Division of Library and Information Science

Assessment Report

2019 - 2020

Prepared by: James Vorbach, Director & Associate Professor

Submitted: July 7, 2020

Approved: November 19, 2020

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

Purpose. The purpose of this document is to report to the DLIS community on the 2019 – 2020 assessments and advisory board meeting (Table 1). The assessments and advisory board meeting engage all constituents - students, faculty, alumni, and employers -in the ongoing process of improving the Master of Science in Library and Information Science (MS LIS) program. The overall process is guided by the DLIS Assessment Plan, approved March 2015. In light of the 2020 Covid-19 pandemic, the advisory board meeting was postponed. Given the reporting timeline, the summary of the 2019 Advisory Board Meeting is repeated in this academic year's assessment report. Although one-year old, the summary of the 2019 Meeting provides the reader with insight into issues on the advisory board's agenda and the board's contributions.

Background. DLIS developed a comprehensive assessment plan in 2015 that called for reconstituting the Advisory Board and adding four new assessment measures. The alumni survey, graduating student exit survey, employer survey, and course artifact assessment measures were implemented between 2015 and 2017. The DLIS Assessