-study, we summarize examples of how we use assessment data as we evolve the LIS program.

The Course Evaluation System (CES) is the UH’s systemwide tool to gather and analyze quantitative and qualitative student feedback on their courses and instructors. The LIS Program Director reviews course evaluation data at the conclusion of each semester, identifies any problematic areas or patterns, and sets meetings with the instructor to gather more information. In the case of full-time faculty, reviewing a preponderance of student evaluations often results in changes to course assignments and expectations, which improves the program at the level of the individual course. In the case of part-time faculty, those receiving consistently poor evaluations even after discussion with the Program Director and attempted corrective action are not hired in the future. We also use CES data to assess SLO attainment more broadly. Each course has a designated primary SLO and if patterns in SLO attainment across many courses and instructors are identified, this may result in more courses in a given area being offered.

Because engagement with the professional community is one of the values we strive to instill, we encourage student participation in professional organizations during their time in the LIS program. Student representatives from various organizations had always attended New Student Orientation
but the number of organizations and sheer volume of information shared with entering students made a different informational venue necessary. Officers from student organizations visited the First Semester Seminar (FSS) early in the semester, where there was more time for discussion, Q&A and ideas about events and tours that would occur throughout each semester, and details on participation. This evolved into a separate student-run Meet & Greet event at the beginning of each semester where students learn about each organization’s activities and participation opportunities in a convivial and largely faculty-free venue. We also have dedicated LIS program funds to support student conference participation and sponsor local conferences.

As students graduate, we ask them to summarize their involvement in professional organizations, conferences, and publications during their time in the LIS program. From 2016–2021, 89% reported participating in student and professional organizations, a percentage that rose to 100% during the height of the pandemic [Appendix 1-14]. This is a key assessment metric for us—if we see participation trending down, we can work with students and organizations to identify and minimize obstacles to professional engagement, or at least better understand the natural ebb and flow of student participation.

The Mānoa Assessment and Curriculum Support Center provides resources and support for the program-level learning assessment report every degree program is required to submit every two years. These assessment reports are more reflective and process-based than they seem. We are asked not just to describe our SLOs and provide data about how students have attained them, but also how they are shared with the community, how they connect with our courses via curriculum maps, how we considered or implemented changes to our curriculum, the assessment evidence we used, and who participates in assessment activities. A repository of our campus assessment reports can be found on our assessment page.

Another valuable aspect of the assessment process is in understanding how other campus units conceptualize and assess student learning and program goals. To that end, the Assessment and Curriculum Support Center has occasionally invited us to share our assessment practices with other campus units in assessment workshops. These are not self-congratulatory sessions held primarily to create a service bullet point on participants’ CVs—we discuss assessment challenges such as subjective metrics, data collection obstacles, and inconsistent faculty engagement. These experiences fed into our assessment practices.

For example, as will be discussed in more detail in Standard II, until fall 2019 we assessed summative attainment of SLOs for non-thesis students via an oral comprehensive examination. Students would prepare and orally present responses to canned scenarios of professional service aligned with program SLOs in a one-hour meeting with two faculty members, who would score their responses partially against a list of response elements, but also impressionistically. In faculty meetings and discussions with stakeholders, we learned that the oral comprehensive exam model was not achieving the goal of assessing students on their SLO mastery, not connecting to their coursework throughout the program, and not giving them the opportunity to reflect on and articulate their personal professional philosophy and career interests.

The data we collect and provide via regular ALISE Statistical Reports also helps us track longer-term enrollment trends and inform campus administration about our program relative to other accredited programs to help justify resource requests.

We value feedback from alumni and employers, gathered via surveys and various stakeholder meetings, as assessment data that informs program decisions. We are fortunate to meet and share information
regularly with the library leaders who serve on the LIS Advisory Board. For example, one program improvement arising from stakeholder feedback concerned our graduates’ preparation in technology areas. To address this, we transformed the role of our only graduate assistantship from distance learning support to technology instruction. The position is currently held by Stanislava (Stasha) Gardasevic, a PhD student with LIS experience who has taught LIS 641 Digital Librarianship, LIS 672 Technology for Libraries and Information Centers, and LIS 676 Creating Digital Libraries among other courses. Since her appointment in fall 2018, student attainment in SLO4 Technologies as measured in the ePortfolio culminating experience outcomes is now on par with that of other SLOs. In 2021 Stasha earned a competitive university teaching award.

Assessing formative attainment of SLOs while students are in the program is a continuing challenge. We introduced a spreadsheet template and asked faculty to assess how many students exceeded, met, approached, or did not meet the assignment objectives associated with the corresponding SLOs. While designed to be flexible enough to accommodate a variety of courses, assignments, and teaching styles, the results tended to vary by instructor and the spreadsheets were simply not completed and returned consistently enough to be used as input for SLO assessment. In response, we decided as a faculty to move to instructor reflections in place of quantitative spreadsheets; details and examples are discussed in Standard II and all reflections are available to reviewers in Appendix 1-15 (Restricted Access).

Elements of systematic planning include...

I.1.4 Communication of planning policies and processes to program constituents.

The program has a written mission statement and strategic or long-range plan that provides vision and direction for its future, identifies needs and resources for its mission and goals, and is supported by university administration. The program’s goals and objectives are consistent with the values of the parent institution and the culture and mission of the program and foster quality education.

Our mission, vision, goals and strategic plan are shared on our website, and we discuss in I.1 how they align with the goals and values of our parent institution. We communicate them to LIS students during NSO [Appendix 1-16] and the required entering/exiting seminar sequence, in posts to the LIS student and alumni email lists, and in news items on the LIS site. We communicate our planning policies and process to the broader community in email announcements, newsletters and publications of professional organizations, local professional conference presentations, and stakeholder meetings. These meetings are not one-way communications. We develop our plans, goals, and objectives in regular consultation with our stakeholders. For example, in employer surveys, Advisory Board meetings, and planning sessions, employers and alumni tell us what skills they envision current and near-future information professionals need to master, and what they envision tomorrow’s jobs will be. Further evidence of how surveys and meeting notes are used to inform curriculum development is presented in Standard II.

One major storyline during the review period that demonstrates our planning, communication, and administrative support is our work with colleagues across campus to create and join a new School of Communication and Information within the College of Social Sciences. Over approximately two years, this required us to do the following:
• Communicate and translate LIS mission, values and goals to other units in the new School and College: Communication, Communicology, Journalism, and the Spark M. Matsunaga Institute for Peace;
• Jointly develop a working vision, mission, and governance structure for the new school, and formal reorganization proposal;
• Hold consultations with impacted units and stakeholders across UHM;
• Document and advocate for LIS and SCI resource needs to various layers of UHM administration;
• Articulate how the proposed school supports the mission and goals of UHM;
• Negotiate with our then-current department chair and dean about the LIS resources that would travel with us to the new school, including faculty and staff positions, graduate assistants, and program funds;
• Negotiate with the provost, our then-prospective dean, associate dean, faculty and staff to secure support for LIS-specific needs, including a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) specifying that any faculty positions lost during the reorganization would be restored; and
• Keep our stakeholders informed of the status and progress toward moving to a new school and college, via email updates and town hall meetings.

Much of the above process is documented in Appendix 1-17 and Appendix 1-18.

Program Goals

I.2 Clearly defined student learning outcomes are a critical part of the program’s goals. These outcomes describe what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time of graduation. They enable a faculty to arrive at a common understanding of the expectations for student learning and achieve consistency across the curriculum. Student learning outcomes reflect the entirety of the learning experience to which students have been exposed. Student learning outcomes address...

The framework of our curriculum is a set of SLOs, which are aligned with the ALA Core Competences. They reflect regular feedback from our students, alumni, faculty, and other stakeholders, and the curricular components of our strategic plan. The current SLOs were approved by LIS faculty in April 2017, effective fall 2017, then slightly modified in December 2017:

• SLO1 Services: Design, provide, and assess information services;
• SLO2 Professions: Apply history and ethics to develop a professional LIS identity;
• SLO3 Resources: Create, organize, manage, and discover information resources;
• SLO4 Technologies: Evaluate and apply information technologies;
• SLO5 Cultures: Analyze and apply knowledge about information needs and perspectives of Indigenous cultures and/or diverse communities; and
• SLO6 Management: Demonstrate skills necessary to manage and work effectively within information organizations.

Every course in the LIS program is associated with one primary SLO, although they may engage with others as well. SLOs are posted on the LIS website, introduced during NSO and First Semester Seminar, and reinforced in individual faculty advising and course selection meetings each semester. All advising is conducted by faculty. Advising meetings are guided and informed by pathway-specific advising sheets.
that list required and recommended courses for each pathway. Each student's individual advising sheet is uploaded to a secure folder and shared by the student, faculty advisor, and Program Coordinator.

Students must take at least one core-eligible course in each of the SLOs and most SLOs have several core-eligible options for students with different professional interests. We strive to offer at least one core-eligible course in every SLO each semester and course offerings are informed by a program-wide tracking sheet detailing which students in which pathways need courses in which SLOs each semester [Appendix 1-19 (Restricted Access)]. Throughout the program, students compile learning artifacts and reflections demonstrating their mastery of each of the SLOs, which culminates in the ePortfolio or thesis.

Table 1-2: Count of Core-Eligible Courses Offered by Term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>FA18</th>
<th>SP19</th>
<th>FA19</th>
<th>SP20</th>
<th>FA20</th>
<th>SP21</th>
<th>FA21</th>
<th>SP22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our program SLOs also support the UHM Advanced Degree Learning Objectives, although mapping program-specific learning outcomes to a set of descriptive categories designed to encompass all degree programs is an inherently uncertain task. We present the following table summarizing how we see the eight sub-elements of Standard I.2 aligning with our program’s SLOs, followed by brief narrative examples. To see the specific courses that are associated with each SLO, we maintain a Curriculum Map by SLO and Pathway spreadsheet on the LIS site.

Table 1-3: Alignment Between Standard I.2 and LIS SLOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard I.2 Elements:</th>
<th>Corresponding LIS SLOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.2.1 The essential character of the field of library and information studies | • SLO1 Services: Design, provide, and assess information services  
• SLO3 Resources: Create, organize, manage, and discover information resources  
• SLO6 Management: Demonstrate skills necessary to manage and work effectively within information organizations |
| 1.2.2 The philosophy, principles, and ethics of the field | • SLO2 Professions: Apply history and ethics to develop a professional LIS identity |
| 1.2.3 Appropriate principles of specialization identified in applicable policy statements and documents of relevant professional organizations | • SLO1 Services: Design, provide, and assess information services  
• SLO2 Professions: Apply history and ethics to develop a professional LIS identity |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard I.2 Elements:</th>
<th>Corresponding LIS SLOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.2.4 The importance of research to the advancement of the field’s knowledge base | - SLO1 Services: Design, provide, and assess information services  
- SLO2 Professions: Apply history and ethics to develop a professional LIS identity  
- SLO3 Resources: Create, organize, manage, and discover information resources  
- SLO4 Technologies: Evaluate and apply information technologies  
- SLO5 Cultures: Analyze and apply knowledge about information needs and perspectives of Indigenous cultures and/or diverse communities  
- SLO6 Management: Demonstrate skills necessary to manage and work effectively within information organizations |
| 1.2.5 The symbiotic relationship of library and information studies with other fields | - SLO1 Services: Design, provide, and assess information services  
- SLO5 Cultures: Analyze and apply knowledge about information needs and perspectives of Indigenous cultures and/or diverse communities |
| 1.2.6 The role of library and information services in a diverse global society, including the role of serving the needs of underserved groups | - SLO1 Services: Design, provide, and assess information services  
- SLO5 Cultures: Analyze and apply knowledge about information needs and perspectives of Indigenous cultures and/or diverse communities |
| 1.2.7 The role of library and information services in a rapidly changing technological society | - SLO4 Technologies: Evaluate and apply information technologies |
| 1.2.8 The needs of the constituencies that a program seeks to serve | - SLO5 Cultures: Analyze and apply knowledge about information needs and perspectives of Indigenous cultures and/or diverse communities  
- SLO6 Management: Demonstrate skills necessary to manage and work effectively within information organizations |

**I.2.1 The essential character of the field of library and information studies;**

Providing access to resources (SLO3) via information services (SLO1) is unquestionably essential but the infrastructure through which services are delivered and resources maintained in order to actually help people is essential as well: management (SLO6). Also essential to the field are the people who work within it. We see “working effectively” as inextricably connected to communication, compassion, and care, including self-care. We discuss in more detail how specific courses connect to specific Standard elements and LIS program SLOs in **II.2**.
I.2.2 The philosophy, principles, and ethics of the field;

We believe that the philosophy(ies), principles, and ethics of the field are developed and expressed through each individual’s professional identity (SLO2). This requires an understanding of the history of the field, seeing how those roots shape our current environment, and making a habit of reflecting on one’s own contribution to its growth. Course assignments throughout the program include reflective components, and reflective essays connected to each SLO learning artifact are the core of the culminating experience.

I.2.3 Appropriate principles of specialization identified in applicable policy statements and documents of relevant professional organizations;

We offer six professional pathways: suggested groups of core and elective courses associated with specific professional (SLO2) information service (SLO1) environments, discussed in detail in II.4:

- Academic/Special Librarianship;
- Archives;
- Asian Studies Librarianship;
- Public Librarianship;
- School Library Media; and
- General/Custom.

All pathways are aligned with the competencies of the corresponding professional organizations, with the exception of Asian Studies Librarianship—unique among accredited LIS programs—and the General/Custom pathway—intended to be the most flexible.

I.2.4 The importance of research to the advancement of the field’s knowledge base;

Research underpins all LIS fields and courses, therefore, we found it impossible to exclude any of our SLOs from this sub-element. All course syllabi include a statement of the research methods students will encounter through readings and assignments. Because so much of our program is community-centered, we wish to highlight the connection with SLO5 Cultures to foreground the socially engaged research consulted and conducted by students (e.g., sample assignments, conference presentations, theses) and faculty (CVs).

I.2.5 The symbiotic relationship of library and information studies with other fields;

In our view, information services (SLO1) connect people within and across cultures (SLO5), be they researchers and students from different fields, or members of diverse communities. Symbiosis also implies listening to and learning from each other, which is the essence of effective LIS practice. Most of our courses are required or recommended for multiple pathways, providing opportunities for students with different interests to learn and work together. For example, the LIS 601 core requirement has
included a reading reaction shared spreadsheet, where students find and summarize two resources outside the syllabus to challenge an assertion made within the LIS textbook. In fall 2022, students drew from literature in law, nursing, ethics, education, economics, psychology and nutrition among others to investigate how LIS topics manifest in other fields.

**I.2.6 The role of library and information services in a diverse global society, including the role of serving the needs of underserved groups;**

Similar to I.2.5, services (SLO1) connect cultures (SLO5). Hawai’i’s ambient diversity and mid-Pacific location creates unique opportunities for our students to experience LIS in a global context. Here we wish to highlight our courses in Hawai’i and Pacific librarianship, Asian informatics and research materials, Indigenous librarianship, and multicultural resources, which center diversity as part of our curriculum. Through internship and practicum placements, students work alongside LIS professionals who face challenges of serving the needs of underserved groups throughout the state.

**I.2.7 The role of library and information services in a rapidly changing technological society;**

We intentionally worded SLO4 Technologies as “Evaluate and apply information technologies” to emphasize the responsibility and agency LIS professionals have in not just purchasing and using technologies, but understanding them sufficiently well to evaluate their appropriateness for the communities and collections they purport to serve. From their first semester in the LIS program, students explore platforms they will use to construct their ePortfolios and assignments, and compare strengths and weaknesses of different databases, content management systems, and instructional technologies.

**I.2.8 The needs of the constituencies that a program seeks to serve.**

While our graduates come from and work in other states and countries, at our core we serve the people of Hawai’i. We are part of a university that strives to be a Hawaiian place of learning, in a place that brings together many cultures and communities (SLO5), where costs are high and wages low. Delivering information services and resources to people across many islands, languages, and traditions is an ongoing management (SLO6) challenge. One of Governor Josh Green’s first official proclamations commemorated the 100th anniversary of the Hawai’i Library Association on December 31, 2022, celebrating how libraries and library workers “build community connections” and “cultivate resilient and inclusive communities” [Appendix 1-20]. As we will detail throughout this self-study, our SLOs, coursework, and internship and practicum opportunities are designed to educate compassionate, reflective professionals with a sense of place and responsibility for creating and delivering LIS services throughout the state.
During the review period, there were four iterations of the LIS Strategic Plan, which expresses our goals and objectives, and how we plan and measure progress toward achieving them. The table below summarizes how our teaching and service-related goals, objectives, and evidence across the four iterations of our Strategic Plan have evolved.

**Table 1-4: Goals and Objectives for the LIS Strategic Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Goals and objectives</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015–2020 Strategic Plan</td>
<td>Advance faculty excellence in teaching, research, and service</td>
<td>Course evaluations average 4/5 or higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and 2018–2023 Strategic Plan</td>
<td>Strengthen the emphasis on Hawai‘i and the Asia-Pacific region in teaching, research, and service</td>
<td>Additional Hawaiian/Indigenous and Asian Studies courses offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020–2025 Strategic Plan</td>
<td>Create a supportive, engaged environment that prioritizes care</td>
<td>Students, staff, and faculty have space to do meaningful work as we define it, within or beyond the context of research and coursework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strengthen the emphasis on Hawai‘i and the Asia-Pacific region in teaching, research, and service</td>
<td>Create opportunities for community-engaged projects, coursework and internships/practica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ Increase community engagement, outreach, and advocacy</td>
<td>Engage Hawai‘i employers to ensure curriculum addresses changing state and local needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty demonstrate excellence in research, teaching, and service</td>
<td>LIS voices are present in any reorganization decision-making process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assess effectiveness of courses and curriculum</td>
<td>Faculty summarize courses and research in LIS seminars, social media, videos, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty actively conduct, publish, and share research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty teach effectively, engage in committee work and professional service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Update ePortfolio guidelines and options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty share online teaching successes/challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022–2023 Strategic Plan</td>
<td>Nurture a professional LIS community where Native Hawaiian concepts and values support well-being and knowledge building among all members.</td>
<td>Hire faculty in Hawaiian Librarianship and/or Archives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nurture Native Hawaiian faculty and future faculty through tenure-track faculty position(s), CIS PhD Program, and adjunct faculty appointments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty, students, and staff collaborate to enhance the overall student experience by evolving a program that prepares students to thrive in the present and future workplace.

Broaden outreach and increase community engagement and advocacy in addressing community information needs and challenges.

Faculty model community building and engagement in advising, teaching, research, and service

Faculty demonstrate high-quality teaching throughout the program

Foster stewardship in students to become active and engaged members in the professional community

Create opportunities for community-engaged projects, coursework, and internships/practica

Identify outreach and engagement opportunities within the School of Communication & Information

Recruit and mentor professionals in our community to serve as adjunct faculty in our program

Faculty engage in committee work and professional service that models leadership and engagement

Program Evaluation and Decision-Making

I.4 Within the context of these standards each program is judged on the extent to which it attains its objectives. In accord with the mission of the program, clearly defined, publicly stated, and regularly reviewed program goals and objectives form the essential frame of reference for meaningful external and internal evaluation.

The table in I.3 provides a synopsis of how our program goals and objectives changed throughout the review period. Our strategic planning page provides a public statement and historical record of our goals and objectives, how we define them, and how they align with our mission. As discussed throughout this standard and visualized in Figure 1-3 and Figure 1-4, our goals and progress are regularly reviewed in consultation with our program stakeholders.

In addition to our “big tent” meetings such as yearly strategic planning sessions, town halls, and Advisory Board meetings, leaders of student organizations regularly attend monthly faculty meetings, provide reports of their organizations’ activities, and share their perspectives on our day-to-day policy discussions. For us, the last passage of this standard, “...the essential frame of reference for meaningful external and internal evaluation,” cannot be fully addressed by compiling bulleted lists of achievements and matching them to goals and objectives and external standards in a spreadsheet, nor by graduating student, alumni, and employer surveys, as valuable as those are. For us, meaningful evaluation also includes the day-to-day experiences and reflections of students, staff, and faculty. Students reflect in course assignments, class discussions, and the culminating experience. Faculty and staff reflect in regular faculty meetings, informal interactions, relationships with members of the professional community, and faculty year-end reflections collected at the end of each academic year.

But how have we done?
Since the current evolution of our program goals was adopted in fall 2022, the following table summarizes some selected higher-level goals and metrics that were in effect from 2015–2022, the majority of the review period, and current outcomes. In accordance with the mission of our program, the goals, activities, and outcomes we summarize here are those that we feel best illustrate the participation of our community stakeholders—particularly students—in helping us evolve as a program.

**Table 1-5: Outcomes for LIS Program Goals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program goal</th>
<th>Selected activities</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide a curriculum that meets the evolving demands of the job market for librarians and other information professionals</td>
<td>Meta-assessment; assess our own assessment practices</td>
<td>Assessment philosophy and process document, <a href="#">revised formative SLO assessment</a>, new ePortfolio culminating experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100% of students meet/exceed standards</strong> in ePortfolio culminating experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop professional pathways and specializations responsive to needs of job market</td>
<td></td>
<td>Introduced new/revised <a href="#">pathways and specializations</a> in spring 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>90% of surveyed employers</strong> rate graduates’ skills excellent or good in 10 of 13 SLO-aligned areas; 80% in 12 of 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modularize SLO-based curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="#">Flexible core options</a> allow students to craft individualized course of study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve the needs of a diverse student population</td>
<td>Increase enrollment</td>
<td><strong>Average enrollment decreased</strong> by 6% from 59.3 to 55; overall <a href="#">UHM graduate enrollment</a> decreased 3% across the same period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create opportunities for community-engaged projects, coursework and internships/practica</td>
<td><a href="#">Students given more opportunities</a> to connect their coursework and ePortfolio with communities they wish to serve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase distance learning options</td>
<td>In spring 2016, 5 of 16 courses (31%) of courses were accessible via distance modes. Currently 100% of courses are.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase opportunities for students to stay connected</td>
<td>Established FSS to support incoming cohorts, an online student gathering space (the “virtual LIS Diner”), and use of Slack for mutual ongoing support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a quality learning and research</td>
<td>Update physical spaces and learning technologies, and provide research space</td>
<td>Updated classroom and distance education technology, and provided lab space and student support for junior faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program goal</td>
<td>Selected activities</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environment for students and faculty</td>
<td>Maintain social gathering, study spaces, and connections</td>
<td>Successfully petitioned to retain LIS common area and diner after UHM space committee planned a temporary reassignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dedicated LIS funds to support neighbor island student travel to O‘ahu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance faculty excellence in teaching, research, and service</td>
<td>Mentoring and supporting junior faculty</td>
<td>100% of faculty members seeking tenure/promotion during the review period received it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grant proposals, refereed publications, effective teaching per course evaluations, and service activities</td>
<td>Our 4–5 research faculty during the review period were PI or Co-PI on four IMLS grants, and published over 20 refereed articles or conference proceedings and 15 book chapters (see III.5). All faculty meet or exceed course evaluation standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish LIS-specific tenure, promotion, and contract renewal procedures and criteria</td>
<td>Faculty teaching, research and service accomplishments during the review period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>LIS-specific TPRC criteria</strong> created by LIS faculty and formally approved by the university and faculty union in 2021.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen the emphasis on Hawai‘i and the Asia-Pacific region in teaching, research, and service</td>
<td>Offer more courses taught by Hawaiian/Indigenous faculty</td>
<td>New tenure-track faculty position in Hawaiian Librarianship approved spring 2023.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty conduct community-engaged research</td>
<td>17 Hawai‘i and Asia-Pacific related courses offered during the review period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create opportunities for community-engaged projects, coursework, and internships/practica</td>
<td>Faculty grants and publications focus on Hawai‘i and Asia-Pacific.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Internships, practica, and theses focused on Hawai‘i and Asia-Pacific.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New pathway in Asian Studies Librarianship, new specialization in Community and Cultural Informatics.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I.4.1 The evaluation of program goals and objectives involves those served: students, faculty, employers, alumni, and other constituents.**

We evaluate our goals and objectives in partnership with our community stakeholders, although not always in ways that fit neatly into a flowchart graphic.

Among our more formal structures for guidance and evaluation is the **LIS Advisory Board**, which includes representatives from local leaders in archives as well as public, school, academic, and special libraries, professional associations, and our alumni group. At yearly meetings, we update the Advisory Board on.
our plans and progress, and listen to their experiences and needs as employers to reach consensus on priorities and directions.

We also hold a wide range of scheduled and ad hoc meetings on a range of topics, such as curriculum decisions, ePortfolio evolution, LIS reorganization, our strategic plan and values statements, and our program culture (see Table 1-6). However, valuable stakeholder feedback also occurs outside of formal program structures. For example, as Principal Investigator (PI) of an Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) grant focused on public librarian professional reflections and collaborations, Vanessa Irvin worked closely with Hawaiʻi State Librarian Stacey Aldrich, the Director of ALU LIKE Native Hawaiian Library Valerie Crabbe, and public library professionals throughout Hawaiʻi, which informed the evolution of the Public Librarianship pathway.

Continuing students evaluate the program formally via course evaluations, informally in reflections, and passively by their performance in the SLO-based culminating ePortfolio. Students consistently identify their experiences in professional organizations as valuable components of their learning, so we gave students the option to reflect on “extramural artifacts” as part of the ePortfolio to demonstrate their mastery of our SLOs. We also ask graduating students, alumni, and employers to rate their mastery of professional skills aligned with our SLOs in separate surveys. Graduating student surveys are circulated each semester, while alumni and employer surveys circulate on a five-year cycle. Details about these surveys and how we use them to inform curricular decisions are discussed in Standard II.

Our committee structure includes students and professionals as appropriate, but with a small faculty most committee work is done by the faculty as a whole. Instead of having formal standing committees, we regularized the idea of having committees activate and hibernate as needed. Committee work often engages and overlaps with that of our student organizations, which helps us evaluate the program. For example, to explore concerns that using Hawaiian for the program’s values was at odds with having no Hawaiian staff/faculty, during the review period the LIS Diversity Council created an LIS program culture survey. This was administered in November 2022 via a Google Form survey to students and faculty, yielding 12 responses. The results [Appendix 1-7] led to several faculty discussions and an open meeting of how our program goals and values could be more appropriately stated and practiced. All of these stakeholders and venues combine to form our program evaluation, which we share on our website, and as input to campus-level biannual Mānoa Assessment reports.

The primary venues for documented program decision-making are our monthly faculty meetings, yearly and ad hoc stakeholder meetings (see Table 1-6), and year-end faculty reflections. The data we use to evaluate our progress toward our goals includes sources discussed throughout this standard, primarily SLO outcomes data, enrollment and student data, course evaluations, faculty CVs, and graduating student, alumni, and employer surveys.

One example of an ongoing decision-making process documented in our faculty meeting minutes is the rollout of our ePortfolio culminating experience. Initially, we were very prescriptive about which course assignments could be used as learning artifacts to demonstrate mastery of each SLO, which had the unintended effect of constraining student course choices. Depending on which core courses they took
earlier in the program, some students were put in the position of having to choose between taking a course outside their area of interest just to secure an eligible artifact, or petitioning the faculty for an exception. Many students elected for the latter approach and, while we admire their advocacy in shaping their own learning experience, this created an untenable situation. We therefore changed the policy to allow students, in consultation with their faculty advisors, to decide for themselves which learning artifact best demonstrated their mastery of each SLO. This policy change aligned well with our goal to educate reflective professionals, as students now had to reflect on their own learning to choose their artifacts.

Some evaluative data is confidential and not discussed in faculty meetings. For example, course evaluations are reviewed systematically by the Program Director at the end of each academic year to identify any patterns in teaching perceptions and performance that might need to be discussed with individual faculty. Otherwise, faculty members review their own evaluations and integrate feedback as part of their own instructional process.

Similarly, the duties and priorities of the LIS Program Director (formerly called the LIS Chair) and LIS Program Coordinator were discussed via a shared spreadsheet and in several faculty meetings [Appendix 1-21], which informed the revised LIS Program Coordinator position description and provided welcome guidance as to how the Program Director and Coordinator can best direct their efforts. The year-end evaluations of the LIS Program Director and Program Coordinator are conducted by the LIS Associate Program Director, and results are reviewed individually.

I.6 The program demonstrates how the results of the evaluation are systematically used to improve the program and to plan for the future.

We offer below a timeline of selected strategic planning and stakeholder meeting dates, topics, evidence, and decisions that illustrate some of the major storylines of program improvement and planning throughout the review period, which will be discussed in detail throughout this self-study. Materials and minutes from these meetings are available in Appendix 1-22.

Table 1-6: Stakeholder Meetings, 2015–2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Meeting Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 2015</td>
<td>LIS Advisory Board Meeting</td>
<td>Wide external audience of LIS Advisory Board, students, and others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2016</td>
<td>No Advisory Board Meeting</td>
<td>Transition period with interim chair, January to June 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2017</td>
<td>LIS Community Curriculum Discussion</td>
<td>Wide external audience of LIS Advisory Board, students, alumni, and employers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2018</td>
<td>LIS Advisory Board Meeting</td>
<td>Small external audience of LIS Advisory Board and LIS faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2019</td>
<td>LIS ePortfolio Alumni Meeting</td>
<td>Small external audience of LIS Alumni Group and LIS faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Meeting Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2019</td>
<td>LIS Advisory Board Meeting</td>
<td>Small external audience of LIS Advisory Board and LIS faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2020</td>
<td>No Advisory Board Meeting</td>
<td>The first year of the COVID-19 pandemic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2021</td>
<td>CSS Town Hall on proposed reorganization</td>
<td>Organized by CSS, all LIS students and faculty invited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2021</td>
<td>LIS ePortfolio Town Hall Meeting</td>
<td>LIS students and faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2021</td>
<td>LIS Advisory Board Meeting</td>
<td>Small external audience with Advisory Board and LIS faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2022</td>
<td>LIS Strategic Planning Summit</td>
<td>Wide external audience of LIS Advisory Board, students, faculty, and others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2022</td>
<td>LIS Town Hall on reorganization and planning</td>
<td>LIS students and faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary Reflection**

We wish to close this section with some reflections on systematic program improvement and planning. Often, improvement is conflated with a mandate to “do more”, and engaging with a broad range of stakeholders and data to figure out what to do, and how best to do it, requires more effort still. As a small LIS program, which at this writing has educated the majority of Hawai’i’s information professionals for 58 years, we navigate layers of cultural protocol and long-term professional relationships that go beyond any single strategic planning or review cycle.

One definition of the word systematic is “done or acting according to a fixed plan or system; methodical”. That Western approach doesn’t always work well here. It can give the impression that as a program we prioritize goals and metrics instead of the people who are part of our community. For example, as a program and university we track Native Hawaiian student enrollment. If you purport to serve the Native Hawaiian community, the implication is that more enrollment must be better. That’s misguided at best, dehumanizing at worst. We appreciate the opportunity to work with Native Hawaiian students whether they choose to complete our program or not, and advise them as we do every student to take the path that’s best for them. We look forward to welcoming a faculty member in Hawaiian Librarianship, but not to serve in a role that has been pre-imagined for them as part of a strategic plan. Similarly, we strive to become a Native Hawaiian place of learning, but as faculty we don’t presume to know in isolation how best to implement or assess those practices. Our kuleana is to work with people within and beyond our program to bring a Native Hawaiian place of learning into being.

One outcome of this self-study process for us as a program has been to more consciously decouple the rigid metrics we resist from the ongoing planning process we embrace. Our program, school, college and university value sustainability and resiliency, and creating an environment where traditional Hawaiian values and knowledge are embraced. This requires a flexible, adaptive, community-based approach to our practice. We plan, but remain keenly aware that plans change.
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Standard II: Curriculum

Our curriculum is the shared point of contact between students, faculty and the profession. In our case, it must enable students to put into practice not just our ideals as a program, but also the needs of the communities we serve. We strive to balance a reflective professional approach with awareness of our place in Hawai‘i and provide a professional LIS education and unique student experience.

Our Master of Library and Information Science (MLISc) degree has been continuously accredited by the American Library Association (ALA) since 1967. Through research, teaching, and service, we educate future generations of librarians, archivists, and other information professionals, and prepare them to thrive in diverse information environments with an emphasis on Hawai‘i and the Asia-Pacific region.

Students complete 39 credits of approved coursework to earn the MLISc degree, 18 of which are flexible core requirements corresponding to each of the six Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). Students complete either a thesis (Plan A) or an ePortfolio (Plan B) for their culminating experience. A seminar sequence during their entering (non-credit) and exiting (3 credit) semesters, where Plan B students complete their culminating ePortfolio, is also required. The remaining 18 credits consist of elective options, which may include up to nine credits from other units with the approval of the faculty advisor. This framework is shown in the figure below.

Figure 2-1: Degree Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Requirements</th>
<th>Plan A (Thesis)</th>
<th>Plan B (ePortfolio)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Semester Seminar</td>
<td>Uncredited seminar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Requirements</td>
<td>18 credits</td>
<td>18 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives</td>
<td>15 credits</td>
<td>18 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Must include a 3-credit research methods course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May include professional pathway electives and fieldwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capstone Experience</td>
<td>6 credits</td>
<td>3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LIS 700 Thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LIS 691 Masters Seminar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Courses are designated as addressing one primary SLO but may also cover other SLOs. SLOs are aligned with ALA Core Competences. These alignments are illustrated in Table 2-2.

Within this framework, we offer six professional pathways and three specializations, which help students tailor individualized study programs based on their professional interests and the needs of the field. Aside from the General/Custom pathway (the most flexible), each pathway suggests groups of core and elective courses associated with specific professional information environments (Curriculum Map by SLO and Pathway). To emphasize the importance of practice, students in every professional pathway (save the General/Custom pathway) must complete LIS 690 Internship or LIS 696 Practicum in School Librarianship in a relevant professional setting.

Students on the neighbor islands may pursue the MLISc degree by attending courses synchronously on Zoom, and via asynchronous coursework. This distance education program was used as an example in
the 2022 campus presentation to the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) accreditation review (pp. 67-70). Details about the neighbor island student experience and resources are described in Standard IV and V.9, respectively.

We also offer nine dual degree programs, which allow students to double-count a maximum of nine credits, a Certificate in Advanced Library and Information Science (CALIS), and an Interdisciplinary PhD as one of four founding units of the Communication & Information Sciences Program.

During the period 2006–2021, we had 416 graduates, who took an average of 2.29 years to complete the degree. See Mānoa Institutional Research Office (MIRO), Common Data Set 2022-2023 and Appendix 1-13.

We regularly review, assess, and evolve our program in consultation with students, alumni, professionals, employers, and other stakeholders. The regular curriculum review process includes students’ course evaluations, faculty’s self-reflections, and feedback from alumni and other stakeholders via surveys and various meetings, which are detailed in II.5 and II.6. Our assessment practices are used as a campus-wide model (shared during the Graduate Program Learning Assessment: Processes, Tools, and Resources workshop on 4/13/2021). A summary of major changes during the review period can be found in Appendix 1-2. In V.13, we also discuss some ways in which course delivery modes were evaluated and changed to adapt to student needs during the pandemic.

Curriculum Planning

Standard II.1 will be discussed in the following four subsections, II.1.1–II.1.4.

II.1.1 The curriculum is based on goals and objectives.

UHM Strategic Goals

As discussed in I.2 and I.3, the curriculum is an expression of our program goals and objectives, and supports the overarching goals of UHM, as expressed in Mānoa 2025: Our Kuleana to Hawai‘i and the World.

As a program, we strive to support UH’s mission to become a Native Hawaiian place of learning by continuously deepening our understanding and practice of the Native Hawaiian values embedded in the concepts of aloha, ‘ohana and kuleana (LIS Program Mission, Vision and Values) throughout the curriculum. For example, course assignments engage with local communities in an environment of mutual support and care (aloha), students work in groups and take leadership roles with student professional organizations (‘ohana), and ethical, responsible professional practice (kuleana) is emphasized. We offer regular and special topics (LIS 693 and 694) courses focusing on Hawai‘i and the Pacific, including:

- LIS 631 Introduction to Hawai‘i and Pacific Librarianship;
- LIS 633 Indigenous Librarianship;
- LIS 634 Multicultural Resources for Diverse User Groups;
- LIS 635 Traditional Literature and Oral Narration;
- LIS 693 Foundations of Hawaiian Collections;
- LIS 693 Access and Care of Indigenous Cultural Knowledge;
- LIS 693 Genealogical Resources;
Increasing the number of Native Hawaiian faculty members is a perennial goal of UHM, and many of the above courses and others across the LIS curriculum were taught by instructors who identify as Native Hawaiian. While it is not culturally appropriate to ask who does and doesn’t identify as Native Hawaiian, at least four adjunct faculty members do, one of whom (Keahiahi Long) will join the full-time faculty in fall 2023.

The LIS program is the only unit on campus to establish dual degree programs with the Hawai‘inuiākea School of Hawaiian Knowledge. Through the LIS 690 Internship, students have opportunities to work with Hawaiian collections and interact with internship supervisors and local communities. There are seven internship sites hosted by Native Hawaiian organizations/institutions and numerous collections focusing on Hawaiian materials held by non-Hawaiian institutions.

**LIS Program Goals**

Our curriculum and program goals evolved together. For the majority of the review period, our program goals changed very little from year to year. In December 2022, we updated our goals statement to both better reflect our existing practice and provide a clearer roadmap for our curriculum.

**Table 2-1: Changing LIS Program Goals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIS Program Goals, 2016–2022</th>
<th>LIS Program Goals, 2022–present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide a curriculum that meets the evolving demands of the job market for librarians and other information professionals.</td>
<td>Nurture a professional LIS community where Native Hawaiian concepts and values support well-being and knowledge building among all members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve the needs of a diverse student population.</td>
<td>Faculty, students and staff collaborate to enhance the overall student experience by evolving a program that prepares students to thrive in the present and future workplace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve the needs of a diverse student population.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a quality learning and research environment for students and faculty.</td>
<td>Undertake, document, and share research and creative activities with social impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance faculty excellence in teaching, research, and service.</td>
<td>Broaden outreach and increase community engagement and advocacy in addressing community information needs and challenges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen the emphasis on Hawai‘i and the Asia-Pacific region in teaching, research, and service.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some examples of how these goals and objectives manifest in our curriculum include the following.

- Courses focused on Hawai‘i and the Pacific mentioned above;
- Our six pathways, each corresponding to a specific professional environment: Academic/Special Librarianship; Archives; Asian Studies Librarianship; Public Librarianship; School Library Media; and General/Custom;
- Our courses in Asian Studies Librarianship, specifically LIS 645 Asian Materials and Research Methods and LIS 662 Asian Informatics, form the foundation of a unique pathway geared towards future Asian Studies librarians and archivists working in a variety of settings;
- LIS 690 Internship and LIS 696 Practicum in School Librarianship provide invaluable networking and practical experience. Requiring LIS 690 or 696 in most pathways is in response to feedback from our alumni stakeholders [Appendix 2-1 (Restricted Access)]; and
- LIS 693 and LIS 694 special topics courses keep the curriculum current and engage students with emerging areas.

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

The SLOs are concrete expressions of our program goals, which are aligned with the ALA Core Competences (2021 draft version), and form the spine of our curriculum.

- SLO1 Services: Design, provide, and assess information services
- SLO2 Professions: Apply history and ethics to develop a professional LIS identity
- SLO3 Resources: Create, organize, manage, and discover information resources
- SLO4 Technologies: Evaluate and apply information technologies
- SLO5 Cultures: Analyze and apply knowledge about information needs and perspectives of Indigenous cultures and/or diverse communities
- SLO6 Management: Demonstrate skills necessary to manage and work effectively within information organizations

The following table displays the alignment of our SLOs, ALA Core Competences, and LIS courses that focus on a particular SLO as the primary learning goal. LIS 690 Internship and 693/694 Special Topics are not included here, as their SLOs vary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIS Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>ALA Core Competences</th>
<th>LIS Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIS Student Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>ALA Core Competences</td>
<td>LIS Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO5 Cultures: Analyze and apply knowledge about information needs and perspectives of Indigenous cultures and/or diverse communities</td>
<td>[9] Technological knowledge and skills</td>
<td>Electives: 641, 657, 674, 676, 677</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*II.1.2 [The curriculum] evolves in response to an ongoing systematic planning process involving representation from all constituencies.*

Many hands, many voices. In our planning process we strive to balance the stories of our community stakeholders with the stories assessment data tell. We work together—sometimes systematically, sometimes more spontaneously—but always collaboratively, to shape our evolving curriculum. In the following sections, we describe the roles of students, alumni, and other stakeholders who join our faculty in a holistic approach to curriculum planning.

**Faculty**

Faculty are at the center of curriculum assessment, planning, and delivery. But we are not sufficient unto ourselves—we appreciate our relationships with our stakeholder groups who provide essential guidance. All faculty members lead at least one pathway and/or specialization. We select, design, and coordinate pathway course requirements to provide effective professional education within the framework of our program SLOs. We regularly revise syllabi, readings, and assignments, and discuss broader curriculum policies in regular faculty meetings, which students and adjunct faculty are invited to attend.

Assessment tools include course evaluations, course SLO assessments, teaching reflections, and culminating experience (oral exam and ePortfolio) results by SLO and are discussed in II.5, II.6, and II.7. At our annual strategic planning meetings, the faculty review and assess program goals, values, and curriculum based on assessment evidence, and revise them if necessary (see I.1.1 for examples). Proposals and discussions involving major curriculum changes are then submitted to stakeholder meetings for further discussion and feedback.

**Curriculum Committee**

Noriko Asato chairs the Curriculum Committee (CC) and leads it with Rich Gazan (Program Director). However, all faculty are *de facto* members and decisions are often made at our monthly faculty meetings. We are grateful to the many students who volunteered to serve on the CC to reflect students’ voices. For example, when considering replacing the oral exam as the culminating experience, one
student from each of four professional areas was invited to explore the possibility of adopting an ePortfolio [Appendix 2-2].

The CC evaluates and approves proposals for new courses and course revisions, and shepherds them through the approval process at the School, College, and Graduate Division levels. In August 2017, we successfully submitted a program modification through the same process, which created new core course options and the seminar sequence as a degree requirement [Appendix 2-3].

**Students**

Our student body, which averaged 54 students during the review period (IV.1), is an essential constituency for feedback. Their voices have a major impact on shaping curriculum because their reviews are key parts of our systematic planning process.

On an individual level, students are invited to complete an online course evaluation administered by UHM on courses they have taken at the end of semester. Between fall 2016 and spring 2022, course evaluations were collected from 129 courses; 66% of 1,236 enrolled students completed the evaluations. The results (discussed in II.5) are examined and analyzed by individual instructors and the Program Director. If issues arise indicating that change is needed, faculty discuss options for modifying corresponding elements of related courses.

All graduating students must complete an online confidential graduating student survey [Appendix 2-4]. Their responses guide curriculum changes; for example, per student recommendations informed our decision to require an internship or practicum experience for the professional pathways.

Students also participated in town hall discussions on adopting the ePortfolio as the culminating experience. One was held in December 2016 [Appendix 2-5], when we were developing the framework for the ePortfolio, and another was held after implementation [Appendix 2-6], which was prompted by students experiencing difficulties collecting artifacts. The town hall was held to seek some ways to relax the rigid policy, while also considering ALA’s standards to assess student achievement across all SLOs. Based on the feedback, we revised the policy to center students’ reflections on their process and experience to encourage their development as reflective practitioners. In another town hall meeting in November 2022, the faculty sought student feedback on the reorganization and formation of the new School, and the new faculty position in Hawaiian Librarianship [Appendix 1-22, pp. 96-120].

**Student Organizations**

We regularly have five to seven registered student organizations (although some were dormant during the pandemic), most of which are affiliated with national and local professional associations. Another organization, Hui Dui, includes all LIS students, and their representatives regularly attend faculty meetings and/or send updates on their activities. During the development of the ePortfolio, they were invited to reflect on the proposed capstone experience [Appendix 2-7].

**Alumni and Other Stakeholders**

Because our alumni constitute roughly two-thirds of the LIS professionals in Hawai‘i, we benefit from their formal and informal input on our curriculum. For example, at the February 2017 LIS Community Curriculum Discussion [Appendix 1-4], faculty proposed a more flexible approach to core course selection. Instead of requiring all students to take one fixed set of core courses, they would be able to meet core requirements by selecting from several core courses that meet each program SLO. This was not always an easy discussion, as we were proposing that some courses that had been required could now be substituted. This initial discussion led to the development of tracks and, later, to pathways.
We also elicit alumni and employer feedback via separate surveys administered every five years. Most recently, we contacted 132 graduates in November 2018 and received 21 responses (16% response rate, alumni who graduated between fall 2013 and summer 2018). We followed up in January 2019 with an employer survey yielding 20 responses [Appendix 2-8 and Appendix 2-1 (Restricted Access)]. Alumni are asked to self-assess their professional skills acquired while in the program or since employment, and employers are asked to assess our graduates’ skills from their perspective. Survey responses are compiled by the Program Coordinator and shared with faculty for potential programmatic changes as appropriate.

**LIS Advisory Board**

Advisory Board members represent a range of employers and professional organizations, and share their valuable perspectives in meetings held annually, or as needed when programmatic changes are being contemplated. For example, Advisory Board members were joint participants in broader meetings of the entire LIS community, such as the 2017 LIS Community Curriculum Discussion, and our 2022 Mission, Vision and Values community discussion [Appendix 1-22, p. 120]. Several Advisory Board members were also consulted in October 2022, as we developed the Hawaiian Librarianship faculty position description in partnership with the broader Hawaiian librarianship community [Appendix 2-9].

**Working Together**

One example of how our constituencies come together to evolve the program is our change to our program SLOs. In 2015, faculty decided to streamline the previous SLOs to make assessment more straightforward. Students were encouraged to articulate and share their perceptions of what they were learning, which served as input to a curriculum overhaul in 2016. Curriculum Committee Chair Noriko Asato engaged five student members and conducted a preparatory study to examine various professional organizations’ statements listed in Knowledge and competencies statements developed by relevant professional organizations [Appendix 2-10] and explored appropriate indicators for each SLO. After several iterations discussed in faculty and planning meetings, proposed SLOs were formed, then formally approved after discussion with stakeholders, culminating in the 2017 Community Curriculum Discussion Meeting [Appendix 1-4], including members of the LIS Advisory Board. The resulting SLOs continue to serve us well.

---

**II.1.3 Within this general framework, the curriculum provides, through a variety of educational experiences, for the study of theory, principles, practice, and legal and ethical issues and values necessary for the provision of service in libraries and information agencies and in other contexts.**

Our curriculum provides students the grounding in theory, principles, practice, legal and ethical issues, and values to become effective information professionals. The Curriculum Map by SLO and Pathway, which displays courses and their primary SLOs, communicates this Standard, however, components of theory, principles, practice, and values are dispersed throughout the curriculum and overlap within courses and are reinforced through other educational experiences.

The following are examples of core-eligible courses for each SLO, which include brief summaries of individual students’ course assignments that demonstrate how they integrate theory, principles, practice, and values in their course projects. A complete list of course descriptions and syllabi is available on the LIS website and sample assignments are available on-site.
SLO1: Services. LIS 601 Introduction to Reference and Information Services

LIS 601 provides an overview of information services, systems and practices, including models of translating stated and unstated information needs into the language of information systems, while also considering cultural and institutional factors.

Example: One student, citing Reference and User Services Association (RUSA) Guidelines for Behavioral Performance of Reference and Information Service (2008), reflected on user intimidation and the anxiety reference librarians may unknowingly inflict, and explained how this shaped her service philosophy to make the library a welcoming place.

SLO2: Professions. LIS 610 Foundations of the Information Professions

In LIS 610, students are introduced to ethical codes and principles from ALA and other professional organizations. Through readings, case studies, and discussion, students gain a grasp of legal and ethical issues and develop their own values as information professionals.

Example: In one assignment, students demonstrated their understanding of professional values/ethics by identifying a social problem in Hawai‘i and proposing a service project to solve the problem. A Public Librarianship pathway student, who worked as a volunteer with incarcerated youth, defended prisoners’ right to read based on ALA core values and proposed coordinating efforts between the Hawai‘i State Public Library System and the Hawai‘i Youth Correctional Facility to offer a series of outreach programs such as mobile library book carts.

SLO3: Resources. LIS 615 Collection Management

Collection management introduces a range of practical and ethical issues for dealing with collections of print and other formats of library and archival materials. The capstone project is the Collection Management Project (CMP), where students compile a collection of 45 items relevant to their chosen library and subject.

Example: An Academic Librarianship pathway student built a collection about multicultural women’s issues and, while searching and consulting sources, discovered how information resources were created, discovered, evaluated, organized, managed, preserved, and disseminated. She reflected on her growth as a future academic librarian and highlighted her philosophy and mission to collect materials that give voice to underrepresented scholarship.

SLO4: Technologies. LIS 655 Digital Archives

LIS 655 discusses theories of selection, preservation of artifacts in a digital collection, and laws governing the acquisition and use of digital assets, such as copyright. Students curate a digital exhibit of 25–30 items, exploring a theme of their choice. The final product is a website with a digital collection and exhibit using the content management system, Omeka.

Example: A digital exhibit created by a student pursuing the Academic Librarianship pathway conceptualized the digital culture to unite dispersed Kānaka Maoli (Native Hawaiians) and ʻāina (place, land) through the participatory space as a community expression. She critically evaluated technologies in relation to the history of the colonial roots of the LIS professions. She compared Omeka with Mukurtu, which is better able to integrate Native Hawaiian perspectives and epistemology, thus a more appropriate digital community archive platform and expression of Native Hawaiian communities’ resistance.
SLO5: Cultures. LIS 631 Introduction to Hawai‘i and Pacific Librarianship

This class introduces students to Native Hawaiian epistemology, which is based on people’s relationship with ‘āina, water, and community, and then explores how to express and apply these ways of knowing in services and collections. For the capstone assignment, students developed a LibGuide to help undergraduates conduct research and gain an introductory understanding of Hawai‘i and Pacific issues.

Example: In her reflective essay, one student expressed her realization that culture is critical in creating welcoming spaces in libraries and how “Western ways of learning and knowing are not the methods used by the ancestors of Kanaka ‘Ōiwi [Native Hawaiians].” As an emerging school librarian, she believes school library spaces can be collaboratively created with patrons, empowering them to have a voice in reimagining library services.

SLO6: Management. LIS 650 Management of Libraries and Information Centers

Students are introduced to nonprofit management theories and practices, including advocacy, human resources, and budgeting so that they can both lead and function effectively within libraries, archives and other professional information environments.

Example: For one service learning project, a student team planned and executed a fundraiser for the Hawai‘i Association of School Librarians (HASL), raising over $5,700 at a local bookstore to promote literacy. They applied skills in leadership, advocacy, needs assessment, collaboration, organization, marketing and assessment, experienced the importance of understanding local culture in marketing campaigns, and discovered their own preferred management styles.

LIS 690 Internship

LIS 690 Internship provides students field experience in professional settings under the supervision of librarians and other information professionals with an MLIS degree. The primary course objective is for students to put theories and knowledge acquired in courses into practice, and develop and apply their skills and professional interests. Students can enroll in LIS 690 Internship after completing LIS 601 Introduction to Reference and Information Services, although some sites require additional courses. LIS 690 is offered every semester (summers notwithstanding) and students can take up to two LIS 690s toward their degree. As of March 2023, the list of internships includes 34 college and university internship sites and 22 for archives and special libraries. In addition, the Hawai‘i State Public Library System (HSPLS) offers its 51 branches as sites for students who wish to intern at a public library.

Students can also cultivate their own internship site by working closely with the LIS 690 Internship Coordinator. Examples of customized internships include an IT/advertising corporation in Tokyo, Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County, Marine Corps Base Hawaii Library, and the National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Central Library in Maryland.

Internship students spend 150 hours (an average of 10 hours per week) for a three-credit internship. Previously, due to that considerable time commitment, students with family or who worked full-time were often unable to participate, which sometimes made it harder for them to find professional employment. However, in Fall 2021 we changed LIS 690 to a variable (1–3) credit course, enabling students to spread the 150 hours over two semesters.

The Internship Coordinator for the duration of the review period has been Associate Professor Noriko Asato. In this role, she monitors interns’ progress throughout the semester using an internship tracker, internship task plan table, monthly logs, a midterm report, an on-site/online visit, and a final report and presentation. The assessment tools include the evaluation of the intern’s performance, and SLO self-
evaluation (filled out by the supervisor and intern together) and evaluation of internship supervisor (by
the intern). The on-site visit is conducted after the midterm report is submitted to review the intern’s
progress and discuss any concerns with the intern and the supervisor.

To accommodate students on the neighbor islands, all course requirements can be met without flying to
the Mānoa campus. More details about LIS 690 requirements and assessment materials are available in
the course syllabus. During the review period, 112 students registered for and successfully completed
LIS 690 Internship [Appendix 2-11].

**LIS 696 Practicum in School Librarianship**

LIS 696 Practicum in School Librarianship is a three-credit course that is required for students seeking
school library licensure in the Hawai’i public schools. The Hawai’i Teacher Standards Board (HTSB)
oversees the process of licensure, described in more detail in II.3. The course is offered each fall
semester and students are advised to take this course toward the end of their program. The HTSB
requires that individuals complete fieldwork in the grade level band they will be licensed in. For
example, an LIS student completing LIS 696 at an elementary school would be licensed as a School
Librarian for grades K-6. Middle school and high school fieldwork leads to a licensure for grades 6-12.
Some students choose to take the practicum twice, either completing an elementary and secondary
practicum for a K-12 license, or to expand their experience in a new setting.

The practicum sets the following course learning outcomes for students: 1) articulate the philosophy,
goals, and objectives of the library; 2) analyze the library’s activities and programs in relation to the
mission and objectives of the library and the school; 3) demonstrate the five American Library
Association (ALA)/American Association of School Librarians (AASL)/Council for the Accreditation of
Educator Preparation (CAEP) *School Librarian Preparation Standards* (2019); and 4) synthesize and apply
skills, concepts, and theories to gain competencies for an entry-level professional position.

The practicum coordinator selects the site assignments based on information provided by the students
at an orientation session in the semester preceding the practicum. At the beginning of the semester
students prepare a proposal that includes a checklist of possible tasks based on the ALA/AASL/CAEP
*School Librarian Preparation Standards*. Students must spend a minimum of 120 hours during the
semester at the assigned school library. Most students average between 130 and 150 hours. To
accommodate school closures and safety protocols during the COVID-19 pandemic, students were
allowed to count hours spent in virtual instruction settings.

Students provide evidence of having achieved the course learning outcomes through participating in
field experiences and seminar discussions, composing reflective entries in shared journals, creating an
annotated record of self-selected professional readings, and ultimately preparing a portfolio of their
work and self-assessing performance using a rubric based on the ALA/AASL/CAEP *Standards*. The
coordinator uses the same rubric for final assessments (see Appendix 2-12 for a sample). Sample
portfolios and assessments will be made available on-site.

Twenty-two students completed the practicum and graduated between fall 2016 and spring 2022. In
summer 2022, the coordinator conducted a survey of these graduates and their cooperating librarians.
Ten have school librarian positions, three are teachers, seven hold other professional positions, and
another two are seeking employment or could not be reached. A table of graduates who completed a
practicum, their placement sites and cooperating librarians, and current employment is provided in
Appendix 2-12.
II.1.4 The curriculum is revised regularly to keep it current.

A summary of major curriculum developments and changes between 2016 to 2022 can be found in Appendix 1-2. These include:

- Revised and streamlined our Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs);
- Created a list of flexible core course options connected to each SLO;
- Changed the Plan B culminating experience from an oral comprehensive exam to an ePortfolio;
- Defined and implemented professional pathways and specializations; and
- Added, changed, and removed courses to reflect the evolving field.

Our major curriculum overhaul began at the November 2015 faculty meeting [Appendix 2-13], after our previous reaccreditation site visit. In December 2015, we surveyed the curricula of other ALA-accredited schools [Appendix 2-14] to learn more about the changing landscape of LIS education. Over the next two years, during faculty and strategic planning meetings (outlined in II.1.2), we conducted regular curriculum reviews including revising SLOs and defining core courses and specializations [Appendix 2-15]. This led to the development of pathways and adoption of the ePortfolio for the culminating experience to replace oral exams [Appendix 2-16]. Between monthly faculty meetings, follow-up discussions took place in a collaborative Google Doc [Appendix 2-17].

II.2 The curriculum is concerned with information resources and the services and technologies to facilitate their management and use. Within this overarching concept, the curriculum of library and information studies encompasses information and knowledge creation, communication, identification, selection, acquisition, organization and description, storage and retrieval, preservation and curation, analysis, interpretation, evaluation, synthesis, dissemination, use and users, and management of human and information resources.

While each LIS course has a topical focus and a corresponding primary SLO, each course encompasses multiple information processes. The table below summarizes the information process, corresponding SLOs, and LIS courses addressing these SLOs as the primary emphasis of the course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Process</th>
<th>LIS SLOs</th>
<th>LIS Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Information and knowledge creation               | SLOs 1, 3, 4, 5 | Core Courses: 601, 602, 605, 615, 630, 631, 645, 655, 656, 659, 661, 662, 665, 672  
|                                                 |          | Electives: 619, 633, 634, 635, 636, 638, 641, 648, 657, 674, 676, 677, 681, 682, 686 |
| Communication and dissemination                  | SLOs 3, 4 | Core Courses: 602, 605, 615, 645, 655, 656, 659, 661, 665, 672  
<p>|                                                 |          | Electives: 619, 638, 641, 657, 674, 676, 677, 681, 682, 686 |
| Identification, retrieval, selection, acquisition,| SLOs 1, 3, 5 | Core Courses: 601, 602, 605, 615, 630, 631, 645, 659, 662 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Process</th>
<th>LIS SLOs</th>
<th>LIS Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization, and description</td>
<td>Electives: 619, 633, 634, 635, 636, 638, 648, 686, 681, 682</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curation, preservation, and storage</td>
<td>SLOs 3, 4, 5</td>
<td>Core Courses: 602, 605, 615, 630, 631, 645, 655, 656, 659, 661, 662, 665, 672 Electives: 619, 633, 634, 635, 636, 638, 641, 657, 674, 676, 677, 681, 682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and interpretation</td>
<td>SLOs 3, 5</td>
<td>Core Courses: 602, 605, 615, 630, 631, 645, 659, 661 Electives: 619, 633, 634, 635, 636, 638, 681, 682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use and users</td>
<td>SLOs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5</td>
<td>Core Courses: 601, 602, 605, 610, 615, 630, 631, 645, 654, 655, 656, 659, 661, 662, 665, 672 Electives: 611, 612, 619, 633, 634, 635, 636, 638, 641, 648, 657, 674, 676, 677, 681, 682, 686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of human and information resources</td>
<td>SLOs 3, 6</td>
<td>Core Courses: 602, 605, 614, 615, 645, 650, 658, 659 Electives: 619, 638, 681, 682, 683, 696</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table below is a matrix showing the relationship between II.2.1-II.2.6 and the LIS courses addressing the corresponding standards.

**Table 2-4: Standards and Corresponding LIS Courses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards II.2.1-II.2.6</th>
<th>LIS Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.2.3 Technology</td>
<td>Core Courses: 601, 602, 605, 615, 650, 656, 658, 661, 665, 672 Electives: 611, 612, 619, 641, 647, 676, 682, 686, 690, ICS 669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.2.6 Lifelong learning</td>
<td>Core Courses: 601, 602, 605, 610, 631, 634, 645, 650, 658, 672 Electives: 611, 619, 633, 635, 636, 641, 648, 676, 682, 683, 690, 696</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As the table shows, each standard is integrated into several courses—both core and elective offerings. As students take courses, those standards are reinforced in other courses, so students can deepen their understanding.

**II.2.1 [The curriculum] Fosters development of library and information professionals who assume a leadership role in providing services and collections appropriate for the communities that are served.**

The first sentence of our mission statement is:

---

*We educate leaders in the information professions.*

---

Leadership can and should take many forms. A key pillar of our curriculum is building on professional ethics and leadership skills in the management-oriented courses but we also encourage students to reflect on their practice in their coursework across the curriculum, and develop and articulate a professional philosophy and identity in the culminating experience that allows them to lead in their own ways.

For example, students in LIS 615 Collection Management write and pitch a grant proposal, including budget, vision, and rationale based on research and competitive intelligence. LIS 650 Management of Libraries and Information Centers and LIS 658 Archival and Special Collections Management engage extensively with leadership, coordination, resource allocation, team skills, advocacy/lobbying, and strategic planning. Students in one LIS 650 course created a white paper with concrete recommendations for the Hawaiʻi Library Association (HLA), contacting lobbyists and researching advocacy best practices from other Hawaiʻi-based organizations, and presented this work at the HLA Annual Conference.

Two specializations—Community & Cultural Informatics and Asian Studies Librarianship—integrate leadership and professional ethics, networking, advocacy, and mentoring into their recommended courses, while emphasizing leadership as engagement with specific communities.

Our 2019 employer survey ranked our students highest in the area of “Manage and work effectively in collaborative problem solving and team projects” [Appendix 2-18]. Another indicator of our graduates’ leadership abilities is the number of recent graduates who reported that they were already serving in leadership roles [Appendix 2-1 (Restricted Access)].

**II.2.2 [The curriculum] Emphasizes an evolving body of knowledge that reflects the findings of basic and applied research from relevant fields.**

Our curriculum evolves as research in the field does, both by incorporating new modules, readings and activities into existing courses, and by experimenting with new courses via LIS 693 Special Topics in Librarianship and LIS 694 Special Topics in Information Technology. After being offered twice, Special Topics courses are eligible to be converted to regularly offered courses based on enrollment and
instructor availability. A list of course additions, deletions and revisions during the review period can be found in Appendix 2-19.

We emphasize the importance of basic and applied research in our courses, as evidenced by the research methodology section found in every course syllabus. On average, an LIS course engages with 3–4 different research methods (Appendix 2-20). Research skills are usually introduced in a scaffolded manner: students evaluate claims within assigned readings or literature they find themselves, learn research ethics, and critically assess research methods for their appropriateness to the people and data involved. Students conducting original research are encouraged to present it in class, in program talks (e.g., LIS Research Forum), or submit it for publication or presentation at professional conferences. We also hosted the International Journal of Information, Diversity, & Inclusion (IJIDI) until 2022 and provided opportunities for students to work as editorial assistants to better understand research and scholarly publishing processes.

The following are some examples of how research methods are incorporated into LIS courses.

**LIS 661 Informatics:** This course is co-listed with CIS 702 Communication/Information Technologies, the required interdisciplinary PhD seminar for the Communication and Information Sciences (CIS) doctoral program, and draws students from both programs who have a research orientation to information services and systems. In this shared setting, LIS students work alongside first- and second-year PhD students who are learning to become researchers themselves. Students from both programs work together on a collaborative synthesis table where research and professional literature are summarized and critiqued. Research methods employed in this course include action research, content analysis, critical incident analysis, heuristic evaluation, naturalistic inquiry, needs assessment, participant observation, and usability analysis.

**LIS 662 Asian Informatics:** Students apply community engagement research methods to examine community information needs and practices. Students search the literature for examples of applied community research relevant to designing an information and communications technology (ICT) project.

**LIS 665 Digital Instruction:** Using structural design analysis, students analyze a learning need for a user group, then design, develop, implement, and evaluate a learning activity addressing that need.

**LIS 690 Internship:** Some internship students, especially those in academic libraries, build literature reviews and develop annotated bibliographies to support patron research as well as their own.

**LIS 699 and LIS 700:** Students may count up to six credits of LIS 699 Directed Reading and/or Research towards the MLISc degree, but are free to take more credits if they choose to do so. Projects undertaken in LIS 699 during the review period often include research components. Examples are discussed in II.3. Additionally, students who complete a master’s thesis apply a variety of research methods in developing their proposal, must take a research methods course before advancing to candidacy, and finally enroll in LIS 700 Thesis Research. More details about students completing theses will be discussed in II.5.

The results of our 2018 LIS alumni survey [Appendix 2-1 (Restricted Access)] indicate that graduates excel in research, e.g., publishing book chapters, presenting research at conferences, writing grant proposals, serving on an IRB committee, and teaching a master’s level evidence-based medical research class.

We anticipate that the new School of Communication and Information (SCI) will provide more opportunities and support for collaborative research within the school and across the College of Social
Sciences. The College’s Social Science Research Institute provides research support and funding for faculty and graduate students.

**II.2.3 [The curriculum] Integrates technology and the theories that underpin its design, application, and use.**

The technology dimensions of our curriculum reflect our engagement with employers and alumni about their current and emerging technological needs as well as the perspectives surrounding technologies that allow them to be used appropriately and effectively. Students in all pathways are required to take at least one SLO4 Technologies core course, each of which includes theoretical, practical and critical perspectives, and practice. We present several examples below.

The Archives pathway sequence introduces theoretical, social and ethical aspects of archives in LIS 654 Records, Archives and Memory, after which students engage in processing and technical practice in LIS 659 Archival Access, Representation and Use. The integration of theories and technologies as the foundation prepares students for archives-related electives such as LIS 655 Digital Archives and LIS 656 Moving Image Archives and LIS 690 Internship in archives.

These and other technology-related courses are open to students in any pathway. For example, LIS 672 Technology for Libraries and Information Centers is designed as an introduction to technological concepts and applications relevant to LIS professions such as Integrated Library Systems/Library Services Platforms, digital libraries, institutional repositories, discovery products, cloud computing, open source software, open access, open educational resources citation management systems, and basic spreadsheet functions. LIS 641 Digital Librarianship includes modules on website usability principles, research methods for website evaluation, text mining, machine learning/AI, CMS, and data management.

Two courses address evaluating and selecting technologies for instruction and learning. LIS 665 Digital Instruction is a core SLO4 option and is strongly recommended for the School Library Media pathway and required for the Academic and Special Librarianship pathway. Students begin by evaluating familiar instructional technologies, review literature about new technologies for effective teaching in virtual environments, and apply their knowledge by creating a video tutorial for a specific user group and learning need. LIS 686 Information Literacy and Learning Resources, is required for the School Library Media pathway and a recommended elective for the Public Librarianship, Academic, and Special Librarianship pathways. The course focuses on designing and delivering inquiry-based learning experiences to build problem-solving and research skills. Students survey a range of collaborative learning tools and produce a lesson or session plan.

During the review period, we were challenged by the retirement of faculty members Péter Jacsó and Luz Marina Quiroga, who specialized in technology-related areas. Our 25-year history as a program within the Information and Computer Sciences Department resulted in fewer technological opportunities for LIS students and less flexibility to hire adjunct faculty than we had envisioned. Student surveys [Appendix 2-4] and the 2018 LIS Advisory Board [Appendix 1-22, pp. 39-63] indicated a need for more technology coursework, although in our most recent alumni survey, graduates rated their ability to create, discover, and organize resources among the highest of all response elements [Appendix 2-8]. In our new school and college, we were fortunate to hire more outstanding adjunct faculty professionals, who impart current technological skills via their course offerings.
II.2.4 [The curriculum] Responds to the needs of a diverse and global society, including the needs of underserved groups.

Our curriculum is shaped by our vision statement.

Our ‘ohana will be compassionate leaders in a world where information connects, supports and respects diverse populations.

We build on this through two of our program goals:

- Serve the needs of a diverse student population; and
- Strengthen the emphasis on Hawaiʻi and the Asia-Pacific region in teaching, research, and service.

We tangibly express these goals in the curriculum via SLO5 Cultures:

Analyze and apply knowledge about information needs and perspectives of Indigenous cultures and/or diverse communities.

Reflecting Hawaiʻi’s uniquely diverse environment, SLO5 Cultures has four core-eligible course options, to provide maximum flexibility for students to apply their LIS skills and perspectives to the communities they want to serve.

One of the central core-eligible SLO5 course options is LIS 630 Community Engagement, where students learn how to ethically conduct community analyses of information needs, data walks, and create community action plans. Some of the student projects resulted in actual professional collaborations, such as an effort with the Hawaiʻi State Public Library System to meet the information needs of houseless people.

LIS 631 Introduction to Hawaiʻi and Pacific Librarianship explores Hawaiʻi and Pacific Islands library resources and issues related to the profession of libraries and archives in the geographic, historical, and cultural context of the Pacific region. Students in LIS 662 Asian Informatics research underrepresented, underserved communities in Asia, Hawaiʻi, and the Pacific region to address specific social and economic problems by designing an ICT project in collaboration with local organizations.

Our curriculum also embraces the cultural richness within literature and public services in courses such as LIS 634 Multicultural Resources, LIS 681 Books and Media for Children, LIS 682 Books and Media for Young Adults, and LIS 683 Services in Public Libraries. LIS 615 Collection Management focuses on small presses, which often serve as a voice for underserved communities, and engages with issues of censorship, diversity, and information inequity.

Students also gain valuable experience via internships, many of which are unique to Hawaiʻi. These include the Hula Preservation Society, Palama Settlement Archives, ʻUluʻulu: the Moving Image Archive of Hawaiʻi, Japanese Cultural Center of Hawaiʻi, and Consuelo Foundation, which is an organization helping families to prevent child abuse and domestic violence in Hawaiʻi and the Philippines.
Results of the 2018 alumni survey indicate that 90% of participants (N=21) felt they were well prepared to “Analyze and apply knowledge about the information needs and perspectives of Indigenous cultures and/or diverse communities” from their coursework in the LIS program [Appendix 2-8].

At this writing, we are welcoming Keahiahi Long, a full-time, tenure-track faculty member in Hawaiian Librarianship/Archival Studies to the LIS faculty, and we very much look forward to her contributions taking us in new directions.

II.2.5 [The curriculum] Provides direction for future development of a rapidly changing field.

The majority of our students come to us wanting to become what they perceive as a traditional librarian or archivist, but if that’s the same perception they leave with—we’ve failed them. We don’t pretend to know the future. Our curriculum is designed for students to master core skills but also to adapt and question them for the benefit of the people they serve, and expand the landscape of possibilities. Through our curriculum, students look back, around, and ahead, develop well-grounded practices, and have the confidence to reach out, advocate, and resist. To imagine, to listen to what others imagine, and find a way to act together, in whatever professional information environments our graduates find themselves.

LIS 602 Resource Discovery has evolved from focusing almost exclusively on professional subscription databases to mirroring people’s diverse everyday information seeking practices. Students learn to identify, discover, and integrate relevant information resources within and beyond those represented in traditional information retrieval systems. They also learn to understand the structure, content and limitations, and assumptions of information systems. This allows students to develop and apply a critical, reflective philosophy and practice of resource discovery, encompassing action research, algorithm audits, case studies, content analysis, field study, heuristic evaluation and information retrieval. For example, spring 2020 LIS 602 students conducted fieldwork investigations of resource discovery pathways and help services in an archive, library or other information institution that was unfamiliar to them, and conducted oral history interviews to compare seeking information from people as information resources with how collection items are represented and discovered within information systems.

In the final project for LIS 661 Informatics, students model the information behavior of a community of interest to them, trace their formal and informal information sources, technologies, pathways and practices, and recommend improvements that align with their social and technological worlds. The essence of the course is the sociotechnical information infrastructure through which the LIS field functions, changes, and evolves.

In LIS 672 Technology for Libraries and Information Centers, Stanislava Gardasevic implemented a final project where students use environmental scanning methods to compare past, present, and five years in the future information technologies supporting LIS services. They provide empirical evidence for their predictions, but are also invited to use their imaginations, to support future user needs.

In LIS 641 Digital Librarianship, students are introduced to the future studies method of scenarios, where they plan and advocate for the implementation of technologies such as mobile apps and wearable technologies in LIS environments, and create information resources targeted at professionals who may be considering adopting the technology.
Our merger into the new School of Communication and Information created new possibilities for students and faculty to adopt global thinking with an interdisciplinary approach. We envision a school-wide curriculum committee designed to identify and facilitate cross-unit collaborations, which would embrace future directions in areas such as media literacy, informed society, digital storytelling, and digital humanities with other units in the social sciences.

II.2.6 [The curriculum] Promotes commitment to continuous professional development and lifelong learning, including the skills and competencies that are needed for the practitioner of the future.

We emphasize to students that obtaining the degree is only the first stage of their career. While it’s easy to tell students we want them to become reflective professionals and lifelong learners, we demonstrate this value with our emphasis on not just completing assignments but reflecting on their process, and how it informs their evolving professional philosophy. Similarly, professional development isn’t necessarily a solo activity. Refreshing skills is important but refreshing professional relationships is essential as well.

During LIS New Student Orientation (NSO), Meet & Greet, and other opportunities, students are introduced to and encouraged to join one or more student professional organizations corresponding to their interests. These events instill the idea that building a network is an essential skill for information professionals, and a source for professional development opportunities. Students also join state and national organizations, and regularly help to organize and present at conferences such as the Hawai‘i Library Association (HLA) and Hawai‘i Association of School Librarians (HASL). These activities demonstrate the importance of partnership with local organizations, give students a window into how policies are shaped, and allow them to inform the conversation. In 2021, our ALA Student Chapter created a speed mentoring program at the ALA conference, and they were awarded ALA Student Chapter of the Year.

Table 2-4 lists ten core-eligible and twelve elective LIS courses that include components of the Lifelong Learning standard. Similarly, Appendix 2-21 maps the ALA/AASL/CAEP Standard 5 that relates to “ongoing professional learning” to two of our six SLOs: SLO2 Professions and SLO6 Management. Faculty actively modify courses to create opportunities for students to interact with professionals who model professional development and lifelong learning. In LIS 650 Management of Libraries and Information Centers, students partner with professional associations to engage in group projects that meet learning objectives and experience firsthand how professionals connect, learn, and advocate through associations. In LIS 696 Practicum in School Librarianship, students are asked to join a professional organization, participate in an online professional social network, and attend and/or present at a professional development session or conference.

In the First Semester Seminar, new students meet practicing librarians and archivists from a range of settings and speak with administrators who employ these individuals, which have included Hawaii State Librarian Stacey Aldrich and University Librarian Clem Guthro. Through conversations with these professionals and hearing their stories, they quickly discover the importance of being engaged, flexible, lifelong learners who see and create opportunities, connect with other professionals, and keep current. Guest talks by professionals and library leaders take place throughout students’ time in the program, e.g., our ALA Student chapter organized a visit by ALA President Julius C. Jefferson Jr. in 2020.
One of the goals of LIS 690 Internship and LIS 696 Practicum in School Librarianship is to connect interns with a professional network, including volunteering at conferences to learn what it takes to support and engage with these critical community interactions. This is a two-way relationship—students learn from mentors and interns bring new skills, energy, and career goals to professional sites.

II.3 The curriculum provides the opportunity for students to construct coherent programs of study that allow individual needs, goals, and aspirations to be met within the context of program requirements established by the school and will foster the attainment of student learning outcomes. The curriculum includes, as appropriate, cooperative degree programs, interdisciplinary coursework and research, experiential opportunities, and other similar activities. Course content and sequence relationships within the curriculum are evident.

Every semester during the course registration period, continuing students meet with their faculty advisor to discuss their progress, career goals, and map out their program of study. New students meet with faculty advisors at NSO. Advising sessions are guided by: course schedules and course descriptions and syllabi posted on the website; a pathway-specific advising sheet to track their progress; and the 3 Year Course Projection for longer-term planning. This allows students to create a coherent, individualized program of study that best reflects their areas of interest.

All entering students take the non-credit First Semester Seminar (FSS) where they are introduced to the program and field, meet information professionals and potential mentors, and create a sense of ‘ohana. Most first semester students also take LIS 601 Introduction to Reference and Information Services. FSS sometimes serves as an informal study group and mutual support space for students, many of whom are in their first semester of graduate school and trying to find a balance with their other commitments.

Students are generally advised to take core-eligible courses early in the program, then proceed to electives to deepen their understanding or explore areas of interest. However, the curriculum is sufficiently flexible in terms of sequencing to allow students to take infrequently offered electives and special topics courses of interest as they are offered. This structure also allows students to explore and change pathways as they proceed through the program. Most students take one or two LIS 690 Internship courses, usually in a professional environment aligned with their pathway. Graduating students (save those completing a thesis) converge again in LIS 691 Masters Seminar to refine and complete their culminating ePortfolios. The seminar also prepares them for job hunting through career preparation activities.

Pathways and Specializations

Following our Strategic Plan (2015–2020 Strategic Plan; 2019-2-24 Strategic Plan), we reviewed and revised the curriculum to better connect the evolving needs of the local job market with the career goals of our students and established six customizable professional pathways:

- Academic/Special Librarianship;
- Archives;
- Asian Studies Librarianship;
- Public Librarianship;
- School Library Media; and
- General/Custom.
The General/Custom pathway offers students maximum flexibility in designing an individualized program of study, and has no course requirements beyond those of the MLISc degree. The General/Custom pathway is designed for students who seek a broad base of professional preparation that combines multiple areas within and beyond LIS.

Because students regularly change and combine pathways, accurate numbers are difficult to determine. Archives and Academic/Special tend to be the two most popular pathways with roughly 20–25% of students expressing interest in each when they apply, followed by Public and School with roughly 10–15% each. To allow students to further customize their degree program, we developed specializations in Asian Studies Librarianship, Community & Cultural Informatics, and Information Technology, which can be combined with any pathway. Sample student plans are available in Appendix 2-22 (Restricted Access).

**Core Courses**

Of the [39 credits needed for the MLISc degree](#), 18 credits (six courses) are core requirements. Students are required to take at least one course among several choices corresponding to each of the six SLOs.

**SLO1 Services: Design, provide, and assess information services**

- LIS 601 Introduction to Reference and Information Services

**SLO2 Professions: Apply history and ethics to develop a professional LIS identity**

- LIS 610 Foundations of the Information Professions
- LIS 654 Archival Ethics and Profession

**SLO3 Resources: Create, organize, manage, and discover information resources**

- LIS 602 Resource Discovery
- LIS 605 Metadata Creation for Information Organization
- LIS 615 Collection Management
- LIS 645 Asian Research Materials and Methods
- LIS 651 Archival Arrangement and Description

**SLO4 Technologies: Evaluate and apply information technologies**

- LIS 655 Digital Archives
- LIS 656 Moving Image Archives
- LIS 661 Informatics
- LIS 665 Digital Instruction
- LIS 672 Technology for Libraries and Information Centers

**SLO5 Cultures: Analyze and apply knowledge about information needs and perspectives of Indigenous cultures and/or diverse communities**

- LIS 630 Community Engagement
- LIS 631 Introduction to Hawai‘i and Pacific Librarianship
- LIS 634 Multicultural Resources for Diverse User Groups
- LIS 662 Asian Informatics

**SLO6 Management: Demonstrate skills necessary to manage and work effectively within information organizations**
The current core alignment offers students a flexible yet coherent course of study corresponding to their chosen pathway. Prior to spring 2018, six core and two technology-related courses were required, with only one core option between general and school library management.

**Culminating Experience: Plan A and Plan B**

Plan A *(Thesis)*: Thesis students must take six credit hours in LIS 700 Thesis Research and three credit hours in an approved research methods course. This capstone option allows students to demonstrate their abilities to synthesize literature, conduct research, and analyze data to explore research questions in their field of study.

Plan B *(ePortfolio)*: Most students opt for the ePortfolio culminating experience, which encourages reflection on their learning artifacts demonstrating mastery of our six program SLOs, and articulation of their professional philosophy.

**Elective Courses, Cooperative Agreements, and Interdisciplinary Courses**

Students also complete 18 credits (9 courses) of electives. Students work with their faculty advisor to select relevant courses from the entire LIS catalog, including LIS 693 and LIS 694 special topics courses, to deepen their knowledge and skills. Students following a professional pathway will select electives as suggested in the pathway. With approval of their faculty advisor, students may also apply up to three graduate-level courses from other campus departments (see Table 4-11) or from other universities to their degree requirements.

**LIS 693 Special Topics in Librarianship and LIS 694 Special Topics in Information Technology**

New and experimental courses are initially offered as LIS 693/694 Special Topics courses, and after being offered twice can be converted to a regular number and incorporated into the curriculum. We welcome a broad range of professionals and researchers who share their interests and experience with students via special topics courses, many of which are discussed in II.7.

**LIS 699 Directed Reading and/or Research**

We also encourage students to pursue research and experiential learning opportunities beyond the scope of regular courses via LIS 699. Students work closely with a faculty advisor to propose a topic and deliverables, and those considering a thesis often first explore their potential topic area via LIS 699, which may be counted towards the LIS 700 Thesis Research requirement. An abridged list of LIS 699 projects during the review period can be found in Table 4-12 and a full list is available in Appendix 2-23.

**Dual Degrees**

Students can also pursue nine *dual degrees*: Master’s with American Studies, Asian Studies, Hawaiian Language, Hawaiian Studies, History, Information & Computer Sciences, Learning Design and Technology, and Pacific Islands Studies; and a juris doctor in Law. The dual Master’s degree option allows students to enroll in and complete two degree programs concurrently, sharing a maximum of nine credits between the two programs.
School Library Media Specialist Licensure

The Hawai‘i Teacher Standards Board (HTSB) licenses students interested in becoming school library media specialists in the Hawai‘i State Department of Education (HIDOE). As part of the licensure process, students must complete the School Library Media pathway and earn a teaching license. If a teaching license has not been earned by the time a student enters the MLISc degree program, he or she may earn one after earning the MLISc degree. While other states and local private schools may not require the same coursework as the HIDOE, students are strongly encouraged to follow the School Library Media (SLM) pathway if they intend to work in school libraries. Between fall 2016 and fall 2022, 11 graduates earned school librarian licensure. In addition to completing a core course for all six program SLOs, those pursuing licensure must also complete:

- LIS 686 Information Literacy and Learning Resources;
- LIS 696 Practicum in School Librarianship; and
- Two elective courses focused on children and youth services.

The Certificate in Advanced Library and Information Science

The Certificate in Advanced Library and Information Science (CALIS) is an opportunity for students to complete a coherent program of specialized study and research beyond the MLISc, as continuing education or to explore a new area within LIS. During the review period we had one student begin, but not complete the certificate, and we are planning to reimagine the certificate in the near future.

Study Abroad

To support our goal of “emphasis on Hawai‘i and the Asia-Pacific region in teaching, research, and service”, strengthen regional ties, and deepen our international understanding, we established study abroad opportunities with two sister programs in the region.

The University of Tsukuba, Japan

The Graduate School of Library, Information and Media Studies (GSLIMS), University of Tsukuba is one of Asia’s largest iSchools. The iSchool was originally an independent national university dedicated to library and information science but merged with a larger research university, which is in the highest rank of Japanese national universities as a top ten Designated National University and part of the G-30 (Global) program. With this international vision, GSLIMS established an international MA program taught in English, which makes it possible for our LIS students without Japanese language proficiency to study there. The GSLIMS is Japan’s first member of the iSchool Consortium, which shows how their curriculum parallels iSchools in North America, while also offering unique courses that examine information structures in Japan and wider Asia. Students can take courses in information and society, media innovation, human computer interaction, information circulation, and information principles and design. Before the pandemic, the LIS program benefited by having visiting students and faculty come and share their experience with our students.

Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand

CSS maintains an exchange partnership with Victoria University of Wellington, which is the only graduate iSchool in New Zealand. The School of Information Management is part of the Wellington School of Business and Government. As a new member of CSS, we look forward to participating in this existing MOU, particularly with their expertise in Māori/Indigenous information behavior and the indigenization of cultural heritage institutions and professions.
Student Satisfaction with Coursework Customization

During fall 2018 and spring 2019, 80% of graduating students agreed or strongly agreed that they were satisfied with their ability to craft a course of study that met their needs [Appendix 2-4]. This is a lower percentage than we would like, and may have been partially attributable to the original policy that only core-eligible course assignments could be included in the ePortfolio. When this policy was relaxed to encourage students to identify for themselves which artifacts best demonstrated their mastery of each SLO, the satisfaction rate improved to 92%. Revisions to the ePortfolio policy are discussed in more detail in II.7.

II.4 Design of general and specialized curricula takes into account the statements of knowledge and competencies developed by relevant professional organizations.

As mentioned throughout this Standard, we regularly review courses for alignment between course content, program SLOs, ALA competences and accreditation standards. Courses in specialized areas take into account relevant guidelines and standards developed by corresponding professional organizations, as evidenced by pathway requirements and course syllabi.

Aligning ALA’s Core Competences with LIS SLOs

In response to the 2021 update of the ALA Core Competences of Librarianship, we reviewed and mapped our program SLOs to the revised Core Competences, and created Table 2-2 to indicate which courses address each component. As we’ll show throughout this Standard element, each pathway is developed and reviewed in conversation with statements of professional knowledge.

Academic and Special Librarianship Pathway

The majority of students in this pathway are interested in preparing for a career in academic libraries, ranging from community colleges to Research 1 universities. Pathway coordinator Andrew Wertheimer and adjunct faculty members who teach in this pathway shape their instruction on the ACRL Standards for Libraries in Higher Education (2018), Competencies for Special Collections Professionals (2017), the Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education (2015), and the Framework for Visual Literacy in Higher Education (2022). Students can create customized pathways with faculty advisors, taking into account position descriptions, research on academic librarianship, and discussion with stakeholders and the pathway coordinator. Examples of standards and guidelines in two required courses are noted below.

LIS 615 Collection Management (SLO3)

- ALA Core Competences of Librarianship - Competences 1B, 1G, and 2
- ALA Intellectual Freedom Committee (IFC) Intellectual Freedom in Library Schools

LIS 650 Management of Libraries and Information Centers (SLO6)

- ALA Core Competences of Librarianship - Competence 4
- Library Leadership & Management Association Leadership and Management Competencies (now part of core)
Through advising, students interested in academic and special librarianship are encouraged to take courses that reflect SLA’s Competencies for Information Professionals and complete an internship in a special or academic library. There are numerous specializations, examples of which are listed below. Students with an interest in this pathway are strongly encouraged to examine the relevant professional association standards when selecting courses.

- Art Libraries Society of North America Core Competencies for Art Information Professionals
- Federal Library and Information Center Committee Federal Librarian Competencies
- American Association of Law Libraries Guidelines for Graduate Programs in Law Librarianship
- Medical Library Association (MLA) Competencies for Lifelong Learning and Professional Success: The Educational Policy Statement of the MLA
- Music Library Association Core Competencies and Music Librarians
- Special Libraries Association (SLA) Competencies for Information Professionals

Archives Pathway

The Archives pathway is intended for students seeking careers that preserve records to sustain cultures and promote government accountability. Professionals in this specialization adhere to national and international standards of practice and conduct themselves in accordance with a professional code of ethics. Andrew Wertheimer currently coordinates this pathway, and both he and Tonia Sutherland led it during the review period. In consultation with stakeholders, the Archival Certificate [Appendix 2-24] was developed and approved, identifying relevant coursework and a requirement for an internship in an approved archival site, or sufficient evidence of working or volunteering in an archive or special collection. The following archives-specific courses and the standards they embody are noted below.

Courses:

- LIS 654 Records, Archives and Memory (SLO2)
- LIS 655 Digital Archives (SLO4)
- LIS 656 Moving Image Archives (SLO4)
- LIS 658 Archival and Special Collections Management (SLO6)
- LIS 659 Archival Access, Description and Use (SLO3)

Standards:

- SAA Guidelines for a Graduate Program in Archival Studies (2011)
- SAA-ACRL/RBMS Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy
- Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials developed by the ACRL/RBMS Bibliographic Standards Committee
- Protocols for Native American Archival Materials

These courses cover: theory and methodology associated with specific areas of archival work; history of the profession and evolution of archival practice; and contexts within which records are created, managed, and kept. A critical component is the incorporation of international and multicultural perspectives.

Asian Studies Librarianship Pathway

We are unique in offering an Asian Studies librarianship pathway, which is ideal for students interested in Asia’s people, cultures, society, languages, history, politics, and business. Students in this pathway can pursue careers in academic libraries and archives, or apply informatics to Asian contexts and information systems. This pathway can also lead to professional opportunities for students with Chinese,
Japanese, Korean, or other Asian language competency. Courses and competencies within this pathway include the following.

**LIS 645 Asian Research Materials and Methods (SLO3)**
- [ALA Code of Ethics](#) (2021)
- [ALA Core Competences of Librarianship](#) (2021, Competencies 2, 3, 4, 6)

Asian Studies librarians work most often in academic libraries. This course covers reference materials, collection management, and basics of managing Asian collections. There is no specific standard for Asian Studies librarianship; however, the curriculum and course contents introduced are based on these frameworks.

**LIS 662 Asian Informatics (SLO4)**
- [ASIS&T Educational Guidelines](#) (2001, Competencies 1, 2)

This course explores the history of information, information technology, and the interplay between information, users, and society in Asia. It is guided by the Association for Information Science & Technology (ASIS&T) information professionals’ competencies 1 and 2.

**Public Librarianship Pathway**

The Public Librarianship pathway prepares professionals to design programs and services that meet the informational, educational, and recreational needs of diverse communities. Meera Garud currently coordinates this pathway. Vanessa Irvin previously served as the coordinator and identified two required courses focusing on professional standards and guidelines, and applied in course assignments.

**LIS 601 Introduction to Reference and Information Services (SLO1)**
- [ALA Code of Ethics](#)
- [ALA Core Competences of Librarianship](#) - Competency 6: Reference and User Services
- [RUSA Definitions of Reference](#)
- [RUSA Guidelines for Behavioral Performance of Reference and Information Service Providers](#)
- [RUSA Professional Competencies for Reference and User Services Librarians](#)

These guidelines for reference and user services are introduced during the early weeks of LIS 601 so students learn the standards and apply them to their coursework throughout the semester. Students are required to discuss and cite readings and standards to explain their rationale for reference interview engagement, database searching, the search process, and query resolution and presentation.

**LIS 683 Services in Public Libraries (SLO6)**
- [ALA Library Bill of Rights](#)
- [ALA Code of Ethics](#)
- [ALA Core Competences of Librarianship](#)
- [PLA Professional Tools](#)
- [PLA Professional Development Theory of Change](#)

All the above items are required readings for the course and serve as a foundation for engagement with public library services. In assignments and group discussions, students identify and discuss funding sources, innovative programming, visit public library spaces, interview professionals, and, for their final project, prepare a one-year public library programming sequence.
School Library Media Pathway

The SLM pathway prepares candidates for service and leadership in P–12 school settings. Critical learning goals include: demonstrating an awareness of learners’ development; promoting cultural competence and respect for inclusiveness; and fostering a positive learning environment that prepares all learners for college, career, and life. The Hawai’i Teacher Standards Board (HTSB) licenses students interested in becoming school librarians in the Hawai’i Department of Education (HIDOE). As part of the licensure process, students must complete the SLM pathway requirements and an accredited teacher education program that includes courses in developmental psychology, curriculum and instruction, teaching of reading, and student teaching.

Meera Garud coordinates the SLM pathway. She developed a table that aligns the ALA/AASL/CAEP Standards with the LIS SLOs [Appendix 2-21]. The two courses required for this pathway are LIS 686 Information Literacy and Learning Resources and LIS 696 Practicum in School Librarianship.

LIS 686 Information Literacy and Learning Resources (SLO1)

- 2016 ACRL Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education
- 2018 AASL Standards Framework for Learners

In this course, students select relevant components from these frameworks to target in their planned instructional services.

LIS 696 Practicum in School Librarianship (SLO6)

- 2019 ALA/AASL/CAEP School Librarian Preparation Standards

The Preparation Standards inform the learning goals for this specialization. In the practicum, students discuss the NSLS, using it as a resource in their course assignments such as designing instruction to support the Standards for Learners, and reflecting on best practices related to the Standards for School Librarians and School Libraries. Students also self-assess their mastery of these standards using a rubric modeled on the one provided in the course syllabus.

Curriculum Evaluation and Decision-Making

II.5 Procedures for the continual evaluation of the curriculum are established with input not only from faculty but also representatives from those served. The curriculum is continually evaluated with input from faculty and representatives from those served including students, employers, alumni, and other constituents. Curricular evaluation is used for ongoing appraisal and to make improvements. Evaluation of the curriculum includes assessment of students’ achievements.

Our assessment philosophy emphasizes the importance of “many voices heard and considered”. We take a holistic approach to examining our curriculum that includes: course evaluations and observations by students and instructors; survey responses contributed by graduating students, alumni, and employers; conversations at LIS summits and retreats with members of the professional community; discussions with the LIS Advisory Board; and achievements and reflections captured in students’
culminating theses, oral comprehensive examinations, and ePortfolios. Our overall decision-making process and stakeholder groups are illustrated in Figure 1-3 and Figure 1-4.

Since 2009, the UHM Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Excellence requires all campus units to submit annual (later biennial) assessment reports that provide snapshots of our processes and achievements. Questions that drive our assessment include: how effectively instruction is delivered; how well students achieve the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs); and how various stakeholders perceive the preparedness of our graduates to succeed in the workplace. The following table summarizes the various methods employed and participants invited to address these objectives.

**Table 2-5: Assessment Metrics Used for Ongoing Curriculum Appraisal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Metric and Participant</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Implementation Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course evaluation – students</td>
<td>Quality of instruction</td>
<td>Every semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course assessment – instructors</td>
<td>Quality of instruction</td>
<td>Every semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achievement of SLOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis – students</td>
<td>Demonstration of ability to</td>
<td>Dependent on student completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conduct research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral comprehensive exam – students</td>
<td>Achievement of SLOs</td>
<td>Every semester for students who entered the Program before 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ePortfolio – students</td>
<td>Achievement of SLOs</td>
<td>Every semester for students beginning in spring 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey – graduating students</td>
<td>Preparedness of graduates</td>
<td>Every semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey – alumni</td>
<td>Preparedness of graduates</td>
<td>Every 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey – employers</td>
<td>Preparedness of graduates</td>
<td>Every 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit/retreat – various stakeholder representatives</td>
<td>Preparedness of graduates</td>
<td>Every year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory board – various stakeholder representatives</td>
<td>Preparedness of graduates</td>
<td>Every year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We organize the evidence presented in this section into the following clusters:

- Course assessments and reflections by students and instructors.
- Assessment of culminating experiences.
- Assessment via stakeholder surveys and meetings.
Course Assessments by Students and Instructors

Course evaluations by students

Students share their course experiences at the end of each semester in response to an online course evaluation system, focusing on content, delivery, and instructor effectiveness. To indicate satisfactory quality, the faculty agreed that courses should average at least 4 out of 5 across all criteria. The Program Coordinator collects the data from individual instructors for the Director’s review. In turn, the Director meets with instructors who fail to achieve the 4/5 standard to discuss how the content and execution of a course might be strengthened.

To provide a high-level overview, we present the results of two curriculum-related questions from the survey. Complete course evaluation data is available on-site.

- Q1: I gained a good understanding of concepts/principles in this field. (Note from fall 2016 through fall 2018, this question was phrased as: “I developed skills needed by professionals in the field.”)
- Q2: This course challenged me intellectually.

In the period under review, evaluations were collected from 129 out of 137 courses. The response rate was 66 percent of 1,236 enrolled students. The following table organizes responses to these two questions by the six SLOs and average scores ranged from 4.4–4.7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>I gained a good understanding of concepts/principles in this field</th>
<th>This course challenged me intellectually</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO1 Services</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO2 Professions</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO3 Resources</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO4 Technologies</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO5 Cultures</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO6 Management</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Course SLO assessments and reflections by instructors

During the first half of the review period, we assessed student achievement of the SLOs at the course level by identifying the number of students who exceeded, met, approached, or did not meet the standards associated with the primary SLO of the course. This was measured by the student’s performance on a major assignment or a set of related tasks. The following table depicts the data collected from AY2017–18 and AY2018–19. By SLO, the table shows the percentage of assignments that were scored as exceeded, met, approaching, or did not meet. Students were counted multiple times within an SLO when they took multiple courses under the same SLO and if that course assessed multiple assignments. For example, the 14 students in LIS 601 (SLO1) are represented 42 times in AY2018–19.
Table 2-7: Course SLO Assessments, 2017 to 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>Terms</th>
<th>Exceeds</th>
<th>Meets</th>
<th>Approaches</th>
<th>Does not meet</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO1</td>
<td>F17–S18</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F18–S19</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO2</td>
<td>F17–S18</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F18–S19</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO3</td>
<td>F17–S18</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F18–S19</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO4</td>
<td>F17–S18</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F18–S19</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO5</td>
<td>F17–S18</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F18–S19</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO6</td>
<td>F17–S18</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F18–S19</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results showed that most of the percentages for both “approaching” and “does not meet” ranged from 1–10%. The higher percentages noted for SLO1 (26%/12% and 14%/17%) were explained by the LIS 601 instructor as the result of a large percentage of first-semester students who had difficulty transitioning to the rigorous nature of the course. Also noted was the higher percentage of SLO2 scores in the “approaching” category (34%) in AY2018–19. The instructor for LIS 610 explained that the directions for the major assignment were “not specific enough” and that she revised this in subsequent semesters.

Upon reflection, we realized that quantitative summaries did not provide us with sufficient details regarding possible areas for instructional adjustments. We now consult instructors’ reflective comments to analyze the strengths of courses and areas for possible improvement. We share this information in faculty meetings and through written reflections, which are sent to the Director. We ask ourselves where students succeeded and where they struggled. Our goal is to integrate these self-reflections into strengthening courses and give faculty the opportunity to see how students are progressing in courses beyond those they teach. We present some examples of faculty reflections that resulted in course changes below.

Balancing cognitive with socio-emotional aspects of assignments

Rich Gazan, who teaches LIS 601 Introduction to Reference and Information Services, which is a core requirement for all students, indicated that the course traditionally instilled rigorous attention to detail in all assignments. However, students reported focusing so much on the details of professional expression and citation styles that they sometimes felt disconnected from the patrons they were supposed to be serving in reference scenarios, as if they were working from a script. This led to an open conversation with students about how librarians often engage in a kind of code switching that involves balancing professional expression with the emotional labor of genuine connection. Gazan said:
As a result, I changed the LIS 601 syllabus to explicitly identify several assignments that would require professional attention to detail, others where a more creative, individualistic approach was welcomed, and a final reflective component where students could consider how they will balance these approaches in their own practice, to provide compassionate and effective information services.

Building intentional support for critical communication skills

Andrew Wertheimer, who teaches LIS 615 Collection Management, realized that while he assigned class presentations for students to develop confidence in public speaking, he assumed that students had learned basic presentation skills during their undergraduate education. He observed, however, that many students had below average skills in presentations, a weakness that had also been flagged by alumni members. In his fall 2019 teaching reflection he noted an “a-ha” moment when he recognized the importance of focusing not only on course content but also on providing more instruction on the elements of an effective presentation. By doing this for assignments where students pitched the Collection Management Project or Digital Collection Prospectus, he reported the following:

I adjusted my teaching and spent about 30 minutes on elements of a good presentation. With these detailed hints, my students did a great job on their performances. I also shared my insights on effective communication skills with other faculty, who were integrating class presentations in their courses. We are trying to more intentionally address soft skills as many of our students are first generation college students who must develop these competencies to land positions and assume leadership in the profession.

Leveraging peer support in overcoming challenges

Noriko Asato, who teaches LIS 645 Asian Research Materials and Methods, realized that students had some background in one or two Asian languages, however, many of the databases offered only one language specific interface. She decided on the following strategy to deal with this challenge:

I encouraged students to share any search techniques, resources, and hints with peers by making posts in Laulima’s forum... This sparked a feeling of team building among the students... This also had a positive impact on the final capstone project, making a subject guide for existing courses either at the UH or at students’ home institutions, where Asian materials are necessary to carry out course work.

Integrating check-in strategies to strengthen collaborative resource sharing

Meera Garud, who teaches LIS 665 Digital Instruction as an asynchronous course, noted that only two or three students came to office hours to discuss their projects. Those who did benefitted from the real-time collaboration and idea/resource sharing. The second and subsequent times she taught the course, she incorporated three required 20-minute one-on-one check-ins, set by students based on their schedules. She elaborated:
I used these meetings as an opportunity to practice collaborative instruction: students were asked to come to the meeting prepared with specific questions or areas to work out and discuss in their projects. I was hesitant to require synchronous meetings for an asynchronous course, but by letting students schedule the time, all students were able to meet without reporting issues with their schedules. Importantly, students found the check-ins valuable for staying engaged and addressing questions or concerns that are more challenging to communicate over email.

She observed that some students were prepared during the meetings and brought specific areas of their project they wanted to discuss, while other students admitted feeling frozen with their projects. Regardless of how prepared they were going into the meetings, all students left with feelings of confidence and plans for next steps.

**Culminating Experiences**

During the review period, we provided students with three options for their culminating experiences: the Plan A thesis and the Plan B oral comprehensive examination (discussed in this section) or ePortfolio (discussed in II.7). The oral examination was phased out as entering students moved to the ePortfolio starting in fall 2018.

**Thesis**

The thesis allows a student to conduct original research with guidance from a faculty advisor and a committee of at least three faculty. The criteria for assessing graduate level research includes the project’s relevance to the field of study, application of theories and methods of research appropriate for the study, citation of appropriate sources, articulation of the context in which the student’s work is situated, and conduct of the research itself. In the past, committees elected to hold informal assessments of the students’ work and offer recommendations. In spring 2023, the faculty agreed on a more formal process that would include a [thesis evaluation form](#) for committee members to complete. Along with proposal defenses, students also prepare public presentations. During this review period, five students successfully completed theses. The range of topics in the following table demonstrates the breadth and depth of scholarship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester/Year</th>
<th>Student Name</th>
<th>Thesis Title and Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
<td>Amy Trimble</td>
<td><a href="#">Exploring Personal Connections in a Digital Reading Environment</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
<td>Valerie Shaindlin</td>
<td><a href="#">Ruth Horie: An Oral History Biography and Feminist Analysis</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
<td>Laila Brown</td>
<td><a href="#">Enacting Critical Feminist Librarianship: Examining LIS Book Clubs as a Means of Collaborative Inquiry and Professional Value Formation</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2019</td>
<td>Holiday Vega</td>
<td><a href="#">Public Libraries and Homelessness: Connecting Vulnerable Patrons with Resources</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Oral comprehensive examination

Through 2018, the Plan B option was an hour-long oral comprehensive examination where students responded extemporaneously to four prescribed scenarios, each linked to a different subset of SLOs and organized by different professional environments [Appendix 2-25]. During this period, five student learning outcomes defined the Program’s curriculum. Two faculty members evaluated each response on a 0 to 7 scale. Passing required a 5/7 or above; lower scores required retakes.

The results showed that of the 103 students who took the oral comprehensive examination from 2016 through 2021, 94–98% of the students had passing scores on all the scenarios and the remainder were given the opportunity to retake and, successfully, work on certain scenarios.

Table 2-9: Oral Examination Results, 2016 through 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spring 2016 through Spring 2021</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Retake</th>
<th>Fail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1. Personal Philosophy (SLO1, SLO5)</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2. Administration (SLO2, SLO6)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3. Public Services (SLO3)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4. Technical Services (SLO4)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Surveys Completed by Stakeholders

While the survey of graduating students is administered each semester, the alumni and employer surveys are conducted every five years. The five-year time span is not frequent enough to inform change, but these two surveys have served as confirmations of data collected through more regular metrics and interactions, e.g., evaluations and reflections, town halls and summits. We are planning to revisit these particular surveys before the next cycle to discuss alternatives for more timely feedback that does not add to the reporting burden of our stakeholders.

Graduating student surveys

As part of the exit requirement, students complete a survey that is a summative assessment of their overall LIS experience. The survey, which was updated in 2018 by eliminating some repetitive and overlapping queries, captures students’ perceptions about their preparedness for the workplace. Some of the items in the earlier version of the survey were also eliminated when faculty realized that these tasks were not necessarily covered in the courses (e.g., developing staff training sessions).

On an annual basis, the results are assembled by the Program Coordinator and reviewed by the Director, who identifies response trends and brings potential programmatic changes to the faculty. For this review period, all graduating students (80) completed the survey. We present the results in the following two tables organized by curriculum areas and depicting responses prior to the updated survey and responses after the update.
Table 2-10: Graduating Student Survey Results from 2016 through 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curricular Area</th>
<th>“I feel I gained sufficient entry-level knowledge needed for…”</th>
<th>FA16 to SU18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Services (SLO1)</td>
<td>Providing reference services</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Providing reader guidance</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction (SLO1)</td>
<td>Designing and delivering instructional services</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics (SLO2)</td>
<td>Applying ethical guidelines of the profession</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applying professional standards of service</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Resources (SLO3)</td>
<td>Contributing to collection management</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technologies (SLO4)</td>
<td>Applying various technologies for management and patron use</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Designing and maintaining an institutional website</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contributing to internal database design</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management (SLO6)</td>
<td>Handling management/administrative responsibilities</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developing programs for users</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using strategic planning to create long and short-term plans</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using marketing and advocacy techniques</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applying research methods to analyze services and/or procedures for data-driven decision making</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developing staff training sessions</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2-11: Graduating Student Survey Results from 2018 through 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curricular Area</th>
<th>“I feel well prepared to…”</th>
<th>FA18 to SU22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Services (SLO1)</td>
<td>Design information services</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Technologies (SLO4)</td>
<td>Provide information services</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assess information services</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction (SLO1)</td>
<td>Provide instruction</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics (SLO2)</td>
<td>Apply ethics to reflect on current practice and implement information services and policies</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Resources (SLO3)</td>
<td>Create information resources</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Technologies (SLO4)</td>
<td>Discover and organize information resources</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manage information resources</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricular Area</td>
<td>“I feel well prepared to...”</td>
<td>FA18 to SU22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management (SLO6)</td>
<td>Manage and work effectively within information organizations</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultures (SLO5)</td>
<td>Analyze and apply knowledge about the information needs and perspectives of Indigenous cultures and/or diverse communities</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism (SLO2)</td>
<td>Engage in reflective professional practice</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apply history to reflect on current practice and develop a professional LIS identity</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify and connect with professional communities and resources to keep current</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the survey administered from fall 2016 through summer 2018, the percentages reported below 75% in different curricular areas led to intensive faculty discussions. The following are examples of actions taken. After the modifications noted below, ratings were markedly higher in the survey administered from fall 2018 through summer 2022.

- Information services: a course in readers’ advisory (LIS 636 Responding to Reading in Libraries) was added to the curriculum.
- Instruction: the course in information literacy instruction (LIS 686 Information Literacy and Learning Resources), originally intended for school librarianship, was modified to include instruction in a range of library settings. In addition, a new course in digital instruction (LIS 665 Digital Instruction) was created for application in varied library settings.
- Technologies: this cluster was integrated into other questions in the updated survey because faculty realized that, essentially, all courses address elements of technology. Several technology-related courses were added to the curriculum, newly designated as core-eligible, and/or offered more regularly (e.g., LIS 641 Digital Librarianship, LIS 655 Digital Archives, LIS 656 Moving Image Archives, LIS 661 Informatics, LIS 662 Asian Informatics, LIS 672 Technology for Libraries and Information Centers, and LIS 676 Creating Digital Libraries).
- Management: two existing courses were modified to strengthen project-based learning opportunities for students to develop programs for users (LIS 650 Management of Libraries and Information Centers; LIS 683 Services in Public Libraries). LIS 690 Internship also became a requirement for most pathways to give students opportunities to observe and participate in administrative responsibilities and strategic planning.

Note that two new curricular areas were addressed in the later version of the survey: cultures and professionalism. Examples of courses that focused on these areas include the following.

- Cultures: LIS 630 Community Engagement; LIS 631 Hawaii and Pacific Librarianship; LIS 634 Multicultural Resources; LIS 662 Asian Informatics.
- Professionalism: LIS 610 Foundations of the Information Professions; LIS 650 Management of Libraries and Information Centers. Importantly, LIS 691 Masters Seminar was created to assist students with the ePortfolio culminating experience.
Alumni surveys

This survey is conducted every five years with the latest survey completed in 2018. The 21 respondents were students who graduated during the five-year span from 2013–2018. Like the survey of graduating students, this instrument captures alumni perceptions of preparedness for various professional skills.

Graph 2-1: Alumni Survey Responses
Question: “From my coursework in the LIS program, I felt well prepared to...”

- Provide information services (N=21): 38% Positive, 0% Neutral, 0% Negative
- Assess information services (N=21): 33% Positive, 0% Neutral, 0% Negative
- Identify and connect with professional communities and resources to keep current (N=21): 33% Positive, 0% Neutral, 0% Negative
- Create information resources (N=21): 31% Positive, 11% Neutral, 0% Negative
- Engage in reflective professional practice (N=21): 30% Positive, 14% Neutral, 0% Negative
- Apply ethics to reflect on current practice and implement information services and policies (N=21): 28% Positive, 14% Neutral, 0% Negative
- Apply history to reflect on current practice and develop a professional LIS identity (N=21): 27% Positive, 19% Neutral, 0% Negative
- Manage and work effectively within information organizations (N=21): 26% Positive, 19% Neutral, 0% Negative
- Provide instruction (N=21): 25% Positive, 15% Neutral, 0% Negative
- Design information services (N=19): 24% Positive, 11% Neutral, 0% Negative
- Manage information resources (N=21): 23% Positive, 11% Neutral, 0% Negative
- Analyze and apply knowledge about the information needs and perspectives of indigenous cultures and/or diverse communities (N=21): 19% Positive, 5% Neutral, 0% Negative
- 15% Positive, 14% Neutral, 0% Negative
- 14% Positive, 13% Neutral, 0% Negative
- 13% Positive, 12% Neutral, 0% Negative
- 12% Positive, 11% Neutral, 0% Negative
- 11% Positive, 10% Neutral, 0% Negative
- 10% Positive, 9% Neutral, 0% Negative

Earlier in this standard we highlighted areas indicated as strengths in the program. Two areas that we felt required action are listed below.

- Providing instruction (15%). This includes designing and executing instruction. We now encourage all students to take the two courses that emphasize instructional design: LIS 665 Digital Instruction and LIS 686 Information Literacy and Learning Resources.
- Designing information services (11%). Students in the Public Librarianship pathway now have LIS 683 Services in Public Libraries as a requirement. The course focuses on project development and management.

Employer surveys

Employers’ assessments were conducted in 2019 using the employer contact information provided by alumni responding to the 2018 survey. Twenty employers rated LIS alumni on demonstrated skills, areas of strength, and job performances. The program follows the same collection and review process as with the graduating student and alumni surveys.
Over 70% of respondents gave ratings of “excellent” on the following skills:

- Manage and work effectively in collaborative problem solving and team projects (85%);
- Provide information services for a range of users’ needs (80%);
- Practice ethical responsibilities of the profession in providing services and resources (70%);
- Engage in reflective professional practice to strive for improvement (70%); and
- Identify and connect with professional communities and resources to keep current (70%).

No item was rated below average, however, one area that at least 20% of the respondents rated as “average” resulted in our renewed emphasis in courses already established:

- Apply the profession’s history in professional practice (22%)

Most of our students take LIS 650 Management of Libraries and Information Centers, which is a core course that provides grounding in basic management history and concepts, and their application in modern LIS environments. In addition, we encourage students to consider LIS 612 History of Information, an elective that explores the history of information services and implications for practice in today’s information centers.

Meetings with Stakeholders

Conversations with stakeholders ranging from LIS students to information professionals are valuable channels for feedback regarding the LIS program. Standard I provided a comprehensive list of these meetings and the actions undertaken for the program. In the following table, we summarize selected meetings that focused on course recommendations and essential professional skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2018 | Progressive Librarians Guild with students | ● Include more hands-on experiences in program  
      |                     | ● Integrate more aspects of social justice in curriculum |
II.6 The program has explicit, documented evidence of its ongoing decision-making processes and the data to substantiate the evaluation of the curriculum.

Noriko Asato (Curriculum Chair) and Rich Gazan (Program Director) lead the Curriculum Committee, though all faculty are de facto members. Elsewhere in this self-study we maintain that our evaluation and decision-making processes are flexible and embrace various kinds of evidence. It is not necessarily a step-by-step streamlined process, but it is an ongoing procedure as we continually review our program throughout the year. In general, we begin with a planning meeting at the start of each year to set goals and objectives for the upcoming year. In our monthly faculty meetings, specific action items related to different aspects of the curriculum are introduced based on faculty members’ course reflections, student course evaluations, survey results from various stakeholder groups, and student outcomes from coursework or the culminating experience. As a small program that supports close relationships with students and the local professional community, we remain alert to the needs and concerns of all stakeholders, that are often conveyed through in person and email conversations and informal meetings as well as more formal channels.

Building on the data we collect and analyze described in II.5, as evidence of our data-informed decision making process we focus on the following changes to the curriculum during the review period:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2018   | Summit with stakeholders         | ● Include more technical topics (e.g., library systems, database design and use)  
                    | ● Strengthen focus on Indigenous topics (e.g., Native Hawaiian knowledge organization systems, Hawaiian databases) |
| 2019   | Meeting with alumni leaders      | ● Allow for practice with oral communication skills for job interviews        
                    | ● Require internships for all students                                        |
| 2019   | Advisory board meeting           | ● Emphasize soft skills, especially communication skills in job interviews    |
| 2021   | Advisory board meeting           | ● Include digital scholarship in curriculum                                    
                    | ● Include data management in curriculum                                       
                    | ● Include more courses on Hawaiian and Indigenous topics                     
                    | ● Include more emphasis on information literacy instruction and assessment   |
| 2022   | Summit with stakeholders         | ● Emphasize cognitive skills (e.g., systems thinking, project planning)        
                    | ● Include more technical skills (e.g., bibliometrics, artificial intelligence) 
                    | ● Encourage demonstration of socioemotional skills (e.g., resilience, compassion) |
• Replacing the oral comprehensive examination with an ePortfolio;
• Establishing professional pathways;
• Requiring an internship or practicum for most pathways;
• Delivering technology related courses, and
• Advancing Native Hawaiian and Indigenous librarianship.

In this section, we document the decision-making processes highlighting the justification and the source of input for these five major curriculum changes. In II.7, we chronicle our efforts to address them and eventually implement these facets that speak to the program’s current and future plans of the curriculum.

Replacing the oral comprehensive examination with an ePortfolio

During the review period, a major undertaking was replacing the oral comprehensive examination with the ePortfolio to more effectively demonstrate students’ understanding and application of the six program SLOs. The ePortfolio currently includes an introduction, a resume, an artifact for each of the six SLOs accompanied by a reflective essay, and a concluding statement. The artifacts range from formal papers and instructional plans to exhibits and service projects that involve community agencies and organizations. Through self-selected coursework and other learning artifacts, students articulate a professional philosophy. The following table highlights the iterative approach of testing, analyzing, and refining our execution of this critical change and captures faculty taking the lead in fostering input from students and field professionals in the process. Appendix 1-5 is a chronological summary of our work on the ePortfolio.

Table 2-13: Implementing ePortfolios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source/Request or Focus</th>
<th>Documentation of Action/Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017: Faculty requested exploration of ePortfolios to replace oral comprehensive exams. Rationale for request: based on past faculty reflections on students’ performance on oral comprehensive exams and informal conversations with students, faculty wanted to shape a culminating experience that encouraged stronger personalization and evidence of student’s voice and more thoughtful reflections on students’ progression through the learning journey.</td>
<td>2016-2017: Curriculum Committee (CC) that included LIS students spearheaded the exploration. Researched ePortfolio options at different LIS graduate programs. Discussions held at monthly faculty meetings. 11-18-2016: CC presented ePortfolio concept at a conference of the Hawai‘i Library Association for informal feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018: Faculty requested guidelines to assist students with ePortfolios.</td>
<td>02-16-2018: Faculty meeting. CC Chair and Program Director worked on version 1 of guidelines that was discussed and approved by faculty. Most artifacts had to come from core eligible courses. Rubric also drafted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As documented in the above table, a critical shift in the ePortfolios was from highly structured, faculty-determined requirements to one that allowed for greater student agency. In addition, the fact that ePortfolios had to be completed by the middle of the students’ graduating semester, to give evaluators...
sufficient time to assess them, created another hurdle because students could not submit artifacts for courses still in progress. For these reasons, students now select artifacts from any LIS course completed before the final semester. They may also opt to include an artifact from an extramural, non-coursework experience. One student, for example, submitted an impressive project for SLO6 that demonstrated her leadership skills in creating a virtual speed networking event for a joint conference of the Hawai‘i Library Association and the Hawai‘i Association of School Librarians.

LIS 691 Masters Seminar is required for graduating students who are pursuing the Plan B ePortfolio option. It is a weekly, two-hour course for three credits that has been facilitated by Meera Garud in fall and by Rich Gazan in spring. There are no letter grades and students receive Credit/No Credit designations. The seminar is an opportunity for those completing their ePortfolios to offer and receive formative peer critiques on drafts of their reflective essays. In comments during the sessions, students often remarked on the insights they gained by examining a colleague’s work. As one student stated:

I am so grateful to receive this kind of nurturing and critical support from my peers. While I am making recommendations, I am also getting fresh perspectives on how I might improve my own work by looking at someone else’s draft.

ePortfolio Student Outcomes

Two faculty members evaluate each student’s execution of essays for the six SLOs. While the faculty initially used a four-point scale to rate these essays, we realized that a pass/revise format adequately met our assessment needs. The following graph captures the results from spring 2020 through spring 2022 for 34 students. The percentages show that 88–97% of all ePortfolio essays received passes on the first round of reviews with the remaining 3–12% of the essays requiring revision before passing. Examples of artifacts and ePortfolios from students in School, Public, Academic/Special and Archival pathways are available for review [Appendix 2-26 (Restricted Access)].

Graph 2-3: ePortfolio Pass Rate by SLO (Spring 2020 to Spring 2022, 34 students)

Along with pass/revise ratings, faculty include comments on individual SLO-related essays regarding the strengths and areas for improvement (comment sheets will be available on-site). While the overall numbers are too small to identify actionable trends, students had the lowest initial pass rate in
ePortfolio reflections connected with SLO2 Professions (88% pass rate on first attempt), followed by SLO4 Technologies (91%). Since the culminating ePortfolio is faculty’s last chance to provide feedback to students before they leave the program and enter the profession, making sure they can articulate their professional perspectives and technological abilities effectively as they will need to do in upcoming job interviews is a particular focus of faculty reviewers, and may explain these initial results.

Students have had the strongest initial pass rate (97%) in ePortfolio reflections connected with SLO5 Cultures, demonstrating their ability to elicit, understand and articulate the information needs of the particular communities they wish to serve as professionals.

The richness of students’ insights and goals are captured in their concluding ePortfolio statements that embody the Native Hawaiian value of kuleana, which is acceptance of responsibility as both a duty and a privilege. In the following excerpts, we hear and feel the students’ passion and dedication regarding their future roles as information professionals.

A librarian’s relationship with collections:

---

*I have come to understand that the collections that we preserve must not be a one-way path. Rather, they have multiple paths where the collections have dialectic relationships with the institution, the researchers, and the stakeholders of that collection.* — SL

---

The importance of championing diversity:

---

*I discovered that my most significant focus throughout my two years in the program was the incorporation of diversity as a critical dimension in information services, the collection and promotion of resources and services that spoke to that goal, and the joy I often found within that process. In the future, I will continue to focus on my relationship with library work through a social justice lens.* — HK

---

Projects engaging with community concerns and social justice

---

*I organized a book drive for O‘ahu inmates, to connect them with the books they need to develop their intellectual curiosity and stimulate their minds while they serve their sentences. I also conducted a needs analysis for the students using the Counseling and Student Development Center at UH to understand where gaps of service were, and if library services could fill them. Finally, as an intern at Honolulu Community College I created a display focusing on stigma against mental illness that inhibits people from seeking care, and detailing local and campus resources for veterans, Native Hawaiian students, and non-traditional students.* — CT
The need to engage community voices:

Libraries have the capability to change lives, but patrons can also change libraries. Libraries can cultivate patron-driven cultures by co-constructing an environment that empowers patrons to have a voice and to reimagine services the library provides. This can be done by inviting patrons to have a voice in curating library collections, involving patrons in the creation of library programming, and having patrons take part in decision-making aspects of the library. It’s my kuleana (responsibility) to be knowledgeable about these different lenses and put them into action. With each course my kūlana (status) as a librarian grows and improves, but it is my kuleana to continuously seek ways to improve my practice. — SA

The librarian as an advocate:

I do not know what the future holds for me; however, I see my role as researching our own cultural ways of thinking to create a place for our Native Hawaiian people. While being in the LIS program, it is not what I learned about library protocol and systems that created my professional philosophy, but it is what is missing that created it. My goal is to fill those gaps with the knowledge that our ancestors have passed down. I want to help future generations reconnect to their ancestors and not be dictated by a four-wall library or what can only be found in writing. I want to create a space where Hawaiians are not bound to the library but can use it as a tool to breathe life back into our practices, language, culture, and ‘āina (land). — HK

Establishing Professional Pathways

While still exploring the possibility of adopting ePortfolios, the faculty was also developing an idea of professional specializations. This evolved from a combination of community needs and faculty leadership and expertise. In admission applications and during advising sessions, students often expressed interest in directing their studies to working in specific professional environments, and employers within those environments value specialized coursework—and often serve as the adjunct faculty members who teach it. Faculty specializing in each area also saw a need to integrate specific skills desired by the field into students’ degree plans, and were motivated to develop and lead tracks, later known as professional pathways.

We initially envisioned core courses for SLO1, SLO2 for all tracks, and flexible cores for SLOs 3, 4, 5 to meet academic needs for individual tracks. Along with the establishment of tracks, we discussed offering a pair of seminars: one for entering students to introduce various aspects of LIS professions and introducing how to develop ePortfolios, and another for exiting students to prepare for the job market and wrap up their ePortfolio as a capstone experience [Appendix 2-16].

Specializations/tracks had been on the agenda for faculty meetings as a framework of revisioning the LIS curriculum. For example, Vanessa Irvin suggested framing questions that would help us to focus how we respond to the whole idea of remodeling the curriculum. Those questions included: “In what ways can what I teach and research be a supportive tenet of a renewed curriculum that is relevant for the 21st century LIS profession?” and “In what ways does my teaching and research connect with the SLOs?”
Andrew Wertheimer suggested clustering courses, and explained the success of issuing a certificate for his archival studies track [Appendix 1-8, 2016-03-18].

At the Community Curriculum Discussion Meeting in February 2017, the draft curriculum was proposed for discussion and input from various stakeholders. The agenda included SLOs, core requirements and tracks, culminating experience (ePortfolio) and master’s seminars (entering and exiting semesters) [Appendix 1-4]. In subsequent faculty meetings, we decided to create pathways in the new curriculum that would have a “lead” person (primary faculty advisor) to manage it [Appendix 1-8, 2017-04-21]. The program modification was approved by the Grad Council and soon was approved by the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs [Appendix 2-3]. In fall 2018, the new curriculum that consisted of the master’s seminar sequence, flexible core courses and electives, and the ePortfolio as capstone were implemented with the incoming students. At this point, there were six pathways: Academic/Special, Archival Studies, Asian Studies, Informatics, Public, and School Library Media. The categories of the professional pathways were later modified and some of them developed into a second tier of clusters, called a Specialization, which will be discussed in II.7.

**Requiring an Internship or Practicum for Professional Pathways**

Given the professional pathways’ focus on preparation for particular information environments (excluding the General/Custom pathway), each of the pathway leads decided to make internships or professional experience a pathway requirement. This was based on the many voices of students, alumni, and other stakeholders, who called for internships to be required for students. The following table captures the process involved in determining whether to require the internship course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source/Request or Focus</th>
<th>Documentation of Action/Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 to 2018: Various informal conversations urging the requirement of internship with members of the professional community, many of them are alumni, and with members of the Advisory Board.</td>
<td>12-13-2019: Advisory Board meeting. Drafts of pathways presented for feedback. Internships now required in Academic, Public, Special, Asian Studies and Archival pathways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018: Survey feedback from alumni requested more field experience and internships.</td>
<td>01-16-2020: Faculty meeting. Revised pathways approved by faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During review period: Enrollment data provided by the 690 instructor.</td>
<td>02-21-2020: Faculty meeting. Forms for tracking pathway courses approved by faculty. Internships are part of the forms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112 students successfully completed an internship [Appendix 2-11].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As described in the table above, students, alumni, and employers were emphasizing the importance of internships, noting that many job descriptions, even at the entry level, expect candidates to have hands-on experience in libraries or archives. However, we had some concerns about making it mandatory as a degree requirement. Students with a full-time job or family obligations might not be able to commit to an internship. We also feared there would be insufficient quality internship sites for everyone. Exploring alternatives, the LIS 690 Coordinator, Noriko Asato, proposed a pilot offering of a variable credit 699 directed study as a trial project. The plan was that if successful, we would convert 690 to a variable credit course to let students split the 3 credits across two semesters, but the trial ended in vain: students were hesitant to sign up for this LIS 699. At the February 2019 faculty meeting, another
approach to encourage internships was proposed where interns would be granted an incomplete for unfinished hours and could carry over the remaining hours to the next semester for full credit [Appendix 1-8, 2018-09-21; 2019-02-15].

The possibility of mandatory internship was also part of the pathway discussions discussed earlier. At the 2019 Advisory Board meeting, drafts of pathways were presented for feedback (Advisory Board Meeting, 2019-12-13), and the faculty approved the revised pathways the following month [Appendix 1-8, 2020-01-16]. Eventually, an internship or practicum was incorporated into all professional pathways (excluding General/Custom Pathway) but not made a degree requirement.

**Delivering Technology Related Courses**

The LIS program recognizes that the rapid changes in the digital age have impacted the way information is created, processed, stored, transmitted, and utilized. We also believe that if information is to be effectively used, it must embrace aspects of the social sciences in order to merge technical knowledge with an appreciation of how people and organizations seek and use information.

Today’s information professionals must develop an understanding of key policy issues and technological trends and recognize how these issues and trends affect libraries and other information organizations. We have designed curricular offerings to include the emerging technologies as well as the core skills required in traditional roles of librarianship. Our courses target the preparation of professionals who can adeptly use information technologies to develop and manage collections, organize information resources, and conduct effective research. To build this segment of our curriculum, we listen to our stakeholders. The following documents the decision-making process that led to fortifying technology related courses.

**Table 2-15: Inclusion of Technology-Related Courses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source/Request or Focus</th>
<th>Documentation of Action/Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2016–2018: Survey feedback from graduating students requested more support for application of various technologies for library management and users. | 2017: Faculty meetings. Reported:  
  - LIS 655 Digital Archives (approved as core-eligible, taught in 2020, 2022)  
  - LIS 661 Informatics (approved as core-eligible, taught in 2019, 2021, 2023); taught as LIS 694 Informatics and Information Design in 2017  
  - LIS 694 Tools for Community Advocacy (taught in 2017) |
| 2018: Survey feedback from alumni requested more assistance with databases, digital librarianship, and digital citizenship. | 2018: Faculty meetings. Reported:  
  - LIS 656 Moving Image Archives (approved as core-eligible, taught in 2018, 2022)  
  - LIS 676 Creating Digital Libraries (approved elective, taught in 2018, 2021)  
  - LIS 694 Curating Digital Culture (taught in 2018) |
| 2018: Advisory Board requested update on technological skills addressed in the program. Suggested range of skills dealing with library systems, software applications, | 12-14-2018: Advisory Board meeting. Program Director provided specific examples of how courses addressed skills:  
  - LIS 601 Introduction to Reference and Information Services. HTML and CSS introduced, students work on building platforms for assignments. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source/Request or Focus</th>
<th>Documentation of Action/Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>database design, basic HTML and CSS, digital resources [Appendix 1-22, pp. 44-53].</td>
<td>- LIS 602 Resource Discovery. Focus on information retrieval systems underlying library functions, digital resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- LIS 641 Digital Libraries and LIS 655 Digital Archives. Cover a range of digital resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Also reported more frequent scheduling of LIS 672 Technologies for Libraries (offered every spring since 2020).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020: Academic librarians requested a course.</td>
<td>02-21-2020: Faculty meeting. Program Director reported LIS 694 Digital Humanities will be offered in Summer 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021: Review of courses that needed retirement.</td>
<td>09-10-2021: Faculty meeting. CC Chair reported on courses being retired. Among them, the following tech related SLO4 courses:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- LIS 673 Media Technology and Resources (content outdated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- LIS 678 Personalized Information Delivery (instructor retired)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021–2022: Advisory Board asked for digital scholarship in curriculum [Appendix 1-22, p. 86]. Feedback from stakeholders regarding tech skills needed (e.g., AI, Ancestry, FamilySearch, FlipGrid) [Appendix 1-22, pp. 113-117.].</td>
<td>04-08-2022: Stakeholder summit meeting. Shared some of the courses addressing these various requests [Appendix 1-22, pp. 118-119].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- LIS 641 Digital Librarianship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- LIS 655 Digital Archives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- LIS 656 Moving Image Archives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- LIS 658 Archival and Special Collections Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- LIS 661 Informatics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- LIS 672 Technology for Libraries and Information Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- LIS 676 Creating Digital Libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- LIS 693 Genealogical Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023: LIS requested a faculty position to teach courses in information technology.</td>
<td>03-24-2023: Faculty meeting. Brainstormed the I3 position request that became the information technology for social good position request.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05-12-2023: Faculty meeting. Program Director reported inclusion of a position to teach information technology for social good in the list of requests being compiled by SCI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023: Proposal for staffing to teach data services in libraries.</td>
<td>06-12-2023: Memo from Denise Konan, Dean of CSS, to Clem Guthro, University Librarian. Dean supported the library’s proposed faculty hire of a data services librarian as a collaborative hire with LIS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table documents how requests and recommendations from our constituents are seriously considered in decisions regarding both core-eligible and elective courses. The faculty responded by adding two new courses to the catalog in 2018: LIS 656 Moving Image Archives (as core-eligible) and LIS 676 Creating Digital Libraries (as an elective). These courses had been previously offered as special topic.
courses; however, we decided to commit to more regular provision. As we mentioned in II.5, the 2018–
2020 survey results from graduating students strongly affirmed that the continuing infusion of
technology in a range of courses was effective. In Table 2-11, we reported satisfaction ratings ranging
from 93-100% in areas including the design and provision of information services as well as the
organization, creation and management of information sources.

An important factor in delivering substantive coursework has been the caliber of adjunct faculty
teaching these offerings. Examples of courses and instructors:

- LIS 655 Digital Archives taught by Adam Jansen, Hawai‘i State Archivist.
- LIS 656 Moving Image Archives taught by Janel Quirante, Head Archivist of ‘Ulu’ulu Moving
  Image Archives.
- LIS 641 Digital Librarianship, LIS 672 Technology for Libraries and Information Centers, and LIS
  676 Creating Digital Libraries taught by Stanislava Gardasevic, PhD candidate in Communication
  and Information Sciences Program and LIS Graduate Assistant. She was the 2021 recipient of the
  Dan J. Wedemeyer Excellence in Teaching Award administered by UHM Graduate Division for a
doctoral student demonstrating outstanding teaching skill and concern for student learning.
- LIS 694 Digital Humanities taught by David Gustavsen, Humanities Librarian at UH Hamilton
  Library.
- LIS 694 Tools for Community Advocacy taught by Jessamyn West, librarian and creator of
  librarian.net.

Our recent move to the School of Communication and Information (SCI) in the College of Social Sciences
has opened doors for exciting possibilities. Dean Konan’s support for a joint hiring of a data services
librarian with the UH Hamilton Library is a promising example of collaborative efforts across units on
campus. We will be initiating preliminary discussions with the UH Librarian Clem Guthro regarding the
types of courses that might be available to LIS and the rest of SCI as well as the CIS doctoral program.
We also requested a new I3 faculty position that would design and deliver courses focusing on the use
of information technology for social good, though this request was not approved for the fall 2023–spring
2024 hiring cycle. We envision that the teaching areas might include social data science and a
participatory design approach to technologies and collections built by, for and with community. Future
discussion regarding this position will involve conversations with other units in SCI to cooperatively
identify courses that might complement and enhance offerings in the school.

Advancing Native Hawaiian and Indigenous Librarianship

The UH Mānoa Strategic Plan centers on building an institution that is a Native Hawaiian place of
learning. In the 2002-2010 document, Defining Our Destiny, the concept of a Hawaiian place of learning
appeared for the first time with mention of the institution’s responsibility to honor the Indigenous
people and promote social justice for Native Hawaiians. The 2011-2015 plan, Achieving Our Destiny
emphasized the importance of physically and conceptually grounding Native Hawaiian knowledge and
values across all strategic goals. The core of the 2015-2025 strategic plan, Our Kuleana to Hawai’i and
the World, once again stresses the importance of becoming a Native Hawaiian place of learning. It refers
to embracing aloha ‘āina, which is a worldview rooted in recognition and practice that sustains the life
breath (ea) between people and the environment. The institution also admits not having a record of
using Native Hawaiian values and knowledge systems to guide decision making and advances the case
for each member of our campus to learn more and engage more in past truths but also in the wisdom
that aloha ‘āina offers [p. 9].
The LIS program has taken the institution’s charge to heart. In Standard 1 we shared our current strategic plan which is aligned with the UHM goal of becoming a Native Hawaiian place of learning along with the values that underlie the LIS mission: aloha (fostering connections of regard and caring), ‘ohana (family and chosen family), and kuleana (responsibility and accountability). During this review period, we have invited critical feedback from stakeholder groups and enlisted the invaluable assistance of Native Hawaiian information professionals to better understand what it means to build themes and elements of Hawaiian librarianship in the existing LIS curriculum. The following table captures how we have addressed needs identified and recommendations made.

**Table 2-16: Inclusion of Native Hawaiian Elements in the Curriculum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source/Request or Focus</th>
<th>Documentation of Action/Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015: Prior to this review period, stakeholders recommended closer alliance with other Native Hawaiian units on campus.</td>
<td>During the February 2015 Faculty meeting, it was reported that the UHM Office of Graduate Education approved dual degrees between LIS and the Hawaiian Language and Hawaiian Studies programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2017-2019: Via survey, graduating students recommended more courses dealing with Indigenous issues. | 2017:  
- Approved LIS 634 Multicultural Resources for Diverse User Groups as core-eligible  
- Offered LIS 693 Access and Care of Indigenous Cultural Knowledge  
- Offered LIS 693 Foundations of Hawaiian Collections |
| 2018: Faculty recognized the need for in-depth reflection on the inclusion of coursework with Native Hawaiian themes. The December 2018 Advisory Board Meeting [Appendix1-22, p. 39] confirmed the importance of involving Native Hawaiian professionals in building our curriculum. | 2018:  
- Approved LIS 633 Indigenous Librarianship as elective |
| 2018: Via survey, alumni recommended more support for Hawaiian librarianship in the curriculum. | 2019:  
- Approved LIS 631 Introduction to Hawai‘i and Pacific Librarianship as core-eligible  
- Offered LIS 693 Genealogical Resources  
- Offered LIS 693 Indigenous Oceania Approaches to Archival Advocacy and Ethics |
| 2018: The December Advisory Board meeting yielded input on Indigenous knowledge expressions in the LIS program. | During the meeting, we identified broad goals such as:  
- Model and practice a 21st century Native Hawaiian learning environment  
- Implement Indigenous ecology teaching practices  
- Include information seeking and collection in relation to various Hawaiian databases  
Resulted in faculty follow-up—examples:  
- LIS 601 Introduction to Reference and Information Services incorporated assignments that include working with various Hawaiian databases  
- LIS 602 Resource Discovery students analyzed Hawaiian databases |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source/Request or Focus</th>
<th>Documentation of Action/Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• LIS 610 Foundations of the Information Professions invited Native Hawaiian librarians as guest resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Encouraged LIS 699 Directed Reading and Research projects as well as Plan A theses connected to Hawaiian and Indigenous topics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| May 2022 Summit: Stakeholders provided input on status and future directions in strengthening the program. | During the meeting, we had a major discussion focused on the importance of retaining Native Hawaiian values of aloha, ‘ohana, and kuleana in the LIS mission.
Resulted in follow-up—examples: |
|                             | • In 2023, Rich Gazan, Andrew Wertheimer, and Meera Garud participated in a course focused on indigenizing and decolonizing the curriculum |
|                             | • Mandi Hull, Program Coordinator, registered for LIS 693: ‘A’ole I Pau: Kanaka Worldviews and Librarianship taught by Keahiahi Long |

Building a Hawaiian place of learning remains both a challenge and an opportunity for the LIS program. As the above table demonstrates, we have created course offerings that introduce Native Hawaiian knowledge systems and information seeking and collection in different Hawaiian databases such as the Bishop Museum archives, Papakilo (Hawaiian newspaper collection), and Ulukau (Hawaiian electronic library). Students, advisory board members, and field professionals continue to be crucial voices that inform our work.

While LIS faculty teach some of the courses with Native Hawaiian themes, we acknowledge the vital scholarship and teaching expertise of adjunct faculty including the following:

- LIS 631 Introduction to Hawai‘i and Pacific Librarianship taught by Kapena Shim, Hawaiian Collection Librarian at UH Hamilton Library;
- LIS 633 Indigenous Librarianship and LIS 693 Access and Care of Indigenous Cultural Knowledge taught by Loriene Roy, Professor specializing in Indigenous cultural heritage development at University of Texas at Austin;
- LIS 635 Traditional Literature and Oral Narration taught by Nyla Fujii-Babb, professional storyteller and retired public librarian; and
- LIS 693 Foundations of Hawaiian Collections and LIS 693 ‘A’ole I Pau: Kanaka Worldviews and Librarianship taught by Keahiahi Long, Librarian for the UH Kamakakūokalani Center of Hawaiian Studies (she will be joining our faculty in fall 2023).

We recognize our limited expertise of Native Hawaiian knowledge systems and values and strive to gain a deeper understanding of these ways of knowing through various means. For example, faculty have attended the annual Ho’okele Naʻauao symposia. The most recent symposium centered on our relationship with the ‘āina. Through panel discussions, presentations, and a talk story event, the symposium explored how ‘āina informs our information practices. In the 2022–23 academic year, faculty also took advantage of other professional development opportunities on campus. Rich Gazan, Andrew Wertheimer, and Meera Garud were part of a CSS cohort in a course offered by Kamakana Aquino, Native Hawaiian Initiative Coordinator for CSS. It focused on navigating through a process of indigenizing and decolonizing the curriculum to make it resonate with the values of Native Hawaiian and local...
students. In addition, Mandi Hull, Program Coordinator, registered for LIS 693: ‘A’ole I Pau: Kanaka Worldviews and Librarianship taught by Keahiahi Long.

With our move to CSS, we were finally able to secure permission for an I3 faculty position in Hawaiian librarianship. This affirmed the UHM administration’s commitment to provide the resources for creating a Native Hawaiian place of learning and Dean Konan’s full support of the LIS program’s intent to meet this charge. We are excited about welcoming Keahiahi Long in the fall semester. The importance of including her fresh voice and critical leadership cannot be overstated. Working collaboratively with Keahiahi and members of our stakeholder communities, we will be addressing key goals that impact curriculum, namely:

- Devising approaches to working with the structure of Hawaiian knowledge;
- Employing processes, philosophies, and language that are intrinsic in Hawaiian knowledge frameworks; and
- Using Hawaiian research methodologies when investigating the information resources and services delivery needs of our various Hawai‘i communities.

Together, we will grapple with questions such as: How might we shape and articulate our curriculum to embody a Hawaiian place of learning? How might we incorporate Native Hawaiian themes into existing courses? What additional resources will we need for this? How might we involve adjunct faculty and Hawaiian serving units in our conversations? The meaning of ho’okele na’auao can be understood as “to sail towards knowledge.” We have set our sights and sails on curriculum that will strengthen Hawaiian stewardship practices in libraries, archives, and information centers.

II.7 The program demonstrates how the results of the evaluation of the curriculum are systematically used to improve the program and to plan for the future.

Culling from the data collected through the various sources described in II.5 and II.6, the faculty concentrated on improving four major facets of the curriculum during this review period: Native Hawaiian and Indigenous themes; technologies; instruction in information literacy and planning for information services; and inclusion of field experiences. The courses are identified below by titles, years taught, and instructors. The new courses are documented in UHM-1 forms that were approved by Graduate Division [Appendix 2-27]. Examples from other courses offered during the review period are also included. Additional actions regarding special topics courses and other options were reported in the LIS faculty meeting minutes. Course syllabi are available in a [Google Drive folder](Restricted Access).

**Native Hawaiian and Indigenous Librarianship**

The following SLO5 (Cultures) core-eligible courses were added to the curriculum:

- LIS 634 Multicultural Resources for Diverse User Groups (taught by Vanessa Irvin in 2020 after running as LIS 693 in 2017); and

A SLO5 elective course was also added to the curriculum, LIS 633 Indigenous Librarianship. This course was taught by Loriene Roy in 2021 after running as LIS 693 in 2017 as “Access and Care of Indigenous Cultural Knowledge.”
Finally, several LIS 693 special topics courses were offered:

- Foundations of Hawaiian Collections (taught by Keahiahi Long in 2017);
- Genealogical Resources (taught by Vanessa Irvin in 2019 and 2021);
- Indigenous Oceania Approaches to Archival Advocacy and Ethics (taught by Joy Enomoto in 2019); and

Courses Focusing on Technologies

The following SLO4 (Technologies) core-eligible courses were added to the curriculum:

- LIS 655 Digital Archives (taught by Tonia Sutherland in 2020 and 2022 and Adam Jansen in 2022);
- LIS 661 Informatics (taught by Rich Gazan in 2019, 2021, and 2023); and
- LIS 656 Moving Image Archives (taught by Janel Quirante in 2018 and 2022).

We also increased the frequency of an existing SLO4 core-eligible course, LIS 672 Technology for Libraries and Information Centers (taught by Stanislava Gardasevic), offering it every spring from 2020.

SLO4 elective courses were also added to the curriculum:

- LIS 676 Creating Digital Libraries (taught by Stanislava Gardasevic in 2019 and 2021); and
- LIS 641 Digital Librarianship (taught by Stanislava Gardasevic in 2018 and 2020).

Finally, several LIS 694 special topics courses were offered:

- Visions of the Library (taught by Rich Gazan in 2016 and 2020);
- Informatics and Information Design (taught by Brian Richardson in 2017);
- Tools for Community Advocacy (taught by Jessamyn West in 2017);
- Curating Digital Culture (taught by Tonia Sutherland in 2018); and
- Digital Humanities (taught by David Gustavsen in 2020).

Courses Focusing on Providing Instruction and Other Information Services

- LIS 686 Information Literacy and Learning Resources is a SLO1 (Services) elective course taught by Meera Garud, which is offered every spring. It is required for students completing the School Library Media pathway but is a recommended elective for all students. It centers on teaching information retrieval, analysis, and use with an emphasis on instructional design and selection of resources that meet diverse learning needs in a range of library settings.
- LIS 665 Digital Instruction, also taught by Meera Garud, is a core-eligible course. Like LIS 686, it focuses on principles of instructional design in developing modules of online instruction and standards-based outcome assessment. Students in all pathways may count this course toward the SLO4 (Technologies) core requirement.
- LIS 683 Services in Public Libraries is a SLO6 (Management) elective course taught by Vanessa Irvin and adjunct faculty member Danielle Todd. It is required for students completing the Public Librarianship pathway and covers planning and implementing services and programs.

Increasing Fieldwork Experiences

As described in II.6, the program was modified to require an internship or practicum with exceptions for students following the General/Custom pathway. In addition, faculty also incorporate fieldwork into course assignments. The following are a range of examples.
**LIS 630 Community Engagement**

This core-eligible course (SLO5 Cultures) has been taught by Tonia Sutherland and adjunct faculty members Stephanie Robertson and Jessamyn West. It explores how information professionals collaborate with community members and organizations. Students work on action plans to meet information-related needs of different community agencies.

Examples: Some examples of past projects include: organizing a Silent Sustained Reading initiative to motivate literacy in a high school setting; collaborating with the Native Hawaiian Student Services on campus to transition from in-person to virtual services during the pandemic; and working with members of the Young Okinawans of Hawai‘i to expand their cultural activities.

**LIS 650 Management of Libraries and Information Centers**

This core-eligible course (SLO6 Management) is taught by Andrew Wertheimer and offered once each academic year. A major assignment requires students to develop community-based projects that demonstrate different managerial competences.

Recent examples include: creating a special lei making activity, planning a STEM-Lego event for public libraries, and creating an award program for children’s books (grades K-3) that focus on Native Hawaiian topics and authors.

**Special Topics Courses**

Special Topics courses like Rare Books and Special Collections, which was taught by Andrew Wertheimer in spring 2022, also challenge students to engage in real-world projects.

Examples from this course include: curating an exhibit for the UH Hamilton Library that showcased items from the library’s rare and special collections and working with staff at the Hawai‘i State Archives to organize a donation of 78 RPM records for processing.

**Demonstration of Student Achievement through ePortfolios**

During the review period, a major undertaking was our move from the oral comprehensive examination to the ePortfolio using an iterative process of testing, analyzing, and refining our execution of this critical change. This section captures our continuing evolution in this ePortfolio journey. Evidence is documented in faculty meeting minutes. Appendix 1-5 details our work on the ePortfolio.

The ePortfolio provides students the opportunity to demonstrate understanding and application of the six program SLOs as evidenced by self-selected coursework and other learning artifacts, and to develop and articulate their own reflective professional philosophy. The ePortfolio includes an introduction, a resume, an artifact for each of the six SLOs accompanied by a reflective essay, and a concluding statement. Artifacts range from formal papers and instructional plans to exhibits and service projects that involve community agencies and organizations. We provide sample artifacts and ePortfolios from students in the School Library Media, Public Librarianship, Academic/Special Librarianship, and Archives pathways [Appendix 2-26 (Restricted Access)]. Two faculty members evaluate each ePortfolio as a whole, and provide pass/revise assessments for each of the six SLO reflections. Students have one opportunity to revise and must pass all six components to graduate. At the end of their graduating semester (in spring for summer graduates), students also prepare an informal 10-minute public presentation summarizing their program experience and professional aspirations.
First Steps

In 2016 the Curriculum Chair led an ad hoc team of faculty and LIS graduate students to investigate how different LIS programs managed their ePortfolio initiatives. The team discussed their findings at the monthly faculty meetings and introduced LIS ePortfolio plans at a Hawai‘i Library Association conference.

Guidelines

Based on ensuing discussions, the Program Chair and Program Coordinator facilitated creation of the ePortfolio guidelines, first posted on the LIS website in 2018. The original document provided details on the expected content as well as technical requirements, and the role of faculty advisors and evaluators. Since then, the guidelines have gone through three revisions based on faculty observations of students’ products as well as recommendations from students completing their ePortfolios. The changes are detailed in the following sections.

Requirements

A shift from highly structured, faculty-determined requirements to one that allows for greater student agency. Initially, four of the six artifacts were required to represent assignments from core eligible courses, however, students found this restrictive. As one student commented, “I did this fantastic project for an elective course, but I had to submit this so-so assignment from a core-eligible course.” In addition, the fact that ePortfolios had to be completed by the middle of the students’ graduating semester, to give evaluators sufficient time to assess them, created another hurdle because students could not submit artifacts for courses still in progress. For these reasons, students now select artifacts from any LIS course completed before the final semester. They may also opt to include an artifact from an extramural, non-coursework experience. One student, for example, submitted an impressive project for SLO6 that demonstrated her leadership skills in creating a virtual speed networking event for a joint conference of the Hawai‘i Library Association and the Hawai‘i Association of School Librarians.

Assessment

Initially, guidelines included a rubric to assess the ePortfolio essays. In debriefing sessions following the first ePortfolio evaluations, faculty indicated that the rubric’s descriptors were “too general” to be useful. We removed the rubric and, with input from students, created a list of guiding questions for the reflective essays. The list includes general questions for the introduction, conclusion, and SLO-focused essays as well as a supplemental list of possible questions for specific SLOs. Student pass rates and highlights about student achievement are discussed in II.6.

Seminars

A unique component of the ePortfolio initiative has been a non-credit seminar in the students’ first semester and a three-credit seminar in their graduating term. The seminars serve as bookends for the LIS experience.

The First Semester Seminar (FSS) began in 2018 as a weekly one-hour activity that met throughout the semester. In 2022, the seminar moved to a ten-week format that allowed students more time to finish their other course assignments in the last third of the busy first term. The intent of FSS is to introduce students to various facets of the program, potential career paths, and, most importantly, networking with faculty, colleagues, technical support teams, and professionals in the field. This non-credit seminar is facilitated by Mandi Hull, Program Coordinator, with support from Professor Emerita Violet Harada.
Students initially received badges for their participation in the sessions and for their reflective logs. We have moved away from formal badges to emphasize this space as collaborative and non-evaluative. We strive to make FSS embody the Native Hawaiian values of aloha and ‘ohana that emphasize the importance of fostering caring relationships and connecting with communities. In their log postings, students confirm the importance of becoming part of professional communities.

---

**FSS is the only time that everyone in my cohort actually gets to meet together. It’s so reassuring to know that what I am feeling is also what others are feeling.**

**I love that there are no lectures in FSS; I learn about the program, courses, and expectations through conversation and dialogue with people.**

**I see each faculty member in a different light when they talk story with us in this seminar.**

**Listening to professionals in the field, I realize that my professional journey will take many twists and what I thought was my goal may change over time.**

---

LIS 691 Masters Seminar is required for graduating students who are pursuing the Plan B ePortfolio option. It is a weekly, two-hour course for three credits that is facilitated by Meera Garud in fall and by Rich Gazan in spring. There are no letter grades and students receive Credit/No Credit designations. This is a critical opportunity for those completing their ePortfolios to offer and receive formative peer critiques on drafts of their reflective essays. In comments during the sessions, students often remarked on the insights they gain by examining a colleague’s work. As one student stated:

---

**I am so grateful to receive this kind of nurturing and critical support from my peers. While I am making recommendations, I am also getting fresh perspectives on how I might improve my own work by looking at someone else’s draft.**

---

While the first half of this seminar focuses on the completion of ePortfolios, the second half transitions from the academic journey to the beginning of a professional one with field professionals invited to conduct mock job interviews and critique resumes and cover letters. These activities provide practice in writing and verbal skills that are essential in seeking entry level positions. The seminar concludes with a celebratory event—the public presentation. Each student is encouraged to “tell your story” in an informal 10-minute talk that is open to all faculty and students. We have also begun to invite professionals in the field to join us. This activity is not graded or evaluated, instead, attendees are invited to share informal feedback with the presenters.

**Summary Reflection**

The self-study process has revealed to us how our curriculum planning, decision-making, and evaluation processes are fundamentally tied to our role as a program within a Native Hawaiian serving institution, with close and longstanding professional relationships and social protocols appropriate for our place in the community. In Figure 1-3, the curriculum decision-making processes are not shown as a flow of procedural, hierarchical steps, but illustrate relationships as a more accurate representation of our system of how curricular decisions are approached, discussed, and implemented in this place.
During the review period, we undertook a major curriculum overhaul, including establishing the ePortfolio culminating experience and in tandem developing new professional pathways. These are not bite size modifications, especially for a small program. But as we discussed in II.6 and II.7, we did not undertake these changes alone. Planning, decision-making, evaluation and iterative refinement of these and other curricular initiatives during the review period emphasized the importance of staying in conversation with our students and other professional stakeholders.

Within this frame, we are following our institutional and program goals—becoming a Native Hawaiian place of learning and more meaningfully embodying Native Hawaiian values. Through curriculum evolution, hiring a faculty member in Hawaiian librarianship and in every other area of the LIS program, we are endeavoring to explore Hawaiian librarianship and archival practice and theory, and infuse these perspectives and practices throughout the curriculum. Our goal is to develop a curriculum that explores the crossroads between traditional LIS foundations and Hawaiian and Indigenous knowledge to uniquely position ourselves as a program, and to educate our students and ourselves in pono (appropriate or just) ways of connecting people and information, grounded in aloha ‘āina.
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Standard III: Faculty

Faculty Community

III.1 The program has a faculty capable of accomplishing program objectives. Full-time faculty members (tenured/tenure-track and non-tenure-track) are qualified for appointment to the graduate faculty within the parent institution. The full-time faculty are sufficient in number and in diversity of specialties to carry out the major share of the teaching, research, and service activities required for the program, wherever and however delivered. Part-time faculty, when appointed, balance and complement the competencies of the full-time tenured/tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty and are integral to the program. Particularly in the teaching of specialties that are not represented in the expertise of the full-time faculty, part-time faculty enrich the quality and diversity of the program.

As we’ve discussed throughout this self-study, our program goals and objectives cannot be fully expressed or realized with only the baseline triumvirate of research, teaching and service. We educate compassionate, reflective information professionals with a specific emphasis on Hawai‘i and the Pacific, in a primarily face-to-face environment, within an institution that strives to be Indigenous-serving and Indigenous-centered. All full-time faculty teach both core-eligible and elective courses and lead one or more professional pathways. Faculty provide one-on-one student advising each semester and connect students with internship, practicum, coursework, and professional organizations to help them craft an individualized program of study and a personal, place-based student experience. As graduates become professionals, faculty maintain these relationships both directly and via local professional organizations. Our alumni often return to share their experiences in guest talks or as part-time faculty themselves. Faculty members’ ability to establish and maintain relationships, and engage and work effectively with diverse constituencies are both more essential to accomplishing program objectives than CVs laden with bullet points.

From 2016–2022, our full-time faculty remained relatively consistent at either five or six individuals, supplemented by between two and three part-time faculty each semester. As will be discussed in more detail in this section, in spring 2022 we lost two of our six full-time faculty members to other institutions, Associate Professor Vanessa Irvin and Assistant Professor Tonia Sutherland. Professor Rich Gazan moved from a split position with the ICS department to 100% LIS in fall 2022 as part of the reorganization into the new School of Communication and Information (SCI) in the College of Social Sciences (CSS).

Anticipating that a dean would not prioritize replacing lost faculty in units set to depart, as part of the reorganization, each participating unit negotiated for and received an MOU signed by the provost and deans [Appendix 5-1, p. 2] that any faculty positions lost during this transition period would be restored. The first of these was approved for LIS in September 2022 and we are happy to report that Assistant Professor Keahiahi Long has joined the LIS faculty in fall 2023, in the area of Hawaiian Librarianship. We also received support from the provost to restore a permanent full-time Instructor faculty position that had been changed to a temporary appointment due to budget limitations in our previous college. Meera Garud is continuing her excellent leadership of the School Library Media pathway in this new position in fall 2023 as well. However, despite the MOU, our requests for faculty positions in information...
technology for social good and LIS professional engagement were not approved by the provost for the fall 2023–2024 hiring cycle, and other SCI units have seen their requests for faculty positions under this MOU denied as well.

Full-Time Faculty

All full-time faculty are appointed to the Mānoa graduate faculty, many of us in multiple degree programs. One LIS faculty member chaired a university-wide committee on Graduate Faculty Responsibilities. We also serve as outside members of committees in other units across campus and as external examiners for theses and dissertations at other universities. As a group, during the 2016–2023 review period our four current full-time faculty members served on seven thesis committees (two as chair) and 22 dissertation committees (seven as chair). Emeritus, retired, and other former faculty members active during the review period served on an additional seven thesis committees (three as chair) and six dissertation committees [Appendix 3-1]. More details about full-time faculty service activities are available in faculty CV on the LIS website and are also discussed throughout this standard. A complete list of courses taught by each faculty member with enrollment counts can be found in Appendix 3-2.

Currently, even with fewer full-time faculty members, we provide leadership and advising for all professional pathways and specializations, and the core courses we teach cover the full range of LIS Student Learning Outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Research Areas</th>
<th>Pathways/ Specializations</th>
<th>SLOs of Core Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noriko Asato</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Japanese/Japanese American print cultures, Asian librarianship, Censorship, Digital libraries</td>
<td>Asian Studies Librarianship</td>
<td>SLO2 Professions SLO3 Resources SLO5 Cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meera Garud</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Information literacy, School librarianship, Instructional design, Data literacy, Visual literacy</td>
<td>School Library Media, Public Librarianship</td>
<td>SLO4 Technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Gazan</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Social aspects of information technology, Online communities, Interdisciplinary scientific collaborations</td>
<td>General/Custom, Community and Cultural Informatics, Information Technology</td>
<td>SLO1 Services SLO3 Resources SLO4 Technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keahiahi Long</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Hawaiian librarianship</td>
<td>(Pending; fall 2023 appointment start)</td>
<td>SLO1 Services SLO5 Cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Wertheimer</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Library history, Japanese American print culture</td>
<td>Academic/Special Librarianship, Archives</td>
<td>SLO3 Resources SLO6 Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3-2: Previous Full-Time LIS Faculty Members Active During the Review Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Research Areas</th>
<th>Pathways/ Specializations</th>
<th>SLOs of Core Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vanessa Irvin</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Public librarian professional development</td>
<td>Public Librarianship, Community and Cultural Informatics</td>
<td>SLO1 Services SLO5 Cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Péter Jacsó</td>
<td>Professor Emeritus</td>
<td>Database evaluation</td>
<td>(active prior to pathway framework)</td>
<td>SLO4 Technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rae-Anne Montague</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Professional education and social justice</td>
<td>School Library Media</td>
<td>SLO5 Cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luz Marina Quiroga</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Information personalization</td>
<td>(active prior to pathway framework)</td>
<td>SLO4 Technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonia Sutherland</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Critical archival and digital studies</td>
<td>Archives, Community and Cultural Informatics</td>
<td>SLO3 Resources SLO5 Cultures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part-Time Faculty

As the following tables show, our full-time faculty consistently taught the major share of courses in almost every SLO area during the review period. During the review period, two technology-oriented faculty members retired, and we hired more part-time faculty to teach SLO4 Technologies courses. We are very fortunate that professionals who practice in Hawai‘i share their knowledge and experience with our students by teaching courses that are most commonly within SLO4 Technologies and SLO5 Cultures. CV for part-time faculty can be found in Appendix 3-3.

Table 3-3: Percentage of Courses Taught by Full- and Part-Time Faculty by SLO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary SLO</th>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
<th>Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Services</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Professions</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Resources</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Technologies</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Cultures</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Management</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average/Total</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3-4: Percentage of Courses Taught by Full- and Part-Time Faculty by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
<th>Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016–17</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017–18</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018–19</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019–20</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020–21</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021–22</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average/Total</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The process by which we hire part-time faculty has changed more than once during the review period, which contributes to year-to-year variability in part-time faculty hiring. Prior to academic year 2021–22, we hired part-time adjunct instructors in fall, spring, and summer terms through UHM Outreach College. This arrangement enabled flexibility in hiring and a more direct return of a percentage of tuition revenue to the LIS program than was possible through CNS. In spring 2020, Outreach College narrowed its focus to supporting fully online programs during the academic year. We found ourselves in a position of having to compete for scarce adjunct instructor slots with the ICS department, which we were a part of at that time. Because undergraduate computer science instructors would benefit far more students than instructors for our modest graduate program, we were at a structural disadvantage for part-time faculty hiring. That, plus a COVID-19 pandemic hiring freeze, limited our ability to hire part-time faculty to just summer terms during the 2021–22 and 2022–23 academic years.

Our hiring ability improved when we moved to SCI in fall 2022. For the 2022–23 academic year, we received approval from CSS to hire up to eight adjunct instructors, reflecting additional allowances to cover courses that would have been taught by the two full-time faculty members who left in spring 2023. Our new school balances adjunct instructor budgeting among the five constituent units, giving us a much firmer foundation upon which to plan future course offerings.

Our part-time faculty enhance the program by offering both regular courses and unique special topics courses (LIS 693 and 694) that increase the breadth of course offerings and student experience, and are integral to the program. Table 3-5 lists part-time faculty who taught at LIS during the review period. A complete list of courses taught by full-time and part-time LIS faculty can be found in Appendix 3-2.

Table 3-5: Positions and Employment for Part-Time Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part-time Faculty</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tisha Aragaki</td>
<td>Assistant Archivist for Research and Outreach, ‘Ulu’ulu: The Henry Ku’ualoha Giugni Moving Image Archive of Hawai’i, UHWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanie Austin</td>
<td>Jail and Reentry Services Librarian, San Francisco Public Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Beamer</td>
<td>Head, Scholarly Communications and Open Publishing Services, The Claremont Colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal Boyce-Gudat</td>
<td>Librarian, Ames Library, Illinois Wesleyan University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Faculty</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachael Bussert</td>
<td>Local History Librarian, Dayton Metro Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzhen Chen</td>
<td>Chinese Language Cataloging/Metadata Librarian, UHM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carina Chernisky</td>
<td>Public Services Librarian, James and Abigail Campbell Library, UHWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Delay</td>
<td>Project Manager—Broadband, Califa Group/California State Library, and Program Coordinator, LIS Program, UHM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Dunn</td>
<td>Preservation Librarian, UHM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheri Ebisu</td>
<td>Program Coordinator, LIS Program, UHM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy Lehuanani Enomoto</td>
<td>Artist, Scholar and Activist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyla Fujii-Babb</td>
<td>Storyteller, UHM Outreach College Statewide Cultural Extension Program, and Retired Librarian, HSPLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanislava Gardasevic</td>
<td>PhD student, Communication and Information Sciences, UHM, and Digital Librarian, National Library of Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Gustavsen</td>
<td>Humanities Librarian, UHM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lala Hajibayova</td>
<td>Associate Professor, School of Information, Kent State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violet Harada</td>
<td>Professor Emerita, LIS Program, UHM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandi Hull</td>
<td>Program Coordinator, LIS Program, UHM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Jansen</td>
<td>State Archivist, Hawai‘i State Archives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Joyce</td>
<td>Hawaiian Materials Cataloging/Metadata Librarian, UHM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Kellett</td>
<td>Systems Librarian, UHM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleanor Kleiber</td>
<td>Pacific Collection Librarian, UHM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keahiahi Long</td>
<td>Librarian III, Kamakakūokalani Center for Hawaiian Studies, Hawai‘inuiākea School of Hawaiian Knowledge, UHM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael-Brian Ogawa</td>
<td>Faculty Specialist, Department of Information and Computer Sciences, UHM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allyson Ota</td>
<td>Electronic Resources Librarian, Kapiʻolani Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janel Quirante</td>
<td>Head Archivist, 'Ulu‘ulu: The Henry Ku‘ualoha Giugni Moving Image Archive of Hawai‘i, UHWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Richardson</td>
<td>Instructional Design Librarian, Business, Humanities and Social Sciences Department, UHM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Robertson</td>
<td>Assistant Professor/Information Literacy and Faculty Outreach Librarian, Brigham Young University-Hawai‘i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loriene Roy</td>
<td>Professor, School of Information, The University of Texas at Austin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Part-time Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part-time Faculty</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kapena Shim</td>
<td>Hawai‘i Specialist Librarian III, UHM, and Archivist, Hawaiian Legacy Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwen Sinclair</td>
<td>Librarian V, Government Documents and Maps Department, UHM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Sommer</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Program Curator, Pacific International Center for High Technology Research, Research Corporation of the University of Hawai‘i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle Todd</td>
<td>Staff Development Coordinator, HSPLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Wahl</td>
<td>GIS Specialist, Hawai‘i State Historic Preservation Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessamyn West</td>
<td>Community Technology Librarian, Randolph Technical Career Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### III.2 The program demonstrates the high priority it attaches to teaching, research, and service by its appointments and promotions; by encouragement of excellence in teaching, research, and service; and through provision of a stimulating learning and research environment.

During the review period, two full-time faculty members were appointed (Meera Garud and Tonia Sutherland), two were tenured and/or promoted (Rich Gazan and Vanessa Irvin), two retired (Péter Jacsó and Luz Marina Quiroga), two accepted positions at other universities (Vanessa Irvin and Tonia Sutherland), and one faculty member’s contract was not renewed. The latter position had been a tenure-track Assistant Professor, was replaced by a temporary Instructor position held by Meera Garud, and as of fall 2023 was restored to a permanent Instructor position, also held by Meera Garud.

Quality teaching, research, and service are valued and incentivized at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa at all levels. Each is formalized within tenure and promotion criteria stated in the UH faculty collective bargaining agreement, standards provided by the Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Excellence, and evolving faculty workload policies and assignments guidelines between UHM and the faculty union. Support services for faculty at the university and college level are detailed in this Standard as well as in V.11. As part of the faculty mentoring process, senior LIS faculty review drafts of contract renewal and tenure and promotion documents of junior faculty members, in addition to day-to-day advice on teaching and research.

As a graduate-only program, LIS faculty are appointed to the graduate faculty via a separate process and standards administered by UH Graduate Division. LIS faculty members have served on various Graduate Division committees to both articulate these standards and review other programs’ adherence to them. While LIS faculty are appointed to the graduate faculty according to a broad list of graduate faculty responsibilities, for the purposes of this Standard we wish to highlight those emphasizing ethics, communication, and individual mentorship and support:

- To foster the development of excellence in every student with supervision and support.
- To advise students concerning the ethics of the profession, encourage the practice of research and publication consistent with ethical standards, and help students identify and avoid ethically questionable projects;
● To review student work in a timely manner and provide students with objective and fair evaluations of their work and progress;
● To be accessible to all students under their guidance;
● To be candid and fair in their relations with students and avoid any conduct that demeans students;
● To recognize the power they hold when engaged in teaching, research, or supervision and avoid engaging in conduct that could be construed as an abuse of that power; and
● To adhere to the policies of the Academic Senate and Graduate Division concerning acknowledgment of student contributions to their work. See Co-Authorship.

While there are many indicators of excellence in teaching, research, and service, all are fundamentally connected to day-to-day practices: open communication; mutual support; and reflective, ethical professionalism.

At the program level, our faculty position descriptions and tenure and promotion criteria explicitly specify achievements in teaching, research, and service (in proportion to the requirements of the position) as essential to the effectiveness of all faculty members. As discussed throughout Standard I, while we acknowledge the value of traditional metrics of teaching, research, and service, our program culture also emphasizes engaging with students and the community in teaching, research, and service to model the kind of reflective, compassionate professionals we strive to help our students become.

LIS faculty typically teach two courses per semester, with an option for additional summer teaching. The usual enrollment is between 8–20 students per course, allowing faculty and students to work together and get to know each other as individuals, which is central to our program culture. Following our assessment philosophy and practice policy, every course is evaluated by students at the end of the semester (see Table 3-6 and Appendix 3-4 (Restricted Access)), and our metrics of teaching success changed during the review period. Our initial minimum target was an average of 4/5 across all evaluation criteria for a given course and instructors who did not meet that quantitative standard met with the LIS Program Director. Areas for potential improvement based on student feedback were discussed, usually in terms of clearer assignment instructions, more regular feedback, or redistributing course expectations and deliverables. We also share teaching practices and impressions during faculty meetings and faculty members evaluate their teaching experiences in year-end reflections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Evaluation Question</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The instructor demonstrated knowledge of the course content.</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor treated students with respect.</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor both sets high standards and helps students achieve them.</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor was available for consultation.</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a faculty, our numerical course evaluations are consistently positive and we are grateful to receive other acknowledgments of our commitment to teaching and student mentorship:

● Five full-time faculty members (Noriko Asato, Meera Garud, Rich Gazan, Vanessa Irvin, and Tonia Sutherland) were nominated for UHM Excellence in Teaching awards;
● LIS Graduate Assistant Stanislava (Stasha) Gardasevic was awarded the Dan J. Wedemeyer Excellence in Teaching Award in 2021; and
Three full-time LIS faculty members (Rich Gazan, Tonia Sutherland, and Andrew Wertheimer) were nominated for the Peter V. Garrod Distinguished Graduate Mentoring Award.

Other evidence of how we provide a stimulating learning environment includes: involving students in research and publication; offering students paid positions as Zoom course assistants to support instructors; providing lab space for faculty funded research projects; supporting faculty service by dedicating program funds to support a student editorial assistant for a faculty journal editor; course releases or exchanges when faculty members are going up for tenure and/or promotion; serving as LIS Program Director or Communication and Information Sciences (CIS) PhD Program Chair; or taking on other large projects such as accreditation data wrangling. We also partner with other institutions on research projects, such as an IMLS Public Broadcasting Fellowship, which provides our students with valuable research and practical experiences outside the regular curriculum.

Faculty research accomplishments are detailed in III.5, institutional funding sources in V.8, and physical and technological resources supporting faculty research in V.9, so here we focus on the more practical and collaborative aspects of our teaching and research environment. At the time of hire, junior faculty receive a research startup package, which LIS faculty use to: hire students as research assistants; support conference travel and summer research; and involve LIS students in research projects, in some cases resulting in co-authored publications, internships, and funding. Senior and Emeritus LIS faculty provide one-on-one mentorship to junior faculty to review drafts of tenure, promotion, and contract renewal documents, as well as offering informal advice and guidance. Senior and Emeritus LIS faculty also serve on the advisory boards of junior faculty grant projects and proposals.

At the campus level, the Office of Faculty Development and Academic Support provides workshops and a tenure and promotion dossier library, among many other services, and two faculty members received research travel grants awarded by the Office of the Vice Provost for Research and Scholarship during the review period. Within our new home in the CSS, the Social Science Research Institute (SSRI) includes a grant development specialist, travel, and research funding.

The LIS Research Committee has gone through several evolutions and changes in faculty leadership during the review period, but the essential goals have remained: provide a forum for student and faculty research via colloquium talks, and an avenue for research engagement outside of the regular course structure. Most recently, two talks were held in spring 2023 by Andrew Wertheimer and Stasha Gardasevic.

Additionally, as one of the four constituent units of the Interdisciplinary PhD Program in Communication and Information Sciences (CIS), we host CIS administration, seminar courses and colloquia within the LIS space, and one crossover LIS/CIS graduate course that draws students from both programs. Having the opportunity to learn in such close contact with PhD students and faculty helps demystify doctoral study, and many LIS graduates have gone on to enroll in the CIS PhD Program.

Overall, graduating students consistently rank the LIS program learning and research environment as effective, although the specific components identified tend to overlap, as exemplified by this graduating student survey open-ended response [Appendix 3-6 (Restricted Access)].

---

I believe the LIS program accomplished its mission and adhered to its values. In particular I felt that as a student I saw a heavy part of the research—both from the obvious, thoughtful research dedicated to crafting our courses and also professors’ additional projects and writings. I think this helped enhance the teaching to help keep
it relevant and engaging. Across the students, staff, faculty, and alumni the program has developed a close-knit community which support and look out for each other.

For example, from fall 2018–spring 2022, over 92% of graduating student survey respondents agreed or strongly agreed with these statements:

- “The physical space(s) provided an effective learning environment”;
- “Full-time faculty taught and communicated effectively”; and
- “Part-time/adjunct faculty taught and communicated effectively.”

As evidenced from our individual CVs available on our website, faculty also engage in considerable professional service. Some of the faculty service awards during the review period include the following:

- Professor Emerita Violet Harada was awarded the Distinguished Librarian Award from the Hawai'i Library Association;
- Three faculty members (Noriko Asato, Tonia Sutherland, and Andrew Wertheimer) were awarded the Lei Lau Kukui Award from the Society of American Archivists Student Chapter; and
- Three faculty members (Noriko Asato, Vanessa Irvin, and Tonia Sutherland) and two LIS staff members (Cheri Ebisu and Christian Delay) were awarded the Sarah K. Vann Professional Service Award from the student chapter of the American Library Association.

III.3 The program has policies to recruit and retain faculty from diverse backgrounds. Explicit and equitable faculty personnel policies and procedures are published, accessible, and implemented.

University policies on faculty recruitment and retention are published and accessible at multiple levels. For example, the UH Board of Regents has adopted executive policies on Faculty and Staff Recruitment and Retention, Recruitment and Selection Procedures, Dual Career Faculty Partner Hires, and Nondiscrimination, Equal Opportunity, and Affirmative Action.

Additionally, among the Goals within the Imperative identified in the 2023–2029 UH Strategic Plan to “Fulfill our kuleana (responsibility) to Native Hawaiians and Hawai‘i” is to:

Model what it means to be an Indigenous-serving and Indigenous-centered institution: Native Hawaiians thrive, traditional Hawaiian values and knowledge are embraced, and UH scholarship and service advance all Native Hawaiians and Hawai‘i.

The first objective in support of this goal is to:

Ensure that UH supports the success of Native Hawaiians in learning, teaching, service and research across our campuses and nurtures Native Hawaiians as leaders.

At the campus level, the Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Excellence (OVPAE) provides additional faculty personnel policies, as well as training and guidance on recruitment and faculty development. We
would like to highlight here the new Search Advocates program via OVPAE, that provides trained search process advisors for faculty search committees to ensure diversity and minimize bias. Our recent, successful search for a tenure-track Assistant Professor in Hawaiian Librarianship/Archival Studies supports UHM goals and objectives, and our search committee benefited from the participation of one of the first Search Advisors to be trained through this program.

From 2018–2022, four of our six full-time faculty members were women of color, including our three most recent hires. While this would seem to provide evidence that we can recruit and retain diverse faculty, when two faculty members departed in the same semester—both Black women, and the first LIS faculty members to have left for positions at other institutions in over twenty years—the effectiveness of our policies to retain faculty from diverse backgrounds must be called into question.

For faculty who receive offers of employment from other institutions, the mechanism by which retention offers are made is the Faculty Special Salary Adjustment, which includes formal consultation with other faculty members in the unit who review the details of the proposed retention offer. While the details and rationale of any employment decision are personal and confidential, and individual instances are not trends, what is demonstrably true is that despite unanimous support from the LIS faculty to make a retention offer to a faculty member who signaled openness to receiving one, no retention offer was made. As discussed in more detail in V.7, among the reasons given for this inaction was that matching the external offer would result in “significant inequalities” in the existing faculty salary structure.

However, this departure created an opportunity for us to fulfill a longstanding program goal. In our recent faculty search, we sought a full-time, tenure-track Assistant Professor in Hawaiian Librarianship/Archival Studies [Appendix 1-11]. Among the minimum qualifications for this position were:

- Demonstrated commitment to information services in Hawai‘i, through coursework or experience;
- Experience with Hawaiian materials and collections in teaching, reference or research; and
- Commitment to, knowledge of, and/or experience with the University of Hawai‘i’s mission and purpose of positioning the University as a leading Indigenous-serving higher education institution.

### Faculty Expertise and Effectiveness

**III.4 The qualifications of each faculty member include competence in designated teaching areas, technological skills and knowledge as appropriate, effectiveness in teaching, and active participation in relevant organizations.**

All LIS faculty members have the qualifications, knowledge, skills, and professional experiences to teach courses in their designated areas. Table 3-7 shows courses taught by full-time faculty members during the review period. The qualifications and professional positions of adjunct faculty members are discussed in more detail in III.1 and Appendix 3-3.
**Table 3-7: Courses Taught by Full-Time LIS Faculty Members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty (Pathways/ Specializations)</th>
<th>Courses/SLOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Elective: LIS 690 Internship (SLOV*) |
| Meera Garud (School Library Media, Public Librarianship) | Core: LIS 665 Digital Instruction (SLO4)  
Elective: LIS 681 Books and Media for Children (SLO3), LIS 686 Info Literacy (SLO1), LIS 691/692 Masters Seminar (n/a), LIS 696 Practicum in School Librarianship (SLO6) |
| Rich Gazan (General/Custom, Community and Cultural Informatics, Information Technology) | Core: LIS 601 Intro to Reference (SLO1), LIS 602 Resource Discovery (SLO3), LIS 650/684 Management of Libraries and SLM/ with Harada (SLO6), LIS 661/CIS 702 Informatics (SLO4)  
Elective: LIS 691/692 Masters Seminar (n/a), LIS 694 Visions of the Library (SLO4), ICS 669 Social Computing (SLO4) |
| Andrew Wertheimer (Academic/Special Librarianship, Archives) | Core: LIS 610 Foundations of Info Professions (SLO2), LIS 615 Collection Management (SLO3), LIS 650 Management of Libraries (SLO6), LIS 658: Archival Management (SLO6)  
Elective: LIS 611 Intellectual Freedom (SLO2), LIS 612 History of Information (SLO2), LIS 654 Archival Ethics and Profession (pre-SLO), LIS 693 Academic Librarianship (SLO2), LIS 693 Rare Books and Special Collections (SLO3) |

*Note: “pre-SLO” indicates the course was offered before fall 2018 and “SLOV” indicates the SLO varies.

For similar information for previous and part-time faculty see [Appendix 3-2](#).

**Evidence of Competence in Teaching Area(s), Pathway Leadership**

Every faculty member leads at least one professional pathway and remains active in research and professional communities to network, develop partnerships, and update their knowledge. Complete details can be found in faculty CVs but we present a brief overview of each faculty member’s qualifications and memberships below.

**Current LIS faculty**

**Noriko Asato developed and leads the Asian Studies Librarianship pathway, which is unique to UHM, and serves as Internship Coordinator.** She oversaw the Kawasaki Japanese Reading Room at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln before coming to UHM. She created two new classes for the pathway. The more traditional class is LIS 645 Asian Research Materials and Methods for which she edited a textbook, *Handbook for Asian Studies Specialists*, with a team of Asian Studies librarians from across the country. As the only course specializing in Asian Studies librarianship in the US, LIS 645 attracts students from other LIS schools. She also developed LIS 662 Asian Informatics, which was recognized as establishing the field by Ma and Zou (2020). She remains active in the Association for Asian Studies and Council on East Asian Libraries, and the Kyoto Institute for Library and Information Science Study Group. She attended workshops in China and Korea, and conferences in Japan. She also took a sabbatical at Kyoto University’s Library Science Program as a visiting researcher and received a Best Research Article award from the Nippon Association for Librarianship. As LIS Internship Program Director, she works
closely with the Academic/Special Librarianship pathway. She refreshes her knowledge by participating in SAA’s Digital Archives Specialist (DAS) Certificate Program, Council on East Asian Libraries webinars and other workshops, and is an active member of the Asia-Pacific Library and Information Education and Practice (A-LIEP).

Meera Garud leads the School Library Media and Public Librarianship pathways. She was president of the Hawai‘i Association of School Libraries (HASL), worked for seven years with Hawai‘i P-20 Partnerships for Education, and volunteered two years at Mānoa Elementary School. She also serves on a number of HLA committees, including the Advocacy Committee, where she is advocating for public schools to hire one school librarian per campus. Her LIS 686 Information Literacy and Learning Resources course is cross-listed with two departments in the College of Education and attracts students from beyond LIS. She is active in HASL, the Hawai‘i Information Literacy Summit, University of Hawai‘i Libraries Information Literacy Committee, and HLA. She was an ALA Spectrum Scholar who received the prestigious Blanche E. Woolls Scholarship for School Library Media Service.

Rich Gazan leads the General/Custom pathway and Community and Cultural Informatics and Information Technology specializations. Before coming to UH he worked in the database publishing industry for eight years and helped launch two startups: a knowledge integration company making diverse data searchable through a single interface; and a Social Q&A site focusing on user-generated and user-vetted content. He was initially a dual hire with the ICS Department before transitioning full time to LIS in 2022. He chaired the Interdisciplinary PhD Program in CIS, reflecting his philosophy of encouraging students to explore many directions, draw outside the lines, and define their own paths. He was PI or Co-PI on two NASA grants and two IMLS grants focused broadly on knowledge integration, and developed LIS’s first course on Informatics, which covers the social aspects of information technologies, and is cross-listed for students in the LIS and CIS PhD programs. His participation with professional organizations includes ALISE, ASIST, the iSchools Conference, and the Association for Computing Machinery.

Andrew Wertheimer leads the Academic/Special Librarianship and Archival Studies pathways. He developed the Archival Studies area and resumed the pathway lead after Tonia Sutherland joined the UCLA faculty. Wertheimer studied special collections librarianship at Indiana University and Archival Studies and Print Culture History at University of Wisconsin Madison. He worked in a number of archives and special collections, most notably at the Chicago Jewish Archives. He also leads the Academic Librarianship pathway using his experience at the University of Wisconsin, Indiana University, University of Nebraska, and the Spertus Institute for Jewish Studies. He refreshes his technology skills through courses in SAA’s DAS Certificate Program, ACRL webinars, and online teaching from the UHM Center for Teaching Excellence. He is active in ALA, HLA, ALISE, ACRL, and RBMS. He is also involved with the A-LIEP Conference, having served on organizing and research committees for A-LIEP Conferences in China, Thailand, the Philippines, and Malaysia.

Emerita and previous LIS faculty

Violet Harada is Professor Emerita and continues to be an integral part of the LIS ‘ohana. She provides invaluable guidance and support at both the strategic planning and boots-on-the-ground levels—she attends monthly faculty meetings, teaches as needed to support students and faculty, and also relaunched our LIS Research Forum in 2023. She remains active in research and publishing, co-authoring books such as Radical Collaborations for Learning: School Librarians as Change Agents (2020) and The Many Faces of School Library Leadership (2017, 2nd ed). In 2021, she was recognized with HLA’s Distinguished Librarian Award. Under her leadership (prior to the current review period), the School Library Media Specialization was ranked in US News & World Report’s Top 10.
Vanessa Irvin developed and led the Public Librarianship pathway, which she built around the essential nature of being a reflective practitioner and taking time to connect with other professionals. She taught public library services based on her experience as a branch librarian and is a leader in street literature, authoring *The Readers’ Advisory Guide to Street Literature*. She also serves as Editor-in-Chief of the *International Journal of Information, Diversity, & Inclusion*. She was PI on an IMLS grant that brought LIS students, public librarians, and Native Hawaiian information professionals and paraprofessionals together as a learning community of practice.

Rae-Anne Montague was hired to administer the School Library Media track (prior to it becoming a pathway) after the retirement of Violet Harada. As an administrator at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign’s Online Education Program, she was PI of an IMLS grant, Mix IT Up! Youth Advocacy Librarianship. She was active in the American Association of School Librarians (AASL) and National Association to Promote Library & Information Services to Latinos and the Spanish Speaking (REFORMA), and worked to promote services for young adults, LGBTQIA+ populations and incarcerated people.

Luz Marina Quiroga was the first dual culture hire with LIS and ICS. She taught courses in personalized information delivery, information filtering, and information architecture. She was an advocate for open source software and institutional repositories, and led an annual workshop on library automation for developing countries at the Free University of Brussels. Before retiring, she was involved in a number of research projects engaging with the information needs of homeless/houseless populations.

Tonia Sutherland led the Archival Studies pathway, co-established the Community and Cultural Informatics Specialization, and reimagined the LIS 630 Community Engagement course as both a core component of the LIS curriculum and a new specialization area within the interdisciplinary CIS PhD program. She is an internationally recognized expert in the study of Black archival practices, author of *Resurrecting the Black Body: Race and the Digital Afterlife* (University of California Press, 2023) as well as over two dozen articles and book chapters in areas including critical and liberatory archival studies, digital studies, and science and technology studies, emphasizing the often-messy entanglements of memory, community, and technology. She is a leader in the Archival Education and Research Institute, was elected to the board of the Association of Hawai‘i Archivists and the Society of American Archivists Council, and received a $357K IMLS grant, “Redescription as Restorative Justice in American Archives.”

Teaching Effectiveness

With the assessment caveats we’ve discussed throughout this self-study, one of our primary teaching assessment tools remains the course evaluation. Students are invited to complete an online evaluation administered centrally by UHM, which may include institutional-level questions in addition to those we include as a program. The results are reviewed by each instructor and reported to the LIS Program Coordinator, who compiles results and shares them with the Program Director for review, discussion with instructors and/or the full faculty, and action. Table 3-6 highlights four aspects of the teaching effectiveness of the faculty. These are considered exceptionally high scores and strong evidence of our teaching effectiveness and positive impacts on students’ learning.

There was only a minimal difference between the average of all scores of the LIS full-time and the part-time faculty members [Appendix 3-4]. These results reflect our high standards to select only highly qualified adjuncts, who are responsible and passionate instructors.

We carefully examine student course evaluations and discuss low ratings with adjunct faculty. In addition, we provide mentorship (e.g., help develop a syllabus), invite them to regular faculty meetings, and NSO, and include them in our faculty handbook, which was revised in spring 2023.
Other indicators of teaching effectiveness that we collected, discussed, and acted upon are covered in II.5 and Table 5-4.

**III.5 For each full-time faculty member, the qualifications include a sustained record of accomplishment in research or other appropriate scholarship (such as creative and professional activities) that contribute to the knowledge base of the field and to their professional development.**

As we compile evidence of faculty research, creative and professional activities during the 2016–2023 review period, it is striking how we are simultaneously diverse in artifacts, expressions, venues and metrics, yet connected to a common theme of community. While numbers are inescapably inexact due to faculty movement, the full-time LIS faculty members active during some or all of the review period combined to publish more than 20 refereed journal articles, over 70 refereed conference papers and presentations, and 15 book chapters while they were members of the LIS faculty. Also, during the review period LIS faculty publications were cited more than 2000 times and LIS faculty members served as Principal Investigator, Co-Principal Investigator, or Co-Investigator on grants in excess of $1.3 million.

Our faculty also actively engage with professional communities, particularly those local to Hawai‘i, and serve on a broad range of committees and editorial review boards as well. Full details about each faculty member’s research, creative and professional activities can be found in their CVs. Here, we provide brief highlights of each faculty member’s activities during the review period and give current faculty members space to summarize their work in their own words. Unless otherwise indicated, all research outputs are from the 2016–2023 review period or the subset of that time served as a member of the full-time LIS faculty.

**Current Full-Time Faculty**

**Noriko Asato, Associate Professor**

Research areas: Asian Studies Librarianship, Intellectual Freedom

Publications and presentations: one refereed journal article, three book chapters, seven conference papers, 14 refereed conference presentations

Funded research: “Development of Japan’s e-Government: My Government as a Step Towards a Ubiquitous G2C Networked Society.” University Research Council Travel Grant, 2016 ($1,200)

Impact metrics: Over 210 citations since 2016, over 370 total (Google Scholar)

Awards and honors: Outstanding Paper Award in the Best Research Category for “Library Exclusion and the Rise of Japanese Bookstores in Prewar Honolulu’” in *International Journal of Information, Diversity & Inclusion* 3 (2019); Lei Lau Kukui Award, UHM SAAsc (2018); Sarah K. Vann Award, UHM ALAsc (2016)

About my research, creative and professional activities:

*My research has had an impact on helping to reframe the discussion of Japanese language schools from institutional histories to one that focuses on the role of language rights and how Japanese American immigrants and their children fought against efforts of racists and nationalists who wanted to limit their opportunity for*
cultural expression and sustainability. One article in particular has over 2,500 downloads from our ScholarSpace institutional repository in addition to its original publication in the History of Education Quarterly and is used in several undergraduate classes. A newer area of research is exploring the role of Japanese American bookstores in the United States.

As the Internship Coordinator for the past 15 years, I've developed a professional community and cycles of mentorship. Many of the students who were in early cohorts have since become internship supervisors themselves. I have the pleasure of working closely with them in order to create internship opportunities for current and future students. I’ve worked with the Hawai‘i State Librarian and Head of Branch Services to establish a new system whereby HSPLS interviews candidates and places them in a desired branch based on the student’s interest in service and location. I believe that this experience of making bridges, networking, and engaging with alumni and other stakeholders leads to an essential learning experience that not only helps students to find a job but also be able to develop as a professional.

Meera Garud, Instructor

Professional interests: Information literacy, School librarianship, Instructional design, Data literacy, Visual literacy

Publications and presentations: one book chapter, one article, three professional conference presentations, six professional development workshops

Awards and honors: Co-President, Hawai‘i Association of School Librarians, 2018–2020

About my research, creative and professional activities:

I work closely with the Hawai‘i Association of School Librarians and the Hawai‘i State Department of Education. I focus on supporting professional development opportunities for in-service school librarians, such as training sessions on O‘ahu, Kauai, Hawai‘i Island, and Maui. This involved discussing learning needs with librarians in each region, developing sessions, and working with HASL and HIDOE to fund travel for the sessions on neighbor islands. Importantly, this initiative allowed me to stay connected and to meet dozens of school librarians.

I have also been on the planning committee for the spring 2020 and 2021 HASL Conferences, the fall 2020 joint conference between HASL/HLA, and the fall 2022 joint conference between HASL and HIDOE, called the Hawai‘i School Libraries Conference. The latter was a first-time collaboration and we plan to continue this partnership again every two years.
Rich Gazan, Professor and Director
Research areas: Social Q&A, Online communities, Interdisciplinary scientific collaborations
Publications and presentations: one refereed journal article, five refereed conference papers, nine refereed conference presentations
Impact metrics: Over 375 citations since 2016, over 950 total (Google Scholar)
Awards and honors: Visiting Researcher, NASA Astrobiology Institute, NASA Ames Research Center, Mountain View, CA (2016)
About my research, creative and professional activities:

My research focuses on how people integrate information from diverse sources, in professional environments such as interdisciplinary scientific collaborations, and in informal environments such as online communities. Both threads of my research address the question of how people without a shared context, be they scientists from different disciplines or strangers on the Web, evaluate, reconcile, share and perpetuate often-conflicting information. By studying similar processes in diverse environments, I see my research as a bridge to help traditionally separate communities inform one another.

I’ve been fortunate to put my research into practice by serving as Graduate Chair of both the LIS program (seven years) and the Interdisciplinary PhD Program in Communication and Information Sciences (four and a half years), and serving on 32 dissertation and thesis committees across both programs, ten as chair. I am currently working with an additional five ABD and seven pre-ABD PhD students, and helping LIS students, staff and faculty get where they want to go professionally has been a consistent source of joy throughout my time here.

Andrew Wertheimer, Associate Professor
Research areas: Ethnic print culture history (primarily Japanese American and Jewish American), History of Librarianship, and Professional Education for Information Professionals
Publications and presentations: two refereed journal articles, five refereed conference papers, two book chapters, 19 conference presentations
Impact metrics: Over 60 citations since 2016, over 170 total (Google Scholar)
Awards and honors: Inaugural Distinguished Service in Library History Award from the ALA Library History Round Table (2023); Outstanding Paper Award in the Best Research Category for “Library
Exclusion and the Rise of Japanese Bookstores in Prewar Honolulu” in *International Journal of Information, Diversity & Inclusion* 3 (2019); Visiting Research Fellow, Faculty of Library, Information and Media Science, University of Tsukuba (2019); Lei Lau Kukui Award, UHM SAAsc (2016)

About my research, creative and professional activities:

*My research is part of an effort to promote a print culture history that is not only diverse and international, but also transnational, meaning that it recognizes that people today and in the past are part of several print culture circuits as they establish residence in different countries with overlapping diasporas. I’m now seeing a number of researchers, especially among Japanese American researchers that are embracing this perspective, and how it recognizes different forms of cultural and political identity as well as literacy. One example of this was how my thesis was used as a primary resource for several University of Washington graduate seminars on Japanese American literature. My research is contributing to an interdisciplinary, international and multicultural view of library history, and in 2023 I was named the inaugural winner of the ALA Library History Round Table Distinguished Service in Library History Award.*

*Most of my service has been to professional associations, including a decade on the Executive Board of the Hawai‘i Library Association as their ALA Council liaison. I also was part of the Steering Committee for A-LIEP, an organization that promotes collaboration between LIS and iSchool faculty and practitioners in the Asia and Pacific region. I’ve also served on the Mānoa Faculty Senate.*

**Emeritus and other faculty active during the review period**

**Table 3-8: Faculty Profile for Violet Harada, Professor Emerita**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research areas</td>
<td>Information literacy, inquiry, project based learning, learning communities, assessment, Japanese American experience in Hawai‘i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications and presentations</td>
<td>Three jointly edited books, two refereed journal articles, five book chapters, one published conference proceedings, three juried conference presentations, one invited conference presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact metrics</td>
<td>Over 425 citations since 2016, over 1360 total (<a href="https://scholar.google.com">Google Scholar</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards and honors</td>
<td>Distinguished Librarian Award, Hawai‘i Library Association (2021)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3-9: Faculty Profile for Vanessa Irvin, Associate Professor (2015–2022)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research areas</td>
<td>Street Literature, Practitioner Inquiry, Librarian Professional Development and Practice, Equity/Diversity/Inclusion and Librarian Identity, Public Libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications and presentations</td>
<td>Seven refereed journal articles, eight refereed conference presentations, four book chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funded research</td>
<td>Principal Investigator, “Hui ‘Ekolu: Bridging Educational, Cultural, And Technical Exchange Among Native And Public Libraries In Hawai‘i” (IMLS Laura Bush 21st Century Librarian Program grant, $249K, 2018–2021)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact metrics</td>
<td>Over 90 citations since 2016, over 140 total (<a href="https://scholar.google.com">Google Scholar</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards and honors</td>
<td>Library Journal Movers &amp; Shakers Award—Educators (2016); Excellence in Teaching Award Nomination (2018), Sarah K. Vann Award for Professional Service, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa (2020)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3-10: Faculty Profile for Péter Jacsó, Professor Emeritus (1994–2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research areas</td>
<td>Database content evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications and presentations</td>
<td>One refereed journal article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact metrics</td>
<td>Over 400 citations since 2016, over 3000 total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3-11: Faculty Profile for Rae-Anne Montague, Assistant Professor (2014–2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research areas</td>
<td>LGBTQ Library Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications and presentations</td>
<td>One refereed journal article, one refereed conference paper, one book chapter, one edited volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact metrics</td>
<td>Over 75 citations since 2016, over 220 total (<a href="https://scholar.google.com">Google Scholar</a>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3-12: Faculty Profile for Luz Marina Quiroga, Associate Professor (2000–2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research areas</td>
<td>Information personalization, Community informatics, ICTs and homeless/houseless people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications and presentations</td>
<td>Two refereed journal articles, one refereed conference paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact metrics</td>
<td>Over 45 citations since 2016, over 255 total (<a href="https://scholar.google.com">Google Scholar</a>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3-13: Faculty Profile for Tonia Sutherland, Assistant Professor (2018–2022)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research areas</td>
<td>Archives, Digital Culture, Critical Information Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications and presentations</td>
<td>Six refereed journal articles, three refereed conference papers, three refereed conference presentations, four book chapters, one book contract, and seven keynote addresses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Funded research               | Principal Investigator, “Premised on Care: Redescription as Restorative Justice in American Archives” (IMLS Laura Bush 21st Century Librarian Program grant, $357K, 2021–2024).  
“Searching for Solitude: Black Women and Resistance in the French National Archives” (Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research (OVCR), UH Mānoa, $1,700, 2019) |
| Impact metrics                | Over 380 citations since 2016, over 410 total (Google Scholar)                                                                                                                                          |
| Awards and honors            | Best Paper Award Nomination, “Social Media and the Black Travel Community: From Autonomous Space to Liberated Space”, Hawai’i International Conference on System Sciences (2019);  
UHM Sarah K. Vann Award for Professional Service (2019)                                                                                      |

Across all of the research, creative and professional activities of full-time LIS faculty members present and past, there is a consistent connection with community. This is one of the reasons we actively created and embraced our move to the new School of Communication and Information in the College of Social Sciences, where we have a natural connection with other researchers who do community oriented work.

III.6 The faculty hold advanced degrees from a variety of academic institutions. The faculty evidence diversity of backgrounds, ability to conduct research in the field, and specialized knowledge covering program content. In addition, they demonstrate skill in academic planning and assessment, have a substantial and pertinent body of relevant experience, interact with faculty of other disciplines, and maintain close and continuing liaison with the field. The faculty nurture an intellectual environment that enhances the accomplishment of program objectives.

The following tables present the PhD degrees and institutions of all current and previous full-time faculty. In addition, all current and previous full-time faculty members, as well as all part-time and adjunct faculty members, hold Master’s degrees in LIS or equivalent from ALA-accredited institutions. Our CVs detail our range of individual professional experiences and our continuing work with student and professional organizations, research, teaching and service collaborations with faculty across disciplines, and continuing connections with the information professions, via both formal student internship and practicum placements and informal relationships and conversations that arise as longtime members of the Hawai’i LIS community.
Table 3-14: Rank and Education for Current Full-Time Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty member</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Doctoral degree field</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noriko Asato</td>
<td>2007–present</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Language Education</td>
<td>Purdue University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meera Garud</td>
<td>2019–present</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Gazan</td>
<td>2007–present</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Library &amp; Information Science</td>
<td>UCLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keahiahi Long</td>
<td>2023–present</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Communication &amp; Information Sciences (in progress)</td>
<td>UH Mānoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Wertheimer</td>
<td>2003–present</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Library &amp; Information Science</td>
<td>U. of Wisconsin-Madison</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-15: Rank and Education for Emeritus, Retired, and Other Faculty Active During the Review Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty member</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Current or last rank</th>
<th>Doctoral degree field</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violet Harada</td>
<td>1993–2013</td>
<td>Professor Emerita</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>UH Mānoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanessa Irvin</td>
<td>2015–2022</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>U. of Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rae-Anne Montague</td>
<td>2014–2016</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>U. of Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luz Marina Quiroga</td>
<td>2000–2019</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Library &amp; Information Science</td>
<td>Indiana U.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonia Sutherland</td>
<td>2018–2022</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Information Sciences</td>
<td>U. of Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As evidence that faculty demonstrate skill in academic planning, all LIS faculty both participate in and reflect upon our planning and assessment practices, as evidenced by our yearly planning meetings, year-end reflections, ePortfolio guidelines and evaluation documents, and our assessment philosophy and practice document. One example of our collaborative reflection process, that also demonstrates how planning and assessment intertwine, can be found in Appendix 3-7. Meera Garud provided particular leadership in both program and student assessment—she uses rubrics and proven assessment models in her courses such as LIS 686 Information Literacy and Learning Resources, which is cross-listed with a course in the College of Education, and LIS 696 Practicum in School Librarianship. Similarly, in LIS 690 Internship, Noriko Asato asks students to provide an SLO self-assessment as a component of their experience. Additionally, adjunct faculty member Michael-Brian Ogawa, in collaboration with Violet Harada, developed and offered a Special Topics course on Evidence-based Practices for Libraries.

**LIS 694 Evidence-based Practices for Libraries (3)** The course centers on the study and application of evidence-based practices in various library settings. It focuses on the evaluation of library programs, services, and infrastructure. Students will be introduced to real-life situations.
that involve data analysis in various situations. Activities include the use of data to evaluate libraries to inform decisions with qualitative and quantitative evidence. Evaluation strategies include cost-benefit, efficiency, effectiveness, opportunity, educational outcomes, and patron satisfaction.

As evidence that faculty demonstrate skill in academic assessment, our assessment practices are recognized at the university level by the Mānoa Assessment and Curriculum Support Center (ACSC). For example, our 2020 LIS Program Assessment report yielded the following feedback from ACSC [Appendix 3-8].

- **Program SLOs are written at the application level which is appropriate for Master’s level students.**
- **Congratulations in achievement of 100% of courses that have course SLOs explicitly stated on the syllabus, a website, or other publicly available document, as well as documentation of learning achievement results for all program SLOs!**
- **Comprehensive array of program-level learning assessment activities. Excellent use of direct assessment results (e.g., portfolios and oral exams) in learning assessment. High level of faculty engagement.**
- **Excellent inclusion of alumni and employer feedback as well as student performance to inform the curriculum changes.**

ACSC feedback on our 2022 Assessment report [Appendix 3-9] was similarly positive.

- **All course syllabi include SLOs.**
- **The program seems to have set up an excellent portfolio assessment system that includes students’ choice of artifacts and their reflection on their mastery of a given SLO. Program directly and systematically assessed student work (using a rubric) to determine whether students are meeting expectations for each SLO. Findings are reported for all SLOs, with additional detail about initial and final pass rates.**
- **Program faculty provided thoughtful reflection on findings, and present clear next steps in continuing to monitor and improve their program.**

As a result, we were invited as a program to present at a campus-level assessment workshop in 2021 [Appendix 3-10], where we discussed our transition from an oral exam to an ePortfolio-based culminating experience, and the corresponding impacts on SLO assessment. This would not have happened without the collective investment of the entire LIS faculty in a culture of reflective assessment.

As evidence that our faculty interact with faculty of other disciplines, we note:

- **Our active leadership in planning and governance with faculty across four other programs in SCI [Appendix 3-11];**
- **Our nine dual-degree programs;**
- **Andrew Wertheimer continues to serve as an elected representative in the Mānoa Faculty Senate on the Committees on Administration and Budget, Student Affairs, and Faculty Service while Vanessa Irvin also served one Faculty Senate term;**
- **Rich Gazan chaired the Interdisciplinary PhD Program in Communication and Information Sciences for 4.5 years with a core research area in interdisciplinary scientific collaborations; and**
- **As a group, LIS faculty have served on 26 interdisciplinary dissertation committees (7 as Chair) during the review period [Appendix 3-1].**
Our engagement with the professional community has taken many forms. As part of her IMLS-funded project “Hui ‘Ekolu: Bridging Educational, Cultural, And Technical Exchange Among Native And Public Libraries In Hawai’i” (2018–2021), Vanessa Irvin worked closely with the Hawai’i State Public Library System, Alu Like Native Hawaiian Library, Nā Hawaiʻi ʻImi Loa, a professional organization dedicated to Hawaiian librarianship, public librarians across the state, and LIS students to promote reflective professional practice and collaboration.

Among the highlights of Andrew Wertheimer’s decade on ALA Council were stronger connections between ALA and the HLA, and his advocacy continues—most recently by taking the lead on defending tenure for academic librarians in 2022 as head of an HLA subcommittee that submitted testimony to the Hawaiʻi State Legislature. He also served on an external review panel for the Victoria University of Wellington (Te Whare Wānanga o Te Ūpoko o Te Ika a Māui) School of Information Management.

### III.7 Faculty assignments relate to the needs of the program and to the competencies of individual faculty members. These assignments ensure that the quality of instruction is maintained throughout the year and take into account the time needed by the faculty for teaching, student counseling, research, professional development, and institutional and professional service.

Our faculty assignments are guided simultaneously by our overall degree requirements and the course recommendations for each of our six professional pathways, both of which are detailed in II.3. A list of all courses taught by each faculty member with enrollments can be found in Appendix 3-2. Each faculty pathway lead is primarily responsible for ensuring that needed courses are offered regularly, both by teaching in the pathway and by reaching out to working professionals to teach courses in the pathway area as adjunct faculty. As a small faculty, almost every course is a recommended option for multiple pathways, and almost every core SLO requirement has multiple course options that can fulfill it. This flexible approach allows courses to be offered more often, serve more students, and create opportunities for interaction between students with different professional interests.

LIS faculty members teach two courses per semester. Per the current University of Hawai‘i workload policy, each faculty member has a baseline expectation of teaching 24 credit hours per year, although equivalencies such as research, service, advising, administration and other non-instructional tasks halve this expectation to six credit hours, or two courses, per semester. Faculty members do not get credit toward teaching load for supervising theses or dissertations (summarized in III.1), and directed reading/independent study courses are taught uncompensated. Summer teaching is optional and cannot substitute for a faculty member’s teaching duties during the academic year.

Courses taught by LIS faculty during the review period are summarized in III.4. For planning, advising, and coordination with adjunct faculty, we maintain a three-year course projection document on the LIS site. This allows faculty and students to see the impact of their course selections in the context of what other courses are scheduled to be offered. We also maintain an internal student tracker spreadsheet that aggregates student progress in terms of completed and missing degree requirements, further segmented by in-person and neighbor island students, which allows us to anticipate when students will need courses in particular SLOs and delivery modes, and schedule accordingly. Of course, much can change within a three-year projection window, and LIS faculty consistently put student needs and mutual support above their individual teaching plans and course preferences; we present examples of this in III.10. In most cases, if a core or pathway requirement unexpectedly needs to be taught in a given semester, we first seek an adjunct faculty member with expertise in the area. If no qualified person is
available that semester, full-time faculty will shift their planned elective course offerings to meet immediate student need.

Given our small student population, course enrollment is a manageable 8–20 students per course, and each faculty member has approximately the same number of advisees, who are assigned at admission time according to their expressed interests in one or more of the pathways led by their faculty advisor. Students meet physically or virtually with their advisors before each semester to discuss their progress, goals and life situations, and plan courses for the upcoming semesters.

Faculty also serve on ePortfolio review teams at the end of each semester and give introductory talks about their research interests, pathways, and corresponding SLOs to students in FSS, and provide SLO-specific guidance to graduating students as they complete their ePortfolios in the exiting LIS 691/692 Masters Seminar.

While our teaching, advising and collaborative responsibilities are many, faculty are still able to make considerable contributions to their research and professional communities, as evidenced throughout this Standard.

Faculty Evaluation and Decision-Making

As discussed in III.2, UHM has clear procedures for faculty evaluation based on their achievements in teaching, research and service. The overall procedural framework is part of the UH faculty collective bargaining agreement and the tenure and promotion processes are administered by the Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Excellence (OVPAE). Criteria and guidelines for faculty tenure and promotion for the current academic year, including guidance on preparing and submitting via the new eDossier system, are also managed by OVPAE.

Within the overall framework of the faculty contract and university policies, each unit has flexibility to create and submit tenure, promotion, and contract renewal criteria of its own. Prior to the reorganization, LIS faculty were evaluated by criteria developed for the entire ICS Department. The way ICS envisions teaching, research, and service accomplishment is inscribed within their faculty policy on work load [Appendix 3-12], and many of these indicators and metrics do not align well with the work of our faculty. However, the complete list of Department Personnel Documents demonstrates the breadth and diversity of criteria and procedures across UHM. These are proposed by the unit, approved by the Chair, Dean, Vice Provost for Academic Excellence, and the UH Faculty Union. We went through this process in 2021, culminating in the formalization of the LIS Criteria and Guidelines for Tenure, Promotion and Contract Renewal, which specify LIS-specific dimensions of teaching, research, and service, and which remain in effect in our new school and college.

Full-time faculty are involved in evaluation as members of Department Personnel Committees for faculty within their unit, and the department or school chair makes an independent assessment, both of which are forwarded to the dean for another layer of review and recommendation. If a faculty member is being evaluated for contract renewal or post-tenure review, the process ends there with action by the
dean. For tenure and promotion applications, the dossier and reviews then move to a campus-wide Tenure and Promotion Review Committee (TPRC), consisting of faculty members outside the candidate’s unit. The combined assessments then move to the provost for final decision and action. Part-time faculty are evaluated by students in regular course evaluations, which are reviewed by the LIS Program Director for discussion with instructors as needed.

Students are also involved in faculty evaluation, via more direct measures like course evaluations, but also by more indirect measures such as who students choose to serve on their thesis and dissertation committees, and which faculty members they choose to nominate for teaching awards, all of which are part of the tenure and promotion dossier. Similarly, members of the professional community also provide indirect yet tangible faculty evaluation, e.g., invitations for service on committees and editorial or award review boards, invited talks, elected positions, and providing letters of acknowledgment for service activities.

In addition to the faculty evaluation procedures discussed in Standard III.8, instructional faculty members are reviewed for contract renewal every 1–2 years depending on the details of the individual appointment, and every five years regardless of rank following OVPAE Periodic Review policies and procedures. The pandemic, reorganization, and other conditions have understandably delayed most review timetables. Per the OVPAE procedures, faculty members are evaluated against the Departmental Expectations for faculty members at each rank, which changed during the review period.

Data substantiating the evaluation of faculty includes artifacts such as refereed publications and grants, course evaluations, courses taught and number of students enrolled, and documented service activities. For contract renewal, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review, faculty select and compile evidence into a dossier where faculty contextualize their teaching, research, and service accomplishments within a narrative, which may draw on additional sources of evidence such as publication downloads, media coverage, community impact, and other altmetrics. Complete course evaluation, teaching and enrollment data, and exemplar faculty dossiers are available on site.

When LIS was a program within the ICS Department, the process by which we asserted autonomy over faculty evaluation standards was for eligible LIS faculty to serve as an ad hoc subcommittee within the ICS Departmental Personnel Committee (DPC) to review and make recommendations to the full ICS DPC and ICS Department Chair. This process, while effective, necessitated additional layers of translation between LIS faculty achievements and ICS Department expectations [Appendix 3-5]. For example, LIS Strategic Plans from earlier in the review period included research productivity metrics and guidelines specific to LIS but understandable within ICS, such as an average of two refereed publications per year or equivalent books, book chapters, etc., and one grant proposal as PI or Co-I every two years.

In 2020, ICS underwent external review and, as a result, changed its faculty research expectations to increase emphasis on computer science standards of research and evaluation, “The annual evaluation now includes higher standards for publication, proposal writing, external funding, and graduate student involvement in research.” Among these higher standards were an increased emphasis on quantitative metrics such as journal impact factor and double workload credit for “major” grant proposals in excess of $100,000. This policy change evolved in response to an external review of the ICS Department
and was not a good fit for the LIS faculty, most of whom produce the kind of research artifacts and funding proposals that cannot be evaluated using the same standards. Also, while the tenure and promotion procedures allowed a subcommittee of LIS faculty to provide an evaluation report of LIS candidates to the full DPC, ICS faculty outnumbered LIS faculty by a factor of approximately four, each with a vote, and LIS faculty members were understandably concerned about the standards by which their research would be evaluated as a result of the change in expectations. Having both LIS and ICS researchers evaluated by the Dean of the College of Natural Sciences created another potential layer of mismatched research goals, standards, and metrics.

Inspired by the Feminist Manifest-No (co-authored by Tonia Sutherland), which rejects harmful data regimes such as overreliance on traditional scholarly productivity metrics, LIS faculty changed the research evaluation guidelines in our subsequent 2020–2025 LIS Strategic Plan to “Faculty actively conduct, publish and share research...as measured by publications, grants and other relevant metrics.” This gave LIS faculty members agency to decide and articulate for ourselves which metrics were most relevant to our research. We formalized this viewpoint in our Assessment Philosophy and Practice document and LIS tenure and promotion guidelines, both of which migrated with us to the new school and college, and we feel this is an example of how our reflective and collaborative faculty evaluation process evolved. Similarly, the LIS Program Director is evaluated via a survey circulated by the Associate Program Director at the end of each academic year [Appendix 3-14 (Restricted Access)].

With that as background, during the review period the following faculty members underwent formal review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Review Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noriko Asato</td>
<td>Post-tenure review 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meera Garud</td>
<td>Contract renewal 2021, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Gazan</td>
<td>Promotion to Professor 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanessa Irvin</td>
<td>Contract renewal 2016    Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rae-Anne Montague</td>
<td>Contract renewal 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luz Marina Quiroga</td>
<td>Post-tenure review 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonia Sutherland</td>
<td>Contract renewal 2019, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Wertheimer</td>
<td>Post-tenure review 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III.10 The program demonstrates how the results of the evaluation of faculty are systematically used to improve the program and to plan for the future.

Generally, the results of any kind of evaluation tend to focus on doing more of something: publishing more papers; getting more grants; or teaching more students. In some cases, the results of evaluation and principles of care sometimes identify where faculty need to do less. For example, one LIS faculty
member was teaching and advising more students than any other faculty member, in high-demand courses, while also being a highly productive researcher. When this faculty member was scheduled to teach an entirely new prep in another high demand area one semester, we adjusted the course schedule to give this faculty member better balance between essential core courses and lower enrollment electives, and better support for their research. Evaluating full- and part-time faculty members’ workload, capacity, and overall life situations in addition to the more traditional metrics of achievement and making changes accordingly is one way we strive to both improve the program and practice care. Some examples are as follows.

● Despite our role as the primary educators of Hawaiʻi LIS professionals, none of the current full-time faculty were from Hawaiʻi, which was identified by students, alumni, and professionals as a consistent area of needed improvement for the LIS faculty, and central to our plans for the future. After years of requests, we received approval for and successfully hired a full-time, tenure-track Assistant Professor in Hawaiian Librarianship/Archival Studies, Keahiahi Long, who will join the LIS faculty in fall 2023.

● When one junior faculty member agreed to serve as editor-in-chief of a journal, we dedicated program funds to supporting a student editorial assistant to help with the ongoing demands of the project.

● When one junior faculty member secured an external grant, we dedicated a room in the LIS area as lab space to support the project and a graduate assistant.

● When students and faculty expressed the need for teaching support in increasingly hybrid learning environments blending in-person and online instruction, we dedicated program funds to pay LIS students to serve as Zoom assistants to help connect students and instructors.

● When two junior faculty members passed their initial contract renewals, we gave both a pre-tenure course release so they could focus on finalizing their tenure and promotion dossiers, as evidenced by faculty CVs and course schedules.

● Faculty consider and integrate student feedback from course evaluations into their syllabi, as evidenced by changes across successive semesters of the same course, and comparisons of course evaluations.

Student degree and professional pathway progress motivate program changes as well. Changes to planned teaching assignments during the review period include the following [Appendix 3-2]:

● Vanessa Irvin taught LIS 615 Collection Management during Andrew Wertheimer’s sabbatical;

● Meera Garud taught LIS 691/692 Masters Seminar several times, sometimes in addition to her regular teaching load;

● Cheri Ebisu and Mandi Hull both taught the First Semester Seminar in addition to their duties as LIS Program Coordinator;

● Tonia Sutherland taught LIS 693 Research Methods so that students in the LIS and CIS programs could maintain their progress;

● Andrew Wertheimer taught LIS 610 Foundations of the Information Professions while Noriko Asato served as LIS Chair;

● Violet Harada and Mandi Hull taught LIS 691/692 Masters Seminar to maintain continuity for students while both regular instructors were teaching other needed courses; and

● Rich Gazan taught LIS 601 Introduction to Reference and Information Services during Vanessa Irvin’s sabbatical, and he continues to teach the course.

We would rather offer a needed course taught by a less experienced instructor than withhold it and delay students’ degree progress. We also change planned course offerings to accommodate adjunct
faculty, shifting courses to the days, times, and semesters that each individual can best support. In the rare instances when adjunct faculty members received consistently low course evaluations, they are not invited back to teach.

Because the context of our faculty evaluation changed as a result of the reorganization, we combine the results of ongoing assessment with opportunities in our new environment. Now that we are within CSS, we attempted to address our need for technology-oriented full-time faculty by developing a proposal for a tenure-track Assistant Professor in Information Technology for Social Good [Appendix 3-15]. While the position was ranked within the highest priority tier of requests from the CSS for fall 2023 recruitment, the request was not approved. To build on our deep connections with the LIS professional community, we also proposed but did not receive a full-time Instructor position in LIS Professional Engagement to lead the ePortfolio culminating experience and help connect students with the profession throughout their time in the program. Approved SCI faculty position requests for this year include specializations in conflict resolution, emerging media and AI in journalism, and digital cultures, all with a mandate to support multiple units within SCI, to provide points of productive faculty crossover within the new school as we move forward.

**Summary Reflection**

Our faculty members’ kuleana is to understand Hawaiian librarianship, information practices and perspectives, to educate the professionals who will serve the information needs of the people who live here. While we made a positive step toward this goal by hiring Assistant Professor Keahiahi Long, this is every LIS faculty member’s responsibility, regardless of our research area or point of origin. Our new College has resources and support for faculty members to deepen our understanding of Hawaiian culture and integrate it with our teaching, research, service and practice that we have only begun to explore.

During the review period we have been forced to confront some of our misconceptions about metrics of faculty success. We have had diverse junior faculty members secure competitive grants, publications and earn tenure and promotion, then seen them hired away by other institutions before their work had a chance to take root here. We have had LIS faculty members—including emeriti—take on extra work to build and maintain the kind of professional relationships that may be less visible on a CV, but which are essential to student and faculty success here. As a result of these experiences, we have a better understanding of how to articulate and nurture a balance of research achievement and local impact to best support our future faculty members.

Securing the MOU to replace lost faculty positions in SCI units [Appendix 5-1, p. 2] was a critical element of faculty support for the reorganization into the new School, and we are concerned that the MOU has not been honored. It would be easy to say that our goal is to hire more LIS faculty during the next review cycle, but even that apparently straightforward metric requires context. The most recent memo from the provost regarding approved faculty positions stated that “SCI positions must include integration across SCI programs within the School, and that search committee[s] should include members from across programs. Also, position hires shall provide courses with and be affiliated with more than one program in SCI.”

LIS has had crossover faculty affiliated with multiple programs since Luz Marina Quiroga’s hire in 2000, and we have always encouraged our students, in consultation with their faculty advisors, to take courses outside LIS that can count toward their degree requirements. Still, program autonomy in faculty
selection and evaluation was one of the core tenets faculty designed School governance to reflect, so if this memo augurs that faculty positions with multiple affiliations will be prioritized in the future, we will need to work even more closely with other SCI units to adapt, and in some cases, resist.

Many of the elements within this Standard refer specifically to program faculty, but using the accreditation process to request program-specific faculty that other SCI units cannot receive undermines the mutually supportive relationships we are trying to build. Instead, we look forward to following the example of Librarian faculty member Kapena Shim and Communications program faculty member Patricia Buskirk, both of whom served on our most recent faculty search committee. As we navigate this new environment, by engaging with faculty searches in other units as well, we can help identify and articulate potential connections between faculty members from programs beyond our own.

Within CSS, the definition of faculty research artifacts encompasses community-engaged work and creative activities with social impact. These are now inscribed within our tenure and promotion documents at the program, school (pending final OVPAE approval) and college levels. Our faculty position requests in the areas of information technology for social good and LIS professional engagement, though denied in this request cycle, reflect both our new environment and our longstanding values. We seek faculty members who are motivated not just to create knowledge, but to deepen the professional relationships that are essential to our mission, and who have the passion to inspire our students to do the same.
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Standard IV: Students

In our 58 years of existence, the LIS program has graduated 1,780 students. They serve, have served, and will serve in public, school, academic and special libraries, archives, and other professional information environments in Hawai‘i, the US mainland, and throughout the world. Our graduates constitute approximately two-thirds of the information professionals in Hawai‘i, many serving in leadership positions in UH libraries, Hawai‘i State Public Library System, and Hawai‘i’s public and private schools.

Given our mission and values, we strive to create an environment of small cohorts, small class sizes, individual faculty advising, and maximum access to local internship and practicum opportunities. We recruit individuals from diverse backgrounds, support and involve them as members of the LIS community, provide professional pathways for them to craft individualized programs of study, and challenge them to understand, confront, and help solve current and future information problems. The majority of our students seek to serve Hawai‘i communities [Appendix 2-4], so we consciously avoid overproducing graduates, given the limitations of local professional employment opportunities.

We primarily offer classes face-to-face on campus, but we also serve neighbor island students by allowing them to join synchronously over Zoom. We also offer roughly two asynchronous online courses each semester. In order to maximize the learning experience for neighbor island students we dedicate program funds to reimburse neighbor island students for transportation to course sessions and field trips and technology for synchronous courses. Bringing students together builds a broader learning community so all students can maintain essential relationships with peers and professionals, regardless of where they happen to live in Hawai‘i. Our experience with distance education helped students, faculty, and staff transition to an exclusively online environment during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Student Admissions and Services

IV.1 The program formulates recruitment, admission, retention, financial aid, career services, and other academic and administrative policies for students that are consistent with the program’s mission and program goals and objectives. These policies include the needs and values of the constituencies served by the program. The program has policies to recruit and retain students who reflect the diversity of North America’s communities. The composition of the student body is such that it fosters a learning environment consistent with the program’s mission and program goals and objectives.

We are fortunate to attract a uniquely diverse student community representative of our place, and our academic and administrative policies centering on students grow out of our mission.

We educate leaders in the information professions. Through research, teaching and service, we contribute to knowledge, solve problems and prepare individuals to thrive in diverse information environments, with an emphasis on Hawai‘i and the Asia-Pacific region.
Capturing race and ethnic diversity for Hawai‘i is a complicated task (see Table 4-1), with the U.S. Census estimating that 25% report two or more races. To better understand success as a Native Hawaiian serving institution, the university counts students as Native Hawaiian even if they also list other races. Therefore, rather than compare to the U.S. Census figures, we look to the Hawai‘i State Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism (DBEDT) 2021 Data Book, which counts people under each race they report. We are proud to report that 21–27% of our students identify as Native Hawaiian, compared to 21% of the state (Table 4-2) and 16–18% of all UHM master’s students (Graph 4-1).

Table 4-1: Differences in Race Reporting Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person Reports</th>
<th>UH</th>
<th>DBEDT</th>
<th>U.S. Census</th>
<th>ALISE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Chinese</td>
<td>Counted once as “Native Hawaiian”</td>
<td>Counted twice as “Native Hawaiian” and “Chinese”</td>
<td>Counted once as “Two or More Races”</td>
<td>Counted once as “Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Samoan</td>
<td>Counted once as “Native Hawaiian”</td>
<td>Counted twice as “Native Hawaiian” and “Samoan”</td>
<td>Counted once as “Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander”</td>
<td>Counted once as “Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese and Japanese</td>
<td>Counted once as “Mixed Asian”</td>
<td>Counted twice as “Chinese” and “Japanese”</td>
<td>Counted once as “Asian”</td>
<td>Counted once as “Asian American”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-2: Estimated Resident Population for Selected Races (2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race (Alone or in Combination)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DBEDT 2021 Data Book, Table 1.34—Resident Population for Selected Races: 2010.
We pride ourselves on being student-centered and inclusive, from the time of prospective students’ first contact with the program, through application, orientation and advising, coursework and internships, and into their careers as LIS professionals. To maintain this environment, and corresponding to our role as the state university, we especially seek to recruit and create opportunities for Native Hawaiian students and residents of Hawai’i who wish to serve as information professionals. Our policies are most fundamentally shaped by our ethic of care, guided by the needs and values of our communities, which have become even more essential in recent years.

In fall 2022, 39 (or 81%) of our 48 enrolled students came from Hawai’i, compared with 58% of all UH Mānoa master’s level students.
Table 4-3: Enrollment Data by Race and Ethnicity (Fall Terms)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Students</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ALISE Statistical Reports

At the beginning of the review period, we experienced a fairly steep decline in enrollment that roughly mirrored the decline of other UH Mānoa graduate programs during the same period, followed by a long period of relative stability. Our average enrollment between fall 2016 through spring 2022 was 59.3 students; we currently have 55 students in spring 2023, a 6% decrease. Applications from out of state and international applicants disproportionately decreased, largely because UHM increased tuition for nonresidents at a greater rate than for residents (see below on tuition). Even before the pandemic, the increasing availability of online degree options at other institutions reduced applications to our program, and several students who began in our program transferred to online programs. Other factors include students from western states and Alaska no longer receive in-state tuition through the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education and the ever-increasing cost of living in Hawai‘i. In contrast, our resident enrollment has remained relatively stable during the review period, from 85% in fall 2015 to 81% in fall 2022. Complete enrollment trend data by gender, ethnicity, residency, veterans and other criteria during the review period can be found in Appendix 4-1 (Restricted Access).
Our recruitment efforts tend to be focused locally as well. They include representation at UH job fairs and HLA recruiting events, and through our partners at the UH System, HSPLS, and Department of Education to encourage library paraprofessionals and volunteers to consider applying. Given the large military presence in our state, we also actively recruit veterans and spouses, who can receive in-state tuition or use VA education benefits. From 2017–2021 we partnered with Principal Investigator Loriene Roy on an IMLS grant, “Reaching Those Who Served: Recruiting and Preparing Military Veterans for Careers in Librarianship”, which provided tuition and support to four veterans who enrolled in our program (one of whom continued her degree at another institution). Program Coordinator Mandi Hull has extensive experience with military communities, for example serving as a Soldier Life-Transition Assistance counselor. Since joining in 2022, she has already expanded our recruiting to include military bases, which further diversifies our student population.

Course Participation Policy

As a primarily face-to-face program, to maximize student interaction, our policy has been that students on O‘ahu attend all class sessions in person, even if distance options are available to neighbor island students. When we could no longer meet in-person during the pandemic, it was even more important for us to prioritize care with our course participation expectations.

Although Hawai‘i had some of the lowest COVID-19 initial infection rates in the nation, all of our students were disrupted to some extent. For example, many students are parents and/or live in multi-generational homes and new caregiving responsibilities. Students’ computers became shared among the entire family, causing students to make additional tech purchases. The pandemic also halted tourism, Hawai‘i’s primary economic engine, which cascaded to the loss of jobs in all sectors. The program understood that many students found it difficult to prioritize course assignments while faced with these stressors.

Because we have taught students on the neighbor islands for years, the faculty had an easier time pivoting to an online environment than some other departments. When we realized that many students did not have a private space at home for Zoom class sessions, we allowed students to attend without turning on their cameras. One month into the state’s stay-at-home order, the faculty posted a web document “Working Together at a Distance”, which assured the following.
● We will give you the resources and support to develop professional LIS skills and perspectives that can be learned and practiced in both online and in-person information environments.
● We will create opportunities in coursework for you to use your skills to help people and communities. Even in an online environment, reference, research, cataloging, digital content management, creating quality informational content and helping people learn to access resources are all very much needed. We encourage you to actively identify people, organizations and communities you’d like to help, and work with your instructors to find ways to direct your coursework accordingly.
● We will create opportunities in coursework for you to interact with other students formally and informally, and build relationships that are an important part of the LIS experience.
● We will ask you to document how you have developed and applied your skills as professionals do: in formal papers, presentations and reports, but also in informal posts, community engagement projects, and other artifacts and reflections.
● We will communicate regularly and provide individual attention and timely feedback.
● When we return to a face-to-face or hybrid learning environment, we will reconfigure our classrooms and common areas to maximize personal space, and to maximize engagement with those working at a distance.
● We understand that we all have lives and commitments beyond the LIS program. We prioritize mutual flexibility and understanding when situations arise that impact course content, assignments and modes of delivery. Whatever happens, we communicate, and work together to find a way.
● We encourage students, staff and faculty to put work on pause when needed to prioritize our families, our communities and ourselves, as long as we communicate those boundaries to other people, so we can all work together effectively.

Care became even more explicitly at the center of our practice. Many faculty members adopted strategies introduced to us by Tonia Sutherland, such as starting each class with a check-in to give students space to share what was impacting their ability to learn that day. Faculty adapted assignments and extended deadlines. Campus administration allowed more flexibility for faculty to offer incompletes, delay adverse actions for degree progress, and allowed students to apply for multiple leaves of absence. We kept in contact with many of these students, encouraging them to continue making progress when they could. Our internship and practicum site hosts continued to provide students opportunities even when physical workplaces were closed. These professionals, many of whom are our alumni, created alternative online learning options and provided personal support, modeling compassionate, reflective professional practice.

Andrew Wertheimer shared the importance of having time and space for students to privately process grief and anxiety and also seek professional mental care. He shared the experience of alumni who developed PTSD after escaping a flood during class in 2004; they reported being more able to cope by talking with others. The faculty moved forward individually with this spirit of offering safe spaces to talk inside and outside of class, and the importance of seeking help. Those wanting or needing more help were referred to UHM’s Counseling and Student Development Center (CSDC), although some students reported extensive wait times. This led Andrew Wertheimer, a Faculty Senator on the Committee on Student Affairs, to advocate for a “Resolution to Increase Student Mental Health and Well-Being Support At UHMC”. In response, the UH administration agreed to dedicate substantial federal emergency COVID-19 funds to hire more CSDC specialists to help students during these challenging times.

It was important for us to share our commitment to care with students and the larger community. In an article for the winter 2021 issue of the Hawaiʻi Library Association’s newsletter, *Kolekole*, Rich Gazan
expressed that “the force majeure of a global pandemic has a way of making carefully crafted missions, goals and metrics seem utterly inadequate.” The faculty also added “Create a supportive, engaged environment that prioritizes care” to the strategic plan in fall 2020. This was shared on the LIS website and a student email list that the program manages to communicate with current LIS students.

Policy Formulation

Meera Garud and the Scholarship Committee worked with UH Foundation and UH Graduate Division to make more funds available to LIS students by checking which funds could be used for different purposes and changing internal policies to allow easier access, such as using the Ralph R. Shaw Funds to support neighbor island student travel to O‘ahu [Appendix 4-2 (Restricted Access)]. We also worked with Hamilton Library to provide zero textbook cost options for most courses and actively supported open access and open educational resources.

Policies related to admissions, financial aid, and other student-related issues align with those of the UH Mānoa Graduate Division, and are considered in the context of our strategic plan. Policies we wish to implement or change based on regular program assessment are discussed and formalized at monthly faculty meetings and annual planning sessions, both of which are attended by LIS student association representatives. Students also participate in program committees that develop policies and plans consistent with our mission and goals. Alumni and other stakeholders participate in policy formulation via membership on the LIS Advisory Board, and via regular surveys. This process is described with examples in 1.1.1.

Tuition

Graduate tuition is charged per credit hour and fees are charged at a flat-rate per semester. Tuition rates are set by the University of Hawai‘i Board of Regents, which is appointed by the governor and approved by the state legislature. The Regents strive to keep tuition low enough to make education affordable to Hawai‘i residents, while addressing increasing costs in areas such as salaries, infrastructure, and energy. Like many other public universities nationwide, there is also declining public funding for higher education in Hawai‘i. State funding for education approached 80% as late as 2008 but has ranged between 50–60% for the period under review.

The decline in state funding for UH resulted in overall tuition increases. However, tuition for graduate students increased only slightly for the period under review (Table 4-4) and was even reduced or rolled back (p. 144) in 2020. UH System President David Lassner summarized our tuition as follows:

- Resident undergraduate rates are close to peers;
- Non-resident undergraduate rates are generally higher than peers; and
- Graduate resident and non-resident rates are higher than peers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AY</th>
<th>Semester Fees</th>
<th>Resident</th>
<th>Non-Resident</th>
<th>Summer Fees</th>
<th>Summer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015–16</td>
<td>$420</td>
<td>$593</td>
<td>$1,430</td>
<td>$87</td>
<td>$637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016–17</td>
<td>$440</td>
<td>$637</td>
<td>$1,532</td>
<td>$87</td>
<td>$637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017–18</td>
<td>$451</td>
<td>$637</td>
<td>$1,532</td>
<td>$87</td>
<td>$637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018–19</td>
<td>$451</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>$1,598</td>
<td>$87</td>
<td>$650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To complete the 39 credit degree, full-time students usually take four semesters of 9 credits plus one summer course for 3 credits, shown in Table 4-5.

### Table 4-5: Tuition and Fees to Complete the MLISc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester Breakdown</th>
<th>Resident</th>
<th>Non-Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semester 1 (9 credits)</td>
<td>$6,301</td>
<td>$13,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester 2 (9 credits)</td>
<td>$6,301</td>
<td>$13,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester 3 (9 credits)</td>
<td>$6,301</td>
<td>$13,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester 4 (9 credits)</td>
<td>$6,301</td>
<td>$13,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer (3 credits)</td>
<td>$737</td>
<td>$737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Tuition &amp; Fees</strong></td>
<td><strong>$25,941</strong></td>
<td><strong>$52,276</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The University of Hawai‘i provides an estimated total cost of attendance, which includes tuition (assuming 8 credits per semester), fees, books and supplies, housing, meals, and personal expenses. This information helps students plan their expenses and is the basis for the maximum amount of funding students can receive via scholarships and financial aid.

### Table 4-6: Estimated Cost of Attendance for Graduate Students (Academic Year 2023–24)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost of Attendance</th>
<th>Living with Parents</th>
<th>Living On-Campus</th>
<th>Living Off-Campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hawai‘i Resident</td>
<td>$24,987</td>
<td>$31,447</td>
<td>$34,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident</td>
<td>$37,019</td>
<td>$43,479</td>
<td>$47,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Regional Graduate Program (WRGP)</td>
<td>$30,187</td>
<td>$36,647</td>
<td>$40,184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Financial Aid and Scholarships

Financial aid is administered by UH Mānoa Financial Aid Services. Students can apply for financial aid, student loans, scholarships, and grants through a single portal. They can also monitor their accounts and receive support from financial aid staff. The LIS program has a range of scholarships available, including technology, conference attendance and travel reimbursement awards, an exemption for out-of-state tuition differential, and merit- and need-based awards of thousands of dollars. We provide information...
about these and other funding opportunities on our website and the LIS student email list. Scholarships available to LIS students include the following.

University Scholarships or Tuition Benefits

- Mānoa Achievement Scholarship
- Mānoa Nonresident Tuition Exemption
- UH Tuition Waiver for Faculty, Staff, and Partners

LIS Program Scholarships and Awards

- Eileen P. and Lennus B. Urquhart Endowed Fellowship
- Shirley Loo Endowed Scholarship for Library and Information Science
- H.W. Wilson Scholarship
- Ralph R. Shaw Memorial Award
- Robert and Rita Blair Memorial Award

Community Scholarships

- Hawai‘i Library Association (HLA) Student Scholarship
- Hawai‘i Association of School Librarians (HASL) Scholarship
- Friends of the Hilo Library Scholarship
- Friends of the Libraries, Kona Scholarship
- Maui Friends of the Library Scholarship

A summary of the LIS funds and scholarships awarded during the review period can be found in Table 4-7, reported by academic year (AY). The decline in awards from the Shaw fund is largely due to travel restrictions during the pandemic, as this award is used to reimburse students for costs such as travel expenses and conference attendance. The Loo and the Urquhart funds are new and faculty have determined a plan for using these funds to attract and retain students, summarized in Appendix 4-3 along with more details on yearly scholarship amounts.

Table 4-7: Scholarships Administered By the Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AY</th>
<th>Shaw</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>H.W. Wilson</th>
<th>Blair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016–17</td>
<td>$2,298.85</td>
<td>$28,400</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017–18</td>
<td>$2,688.10</td>
<td>$28,400</td>
<td>$6,650</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018–19</td>
<td>$15,278.47</td>
<td>$28,400</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019–20</td>
<td>$40,162.77</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020–21</td>
<td>$25,400.00</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021–22</td>
<td>$29,078.61</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022–23*</td>
<td>$23,587.88</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$138,494.68</td>
<td>$141,200</td>
<td>$17,150</td>
<td>$6,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All students must complete a Graduate Student Service Record in their final semester before graduation. Every few years, we review this data to identify trends. This was last reviewed in 2021. Consistently, over two-thirds of students reported receiving scholarships during their degree.
Table 4-8: Percent of Graduating Students Who Reported Receiving Scholarships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AY</th>
<th>Graduates</th>
<th>Any Scholarship(s)</th>
<th>LIS Scholarship(s)</th>
<th>Other Scholarship(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016–17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017–18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018–19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019–20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020–21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All 5 Years</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For more details see Appendix 1-14.

Assistantships and Campus Jobs

The University of Hawai‘i hosts a system-wide portal for faculty, staff, and graduate assistantship employment opportunities. Faculty and staff are eligible for a tuition waiver for up to six credits each semester. LIS students who are faculty or staff often take one or two courses per semester to maximize their tuition savings. Graduate assistantship (GA) positions come with tuition exemption, stipend, and health benefits. GA positions are available across campus and stipends are based on the current compensation table. Effective fall 2023, the minimum GA appointment level is step 12. Per Graduate Division rules, those with 0.5 FTE appointments work approximately 20 hours per week under a 9-month or 11-month appointment. Stipends are intended to cover the estimated UH Mānoa Cost of Attendance. Total stipend and tuition savings for the MLISc program is illustrated in Table 4-9, roughly $70,000 for residents and $99,000 for non-resident students, if holding a 9-month appointment at step 12.

Table 4-9: Estimated Stipend and Tuition Savings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Breakdown</th>
<th>9-Month, Step 12</th>
<th>Resident Tuition</th>
<th>Non-Resident Tuition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1 (21 credits)</td>
<td>$22,140</td>
<td>$13,650</td>
<td>$29,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2 (18 credits)</td>
<td>$22,140</td>
<td>$11,700</td>
<td>$25,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$44,280</td>
<td>$25,350</td>
<td>$54,678</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty seeking grants often include GA positions, and two LIS students received these appointments through LIS faculty who had been awarded various Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) grants. We also helped place students in assistantships across campus, such as Librarian of the Sunset Reference Library in the Shidler College of Business and the Center on Disability Studies. Additionally, three faculty members received grants and startup funds that provided stipend and tuition assistance to six LIS students in addition to GA positions discussed above.

Many LIS students also find paid hourly positions in UHM Libraries or other campus offices via the Student Employment and Cooperative Education (SECE) site. These do not offer benefits or tuition waivers. We have used SECE to hire students to support online instruction as Zoom assistants. Zoom assistants are LIS students who are not enrolled in the course, and they are responsible for
troubleshooting audio and video connection issues, monitoring chat, managing breakout rooms, and other associated tasks so faculty can focus on teaching.

IV.2 Current, accurate, and easily accessible information about the program is available to students and the general public. This information includes documentation of progress toward achievement of program goals and objectives, descriptions of curricula, information on faculty, admission requirements, availability of financial aid, criteria for evaluating student performance, assistance with placement, and other policies and procedures. The program demonstrates that it has procedures to support these policies.

Program information is maintained and updated on the LIS website, including: admission and degree requirements; course descriptions; curriculum, pathway, and specialization information; faculty information including CVs; financial aid opportunities; current and recent strategic plans tracking progress on program goals; an assessment page with compiled reports; internship, practicum, and job placement information; and links to policy documents and forms. The site is currently maintained by the LIS Program Coordinator and Program Director and, with our recent reorganization, we now have access to other web support resources as well through CSS shared services.

We welcome potential applicants with a prospective students page on the LIS site dedicated to anticipating their questions, outlining career possibilities, providing links to placement information, and encouraging them to contact us to see how our program might support their interests. The admissions menu also includes links to how to apply, financial aid, health clearance requirements unique to Hawai‘i, and student orientation. Students can review assessment information including time to degree and employment data, and internship sites where they can develop hands-on professional experience. We encourage prospective students to contact the Program Coordinator, Program Director, and/or individual LIS faculty with questions. Many of those informal conversations helped students determine if the LIS field is a good fit and if we’re the right program for them.

Effective access is related to effective web design. In spring 2020, former LIS Program Coordinator Cheri Ebisu worked with graphic design Professor Chae Lee Ho and his senior seminar class to redesign our logo. The students met with LIS students and faculty to learn about our program goals and practices, and each created a proposal that reflected their vision. We selected student Jana Sasaki’s design, which uses navigation and wayfinding as its main theme, with an abstracted open book as the background. The design emphasizes unity, teamwork, and forward momentum.

In 2020–21, we contracted with Michelle Carino, an LIS student with a graphic design background, to revitalize the website and integrate the new logo. She also engaged with the LIS community as part of her redesign and made it more user friendly, with smoother design and fewer clicks to access commonly needed information. We also actively disseminate information via email lists, primarily one that includes all current students. The main function of the student email list is to distribute official announcements, although any LIS student can post to the list. We also maintain a jobs list where we share selected current postings. Faculty, staff and alumni can post, and the LIS Program Coordinator moderates the list to ensure only relevant job postings (usually entry-level) are circulated there. Students are informed that these are not comprehensive resources, and they are encouraged to explore job boards and other career resources.
At LIS New Student Orientation (NSO), incoming students are introduced to the architecture of the LIS website, and where to find needed resources such as faculty information and course projections. The Program Coordinator shares students’ advising records via password-protected Google Docs and adds students to our syllabus repository. We placed syllabi in this secured Google folder because when syllabi were freely available on the website, faculty reported finding their syllabi reposted without permission.

Information does not always flow in formal channels. Students maintain an informal Slack channel where they may communicate amongst themselves without faculty observation. Before and after the pandemic, the LIS commons area included a diner space where students would spend time in between classes. Students reported that Slack became a virtual diner during the pandemic and helped them to feel connected. Students also use the Slack channel to provide mutual coursework assistance and support. It also allows students to become more proficient with this and other platforms, and better able to create and maintain informational spaces of their own.

**New Student Orientation (NSO) and First Semester Seminar (FSS)**

Before each semester we hold an NSO to introduce students to campus resources, course offerings, campus employment, scholarship opportunities, financial aid, and library resources. Critically, continuing students and officers from student professional organizations also attend to welcome new students. Regardless of the size of the incoming class, we offer FSS each semester to help create a learning cohort (we use this term liberally since students have the freedom to take from one to three courses each semester, and follow different academic paths). Each student meets with their faculty advisor during orientation to plan courses and discuss short and long term goals, and provide funds to reimburse students from neighbor islands to attend. In the rare instance when a student cannot attend NSO, they can view a recording and connect with their faculty advisor at another time. Program information is also introduced in the uncredited First Semester Seminar (FSS).

Program Coordinator Mandi Hull is an alumnus of the LIS program with several years of academic program administration and student support experience. Mandi regularly fields walk-in, phone, and email inquiries from the LIS office in Hamilton Library, and is an indispensable hub of information and support for students. She and Program Director Rich Gazan are the official points of contact for questions about the program and responsible for keeping the UH Mānoa Catalog of program and course information current.

The LIS Outreach Committee holds online and in-person information sessions, table events, and creates recruitment brochures customized for different audiences. For example, in 2021 Cheri Ebisu and Meera Garud held an online information session aimed at paraprofessional staff from local public, school, and academic libraries and our dual degree partners’ undergraduate students. In 2022, Mandi Hull represented LIS at the Marine Corps Base Hawai‘i Education Fair, HLA Conference Centennial Social, and Virtual Fall Graduate & Professional School Fair at UH West O‘ahu.

**Assessment**

During the period under review, the LIS program improved student satisfaction on graduating student surveys. Response to “Access to general information about the program” improved from 88% high or very high (fall 2016–spring 2018) to 98% high or very high in response to the revised question of “sufficient access to program-related information (e.g., news, events, jobs, policy announcements)” (fall 2018–spring 2020), and 97% in subsequent years (fall 2020–spring 2022) [Appendix 2-4]. We believe that this improved satisfaction is evidence of our program’s efforts to strive to maintain a sense of place.
along with the impact of improved data-driven analysis during the pandemic, especially as we transformed curriculum and assessment from the old oral exam to ePortfolios.

**Placement**

As a professional program, one of the most important factors in evaluating our success is the ability for our graduates to find rewarding careers. In our 2018 alumni survey, 71% of 21 respondents reported that they had found an LIS-related professional position, primarily in academic (29%) and public (14%) libraries. Most respondents (74%) work in Hawaiʻi with 26% working on the US mainland or internationally [Appendix 4-4 (Restricted Access)]. Placement information for the 22 students who completed a school library practicum is reported in Appendix 2-12.

For the 2022 *Library Journal* survey, we sent a request to the 17 alumni who graduated in 2021. Ten of the 17 students completed the survey (59%). Of the ten respondents, four were employed full-time and reported salaries ranging between $45,000 and $88,000, with an average of $63,542. This amount is higher than the national average ($61,099), but below our regional average ($83,143 in the “Pacific”). This reflects the ability of our program to produce employable graduates but also highlights the impact of the “paradise tax” one pays for living in Hawaiʻi, especially in the public sector where salaries do not come close to matching the high cost of living. Table 4-10 is adapted from the 2014–2021 *Library Journal* surveys.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grad. Year</th>
<th>Employed FT</th>
<th>Average Salary</th>
<th>Median Salary</th>
<th>Low Salary</th>
<th>High Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>63,542</td>
<td>60,584</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>88,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50,625</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>56,387</td>
<td>54,468 W 50,000 M</td>
<td>40,000 W 50,000 M</td>
<td>83,000 W 50,000 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,519 W 49,000 M N/A NB</td>
<td>51,932 W 49,000 M N/A NB</td>
<td>33,000 W 49,000 M N/A NB</td>
<td>69,094 W 49,000 M N/A NB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>48,332 W 56,559 M 50,800 ALL</td>
<td>43,500 W N/A M</td>
<td>41,244 W N/A M</td>
<td>53,510 W N/A M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>45,439 W N/A M 45,439 ALL</td>
<td>43,500 W N/A M</td>
<td>41,244 W N/A M</td>
<td>53,510 W N/A M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48,320 W N/A M 48,320 ALL</td>
<td>45,000 W N/A M</td>
<td>38,000 W N/A M</td>
<td>65,000 W N/A M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45,100 W 42,000 M 44,480 ALL</td>
<td>52,500 W 42,000 M</td>
<td>20,000 W 42,000 M</td>
<td>55,400 42,000 W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We announce professional openings for graduates and those nearing graduation via our jobs mailing list. Additional job seeking support is provided by faculty, staff, and student organizations in presentations, mock interviews, resume review, and mentoring. Experience gained through internships, practica and professional networking provide additional job search support. The graduating student seminar also includes resume/CV and interview preparation, as well as presentation tips. In the final weeks of their last semester, graduating students give a public presentation where they articulate their professional interests, goals, and philosophy.

IV.3 Standards for admission are applied consistently. Students admitted to the program have earned a bachelor’s degree from an accredited institution; the policies and procedures for waiving any admission standard or academic prerequisite are stated clearly and applied consistently. Assessment of an application is based on a combined evaluation of academic, intellectual, and other qualifications as they relate to the constituencies served by the program, the program’s goals and objectives, and the career objectives of the individual. Within the framework of institutional policy and programs, the admission policy for the program ensures that applicants possess sufficient interest, aptitude, and qualifications to enable successful completion of the program and subsequent contribution to the field.

Application Requirements and Process

All current faculty are involved in admission, either as formal committee members or as consultants for individual applications within their areas of expertise. We have autonomy to formulate our own admission standards and make student selection decisions within the framework of Graduate Division admission requirements: generally, a bachelor’s degree from an accredited institution with a 3.0 GPA or higher. GRE scores are required if at least 25% of a student’s courses were taken at an institution that does not assign numeric or letter grades. International applicants must meet these same requirements and also must meet additional requirements based on country and demonstrate English proficiency.

We welcome students from any undergraduate major and, following our assessment philosophy, are not looking primarily at scores on standardized tests. We look for students who can articulate not just why they want to join an LIS program, but why they think they will thrive in our program particularly. We look for people with a personal investment in communities and collections in Hawai‘i and the Pacific. We look for evidence of hard skills like writing as well as soft skills like leadership, problem-solving, and having a service orientation. We tend to look for people who value a small, highly collaborative program and can contribute to a learning environment of mutual support, as evidenced by their statement of objectives and recommendation letters. Beyond transcripts, application materials include:

- Statement of objectives;
- Two letters of recommendation; and
- Resume or CV.

Students apply via the Graduate Division application portal. Once transcripts are reviewed, Graduate Division forwards application packets to the LIS Program Coordinator, who stays in contact with applicants and maintains shared, restricted-access spreadsheets to ensure applications are reviewed in a timely manner. The Admissions Committee consists of three rotating faculty members. After reviewing applications, they determine eligibility and identify clarifying questions if eligibility is not clear. In some
cases, the Program Director may request a phone or Zoom meeting with applications to resolve questions and inform a decision. These initial consultations can also help students with long-term planning, especially those who work full-time such as teachers who often need to schedule sabbaticals to complete coursework.

We embrace our mission as a state university and welcome local applicants, many of whom are already connected with our professional ‘ohana. For out-of-state and international applicants we prioritize those who demonstrate an appreciation of our mission, diverse community, and the role of librarians and archivists. Some students were attracted to our program’s unique offerings, such as Asian Studies librarianship, and are able to convey that connection in their statement of objectives. We evaluate applicants by these guidelines not only because of our mission as a state university, but in response to calls from our constituents to educate students who can contribute to our increasingly diverse and complex information organizations.

Admission decisions are made on a rolling basis as completed applications are processed. Students are admitted only during the fall and spring semesters; the priority deadline is April 1 for the fall semester and November 1 for the spring. Students admitted for fall may take courses in the summer as unclassified students. Graph 4-4 shows how many students applied, were admitted, and enrolled. Graph 4-5 shows the percentage of applicants who are admitted, and of those, the percentage who subsequently enrolled. Regardless of the size of an incoming cohort, all new students participate in the non-credit First Semester Seminar as a way to connect with each other, with all faculty, and with graduating students.

Graph 4-4: LIS Applications, Admissions, and Enrollments, Fall 2016–Fall 2022

Source: UHM Graduate Division
Exception, Conditional Admission, and Denial

A benefit of staying connected to our alumni and employers is keeping current with the needs of local employers and we keep this in mind when reviewing applications and considering petitions for admission by exception, generally for promising applicants whose undergraduate GPA is below the 3.0 threshold.

At the recommendation of the Admissions Committee, some promising applicants who are not offered admission are sometimes invited to take LIS courses as a Post-Baccalaureate Unclassified (PBU) student and then reapply in a subsequent semester. The PBU option also allows students who did not meet the undergraduate GPA requirement to take 12 credits (four courses) and receive a 3.0 or higher in order to be considered for admission. Upon admission, previously conditional students can petition to have their LIS coursework applied to their MLISc degree requirements.

Some criteria that would indicate denial of admission include:

- A poorly written statement of objectives;
- No articulation of how the student believes they would benefit from our program specifically;
- An inconsistent or poor academic transcript;
- Career goals that would be better achieved in a different degree program; and
- Weak or unconvincing reference letters.

Applicants may be granted conditional admission (also referred to as admission by exception) if they have not completed all requirements. Students who correct the deficiency and maintain a 3.0 GPA are moved from conditional status to regular admission status.

Of the 122 students who enrolled between fall 2016 and spring 2022, 11 were admitted by exception. Of these, eight graduated, one withdrew, and two are still enrolled. Their 91% persistence rate (graduation rate...
or continued enrollment) is on par with the average four-year persistence rate (90%) for our 2016–2018 cohorts. A report on students admitted by exception from 2016–2022 will be available on-site.

Graph 4-6: Four Year Persistence Rate

IV.4 Students construct a coherent plan of study that allows individual needs, goals, and aspirations to be met within the context of requirements established by the program. Students receive systematic, multifaceted evaluation of their achievements. Students have access to continuing opportunities for guidance, counseling, and placement assistance.

A coherent program of study encompasses more than just the curriculum. We strive to create a learning environment where students have a balance of structure and freedom along with supportive feedback to create and complete individualized programs of study. Our professional pathways, individual faculty advising, entering/exiting seminar sequence, and reflective culminating ePortfolio provides an environment of mutual support where students can experience a range of possibilities and find their own path. According to the 2018–2022 graduating student surveys, students consistently expressed satisfaction with faculty guidance and academic advising. This improved from 62% of students in 2016–18 expressing high or very high satisfaction to 88% (2018–20) and 92% (2020–22). We believe that this improvement is a result of our curriculum, advising and student support policies, and our willingness to modify them in response to student feedback.

Pathways and Specializations

As detailed in II.3, we offer areas of emphasis within the overall LIS curriculum corresponding to particular professional environments, which we refer to as pathways: Academic/Special Librarianship;
Pathways are suggested groups of core and elective courses associated with specific professional information environments, and course substitutions must be approved by the student’s faculty advisor and the pathway lead. To contextualize pathways in the context of the curriculum, we provide a curriculum map organized by both SLO and professional pathway for a general overview of applicable courses for each pathway.

To allow students to further customize their program, we developed specializations that consist of clusters of two to four courses. Specializations can be added to any pathway, in consultation with a faculty advisor. These specializations include: Asian Studies Librarianship; Community & Cultural Informatics (centered on community and cultural information practices and the social nature of information technologies); and Information Technology (centered on technology-oriented coursework beyond the core requirement). Pathways and specializations are optional and do not appear on students’ transcript or diploma.

Flexible Core Options and Fieldwork

Students receive regular guidance and support via regular meetings with their faculty advisor (discussed in II.3) to select courses based on interests and track progress towards professional pathways. Students can customize their plan of study via flexible core course options, internships, practica, directed reading/independent study experiences, and other options detailed in II.1.3. These include completing one of our nine dual degree programs or taking up to nine credits of graduate-level courses in other departments.

Between fall 2016 and spring 2023, 50 students enrolled in graduate-level courses in 25 other departments, most frequently in our dual degree departments: American Studies, Law, Hawaiian Studies, Learning Design and Technology (LTEC), and Information and Computer Sciences (Table 4-11). The number of students taking courses in other units has declined in recent years. While we have not studied this comprehensively, we believe this may be related to an early policy for ePortfolios, when only core-eligible LIS courses could be included in the ePortfolio. This is discussed more in II.3.

Table 4-11: LIS Student Enrollment in Non-LIS Courses, Fall 2016–Spring 2023

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of LIS Students Who Took a Non-LIS Course</th>
<th>Most Common Departments (Number of Enrolled LIS Students)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AY2016–17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>American Studies (5), LTEC (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY2017–18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>American Studies (5), ICS (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY2018–19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>American Studies (2), Dance (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY2019–20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hawaiian Studies (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY2020–21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>ICS (4), Hawaiian Studies (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY2021–22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>None larger than one student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY2022–23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>None larger than one student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students have regular opportunities to explore the LIS community in interactions with professionals as adjunct lecturers and guest speakers, student organization activities, and informal conversations about the breadth of possibilities the program affords. We encourage students to build their professional...
networks and document their engagement through conference attendance and presentations, publications, and participation in professional organizations. In the most recent graduating student survey, 92% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “I was able to craft a course of study that met my needs” [Appendix 2-4].

**Evaluation of Student Achievements**

At the highest level, the framework for grading policies is established by the UH Graduate Division and implemented by individual instructors, as stated in their syllabi. However, students receive multifaceted evaluation beyond just their assignment and course grades: class discussions; posts and responses on Slack and similar course platforms; instructors who provide feedback on assignment drafts; critical friend and peer feedback pairings; and small group breakouts and discussions with their faculty advisor and internship/practicum supervisor. Finally, the reflective essay component of the ePortfolio culminating experience is built around self-evaluation of their own previous learning artifacts, providing yet another assessment dimension. Quantitative and qualitative evaluation results are discussed in II.6.

**Guidance**

Because the LIS program is so small, our faculty jump to action when we see students struggling. If an entire class seems lost, lesson plans are revised, usually in consultation with students. Faculty also confer in Executive Sessions at monthly faculty meetings to identify any patterns in student progress or obstacles that we see, and which LIS or campus resource might best be able to assist. If an individual student is struggling, faculty contact the student and discuss options. A number of reasons might affect an individual student’s performance; we remind students of the campus resources described in IV.5.4 that can help with counseling, learning abilities, writing, and financial aid. A student might be encouraged to reflect on and change their study habits, take fewer courses, consider changing pathways, or take a Leave of Absence.

During the pandemic we saw increased anecdotal evidence of student need for counseling and financial services. This impacted our mission of self-care and instruction, described in IV.1. Faculty also noticed an increase in students disclosing neurodivergence, depression, and anxiety, so we invited specialists from campus offices (described in IV.5.4) to give advice at faculty meetings on how to work with these students appropriately and effectively. We invited adjunct faculty and staff to these sessions and shared resources with them as well.

**Advising**

The core of effective advising is creating and maintaining good relationships. Many graduates remain in contact with faculty for professional reasons such as reference requests, interview strategies, and negotiating job offers, but also just to keep in touch. From fall 2016 to spring 2018, 62% of students rated their satisfaction with academic advising high or very high—this rose to 88% in fall 2018 to spring 2020, then rose again to 92% in fall 2020 to spring 2022 [Appendix 2-4]. We often claim that the advantage of the small size of the LIS program is more opportunity for individual interactions among faculty and students, but feel that some of the dramatic improvement in student advising satisfaction is the result of our efforts to support and stay connected with students, even over Zoom during the pandemic.

**Placement Services**

We strive to create an ambient environment of career possibilities, guidance, and job search assistance. Students receive career information and advice in the entering/exiting seminar sequence, from
internship and practica supervisors, guest speakers, and faculty advisors and their instructors throughout their time in the program. Job opportunities are posted to an LIS jobs mailing list, which is moderated by the Program Coordinator, although faculty, students, and alumni can submit job opportunities as well. We also maintain a page on our site with LIS job information. Each year we review the results of the Library Journal survey of graduates, but we do not track numbers of students in paraprofessional positions or who take positions outside of LIS, given our small student numbers and the smaller survey return rate. More importantly, it is not uncommon for students to have to wait some time between graduating and finding a permanent position, especially since most libraries are part of statewide systems that tend to hire in batches.

Several courses contain required units on curating professional resumes, such as LIS 690 Internship. Guest speakers also share career guidance and inspiration, such as alumnus Felton Thomas, Jr. who served as Executive Director of the Cincinnati Public Library, and UCLA Information Studies Professor Anne Gilliland. Program Coordinator Mandi Hull offers students individual resume editing suggestions and interview practice, and is working with a specialist on federal government positions to offer a workshop on the unique requirements for posts on USAJOBS. Beyond LIS, the Mānoa Career Center offers resume consultation, interview workshops, and job postings. Anecdotally, LIS students have used these services, including one student who was recently hired by the Library of Congress.

In response to the statement “I had sufficient opportunities to network with professionals in the field”, 80% of students in fall 2018 to spring 2020, increasing to 90% in fall 2020 to spring 2022, agreed or strongly agreed. From fall 2018 to spring 2022, 97% of graduating students reported being satisfied with access to job information and announcements [Appendix 2-4].
At the program level, students are invited to attend LIS faculty meetings and broader planning events, generally as leaders of student organizations, and serve on program committees to inform the evolution of the curriculum. Students and representatives of student organizations are invited to attend and participate in faculty and committee meetings. Students have been particularly involved with curriculum as discussed II.1.2; II.5, II.6. As the student organization that represents all LIS students, Hui Dui is the primary group for student issues.

The LIS program has one elected representative and an alternate representative to the UH Mānoa Graduate Student Organization (GSO). GSO is the representative body for graduate students across the university, providing a voice in academic affairs and policies impacting graduate students. For example, the GSO was formally consulted on the proposed LIS reorganization as part of the Mānoa Faculty Senate Committee’s formal review of the proposal.

Faculty both welcome student participation in their research projects and nurture an environment where students conduct and share their own research. During the review period, three faculty members were PI or Co-PI on four IMLS grants (discussed in more detail in III.5), all of which involved LIS students via Research Assistantships with full funding (tuition exemption plus stipend), co-authoring journal articles and conference papers, conference travel, participation via dedicated LIS 699 Directed Reading and/or Research projects, and opportunities to observe and/or volunteer in data collection. New faculty have also dedicated startup funds to hiring students to assist in developing research projects.

Students also participate in research projects with partner organizations. For example, as part of a IMLS-funded collaboration between WGBH Educational Foundation, the American Archive of Public Broadcasting and the LIS program, LIS student Kimo Nichols completed a two-semester audiovisual preservation fellowship at ‘Ulu‘ulu: The Henry Ku‘ualoha Giugni Moving Image Archive of Hawai‘i (‘Ulu‘ulu) at the University of Hawai‘i at West O‘ahu, where he digitized and described 128 videotapes from the PBS Hawai‘i television series Biography Hawai‘i television series to support future archival research, in partnership with the Biographical Research Center at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa. Kimo worked with UHWO Head Archivist and Principal Investigator Janel Quirante and Digital Media Specialist Robert Omura at ‘Ulu‘ulu, and LIS faculty advisor Rich Gazan, and presented his work at the 2022 Association of Moving Image Archivists (AMIA) conference.

Additionally, in 2019 we became a co-sponsor of the International Journal of Information, Diversity, & Inclusion (IJIDI), with Vanessa Irvin as editor, to provide students with opportunities for hands-on experience with the scholarly publishing process. We dedicated program funds to hiring LIS students as IJIDI editorial assistants, who not only experienced how scholarly journals operate, but sometimes became authors and peer reviewers themselves. Some alumni, like Stephanie Robertson, continue their relationship with the journal after sponsorship moved to East Carolina University with Vanessa Irvin. We celebrate the success of student research in the LIS news section of our website, to encourage other students to engage in meaningful and publishable research.
Each semester the Program Director offers a thesis orientation and Q&A session for students who might be interested in undertaking thesis research. Because a thesis has specific requirements, such as research methods courses and potentially human subjects approval, only five students elected to complete a thesis during the review period (detailed in II.5). Students can develop and share their thesis research in LIS venues such as brown bag talks, and formal thesis defense.

Students also engage in research through LIS 699 Directed Reading and/or Research projects. These might grow out of research-oriented assignments in other courses as well as experiences in student and professional organizations. A selection of LIS 699 projects undertaken during the review period are listed in the following table and a complete list is available in Appendix 2-23.

Table 4-12: Abridged List of LIS 699 Directed Reading Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gazan</td>
<td>Kevin Houck</td>
<td>Botanical Records Management Applied: The Biology and Systematics of Tropical Plants</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogawa</td>
<td>Kelly McDermott</td>
<td>Conducting Research on Information Literacy Instruction</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asato</td>
<td>Hiroaki Hara</td>
<td>History of Okinawans in Hawaii and Okinawan Ethnic Identity in Hawaii</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutherland</td>
<td>Lilla Faint</td>
<td>Finding the Link Between Online Finding Aids and Digital Collections: Understanding Users’ Information Seeking Behaviors in the University Archives and Special Collections to Facilitate More Robust and Savvy Archival Researchers</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garud</td>
<td>Chadde Holbron</td>
<td>Developing Literacy Programs/Services/Events for Parents and Children in Public Library Management</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvin</td>
<td>Laila Brown</td>
<td>Together We Read, Together We Learn: Examining LIS Book Clubs as a Means of Collaborative Inquiry and Professional Identity Formation</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wertheimer</td>
<td>Nargis Sultana</td>
<td>Exploring the Skills and Qualifications for Geospatial/GIS Librarians</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the review period, we collected data on student publications and presentations as part of the graduating student service records [Appendix 1-14]. While the percentage of students reporting publications shows positive growth, the corresponding percentage of those who presented research tends to be more variable (although the 2019–2020 downturn is certainly understandable). We continue to encourage and incentivize student publications and presentations via funding, extra credit, and workshops on how to conduct research and present research. We also have physical wall space dedicated to showcase student research posters.

Table 4-13: Percent of Graduating Students Who Published or Presented Research as a Student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Published Research</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presented Research</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As discussed in IV.4 and elsewhere, every LIS student meets before each semester with an individual faculty advisor to select courses and discuss their career interests and goals. A large component of the internship and practicum experiences, which are required in every pathway save General/Custom, is to receive career advice and insights in practice and reflection with working professionals and faculty. The entering/exiting seminar sequence also includes modules dedicated to both academic and career advice and the LIS Program Coordinator provides and connects students with other career resources as well.

Students are assigned an initial faculty advisor based on the interests they state in their applications, although they are free to change advisors at any time. The Program Coordinator maintains a shared spreadsheet so that faculty members can identify any student’s advisor and reach out directly if there are questions about a student’s progress in their course, or career opportunities that may interest them.

Student Support Services

In Hawaiian, kōkua has many shades of meaning, including support and help, but also a willingness to practice them. UH Mānoa offers a wide range of support services, including:

- University Health Services Mānoa;
- Counseling and Student Development Center;
- LGBTQ (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender & Queer)+ Center;
- Women’s Center;
- Bridge to Hope (for students with children);
- UH Mānoa Children’s Center (child care);
- Mānoa Writing Center;
- International Student Services;
- Department of Public Safety;
- Office of Title IX;
- Office of Student Equity, Excellence and Diversity; and
- Office of Veteran Student Services.

Students’ Basic Needs are a concern throughout the UH System. To address food insecurity on the Mānoa campus, Food Vault Hawai‘i works with community partners and donors to collect and distribute food and toiletries to students in need. In 2022, Food Vault Hawai‘i also established a garden to grow organic produce for distribution. The Campus Center Complex also hosts a computer lab, farmers market, graphics services, meeting and event space, and a thrift store.

On every LIS syllabus is information about the KOKUA Program (Kahi O Ka Ulu ‘Ana—“The Place of Growing”), which provides academic access services to students with special needs. Instructors with self-identified special needs students in their courses are alerted via a confidential and non-specific notification from the KOKUA Program, providing both the student and instructor a channel of communication before the course begins, to plan needed support and accommodations. The KOKUA
Program has referred students to our program based on our record of success supporting students with disabilities.

**IV.5.5 [Students are provided with opportunities to...] Form student organizations;**

Organizations conceived, created and run by students are an essential component of the LIS program experience. While each group has a nominal LIS faculty advisor, students define agendas, create activities, and are ultimately responsible for the direction and longevity of their organizations. Each organization has a constitution, officers, and membership, and is officially designated as a Registered Independent Organization (RIO) recognized by the University of Hawai‘i Board of Regents, which provides access to a website, email account, and campus facilities. We encourage students to join and form student organizations from their first day in the program at NSO, and provide organizations informational pages on the LIS site, as well as the student email list, social media, and bulletin board space for event announcements. Our space includes a dedicated student organization room where groups can store materials and hold meetings. The following Table summarizes the student organizations active during the review period, and their current status.

**Table 4-14: LIS Student Engagement in Professional Organizations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active Student Organizations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hui Dui; American Library Association Student Chapter; Nā Hawaiʻi ʻImi Loa Hui Haumana (Student Chapter); Society of American Archivists Student Chapter; Special Libraries Association Student Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inactive Student Organizations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Diversity Council; Progressive Librarians; Feminist Book Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Governance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>UH Mānoa Graduate Student Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Organizations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Association of Hawaiʻi Archivists; Association of Records Managers and Administrators; Hawaiʻi Association of School Librarians; Hawaiʻi Library Association; Nā Hawaiʻi ʻImi Loa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Organizations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>American Library Association; Association of Tribal Archives, Libraries, and Museums</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nā Hawaiʻi ʻImi Loa (Advisor: Wertheimer; Pelekekina (President) Ani Kawada)**

Nā Hawaiʻi ʻImi Loa (NHIL) was established by LIS students in 2012, with a mission to expand the Native Hawaiian presence in the Library and Information Science profession, and build the capacity of the Hawaiian community in Library and Information Science practices. NHIL has been extremely successful in creating a thriving community around their mission, e.g., by creating and hosting events such as Hoʻokele Naʻauao, an annual symposium. The LIS program co-sponsored the first two symposia, along with NHIL and the Hawaiʻinuiākea School of Hawaiian Knowledge. The symposium attracted around 400 people—especially from the Native Hawaiian student population and community—and the program included speakers on Indigenous librarianship from Aotearoa (New Zealand) and other Pacific communities. Some of our applicants said that they learned about LIS from this symposium. NHIL has
also offered several community archival workshops and participated in international Indigenous LIS meetings, such as the Association of Tribal Archives, Libraries, and Museums.

During the review period, NHIL has grown from a student organization into two sister organizations, one for only students called Nā Hawai‘i ʻImi Loa Hui Haumāna, and a professional organization that kept the original name. The student organization conducts professional development activities such as a tour of the Kamehameha School’s Archive and Library, and professional service activities, such as a book talk by Dr. Tiffany Ing, the author of “Reclaiming Kalākaua” in partnership with Laka me Lono and the Hawaiian Historical Society. In 2022 they went outdoors to help the nonprofit organization, Protect & Preserve Hawai‘i with their monthly Pōhaku session, rebuilding Hawaiian dry stack masonry.

The parent organization of NHIL continues to support the annual symposium, Hoʻokele Naʻauao, was a partner in Vanessa Irvin’s IMLS-funded project, “Hui ʻEkolu” (Laura Bush 21st Century Librarian Program Grant), and later received their own IMLS grant (Native Hawaiian Library Services) to “create awareness of culturally-relevant library resources...to effectively engage with culturally relevant information.” Through all of these and many other activities, NHIL has grown from a student-established organization into an essential organization for Native Hawaiian librarianship.

**Hui Dui (Advisor: Gazan; President: Jesse Shiroma)**

Hui Dui is a student-run organization dedicated to supporting students, akin to Library and Information Science Student Associations at other schools. All students are automatically Hui Dui members once admitted to the program. The name comes from the Hawaiian word for a group or association (Hui), and Melvil Dewey’s preferred spelling of his name (using simplified English). Students came up with the name in the 1970s, just after the school was established.

Hui Dui coordinates NSO, where new students meet and interact with continuing students and have time to talk informally before the official program begins. Hui Dui also conducts fundraising activities, particularly keeping the LIS dining area stocked with drinks and snacks purchased in bulk and resold at low prices. The proceeds help raise funds for the graduation dinner. Hui Dui also oversees the LIS lending library, which then-student Caitlin Nelson established in 2005 to help students share textbooks. The lending library is made up entirely of books donated by students, alumni, and faculty, and has evolved from textbooks to become a small, eclectic collection. Students can check out books from the lending library on an honor basis.

At the end of each semester, Hui Dui coordinates a graduation dinner that serves as both an awards ceremony and a fond farewell to graduating students, who attend free of charge.

**Other Student-Run Organizations Active During the Review Period**

The Progressive Librarians Guild Student Chapter is advised by Andrew Wertheimer. The Progressive Librarians Guild (PLG) was established in 1990 by librarians in New York who wanted to develop socially responsible librarianship, and several LIS students launched a student chapter in 2018. Several PLG liaisons attended faculty meetings and curriculum committee meetings in order to secure more socially responsible librarianship or critical librarianship content in the curriculum. Noriko Asato invited PLG students to lead a group presentation and discussion on critical librarianship concepts. The faculty also had extended discussion in October 2018 and worked with students to incorporate more aspects into core and elective courses dealing with social justice, diversity, equity, and inclusion.

The Diversity Council Book Club (joint with PLG), which was an offshoot of the Diversity Council advised by Vanessa Irvin, held weekly readings and discussions around a range of books, for example fiction by...

Student Chapters of Professional Associations

The following student associations are recognized by their respective national associations as qualified student chapters. The following are active chapters.

American Library Association Student Chapter (ALAsc) (Advisor: Wertheimer; President: Kylee Munro)

Founded in 1992 and perpetuated by students, the American Library Association Student Chapter at UHM (ALAsc) coordinates educational programs such as brown bag talks by faculty, visiting librarians, and LIS scholars that complement coursework and enhance the LIS program experience. While their work is consistently excellent, their work to keep the community together during the pandemic by offering a variety of virtual tours and talks led to their selection as ALA Student Chapter of the Year in 2021 and runner-up for 2022. This is especially impressive given that our school is one of the smallest accredited programs.

Two ALAsc student leaders, Stephanie Robertson and Jade Sunouchi, were appointed to the national ALA New Members Round Table (NMRT) and the ALA IFC Membership Promotion Committee. To increase bonds between LIS students and professionals nationwide within ALA, Stephanie and Jade created “Librarian Lounge” online events with East Coast and Southern ALA LIS student leaders in 2020–2021. In 2018, ALA Midwinter was in Seattle, so students held a fundraiser to help sponsor their attendance. Other recent ALAsc activities include meetings with ALA Presidents Julius C. Jefferson, Jr., Patty Wong, Lessa Kananiʻopua Pelayo-Lozada, a panel of visiting experts on Library Advocacy, ALA NMRT President Jennifer Wilhelm, and an archives panel with Tonia Sutherland, recent alumna Sharnelle “Moki” Rentí Cruz of the Hula Preservation Society, and Holiday Vega of the University of Chicago on self-care and self-awareness in the LIS professions. Other events included a virtual cocktail hour social via Zoom. ALAsc members also partner with other student organizations to offer homework help sessions aimed at new students.

Since 2004, ALAsc has presented an annual award to people who have “positively impacted librarianship in Hawaiʻi in terms of intellectual freedom, advocacy for libraries and librarians, professional education, and international relations.” The award is named after LIS Professor Emerita Sarah K. Vann, who was an international leader on intellectual freedom, library history, and international librarianship.

Special Libraries Association Student Chapter (SLAsc) (Advisor: Gazan; Past President: Jessika Ross)

The SLAsc’s primary focus is to “explore the field of Special Libraries and special collections by arranging tours in professional settings and inviting guest speakers to present on various topics.” Students arranged and led tours at a variety of venues, including: the Hula Preservation Society; Laie Hawaiʻi Family History Center Genealogy Library; Hawaiʻi State Library for the Blind and Print Disabled; Honolulu Museum of Art Library; and Hawaiʻi Supreme Court Law Library. During some years of the review period, SLAsc and ASIS&T student chapters operated as one unit due to an overlap in student interests. SLAsc has a website, social media pages, and even produced a video podcast (The Uncommon Library Podcast).
Society of American Archivists Student Chapter (SAAsc) (Advisor: Wertheimer; President: Kate Marsi)

Since 2007, SAAsc engaged in community activities and service projects on O‘ahu and the neighbor islands, working with organizations such as the Consuelo Foundation and Hawaiian Historical Society. SAAsc also arranged brown bag talks with local and visiting archivists and archival educators, such as:

- Ju Sun Yi, Hawai‘i State Archives;
- Malia Van Heukelem, Jean Charlot Collection, UHM Library;
- Georgina Tom, ‘Iolani School; and
- Stuart Ching, Congregation of the Sacred Hearts.

In order to bridge with local professionals, SAAsc invited alumni and members of the Association of Hawai‘i Archivists (AHA) to an annual wine tasting event, presented posters at AHA conferences, and cooperated on a fundraiser to send SAAsc students to the AHA conference. The chapter became inactive during the pandemic, however, a new group of students revived the chapter and completed paperwork to be a recognized chapter and UHM student organization. The chapter initiated an award in 2017 to encourage leadership in archival education called the Lei Lau Kukui Awards. The initial award was presented to Deborah Dunn, Nicolita Garces, and Andrew Wertheimer.

Leadership in student organizations often serves as a stepping stone to participation in professional organizations. In the following sections we present some examples of student participation in Hawai‘i LIS professional organizations during the review period.

Hawai‘i Association of School Librarians (Liaison: Meera Garud)

The Hawai‘i Association of School Librarians (HASL) invites an LIS student to represent the program as an ex-officio member of the executive board. The student representative has time on the board agenda at each meeting to share announcements and concerns on behalf of LIS students. HASL also provides two annual scholarships to LIS students. The organization involves students in conferences and service activities, such as reading at the HASL booth during the Hawai‘i Book and Music Festival. LIS students Jennifer Duncklee, Michelle Hatami, Lori Misaka, and Jesse Shiroma worked with Kalani High School librarian Daphne Miyashiro to raise funds for HASL during National Library Week in 2022. They ran a fundraiser at Barnes & Noble, coordinated event marketing, scheduled volunteers, created promotional and advocacy materials, and worked at the book fair. They raised over $5,000, which will support HASL’s efforts for school libraries.

Hawai‘i Library Association (Liaison: Andrew Wertheimer)

The Hawai‘i Library Association (HLA) is the largest professional organization in the state and LIS student involvement in HLA has been an ongoing strategic goal between the LIS program and HLA leadership. The HLA board offers students a reduced membership price in cooperation with ALA and subsidizes student conference attendance. HLA considers this support an investment in the future, along with a $1,000 annual student scholarship.
Andrew Wertheimer served as the ALA Chapter Counselor, an HLA Board position, for part of the period under review. To make this a continuing effort, the board revised its constitution in order to create a new permanent officer position for an LIS student liaison. This position is selected by election of members of the ALAsc. Other students and alumni have also invigorated the board and the association. For example, LIS student Jessika Ross designed the logo for the HLA centennial, and students Jade Sunouchi and Brooke Jones serve on the HLA Legislative Advocacy Committee.

LIS faculty members Meera Garud and Violet Harada both serve on the HLA Conference organizing committee. HLA has given current students greater visibility by dedicating no-conflict time for them to present their work in poster sessions. Numerous students and faculty gave presentations at the 2022 HLA Centennial conference, including the following.

Student Presentations

- Ikaika Keliiiliki and Kylee Munro: “I Nā Au o Ka ʻIke—In the Currents of Knowledge” (a student-led panel with ALA President Lessa Kananiʻopua Pelayo-Lozada on what it means to be a librarian and a mentor)
- Jessika Ross: “Printing in Another Dimension: 3D Printing at the MCBH Library”
- Kristin Tarnas, Alita Charron, and Sheri Kelly: “Ānuenue Hawaiʻi Keiki Book Award: Advocating For the Literature Created in Hawaiʻi For and About Our Keiki”

Student Poster Presentations

- Timothy Buckley: “Climate Resilience for Hawaiʻi and Pacific Archives”
- Kate Marsi: “Databases, Open Source, and Cultural Heritage”
- Kylee Munro: “How to Make Friends with Books”
- Jessika Ross: “History of the Lending Collection at Honolulu Museum of Art”

Faculty Presentations:

- Rich Gazan: “How Information Flows: LIS and the Co-Creation of the New School of Communication & Information”
- Andrew Wertheimer: “Talk Story on Advocacy: Sounding Out Our Strategies for the Future” (with student Jade Sunouchi)
- Andrew Wertheimer: “Celebrations and Challenges: Reflections on a Century of Librarianship in Hawaiʻi”

Adjunct Faculty Presentations:

- Carina Chernisky: “Bolstering OER Efforts: Developing a Collection of Support Resources for UH Faculty”
- Stanislava Gardasevic: “Library Metadata and Technologies Through Time”
- Brian Richardson: “Creating Hamilton Library’s Loanable Technology”
- Gwen Sinclair: “Hawaiʻi Library Association Highlights” (poster)
- Danielle Todd: “Navigating Librarianship Through the HLA Mentoring Program”

Association of Hawaiʻi Archivists (Liaison: Andrew Wertheimer)

Like most professional associations in Hawaiʻi, the Association of Hawaiʻi Archivists (AHA) strives to mentor a new generation of local leaders within the profession. To encourage this, AHA created a board
member position for a LIS student, subsidizes student conference registration, and established a student poster session. Sharnelle “Moki” Renti Cruz began serving on the AHA board while a student, Tonia Sutherland served on the board in 2021, and Andrew Wertheimer’s longstanding involvement includes service as AHA Vice President, President, and Past President between 2005 and 2009.

LIS students and faculty are frequently active at AHA Annual conferences. For example, student members of SAAsc and Nā Hawai‘i ‘Imi Loa helped organize and provide protocol and conference support in 2016. The 2022 AHA Annual Conference keynote speaker was adjunct faculty member Janel Quirante (‘Ulu‘ulu/UHWO). Other adjunct faculty or internship site supervisors who have been speakers include Nicki Garces (Consuelo Foundation), Helen Wong Smith (UHM), Malia Van Heukelem (UHM), Gina Vergara-Bautista (Hawai‘i State Archives), and Dawn Sueoka (UHM).

**Association of Tribal Archives, Libraries, and Museums (ATALM)**

While there is no official liaison for ATALM, two LIS alumni presented at ATALM’s [2022 International Conference of Indigenous Archives, Libraries & Museums](https://www.atalm.org):

- Keikilani Meyer (LIS alumna and CIS PhD student): “Pūnaewele: Providing Access to Cultural Content in the Wake of COVID”
- Hau’olihiwahiwa Moniz (LIS alumna): “Native Hawaiian Methodologies to Community Engagement”

The LIS program recently heard that there are plans to offer this conference in Honolulu in the future, and officially expressed our interest in providing support as appropriate to the goals of the organization.

At various points during the review period, students also engaged with Hawai‘i chapters of the Medical Library Association and Special Libraries Association via webinars, scholarships, and mentoring events.

**Planning for Leadership and Assessing Student Engagement**

This level of engagement is student-driven but also part of our strategic planning and student experience. Graduating student survey response data shows that 89% of graduates participated in professional organizations as a student, 54% served in a leadership role, 82% attended conferences, 49% gave presentations, and 18% helped to plan conferences [Appendix 1-14].
Student leadership has been recognized by some of these organizations via scholarship funding and other awards, including:

- LIS students help raise over $5K to support school librarianship (2022);
- LIS student Ellen-Rae Cachola selected as a Fellows for the Andrew W. Mellon Fellowship for Diversity, Inclusion, and Cultural Heritage (2020);
- LIS student Minyoung Chung received HLA Scholarships (2020);
- Caroline Lee received the Faith C. Ai Memorial Scholarship (2017) and the HASL Scholarship (2017); and
- LIS students received Smithsonian internship positions (2016).

With such engaged students, it is no surprise that our alumni make outstanding professional contributions as well. Professor Emerita Violet Harada co-authored *Radical Collaborations for Learning: School Librarians as Change Agents* that documents some of these stories. Other alumni that have received professional recognition during the review period include:

- Jason Ford (2022) was [highlighted in University of Hawaii magazine for his archival work](#) (2023);
- Diane Mokuau (1998) was named [School Librarian of the Year by School Library Journal](#) (2021);
- Wrayna Fairchild (2016) [received a Voya Unsung Heroes Grant](#) (2021);
- Kathleen Ageton (1989) shared LIS skills in Zambia and Zimbabwe (2019);
- Lori Chun received the [Excellence in Education Award by Alpha Delta Kappa](#) (2018);
- Tori Ann Ogawa (2015) was [selected as 2017 Emerging Leader by ALSC](#) (2016);
- Christin Lozano published a children’s book (2016);
- Kurahara (1970) and Young (1991) were [honored by Historic Hawai’i Foundation](#) (2016); and
- Carolyn Kirio (1994) was [selected as one of the nation’s great educators](#) (2016).
As discussed in I.4, II.1.2, and III.6, faculty members collect evidence of student achievement and work with our stakeholders to analyze and apply it to program evolution. Assessment indicators are discussed in detail in II.5 and II.6, and include:

- Performance-based measures, such as course grades and culminating experience (oral exam and ePortfolio) results by SLO;
- Self-reporting measures, such as course evaluations, graduating student surveys, faculty reflections and student participation in professional activities;
- Indirect measures, such as enrollment, time to degree, and persistence; and
- Longitudinal measures, such as alumni and employer surveys.

By analyzing these and other indicators of student achievement, we identify areas of strength and needed improvement, which are discussed in yearly strategic planning meetings at the beginning of each academic year. These are incorporated into our strategic plan and/or our yearly goals, objectives and activities, and revisited throughout the year in monthly faculty meetings, where individual student progress is discussed in executive session. Broader course, pathway, and program policies are discussed in open session. Resulting issues and proposed policy changes are shared with stakeholders in town halls, advisory board meetings, and other events.

Examples of programmatic changes during the review period include our migration to an ePortfolio culminating experience based on student feedback that the previous oral examination did not map well with our program SLOs. Subsequent incremental changes to ePortfolio artifact eligibility are based on student feedback seeking more flexibility to choose the artifacts they felt best evidenced their learning, and research into the portfolio requirements of other ALA-accredited programs. More detail can be found in Appendix 1-5.

These indicators and outcomes also serve as input to our campus-level Mānoa Assessment reports, which were among those selected for examination by the WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) in the distance education section of its 2021 accreditation report (pp. 67–70):

The programs at UH Mānoa—both in-person and online—submit regular assessment reports that demonstrate the use of both direct and indirect assessment methods, with the findings incorporated into the further development of instruction and the curriculum. For the programs examined, where relevant, professional organization accreditation standards were applied to both the online and in-person assessments. In the recent assessments, detectable differences were not found when comparing in-person to online program student performance.
Other changes resulting from student achievement evaluation include the entering/exiting seminar sequence, which was implemented both to support the creation and development of the ePortfolio. This change also provided new students, who often reported being overwhelmed in their first semester, a lower-stakes venue for cohort engagement and an introduction to the program and profession.

**IV.7 The program has explicit, documented evidence of its ongoing decision-making processes and the data to substantiate the evaluation of student learning outcomes, using appropriate direct and indirect measures as well as individual student learning, using appropriate direct and indirect measures.**

Our faculty and planning meeting notes are the most explicit evidence of our ongoing decision-making processes, informed by our repository of student outcomes data. We welcome stakeholders into these conversations and share documented distillations of our philosophy and outcomes on our assessment page, and future directions on our strategic planning page.

Direct measures include course and assignment results, internship and practicum evaluations, culminating experience outcomes, and theses. Self-reported direct measures include student participation in professional organizations and other elements of the graduating student survey. More informal and conversational direct measures include student responses to prompts about their experience, which are sometimes posted and shared as threaded conversations on a platform such as Slack.

Indirect measures include course evaluations, assignment and culminating experience reflections, program data such as enrollment, time to degree, persistence, student demographics, and placement data. The same course evaluation or time to degree data might indicate a curricular bottleneck, or a shift in student interests and career goals. Does the rise in graduating student survey respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that they feel well prepared to “Analyze and apply knowledge about the information needs and perspectives of Indigenous cultures and/or diverse communities” (SLO5) from 77% in fall 2018 to 97% in spring 2022 indicate persistent or momentary strength in this area? We strive to understand and contextualize direct and indirect measures via discussion and reflection before proposing action, which is why we rely on multiple forms of input and data as discussed in **I.1.1**.

**IV.8 The program demonstrates how the results of the evaluation of student learning outcomes and individual student learning are systematically used to improve the program and to plan for the future.**

Our evaluation process specific to our SLOs is introduced in **I.1.1**, discussed in **I.1.3**, and throughout **Standard II**. We also discuss how both the program and individual faculty members review course evaluation data as input to program improvement in Standards II.5 and II.6. During the review period, we examined student achievement of our six SLOs in different ways, so we present an example that draws on evidence from both eras.

At the beginning of the review period, the last of three senior faculty members who taught in technology-related areas retired and student achievement in SLO4 Technologies was one of our weakest areas. Formative assessment of SLO4 achievement took place via Course SLO Assessments, where
instructors evaluated student achievement for separate assignments in their course. In August 2019, faculty reviewed the data in Table 2-7, which summarizes the outcomes for the two years that we used this method. We found that only 10% of students exceeded standards in SLO4 courses, in sharp contrast with the outcomes for the prior year when 88% exceeded. Correspondingly, SLO4 achievement in the summative oral comprehensive exam for calendar 2019 was the lowest of any SLO as well: 53% exceeded standards [Appendix 4-5 (Restricted Access)], while achievement exceeding standard in every other oral exam SLO ranged from 67–87%.

While the straightforward response would have been to hire more technology-oriented faculty members, our position as a program within the ICS department (teeming with tech faculty) made this appear to be a lower-priority request. However, LIS students rarely met course prerequisites that would allow them to enroll in ICS courses. Our ability to hire adjunct lecturers was curtailed as well, given the order-of-magnitude greater needs of the ICS department. We responded to this by dedicating the one position we did control—a graduate assistantship—to technology instruction. Previously, the position had been held by a graduate student who assisted with distance education, but we were able to hire a PhD student with LIS experience into this position, Stanislava (Stasha) Gardasevic, who reinvigorated our technology course offerings with an accessible approach ideal for LIS students and won a competitive teaching award. We discuss additional examples of curriculum revisions in II.7. From spring 2020 to spring 2022, 91% of students passed the SLO4 ePortfolio essay on the first attempt, on par with the other SLOs.

Stasha’s upcoming graduation made our request for a full-time tenure-track faculty position focused on “information technology for social good,” even more urgent. For a semester at least, we are fortunate to report that Stasha is willing to teach as adjunct faculty, and continue to impart technological skills as well as the mindset and approach of a lifelong learner that transcends the technologies of the moment. In our new school, we also have the freedom to hire more adjunct faculty to teach in technology-related areas, such as digital and moving image archives. This will provide more focused instruction in one of our fastest-growing professional pathways.

While the above example engages with more quantitative evidence and organizational constraints, our practice is also guided by our assessment philosophy and process, which includes reflections by individual faculty on their course experiences at the end of each year. These are reviewed, distilled, and shared back with faculty in the subsequent year’s planning session. Additionally, adopting a reflective approach to assessment, as compared to the prior course SLO assessment spreadsheets, yielded better faculty responsiveness and richer evidence to ground discussion of potential course and program changes. Overall, our systematic planning and assessment processes are flexible enough to encompass multiple kinds of evidence and adapt to changing conditions—something closer to an ecosystem—which is more descriptive of our practice.

Summary Reflection

It’s constructive and frankly breathtaking to reflect on the period under review as it relates to the student experience. Through the pandemic, economic uncertainty, a shift to online learning, new professional pathways and migration to a new School and College, we’ve prioritized an ethic of care in recruiting, supporting and empowering students to find their voice and become future information professionals in this fast-changing environment in ways we have detailed throughout this Standard. When we see our graduates serving as librarians and archivists and in other information-related professions, preserving, organizing and providing people access to local collections, fostering cultural literacy, engaging in advocacy to fight for public library funding and librarian tenure, and inspiring and
welcoming the next generation of students as interns or staff, we see how our students are essential partners in the Hawai‘i information environment. Their passion for engaging in this work comes through from their first application essay to their last reflective essay in their culminating ePortfolio or thesis. As we welcome our largest incoming student cohort during the review period, we look forward to extending our ethic of care to a larger circle, but we also welcome the opportunity for their experience to evolve.

As we look to the future in our new School with new faculty, we are excited to develop a new strategic plan focused on the student learning experience. It takes trust, patience, humility, cultural competency, repeated consultation, and respect for protocol for a diverse group of learners and educators to come together to engage meaningfully with Hawaiian librarianship and archival theory and practice. Our students must understand and balance critical decolonial perspectives with professional norms, standards, and technological skills, so they can work effectively within information organizations in Hawai‘i or anywhere in the world.

Our merger into SCI might also allow us to develop an undergraduate informatics emphasis with our new partners, which could help us impact a broader range of students, and become a gateway into the LIS program. We will also need to consider the extent to which we wish to remain a primarily face-to-face program with online options restricted to in-state students, or if we will expand our online options to reach students in the Asia-Pacific region and the US mainland. Whichever direction we take, it will be as part of a systematic exploration with students, alumni, employers, other stakeholders, and our new SCI colleagues. We are excited about creating an innovative, interconnected LIS degree program while maintaining our quality professional education and student emphasis.
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Standard V: Administration, Finances, and Resources

Institutional Role

V.1 The program is an integral yet distinctive academic unit within the institution. As such, it has the administrative infrastructure, financial support, and resources to ensure that its goals and objectives can be accomplished. Its autonomy is sufficient to assure that the intellectual content of its program, the selection and promotion of its faculty, and the selection of its students are determined by the program within the general guidelines of the institution. The parent institution provides both administrative support and the resources needed for the attainment of program objectives.

Administrative Infrastructures

The University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa is the flagship campus of the University of Hawai‘i (UH) System, which consists of ten campuses across the state. The UH Mānoa Office of Business and Finance maintains updated organization charts and functional statements for every unit on campus.

Throughout the review period, the UH System President has been David Lassner. He is a graduate of the Communication and Information Sciences (CIS) PhD program and formerly served as Vice President for Information Technology and Chief Information Officer. From 2016–2019, President Lassner also held the role of Interim Chancellor at UH Mānoa. The UH Mānoa Provost is Michael Bruno, who was appointed in 2019. Provost Bruno previously served as Vice Chancellor for Research and Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. In response to concerns from internal and external stakeholders about the dual roles held by both, in 2019 the positions were separated into President and Provost.

From 1997 through 2022, the LIS program was a distinct unit within the Information and Computer Sciences (ICS) Department in the College of Natural Sciences (CNS). LIS received administrative and financial support from ICS, and a high degree of autonomy over our curriculum, hiring, and admissions. This was initially conceived as a way to broaden the technological background and opportunities of LIS students, but divergent faculty research goals and methods, and challenging prerequisite ICS course requirements resulted in less ICS-LIS crossover than was initially envisioned.

Prior to the reorganization, LIS was a program within the ICS Department, chaired by Scott Robertson, in CNS, which was led by Dean Aloysius Helminck. While we received sufficient support and autonomy to deliver our program, the process was not always smooth. Curricular changes needed to be approved by both ICS and CNS committees, which presented translational challenges because LIS courses tend to differ from those in computer and natural sciences. Because ICS has approximately four times as many faculty members and ten times as many majors as LIS, our resource requests were rarely seen as a high priority. Due to persistent budget challenges within CNS, the LIS budget was fairly ad hoc throughout the review period—we would request funds as needed via the ICS Department, but we were not given a budget from which to plan expenditures. Similarly, the small percentage of LIS summer tuition funds that was returned to the units went into an ICS Department account. While LIS could draw from these funds, they were also used to support ICS expenses beyond LIS.

In July 2022, we moved to the College of Social Sciences (CSS) as one of five programs within the new School of Communication and Information (SCI), along with programs in Communication,
Communicology, Journalism, and the Spark M. Matsunaga Institute for Peace. This reorganization is described in I.1, visualized in Figure 1-2, and documented in Appendix 1-17 and Appendix 1-18. The inaugural SCI Chair was Colin Moore, who was appointed from the Matsunaga Institute within SCI. His research interests include American political development, public bureaucracies, veterans’ affairs, and the politics of U.S. territories. As of fall 2023, the new SCI Chair is now Hye-Ryeon Lee from Communicology, whose research areas include health communication, environmental communication, persuasion, and social influence.

The Dean of CSS is Denise Eby Konan, who has served in that role since January 2012. Dean Konan is a Professor of Economics and also served for two years as Interim Chancellor of UH Mānoa. She is assisted by Associate Dean Ross Sutherland, Administrative Services Manager Kat Tagaca, and Interim Director of the Social Sciences Research Institute (SSRI) Jack Barile. The CSS directory has more information about staff.

Social Sciences is one of eight colleges that, along with seven schools, make up the academic structure of UH Mānoa (Table 5-1). Note that despite the nomenclature, SCI is a department-level unit, not a school or college with its own dean like those listed in the table. With 451 majors as of spring 2023, SCI enrollment is well below the typical campus threshold to be a college-level unit (average is 1,717). The average school-level unit is about 410; while SCI has 451 majors, the university is moving away from adding new schools. One of the rationales for creating SCI was to support the goals of the UH Mānoa Planning for Post-Pandemic Hawai‘i, which focuses on reducing administrative overhead and combining academic units.

Table 5-1: UH Mānoa Colleges and Schools with Number of Majors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colleges</th>
<th>Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts, Languages &amp; Letters (1,822)</td>
<td>Hawai‘inuiākea School of Hawaiian Knowledge (167)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Natural Sciences (2,578)</td>
<td>John A. Burns School of Medicine (456)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Social Sciences (1,917)</td>
<td>School of Architecture (295)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education (1,886)</td>
<td>Nancy Atmospera-Walch School of Nursing (691)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering (1,256)</td>
<td>School of Ocean &amp; Earth Science &amp; Technology (357)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Tropical Agriculture &amp; Human Resources (979)</td>
<td>Thompson School of Social Work &amp; Public Health (605)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shidler College of Business (1584)</td>
<td>William S. Richardson School of Law (300)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach College (n/a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UH Institutional Research and Analysis Office

LIS is also one of four founding constituent units comprising the interdisciplinary CIS PhD program, a unique program that spans four units and three colleges across the University of Hawai‘i. In this role, LIS collaborates with the ICS Department, Communication and Communicology programs within SCI, and the Shidler College of Business to teach and supervise PhD students and serve on the CIS Executive Board. All tenured and tenure-track LIS faculty members are also members of the CIS graduate faculty. As an interdisciplinary program, all CIS PhD committees include members of multiple units, providing another environment where we can define and share our own intellectual contributions.
Within SCI, LIS is a member of the Council of Program Directors, consisting of each of the five directors and the school chair. The School Council is where programs plan, share information, and actively seek collaboration opportunities [Appendix 3-11].

**Financial Support and Resources**

Within CNS, LIS financial support was equivalent to that of similar units (Table 5-2). For example, in 2021–2022, seven of the 181 FTE positions within CNS instructional units (3.9%) were LIS faculty and staff. The total CNS expenditures during this year were $24.8M (CNS budget 2021–22), 3.9% of which is $967K, which aligns almost perfectly with the $956K in LIS program expenditures that year.

*Table 5-2: LIS Program Expenditures, 2016-2022*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$955,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$946,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$949,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$850,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$818,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$1,031,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$1,107,225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ALISE Statistical Reports

The variation in year to year expenditures was due to three faculty departures early in the review period and periods of staff transition. Under this administrative structure, the ICS department provided approximately 20% of its allocation to LIS through faculty salaries and shared infrastructure, including support staff, student help, classroom and office space, labs, equipment, utilities, telecommunications, photocopying, postage, printing, contractual services, and supplies. LIS received additional funds from tuition revenue through courses offered via Outreach College (OC), although CNS keeps OC tuition revenue for distribution at the college’s discretion. LIS also maintains a Program Enrichment fund with the UH Foundation and several other funds to cover smaller expenses. LIS fiscal matters were managed by the LIS Program Chair in consultation with the LIS faculty, ICS Department Chair, and the ICS Administrative and Fiscal Support Specialist.

At this writing we have not completed a full fiscal year in our new administrative home, however, our staff and faculty position numbers and resources moved with us per the reorganization MOUs [Appendix 5-1], and the CSS Governance and Budget policies are clearly and transparently stated.

**Program Autonomy**

Throughout the multi-year planning process for the new school, one of our core design tenets was collaborative autonomy. As we have detailed throughout this self-study, and as evidenced in the fully executed SCI governance documents, each SCI program is empowered to control its own administration, curriculum, and hiring, and encouraged to preserve and extend its own identity and student experience, while identifying opportunities for collaboration and mutual support [Appendix 5-2]. Additional SCI governance documents will be available on-site.
LIS articulates our distinctiveness by maintaining our own vision, mission, goals, curriculum, student learning outcomes, admissions standards and policies, faculty and staff selection and evaluation criteria, and physical space. All of these complement but are distinct from those of SCI and other units within the CSS. Within SCI, autonomy for all programs in terms of curriculum, admissions, faculty hiring and evaluation are inscribed within the founding SCI documents. Other evidence of our autonomy and support include:

- We have a program-specific budget each year, provided by the CSS Dean via the SCI Chair (available on-site);
- We receive a consistent, higher percentage of summer tuition funds returned to the program (25% in SCI/CSS vs. a variable fraction of the 10% the CNS Dean returned to the ICS Department);
- We receive a higher percentage of Research and Training Revolving Fund (RTRF) funds returned to individual investigators (15.78% in FY2023 in SCI/CSS vs. 12.5% in ICS/CNS);
- Each program within SCI can create criteria and guidelines for tenure, promotion, and contract renewal specific to the program;
- Flexible DPC composition standards are designed within SCI, with the goal of ensuring that program faculty are evaluated by a majority of faculty from within their program.

Selection and Promotion of Faculty

LIS faculty have primary responsibility to specify faculty hiring priorities, advocate for position requests, draft position descriptions, establish and serve on selection committees, and evaluate candidates, although SCI faculty and other stakeholders may be invited into the process as well. LIS faculty have majority membership on LIS faculty search committees and at the conclusion of the search process make a hiring recommendation to the SCI Chair, who forwards it to the dean.

Tenure and promotion criteria follow standards established by UHM for all faculty. Initiating a new faculty appointment begins with a request from SCI to the CSS Dean, who prioritizes position requests across the college, then submits it to the Office of the Provost for approval. Selected LIS faculty position requests and position descriptions during the review period are available [Appendix 5-3].

Previously within ICS and CNS, departmental tenure and promotion review of LIS faculty consisted of an ad hoc review committee of all tenured LIS faculty, in addition to sufficient ICS faculty to constitute a committee of at least five. The ad hoc committee reviewed applications and made recommendations to the full ICS DPC where all eligible faculty may vote. In parallel, the ICS Chair made an independent review and recommendation to the CNS Dean. This is the process by which all current faculty have been evaluated for tenure and promotion.

A core challenge during our time within ICS and CNS was that traditional metrics of faculty research impact within computer and natural sciences did not always align well with the more historical, qualitative and socially engaged research conducted by LIS faculty. While no LIS faculty member who sought tenure or promotion was ever denied it, this necessitated an extra layer of translation and interpretation of the intellectual content of our research. We proactively addressed this prior to the reorganization by getting formal approval in 2021 for LIS-specific tenure, promotion, and contract renewal criteria and procedures, which remain in effect in our current school and college, and are being used as a model as we collaboratively design school-wide criteria and procedures that balance autonomy and collaboration across all SCI programs.
Within SCI and CSS, we are still developing formal criteria and procedures. The working draft of the SCI tenure and promotion policy [Appendix 5-4] invites each unit to create program-specific criteria, and provides a mechanism for each program to have a majority of faculty members evaluating candidates from their program. In addition to the SCI-level review, the SCI Chair does an independent review and recommendation for each candidate to the CSS Dean. The dean’s recommendations are then forwarded to the Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Excellence, who assigns them to the appropriate TPRC for review at the university level. More details about the tenure and promotion process are discussed in Standard III.

Admissions

LIS selects students for admission in alignment with the policies of UH Graduate Division. The Admissions Committee is chaired by Andrew Wertheimer and the admissions process is discussed in detail in IV.3. The Admissions Committee consults with individual faculty members regarding admissions decisions when a prospective student’s experience or professional interests might align well with those of an individual faculty member, or when admissions by exception may be made.

V.2 The program’s faculty, staff, and students have the same opportunities for representation on the institution’s advisory or policy-making bodies as do those of comparable units throughout the institution. Administrative relationships with other academic units enhance the intellectual environment and support interdisciplinary interaction; further, these administrative relationships encourage participation in the life of the parent institution. Decisions regarding funding and resource allocation for the program are made on the same basis as for comparable academic units within the institution.

Campus-wide representation

Despite our small number, LIS faculty are well represented on campus committees and other advisory and policy-making groups. Andrew Wertheimer continues to serve as an elected representative in the Mānoa Faculty Senate on the Committees on Administration and Budget, Student Affairs, and Faculty Service. Vanessa Irvin also served one Faculty Senate term.

LIS also has an institutional identity in several cross-cutting administrative structures. The UH Graduate Division is headed by Interim Graduate Dean Julienne Maeda. Among the core functions of Graduate Division are:

- Development, implementation and assessment of graduate programs;
- Revision and evolution of graduate programs, courses, and curricula;
- Appointment and evaluation of graduate chairs and graduate faculty; and
- Admission and guidance of graduate students from matriculation through graduation, including assistantships and fellowships.

Assessment functions are conducted by Graduate Division via the Graduate Council. Nominated by the Faculty Senate and appointed by the Graduate Dean, members of the Graduate Council serve terms of three years. The council meets monthly and advises the Graduate Dean on matters related to graduate education. The council also reviews existing graduate programs, proposals for new graduate courses and programs, and appointments of graduate faculty. The Graduate Dean chairs the Graduate Council. Two
LIS faculty members, Rich Gazan and Andrew Wertheimer, have served on Graduate Council, giving us a voice and insight into the evaluation and evolution of graduate education across the UH campus.

Rich Gazan chairs the university-level Graduate Faculty Responsibilities Task Force and LIS faculty also served on the university-level Internal Review Committee for the US Established Program to Stimulate Competitive Research grant proposals, as Resident Faculty with the UHM Study Abroad Office and Affiliate Faculty with the Center for Japanese Studies, and on various advisory boards and Tenure and Promotion Review Committees. More details can be found in faculty CVs.

LIS students elect and send a representative to the UH Graduate Student Organization (GSO) Assembly, which evaluates applications for research and conference funding among many other activities, giving them a voice in student affairs across the Mānoa campus.

Interdisciplinary Interactions

During the review period, LIS was a program within the ICS department and is now one of five programs within the new School of Communication and Information, along with Communications, Communicology, Journalism, and the Spark M. Matsunaga Institute for Peace. Both relationships created opportunities for cross-unit interactions, but perhaps the most fruitful and longstanding interdisciplinary relationship is our role as one of four founding units of the Interdisciplinary PhD Program in Communication and Information Sciences (CIS), which was established in 1996 and spans four units and three colleges. Two faculty members active during the review period were hired specifically as “dual-culture” faculty members to teach in LIS, ICS, and the CIS PhD program, and their positions were created precisely to support interdisciplinary interaction across these and other fields.

- Luz Marina Quiroga was a member of the ICS/LIS faculty from 2000 until 2019. She taught and conducted research in information retrieval, database design, personalization, and use of technology by homeless/houseless people. She taught in all three programs and had active collaborations with researchers in Communications and other disciplines beyond LIS. She passed away in 2022 and her work collaborating across disciplines and humanizing information technologies continues to impact those who knew her.
- Rich Gazan was the second ICS/LIS dual-culture hire, appointed in 2007. His research areas include interdisciplinary scientific collaborations, which he carried out in several NASA Astrobiology Institute grants involving diverse units across campus. He served as chair of the Interdisciplinary PhD Program in Communication and Information Sciences for nine semesters, taught in all three programs, and was awarded promotion to Professor in 2017. He currently serves as LIS Program Director.

We also maintain relationships with other academic units through our nine dual degree programs, which provide faculty and students a bridge to the application of LIS principles and practices in diverse domains.

Perhaps not surprisingly, we also have strong relationships and administrative partnerships with the UHM campus libraries. University Librarian Clem Guthro serves on the LIS Advisory Board and our graduates are employed at libraries on the UHM campus and throughout the UH System. LIS students participate in experiential learning assignments and internship arrangements in which they receive firsthand experience performing professional library work in the collections of campus libraries, archives, and collections, and develop relationships with faculty and students from across UHM. Additionally, UH librarians are frequent guest lecturers and adjunct instructors. Meera Garud serves on...
the UH Library Council Information Literacy Committee, which develops instruction programs with library faculty representing UH libraries system-wide.

**Funding and Resource Allocation**

Budget and funding decisions within CSS are made in accordance with the College Focus document that details adjunct lecturer and graduate assistant allocation formulas, operating budget and new faculty costs, and distribution of tuition and research return funds. Within SCI, we collaboratively created a set of governance documents that detail how school-wide resources are equitably shared and distributed. Budget-specific documents can be found on p. 6 of the SCI Policies and Procedures document [Appendix 5-2].

V.3 The administrative head of the program has authority to ensure that students are supported in their academic program of study. In addition to academic qualifications comparable to those required of the faculty, the administrative head has leadership skills, administrative ability, experience, and understanding of developments in the field and in the academic environment needed to fulfill the responsibilities of the position.

The LIS Program Director serves as the executive officer of the program and graduate chair, with equivalent title, salary, status, and authority as others with equivalent responsibilities at the University of Hawai‘i. The UH Graduate Division provides a repository of guidance and information for graduate chairs detailing the responsibilities of the role and the support resources available.

The appointment of the LIS Director is done by vote of the LIS faculty, whose recommendation is sent to the SCI Chair, then to the CSS Dean, who appoints the LIS Program Director within SCI. In parallel, the Graduate Dean appoints the LIS Program Director as LIS Graduate Chair. The LIS Program Director’s salary is in accordance with UH faculty salaries of corresponding rank across the university. The LIS Program Director also receives a pay differential equivalent to one-ninth annual salary.

The current LIS Program Director is Rich Gazan, who was appointed in spring 2015. Noriko Asato served in this role in spring 2016 and fall 2019–spring 2020. The LIS Program Director's responsibilities include:

- Serving as the primary point of contact for the LIS program;
- Representing the LIS program on the national level to ALISE and ALA;
- Producing the ALA Biennial Narrative Report, ALISE Statistical Report, and regular program assessments at the university level;
- Representing LIS on the SCI Council of Program Directors;
- Maintaining regular communication with students and other stakeholders;
- Serving as a member of the CIS PhD Program Executive Board;
- Planning and running monthly LIS faculty meetings, annual strategic planning sessions, and LIS Advisory Board meetings;
- Writing and maintaining LIS policy documents;
- Approving LIS admissions, scholarships, and awards;
- Scheduling LIS courses;
- Coordinating distance education scheduling and support;
- Hiring adjunct LIS instructors; and
- Supervising the LIS Program Coordinator and student help.
While the LIS Program Chair (now Director) position was initially imagined to rotate among senior faculty at intervals of approximately two to four years, in practice we have attempted to share responsibilities among faculty as equitably and supportively as we can. Under ICS and CNS, the LIS Program Chair served as LIS Graduate Chair, program administrative head, and as one of two Associate Chairs of the ICS department, although the latter was a somewhat ceremonial title. Under SCI and CSS, the LIS Program Director serves as one of five coequal directors within the school and represents and advocates for the LIS program at the school, college and university levels, as well as representing LIS to external stakeholders. The LIS Director reports to the SCI Chair, who reports to the CSS Dean. The LIS Program Director is evaluated by faculty and staff at the end of each academic year [Appendix 3-14].

The LIS Program Director is assisted by an Associate Program Director, Andrew Wertheimer (spring 2021–present). During the review period, Noriko Asato (spring 2015–spring 2019), Rich Gazan (fall 2019–spring 2020), and Vanessa Irvin (fall 2020) also served in this role. One of the Associate Program Director’s responsibilities is to coordinate year-end faculty reflections and evaluation of the LIS Program Director at the end of each academic year (beginning in 2020–2021).

Our environment is arguably the most important contribution we make to the student and faculty experience. This isn’t evidenced by a dry recitation of program values or accomplishments discussed throughout this self-study that we imply could only have arisen from our environment, and by extension, from the successful leadership of the LIS Program Director. This is an example of the kind of reflective questioning of professional standards that we value, practice, and instill in our students.

Rich Gazan is the LIS Program Director (previously chair), and has served in that role for seven of the eight years during the review period. Our ability to both create and adapt to the seismic changes that have occurred during the review period—the overhaul of the culminating experience and our reorganization into a new school to name but two—occurred because of our program’s openness to change, and our willingness to embrace uncertainty and take on extra work to make change happen. Individual faculty members are given maximum flexibility to teach courses that support the professional pathways they lead, select service assignments, and balance the demands of teaching, research and service as they think best, while working in close collaboration. Following our assessment philosophy and process, at the end of each academic year the LIS Associate Program Director circulates a survey assessing the Program Director [Appendix 3-14]. Quotes are from the yearly faculty evaluations of the LIS Program Director.

Rich has established working committees for the myriad facets of program management, e.g., recruitment and outreach, curriculum. His laudable leadership style is collaborative rather than supervisory.

More important than our committee structure is our environment of mutual support. People’s professional and personal lives rarely play out exactly how a Program Director might have carefully
planned them years in advance. Here as well, we anticipate and embrace being flexible and compassionate; we regularly change courses we planned to teach to support others going up for tenure and promotion, or who just need a break, so as a group we can continue to support students as well.

Rich is empathetic to the needs of faculty and staff. Junior faculty find him to be a valuable mentor.

Interaction with other academic units

As a faculty, we are well acquainted with working beyond the boundaries of LIS. In addition to our ongoing participation as one of the four founding units within the interdisciplinary CIS PhD Program, the event during the review period that best illustrates our collaborative interaction with other academic units has been our work with four other programs—Communications, Communicology, Journalism, and Spark M. Matsunaga Institute for Peace—to collaboratively design and join CSS.

Rich is doing a remarkable job of juggling multiple responsibilities as LIS transitions from one college to another. He is in constant communication with all parties involved and is striving to resolve issues facing us as we make the move. He is also organizing us to work on re-accreditation requirements and keeps abreast of the campus goals and strategic plans while aligning all of this with national accreditation processes.

Students are encouraged to take courses outside LIS as their professional pathways or individual interests. Among many other reorganization planning activities, we proactively identified areas of potential course alignment and crossover between LIS and the other SCI programs, which helped inform our planning and better justify how the reorganization could broaden the base of professional preparation for our students.

We also maintain nine dual degree agreements with other master’s degree programs and our faculty regularly collaborate with researchers from other departments. Rich Gazan was hired as a dual-culture faculty member in ICS and LIS in 2007, and served as chair of the CIS PhD Program. One of his core research areas is interdisciplinary scientific collaborations.

Socialization into the field

Supporting student participation in professional organizations and conferences, and providing internship and practicum experiences are both foundational to our program. From 2018–2022, 95% of graduating students “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that they felt well prepared to:

- “Identify and connect with professional communities and resources to keep current”; and
- “Engage in reflective professional practice”.

We dedicate program funds to supporting student travel, conference registration, and associated expenses. During the review period we implemented a way for students to identify an extramural experience such as organizing a professional event as an artifact of their learning, demonstrating mastery of one of our program SLOs.
Dr. Gazan has been very proactive in trying to...maximize student support such as scholarships, and has been in dogged contact with the Foundation and Alumni offices to make funds available for students.

Additionally, during the review period, all professional pathways except the General/Custom pathway now require an internship or practicum in a related professional information environment. Internship and practicum courses are taught by full-time faculty as part of their teaching load, in recognition of the time and effort required to build and maintain relationships with the working professionals who serve as internship and practicum supervisors on site. Internships and practica are discussed extensively in Standard II. Hiring LIS professionals to teach courses as adjunct faculty also provides regular avenues for socialization into the field.

Administration and Facilities

V.5 The program’s administrative and other staff support the administrative head and faculty in the performance of their responsibilities. The staff contributes to the fulfillment of the program’s mission, goals, and objectives. Within its institutional framework decision-making processes are determined mutually by the administrative head and the faculty, who regularly evaluate these processes and use the results.

LIS receives dedicated administrative support from one full-time LIS Program Coordinator (Mandi Hull) and a School Secretary (Brandon Zakahi), who is our primary point of contact with SCI and helps us triage and appropriately direct our requests within the CSS. The College operates under a new-to-us shared services model where tech support, human resources, fiscal support, hiring, and course scheduling among other functions are managed centrally. For example, in the first few months since we joined SCI and CSS, we received new staff and instructor workstations, classroom projectors and other instructional technology for our classrooms, which have not been updated in years within our previous department and college. Some LIS faculty members requested and received new computers, which had not been offered in our previous department for seven years.

Similarly, CSS maintains the Social Sciences Research Institute (SSRI) with a staff of eleven who support faculty and student research endeavors, and Hui ‘Āina Pilipili, a CSS Native Hawaiian initiative, which supports students, staff, and faculty toward the overall goal of becoming a Native Hawaiian place of learning.

In contrast, while the ICS department staff (Department Secretary Janice Oda-Ng, Administrative and Fiscal Support Specialist, Wesley Sugimoto, IT Specialist Todd Tomita) supported us consistently and often heroically, the CNS Dean’s Office was chronically understaffed. Repeated requests for common activities such as instructor hiring, purchasing, and policy questions would often go unanswered. Our experience with CSS has been very different. The College has been responsive and supportive in helping us accomplish our objectives. For example, CSS staff worked with us to:

- Successfully request an exemption from the hiring freeze to replace our LIS Program Coordinator, and reclassify the position to a higher step, band and salary; and
Successfully request two full-time faculty positions—one to replace a departing faculty member, and another to restore our School Library Media faculty position to permanent, after it had been downgraded to a temporary position in our previous college.

The LIS Program Coordinator, Mandi Hull, began in August 2022 as a full-time Administrative, Professional and Technical (APT) staff member. As an alumna of the LIS program with four years of professional experience providing support to academic programs, her role goes well beyond administrative support and encompasses outreach, advising current and prospective students, and maintaining relationships with stakeholders across campus, the profession, and the state. She serves on the LIS Outreach Committee, attends staff training workshops, and provides catch-all support for essentially all faculty and student endeavors. Her job responsibilities include:

- Provide support to the LIS program for all administrative matters, including but not limited to office operations;
- Design data collection instruments, oversee data compilation efforts, and analyze data and draft reports for accreditation and assessment;
- Determine compliance with assessment and accreditation requirements, trends, policies and procedures and relay information to faculty and staff;
- Coordinate with program chairs, faculty and staff to establish and meet unit and program goals for continuous improvement;
- Create and maintain databases and print archives of LIS program data;
- Develop and maintain relationships with internal and external stakeholders;
- Advise current and prospective students using professional independent judgment;
- Serve as liaison with alumni and professional organizations for development and continuing professional education;
- Process hiring of adjunct instructors and faculty;
- Coordinate oral examinations, internships and practica;
- Coordinate student recruitment, admissions, and enrollment;
- Schedule courses and program events;
- Maintain office presence and serves as the initial public contact for the LIS program; and
- Supervise student assistants.

We also wish to acknowledge the work of Cheri Ebisu and Christian Delay, our previous LIS Program Coordinators during the review period. All staff are evaluated by their direct supervisor along performance dimensions such as problem-solving and decision-making, planning, organizing and implementing tasks or projects, dependability, communication skills and interpersonal relations. Supervisors may nominate staff for a performance award if their rating is “exceptional” across all evaluation categories, and both of our previous program coordinators received these awards.

In 2018, the graduating student survey was updated to include a question about the helpfulness of the LIS staff. Across the four years of graduates, overall 98% “Agreed” or “Strongly Agreed” that “the LIS staff was helpful” [Appendix 2-4].

CSS and SCI staff with whom we have interacted thus far include:

- Hanalei Abbott, Grant Development Specialist;
- Kamakanaokealoha Aquino, Native Hawaiian Initiative Coordinator;
- Laura Armer, Director of Digital Learning Initiatives;
- Jose Barzola, Educational Specialist;
- Dean Gushiken, HR Specialist;
Shared governance

Because our governance model is collaborative, LIS faculty and staff work together on nearly every decision, primarily during regular faculty meetings. While we sometimes work within a more formal committee structure, committees often activate and hibernate as conditions warrant. For example, after a multi-year overhaul of our course list, degree requirements, and culminating experience, the LIS Curriculum Committee has not needed to meet to pursue subsequent large-scale initiatives. Decision making begins with the work of individual faculty, or standing and ad hoc committees, who craft and present proposals and recommendations for action to the full faculty. As a small program, we feel we are most effective when governance is somewhat decentralized, so all faculty and staff can contribute. LIS policies (available on-site) and SCI governance documents provide a flexible structure for our practice.

For each initiative connected to our Strategic Plan, chairs or leads coordinate work of standing or ad hoc committees, which include students and other stakeholders. Leads are responsible for documenting goals and milestones at the beginning of each academic year, reporting progress to full faculty throughout the year, and assessing progress and outcomes at the end of each year. These assessments are discussed at yearly strategic planning sessions and used as input for the next charge or iteration of each committee’s work. This process is described in I.1.

Admissions Committee (Chair: Andrew Wertheimer)

The Admissions Committee coordinates all aspects of student admissions and new student orientation. Each semester, the work of the Admissions Committee begins upon initial receipt of an inquiry from a prospective student and ends when all incoming students are assigned to a faculty advisor and enrolled in their courses. The LIS Program Coordinator fields, responds to and tracks inquiries from prospective students, and works with the Admissions Committee to support the needs of incoming students and transition them successfully into the program.

Assessment Committee/Working Committee on Accreditation (Chair: Rich Gazan)

The Working Committee on Accreditation includes all full-time faculty members, supported by administrative staff and student workers. The Working Committee is established roughly two years prior
to each ALA accreditation cycle and analyzes and distills program data and documentation to create a formal self-study, demonstrating how the LIS program meets ALA accreditation standards. The Working Committee on Accreditation hibernates after each accreditation cycle is complete; its work is continued by the ongoing processes of data gathering, analysis and evaluation of the Assessment Committee.

**Curriculum Committee (Chair: Noriko Asato)**

The primary charge of the Curriculum Committee is to assess the LIS curriculum for achievement of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and to evolve the SLOs. The CC also researches, recommends, and implements changes to the LIS curriculum, and proposes courses and other educational experiences inside and outside of LIS to meet curricular objectives.

**Outreach Committee (Chair: Meera Garud)**

The Outreach Committee works closely with the LIS Program Coordinator to recruit new students, cultivate and maintain relationships with external stakeholders such as alumni and professional organizations, create professional development activities, maintain the LIS social media presence and other communications, and coordinate LIS events.

**Scholarship Committee (Chair: Meera Garud)**

The Scholarship Committee advertises and informs LIS students about available scholarships. It works closely with faculty and UH Foundation to administer and award program scholarships. It also maintains a resource page about other university, state, and national scholarships.

**Research Committee (Chair: Violet Harada)**

The Research Committee is charged with creating and maintaining a thriving research environment for LIS faculty and students, primarily via research talks and colloquia, and increasing awareness of and access to research tools and facilities.

V.6 The parent institution provides continuing financial support for development, maintenance, and enhancement of library and information studies education in accordance with the general principles set forth in these Standards. The level of support provides a reasonable expectation of financial viability and is related to the number of faculty, administrative and support staff, instructional resources, and facilities needed to carry out the program’s teaching, research, and service.

The University of Hawai‘i receives approximately 50% of its budget from state government appropriations, roughly 30% from tuition, and the remainder from a combination of federal, external and special funds. The UH Mānoa Office of Business and Finance maintains a budget page with publicly accessible reports.

In our previous administrative structure, LIS was funded with a subset of the budget of the ICS department, which received a subset of the budget of the CNS. During this period, despite a very challenging economic environment, we were able to hire two faculty members and one staff member. However, as a unit within ICS, requests to replace LIS faculty and staff often traded against the ability to request and replace a corresponding ICS position. While neither ICS nor LIS would claim to have been
fully staffed or resourced during this period, we received sufficient support to maintain a high standard of LIS education, relying on the shared commitment of students, staff, and faculty.

At the time of our previous 2015 accreditation, LIS had seven faculty FTE, including one part-time instructor with a teaching load equivalent to a full-time faculty member and two ICS/LIS crossover faculty counted at one-half FTE each. After three retirements, a contract non-renewal, two new hires, two faculty members departing for other institutions, and one crossover faculty member moving full-time to LIS, we currently have four full-time faculty members, with a search for a fifth successfully completed. We are very happy to report that Assistant Professor Keahiahi Long will be joining the LIS faculty in fall 2023, in the area of Hawaiian Librarianship. Additionally, we also successfully advocated for our Instructor position to be restored to permanent from a rolling contract, and that Meera Garud will be continuing her excellent leadership of the School Library Media pathway in this new role in fall 2023.

We note that of the six tenure-track faculty position requests within SCI in 2022–23, only the LIS faculty position in Hawaiian Librarianship was approved for recruitment. As discussed previously, our 2022 reorganization into the SCI in the CSS resulted in an MOU signed by the provost assuring that any faculty positions lost during the reorganization period would be restored [Appendix 5-1, pp. 2-6]. The Assistant Professor position in Information Technology for Social Good that we requested for the 2023-24 academic year was ranked in the top tier of priority requests, and would have returned us to the same six full-time faculty members we had prior to the reorganization, and would be sufficient to maintain our ratio of roughly 9 students per full-time faculty member.

Similarly, due to budget constraints in CNS, the LIS Program Coordinator position was downgraded to an APT Band A staff position without a corresponding reduction in responsibilities, which was a factor in the incumbent leaving the position. In contrast, the CSS helped us navigate a request for an exception to the 2022 UH-wide hiring freeze to replace the program coordinator, and also to have the position restored to a higher Band B, which carries more salary, responsibility and independent judgment [Appendix 5-5 and Appendix 5-6].

As mentioned previously, Table 5-2 details LIS expenditures from ALISE data reported during the review period. CSS makes budgetary decisions in accordance with the College Focus document and SCI recently created a governance document that details how school-wide resources are equitably shared and distributed [Appendix 5-2].

CSS provides responsive technical support, instructional resources, and infrastructure to LIS, which are supplemented by those at the university level. For the majority of our 57 years, UHM has provided us with a comfortable, updated space on the ground floor of Hamilton Library, which is an essential component of our environment. In addition to faculty offices, our space contains research labs, student organization offices, administrative offices, and common areas. All of these dimensions of support from the parent institution have been sufficient to carry out our teaching, research, and service.
While the cost of living in Hawai‘i can be as breathtaking as the natural beauty that surrounds us, salary ranges for UH faculty at all ranks are competitive, and equitably established via the University of Hawai‘i Professional Assembly (UHPA) faculty union. Requests for above-threshold starting salary are considered at the discretion of the dean and have been granted to new LIS faculty. During the review period, faculty salaries university-wide increased modestly (2–5%) most years, per the 2015–2017, 2017–2021, and current 2021–2025 faculty contracts. New faculty members receive a standard benefits package, moving allowance, course release, start-up funds for research support, and priority access to subsidized faculty housing.

The budget discussions connected to the reorganization brought into focus some of the faculty salary inequities between colleges and departments. As longtime members of the ICS department within CNS, LIS faculty salaries are higher than those at the same rank—in some cases, higher than those at higher ranks—who were hired in other colleges.

Staff salary schedules are flexible enough to allow those with sufficient education, experience or job responsibilities to receive a higher salary band or step classification, and additional financial awards are available for exceptional performance. As mentioned in the previous section, the LIS Program Coordinator position was reclassified to a higher band and salary step, in response to previous coordinators leaving in part because they found the salary insufficient given the responsibilities of the position and the cost of living in Hawai‘i. We view this as a positive example of UHM’s responsiveness and support for the LIS program, and commitment to equitable staff pay.

Conversely, as discussed in III.3, when one LIS faculty member received an offer from another institution, multiple levels of UH administration including our previous and current colleges had the opportunity to make a retention offer, but did not. Among the reasons given for this inaction was that matching the external offer would result in “significant inequalities” in the existing faculty salary structure, even though LIS faculty were aware of the amount of the salary difference and unanimously supported making a retention offer. Faculty salaries are public information at UH, and the complete list of SCI faculty salaries is available in the corresponding reorganization MOU [Appendix 5-1, pp. 4-6]. Matching the offer would have made this Assistant Professor the highest paid faculty member in the SCI, at any rank. While this may be an isolated instance, and of course many other factors are at work in any decision to accept a job offer, in this case faculty compensation was not sufficient to retain a valuable faculty member.

Overall, however, staff and faculty compensation are sufficient to attract, support, and retain personnel needed to attain program goals and objectives.
V.8 Institutional funds for research projects, professional development, travel, and leaves with pay are available on the same basis as in comparable units of the institution. Student financial aid from the parent institution is available on the same basis as in comparable units of the institution.

LIS faculty and students have a number of avenues by which to apply for institutional funding, which are the same as in comparable academic units. Faculty can access research travel support and limited grant submission opportunities via the Office of the Vice Provost for Research and Scholarship. Faculty can also apply for competitive research funds via the Provost’s Strategic Investment Initiative.

In the CSS, the SSRI offers research support (up to $27,000) and travel awards, as well as other opportunities, on a project-by-project basis. For example, the CSS sponsors the Daniel K. Inouye Fellows Program, which offers faculty and students $5,000 to conduct research using the late senator’s archives. The LIS Program Director’s Association for Library and Information Science Education conference travel and registration is reimbursed by CSS, just as it was in our previous college. Additional funds for research and professional development are available at the college level at the discretion of the dean.

Tenured faculty are also eligible for paid sabbatical leave every seven years, as well as other forms of leave in accordance with the UHPA faculty contract. Students can apply for research funding and conference travel support through the GSO.

Program-specific financial aid, as well as financial aid resources from UH Graduate Division, is equitable with other units and discussed in more detail in Standard IV.

V.9 The program has access to physical and technological resources that allow it to accomplish its objectives in the areas of teaching, research, and service. The program provides support services for teaching and learning regardless of instructional delivery modality.

Our physical, technological, and support infrastructures are sufficient to allow us to meet our objectives. We detail our physical spaces in V.10 and technological infrastructure in V.11, so we focus here on the support services we provide as a program.

During the first half of the review period, we were primarily a face-to-face program. We accommodated neighbor island students via Hālāwai (a local implementation of Adobe Connect) for selected courses, and our teaching assistant (not an LIS student) sat in on each of the remote-enabled class sessions and served as a conduit between the remote students and the in-class environment. We also conducted some early experiments with Zoom course delivery prior to the pandemic. In these cases, the tech support team from the ICS department supplied our classrooms with high-resolution video cameras, microphones, and software, along with troubleshooting and support as needed. While some workshops and resources were available at the campus level to design and deliver online learning, the LIS Program Coordinators, course instructors, and students had to take on the responsibility of delivering a reliable and engaging remote learning experience. Due to these resource limitations, we restricted Hālāwai and Zoom coursework to neighbor island students, usually between five and ten individuals in any given semester. Students on Oʻahu were required to attend sessions in person and we were unable to offer distance education to mainland or international students who might have wished to attend our program.
In fall 2018, we began offering LIS students who were not enrolled in a given course the opportunity to serve as paid Zoom student assistants to support instructors who requested help. The students were responsible for: connecting equipment and light troubleshooting; working with instructors and students to help them use technologies effectively; coordinating breakout sessions and online interactions; relaying chats; providing general support for students; and creating a harmonious environment for students in all locations, as well as the instructor.

Students also provide support for each other. For example, the ALAsc runs study group sessions each semester. They review course syllabi and plan study sessions before the due dates of major assignments, creating an opportunity to bring new and continuing students together.

We also offer students dedicated technology support sessions to work collaboratively on the content and design of their ePortfolio platforms—these take place in the entering/exiting seminar sequence and occasional “Lunch and Learn” workshops. Prior to the reorganization, teaching assistants from the ICS department supported most of these tech sessions. These sessions were valuable although, occasionally, the broad gulf between ICS and LIS students’ technological background proved challenging. Since the reorganization, we built a more community-oriented, studio-based approach, where students explore and comment on each other’s works in progress and learn together.

Our classroom technologies were upgraded in 2022 after we joined CSS. Each classroom now has a new instructor station, Owl Labs integrated 360-degree camera, speaker, microphone, and microphone extension. At the campus level, Zoom Pro accounts are available and over 70 Zoom-blended “Here or There” (HOT) classrooms were created and are supported by the Center for Instructional Support. They provide technologies, orientation sessions, and teaching strategies for these blended learning environments.

UH Information Technology Services maintains a list of site licenses available for office, reference management, statistical analysis, and a range of other educational software packages. LIS also maintains subscriptions to software needed for professional courses, such as Classification Web, OCLC Connexion, RDA Toolkit, and Slack Pro.

V.10 Physical facilities provide a functional learning environment for students and faculty; enhance the opportunities for research, teaching, service, consultation, and communication; and promote efficient and effective administration of the program.

Physical facilities on the Mānoa campus are centrally managed and controlled by the UH Planning Office, following principles and plans summarized in the Mānoa Campus: Framework for the Future documents. While the ground floor of Hamilton Library has been home to LIS for over half a century, occupying a space does not mean that a unit controls it.

The LIS program encompasses two spacious yet cozy wings on the ground floor of Hamilton Library, the main library on the Mānoa campus [Appendix 5-7]. Turn left from the entry hall into the 002 wing and you enter the main LIS office, containing the LIS Program Coordinator’s workspace, a couch and chairs to welcome students and guests, adjacent Director’s office, mail/copier room, and two storage rooms.
Further down the hall in the 002 wing are two faculty offices, each with views out to the verdant McCarthy Mall. Furthest from the entry hall in the 002 wing, and accessible via a separate entrance, are three faculty offices, an administrative office, research lab, combination conference and storage room, and medium-sized classroom. From fall 2022 through fall 2025, we will temporarily welcome a small team of student advisors into these seven LIS program spaces as they await the completion of a $53M remodeling of Sinclair Library into the Sinclair Student Success Center. We worked directly with the student advising team as well as the campus space planning committee and Provost to come up with a solution that would be minimally disruptive to both of our units (Appendix 5-8). When we were displaced from Hamilton Library after the 2004 flood, we remember how the campus came together to find us a temporary home, and we are happy to have the opportunity to pay that forward. We are also using this as an opportunity to rethink and redesign these seven spaces in consultation with student, alumni, and employer stakeholders when they are returned to us.

Turn right from the entry hall and you enter the LIS Commons, the centerpiece of the LIS space. It includes a PhD student lounge (003A), lockers for student use, study alcove, dining area (003J), lecture and seminar classrooms, five faculty offices (one of which was a research lab), and a student organization room, all surrounding a central common area with moveable tables and seating, cataloging collection, laptop counter, charging station, Mac and PC computers, take-one-leave-one library, alumni donation library, and a corner chair-and-loveseat reading nook.

**Instruction and Research Facilities**

- The lecture classroom (003F) seats 32 at tables, and has an instructor workstation, overhead projector, automatic screen, whiteboards, computer, and a webcam.
- The seminar classroom (003G) has moveable tables with 14 chairs, an instructor workstation, projector, webcam, screen, and whiteboards.
- The study alcove in the 003 wing had been a small computer lab and printing station, but as these were underused, we are in the process of rethinking the space.

**Commons**

The LIS commons is the center of our community. While the commons nominally provides study and meeting areas for students, faculty and staff, it contributes significantly to our convivial atmosphere and learning environment. A half-dozen vertical windows look out onto the monkeypod trees that shade people moving through McCarthy Mall, the main campus walkway.

The space offers four round tables, three large rectangular tables, and 28 chairs. There is a laptop counter with four barstools and two dedicated large screen computer tables with sufficient space for several students to collaborate around each machine. In addition, there are two informal seating areas, each with a couch, table, and one or more chairs. The cataloging collection holds multiple volumes of Library of Congress and Dewey schedules. Book trucks are
available to move volumes to and from classrooms as needed. Bookshelves hold reference works and course materials such as textbooks, in-press articles, and special journal issues for individual courses.

Student organizations have a workroom where they can store materials for their programming, outreach, and fundraising efforts. Student lockers, which are managed by the Hui Dui student organization, are conveniently located in the hallway to the commons. Bulletin boards with news, job announcements, and information about student and professional organizations are located in several places in the study area. A board with photos of new students and program events is nearby.

The LIS program is part of the CIS PhD program, and we host an office and study area for CIS PhD students in the hallway leading to our commons area, with a large table and chairs, a couch, whiteboard, bookcase, and a mini-refrigerator.

The dining area looks onto the commons through glass walls and includes a kitchen with a refrigerator, sink, cabinets, microwave, coffee maker, and water heater. Thirty-two people can sit at eight round tables. A long table is used to serve drinks and food for events. Snacks and drinks can be purchased from a self-serve snack bar, which is stocked and maintained by student volunteers from Hui Dui.

**Administrative offices**

The LIS administrative offices are grouped together, adjacent to the LIS Program Director’s office for efficient communication. The main administrative space has three desks, tables, 19 filing cabinets, a couch and chairs for welcoming guests and informal talks, credenza, several storage cabinets, three telephones, a fax machine, two computers, a large printer, and a photocopier. There are two storage/filing rooms and a combination copier/printer/mailroom.

---

**V.11 Instructional and research facilities and services for meeting the needs of students and faculty include access to information resources and services, computer and other information technologies, accommodations for independent study, and media production facilities.**

Instructional and research facilities for the LIS program are provided by UHM, CSS, and Hamilton Library. Throughout this self-study we have made reference to “our” space on the Hamilton Library ground floor and while instructional and research facilities have been primarily within the LIS area, we occasionally teach in facilities across campus, e.g., the [Sakamaki Innovation Zone](#). A network of resources and services provided by the LIS program, CSS, Hamilton Library, and campus-level units enables access to spaces and technologies essential to student and faculty success.

Two spaces in the LIS area were used as research labs by LIS and CIS faculty to support junior faculty members who have received external grants, and to house graduate assistants and equipment. The doors to each wing of the LIS space are code-locked for security. Students have access to the facilities during regular [Hamilton Library hours](#) but faculty and staff enjoy 24/7 access to the library. With the exception of computers purchased by faculty on grants, computer equipment and software are purchased with the assistance and
advice of the CSS information technology staff, who also provide ongoing technical support. Support tickets are submitted via a Kuali Web form.

With the reorganization to the CSS, our computing environment has changed significantly and, so far, seamlessly. Within ICS and CNS, instructional and staff computers ran Windows exclusively, and our network was monitored, maintained, updated, and secured by ICS staff via a dedicated server in the LIS space. We now have Mac computers in every classroom and can provide access to both Windows and Mac environments. Wired internet access is provided by a local area network via Hamilton Library, although most students connect through the UHM wireless network. An iMac and PC in the common area were updated in 2022 and 2023, and are for student use. One floor above the LIS space, the Computer Learning Instruction Center labs in Hamilton Library offer additional workstations and loanable technologies.

To accommodate independent study, Hamilton Library’s public spaces were renovated prior to the pandemic and now offer a wide range of public and private study spaces for groups and individuals, as well as two presentation practice rooms.

At the campus level, LIS benefits from facilities, services, and infrastructure provided by several entities.

- **Information Technology Services** (ITS) supports the courseware environment (currently Laulima, but a replacement is being sought), Course Evaluation System, and overall network connectivity and security. ITS also offers video production services, livestreaming, pre-production support, and an audio/video recording room. A complete list of ITS services is available on their site.
- The **Center for Instructional Support** within ITS supports instruction through technology-enhanced classrooms, technology, and media equipment lending and troubleshooting. For example, the center recently began offering Bring Your Own Device (BYOD) Rooms, designed to allow students and faculty to more easily share screens from their own devices in a classroom environment. Other services include consultation, scanning services for standardized tests, and media conversion.
- Within the **Office of Faculty Development and Academic Support**, the **Center for Teaching Excellence** focuses on creating successful teaching and learning environments. Areas of support include teaching assessment services (small group instructional diagnosis; assessment; classroom observation) and teaching enhancement seminars and services, including training and orientation for teaching assistants, publications, and faculty research showcases. The **Faculty Mentoring Program** focuses on professional development related to successful renewal, promotion, and tenure for UHM faculty. Their facilities and resources include an extensive tenure dossier library and a series of events where UHM faculty members share their experiences on distance education and the use of teaching technologies.

V.12 The staff and the services provided for the program by libraries, media centers, and information technology units, as well as all other support facilities, are appropriate for the level of use required and specialized to the extent needed. These services are delivered by knowledgeable staff, convenient, accessible to people with disabilities, and are available when needed.

Per the July 2022 UHM library organization chart, the library has a staff of over 105 full-time equivalent (FTE) faculty, professional, and support staff positions, including 43 tenure-track librarians and archivists, 26 library technicians, nine library assistants, and other education, technology and
administrative staff. Technology and fiscal units report directly to University Librarian Clem Guthro, as do units in Public Services and Collection Services. Its functional statement reflects both the core functions of an R1 academic library as well as the cultural and environmental uniqueness of Hawai‘i.

The Library is an active participant in the teaching, research, and service missions of the University. Its resources and services are designed to nourish and enhance all University programs, particularly those programs which take advantage of Hawai‘i’s unique location, physical and biological environment and rich cultural setting. In fulfilling this mission, the Library selects, acquires, organizes, preserves, and provides intellectual and physical access to collections in a wide range of formats. The Library fosters the sharing of its resources among all UH system campus libraries.

UH librarians—many of whom are our graduates—serve varied roles in the LIS program. Most semesters, one to three library faculty teach as adjuncts in their areas of expertise, and visit other courses for guest talks. They also employ students as reference and circulation assistants, and supervise for-credit internship experiences. The University Librarian is a member of the LIS program’s Advisory Board and participates in LIS program strategic planning and other events.

The University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa library contains over 3.2 million volumes as well as archives and manuscripts, maps, rare books, audiovisual items, art, and millions of digital resources. The library has world-class collections related to Hawai‘i, Oceania, and the Pacific Islands, as well as China, Japan, Korea, Okinawa, the Philippines, Russia, South Asia, and Southeast Asia.

Collections are primarily housed in Hamilton Library. With a total of 304,265 square feet of space, it houses the research collections in the humanities, social sciences, science, technology; depository for US Government documents; area focus collections for Asia, Hawai‘i, and the Pacific; and archives, manuscripts, and other special collections. The 95,000 square foot Sinclair Library formerly housed the UHM music and audiovisual collections along with presentation and study spaces, but in 2019 their holdings were merged with those of Hamilton Library in preparation for the construction of the renovated Sinclair Student Success Center. A complete list of UHM library services and locations is available, and include:

- John A. Burns School of Medicine Health Sciences Library;
- Institute for Astronomy Library;
- William S. Richardson School of Law Library; and
- Travel Industry Management Sunset Reference Center, Shidler College of Business.

While LIS students and faculty work closely with most UH librarians, one liaison librarian, David Brier, is directly responsible for LIS materials in Hamilton Library and support for teaching resources, course reserves. He works with students and faculty to select materials related to LIS, and connect students and faculty with the range of services and resources offered by the UHM Library. As department head of the Business, Humanities and Social Sciences Division, he also connects LIS students with opportunities to work at the Hamilton reference desk, conducts library orientations and tours at NSO, and actively seeks out opportunities to provide textbooks and other course readings via the library’s holding. We also wish to acknowledge Science and Technology Librarian Jonathan Young, who had been our liaison throughout most of the review period when we were a unit within CNS.
In addition to the 500+ online databases and digital collections available via UHM, our students also have access to databases offered by the Hawai‘i State Public Library System (HSPLS) online resources. Students—especially those new to Hawai‘i—are encouraged to acquire HSPLS library cards to gain access to these information resources and interact with public library services, collections, and spaces here.

As a program, we also maintain subscriptions to professional online resources to meet our instructional needs, including OCLC Connexion, Library of Congress Classification Web, and RDA Toolkit. Students in courses that cover design and creation of systems used in libraries and archives have access to commercial, open source, or free software such as Omeka. We also arranged with SpringShare to provide students and faculty with free access to the LibGuide platform, and integrate LibGuides into course assignments in the program, e.g., in LIS 601 Introduction to Reference and Information Services and LIS 641 Digital Librarianship. Students can also choose SpringShare LibGuides as the platform for their ePortfolio, although most choose Weebly or Wordpress.

At the university level, the KOKUA Program provides services to students with various disabilities, including serving as confidential faculty liaison, note-taking services, exam accommodations, transportation, furniture placement, classroom relocation, American Sign Language interpretation, real time captioning services, assistive technology, bookstore services, library assistance, campus advocacy, physical assistance, mobility assistance, and making accommodations for service or assistance animals. Information about broader resources for faculty, staff, and students is available on the UHM library website. Additionally, the mission of the Center on Disability Studies is to promote diverse abilities across the lifespan through interdisciplinary training, research, and service, and the Counseling and Student Development Center offers mental health and wellness resources. LIS has benefited from the training and resources provided by all of these groups.

Program Planning

V.13 The program’s systematic planning and evaluation process includes review of its administrative policies, fiscal and support policies, and resource requirements. The program regularly reviews the adequacy of access to physical resources and facilities for the delivery of face-to-face instruction and access to the technologies and support services for the delivery of online education. Within applicable institutional policies, faculty, staff, students, and others are involved in the evaluation process.

Our culture of systematic-yet-flexible planning and evaluation takes place through yearly strategic planning sessions, monthly faculty meetings, regular meetings of program committees, and informal discussions, and involves faculty, students, alumni, and other stakeholders throughout the LIS community. Some examples of the administrative, fiscal, and support policies we reviewed via these mechanisms during this period include the following.

• We inventoried and prioritized the administrative duties of the LIS Program Director, Associate Director, and Program Coordinator. This helped us identify a registration bottleneck that required excessive staff time each semester so we changed our administrative policy to allow staff to intervene in course registration only as needed, instead of as a requirement before students can register for courses.
• We streamlined support for faculty teaching-related expenses by preapproving reimbursements for up to $100 each year from the LIS program Enrichment Fund, with additional support above
that threshold available by request.

- We increased the amount and types of awards made to students from the Ralph Shaw Fund, to incentivize conference presentation and participation, and neighbor island student travel to the UHM campus to create opportunities for personal engagement.
- We revised our LIS space and classroom use policy after LIS students told us in a reorganization Town Hall that they wanted more opportunities to interact with students from SCI units, as well as to maintain clear communication with the student advising team, who will be sharing our space. A spring 2023 Journalism course was held in LIS and two meetings of the full SCI faculty were held here.
- We evaluated instructor and student satisfaction with online instruction via student surveys and informal discussion, and made corresponding policy changes to in-person course requirements and support technology requests.

Facilities are primarily evaluated through graduating student surveys and course evaluations conducted each semester. Throughout the review period, 90% or more of respondents found our physical facilities accessible and effective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The physical space(s) provided an effective learning environment:</th>
<th>Percent Agree or Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY2018 and AY2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They met my learning needs</td>
<td>95% out of 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They allowed me to collaborate and socialize</td>
<td>93% out of 40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The physical facilities of the LIS program provided maximum access in the following areas:</th>
<th>Percent Agree or Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY2016 and AY2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom facilities and equipment</td>
<td>90% out of 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity and availability of library resources</td>
<td>92% out of 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity and availability of computer resources</td>
<td>90% out of 48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We also assessed student perceptions of course delivery formats before and during the pandemic. We examined selected items from the course evaluations in spring and fall 2019 (before) and spring and fall 2021 (during). The following tables are organized by the different course formats and capture average scores from the evaluations before and during the pandemic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>During</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid Here-or-There</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Person</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Synchronous</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Asynchronous</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Courses</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5-5: Average Course Evaluation Scores Before and During COVID-19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Evaluation Question</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>During</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I gained a good understanding of concepts/principles in this field.</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid Here-or-There</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Person</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Synchronous</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Asynchronous</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor was able to explain concepts clearly and effectively.</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid Here-or-There</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Person</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Synchronous</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Asynchronous</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor was well organized and prepared for each session.</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid Here-or-There</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Person</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Synchronous</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Asynchronous</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Average</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Throughout the course evaluation questions, in-person courses before COVID received higher scores (between 4.87–4.90) than those of online synchronous (4.57–4.75) or online asynchronous (3.91–4.02) during COVID. Those results suggest, unsurprisingly, that students rated traditional face-to-face instruction more highly than online course delivery during a pandemic. However, students’ open-ended comments identified some positive aspects of online learning that we as instructors can learn from. For example, building in more flexibility for remote and asynchronous sessions, creating well organized schedules in Laulima, Slack, and Canvas that consist of clear directions; well sequenced modules; and opportunities to receive online peer feedback and critiques. Students reported that consistent avenues of communication with the instructors were critical. They commended teachers who “had communication open 24/7.” One student noted, “I didn’t have to wait to ask questions, my instructor responded to emails almost immediately.”

As expected, the negative aspects mentioned related to a feeling of distance from other students, “I was not able to see and hear everyone as some students did not wish to show their faces and were not consistently participating,” and “Negatives are simply Zoom fatigue in general not necessarily related to this course.”

Online synchronous courses taught via Zoom allowed more interactions between students and instructors, which might have contributed to their higher ratings than those for online asynchronous courses. We also discussed some ways in which course delivery modes were changed to adapt to student needs during the pandemic, as evidenced by faculty teaching reflections during the pandemic [Appendix 5-9]. In CSS, we now have access to more training in online course design, and more support to integrate student feedback for effective online instruction. With this experience and support.
infrastructure, we can better explore the extent to which we can support and embrace more diverse course modalities.

While we learn the administrative structures and processes within our new college, issues identified by students, staff, faculty, and/or other members of the LIS community are discussed and prioritized in yearly planning meetings and regular faculty meetings, compiled by the LIS Program Director, then shared with SCI and CSS staff and administrators for action.

V.14 The program has explicit, documented evidence of its ongoing decision-making processes and the data to substantiate the evaluation of administration, finances, and resources.

As discussed throughout this self-study, particularly in Standard I and appendices, we maintain a repository of meeting agendas, notes, and supplemental materials documenting our decision-making processes. We collect and analyze the data to determine our stakeholders’ engagement with these processes. The data we analyze that arise from these processes include notes and outcomes from yearly strategic planning meetings, monthly faculty meetings, advisory board meetings, town halls, stakeholder surveys, student support and financial aid, budget expenditures. There are also the less tangible data that arise from our relationships and informal communications with our students, the professional community, and each other.

Reflecting on and reviewing evidence of our own decision-making practices over the review period rarely yields a story of a smooth, linear process from goal to achievement. Internally, we are reflective, collaborative, and iterative. We re-evaluate policies as new information is discovered, and as the administrative consequences of initial decisions play out. For example, our shift to an ePortfolio culminating experience began with such strict guidelines for eligible artifacts that if one course couldn’t be offered as scheduled, students, and advisors were structurally forced to submit exception petitions, which created a significant administrative burden. After asking ourselves whether students were benefiting from these policies, we found that being overly restrictive with ePortfolio artifact requirements not only created administrative obstacles, but constrained student creativity and reflection in choosing the best evidence of their own learning, which is essential to our program culture. This is an example of how program decision-making in one area tends to impact others and cross boundaries of individual committees and accreditation standards. These situations demonstrate the strength of our collaborative approach.

Externally, we are responsive to changing conditions but we also advocate creating opportunities, as evidenced by our role in not just reorganizing, but actively helping create the new school we joined. While larger-scale budget decisions are made centrally, our historical budgeting model supplemented by college and school policies help us identify sources of and pathways to additional program funding. In the new school, we feel we are within a more stable framework to enable longer term planning.
The program demonstrates how the results of the evaluation of administration, finances, and resources are systematically used to improve the program and to plan for the future.

We are certainly not alone in our experience that within a culture of assessment, establishing practices is relatively easy, but actually translating the results of assessment into action and change is more difficult. It is interesting to note that assessment efforts at the level of the university and Graduate Division tend to focus on students, curriculum and faculty—not on administration, finances, and resources that this Standard element requests—which may contain some subtext about the relative power programs have to effect change in these areas. Still, within the LIS program and even outside it, throughout this self-study we have referred to evidence of how our assessment practices have resulted in improvements, and a more stable foundation for the future.

The evaluation of the LIS Program Director led to an enumeration of the responsibilities that had accreted to the position, and greater support from all faculty in sharing responsibility for more of these duties. This process also informed the position description of the chair of the new school, which specifies that the same individual cannot serve simultaneously as both Program Director and SCI Chair, as the combined duties would be unmanageable [Appendix 5-2].

The evaluation of the LIS Program Coordinator led to changes in the position description that allowed us to upgrade the position classification and attract an excellent candidate at a salary appropriate to the demands of the position [Appendix 5-5]. The evaluation of our program budget, specifically how our tuition account was being spent down by our former unit, led us to advocate for and receive carryover funds from our previous dean that traveled with us to our new college. This allowed us to negotiate for a clearer and larger share of tuition and RTRF than we had in our previous administrative home (V.1).

The evaluation of our physical space needs and how connected our space is to our program practice led us to successfully advocate for and reverse a campus decision that would have temporarily displaced us from our common area. Finally, the evaluation of our technology needs led us to work quickly with CSS technology staff to update our classroom, administration and faculty computers, and upgrade our facilities to better support our increasingly hybrid learning environment.

**Summary Reflection**

During the review period, we successfully advocated for and helped create a new entity, the School of Communication and Information, that is a more natural and hospitable fit for our program’s socially-engaged mission, and after 25 years in the ICS within the CNS, is now our new administrative home. Our technology infrastructure is up to date, our governance documents emphasize program autonomy within a collaborative structure, and we are extremely fortunate to have our comfortable space on the ground floor of Hamilton Library, even as we are temporarily sharing it with a student advising team as their new space is constructed. Looking forward, faculty members are actively participating in the governance of the new School, creating opportunities for staff career growth, and engaging students in the question of how to redesign our social and learning spaces once they are returned to us.

Our experience during the review period has shown us that while our advocacy for the LIS program has been effective in supporting our administrative goals, larger-scale conditions make everything more tentative. The university’s move to more online teaching and working modes has created questions about space allocation campus-wide. As we’ve tried to emphasize throughout this self-study, success
here does not result from a single-minded focus on advocating for one program’s needs at the expense of others—it comes from creating and maintaining relationships and supporting the changing needs and responsibilities of our students, staff, and faculty so they can educate and become the information professionals that our communities need. In an environment of limited resources, we need to be mindful of balancing the concerns of the LIS program with those of our new colleagues in SCI and CSS. Finding out what that balance is, and how best to achieve it, will be the administrative focus of our next decade.
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As we conclude this self-study in the spring of 2023, the news cycle is peppered with reports of generative AI systems such as ChatGPT being openly or silently integrated into the services and applications that have become part of the social information infrastructure. After approximately 180 pages of reflective self-study, this second sentence of the synthesis and overview section would be the ideal place for the shocking revelation that what you have been reading was generated by an AI system.

It was not.

As a program we value reflection and connection, and every word of this self-study has been hand-crafted, reviewed by actual people, and represents us, not our projection of what we believe ALA expects a generic accredited LIS program to be. It occurs to us that a present or very-near-future generative AI system may ingest previous self-studies and excrete a simulacrum of assessment and reflection that is algorithmically responsive to whatever ALA Accreditation Standards are then in force. Additionally, a different AI system might analyze the output to determine compliance.

A world where stories, images, and music can be custom-generated from a supermassive corpus upends traditional notions of authorship, publishing, and information services. For decades our field lamented the decline in information quality brought about by unmoderated online resources, profit-driven relevance ranking, and intentional disinformation delivered to a public that is too inundated and overwhelmed to question what appears on our screens. Generative AI systems promise to conceal all that messiness. You ask, it answers. Or more accurately, you ask, and it generates a response.

It is in this world that the next generation of information professionals will find themselves. One where ambient information is increasingly abstracted from place, from context, often from facts. As information professionals, we will always resist. Our small program educates reflective, compassionate professionals. We serve Hawai‘i and its people by listening to their needs and helping them navigate and discover the landscape of information—its histories, connections, meanings and protocols—regardless of the trends or technologies of the day. A person looking for help but not sure how to ask. A room full of children excited to hear a story. Designing and delivering engaging programming. Appropriately describing resources for access. Demystifying technology.

Like the sailing canoe that is the centerpiece of our logo, as the field moves, we move. But our values of aloha, ʻohana, and kuleana travel with us. We thank you for reading this self-study and for the opportunity—increasingly rare in this world—to pause and reflect.

Aloha. A hui hou!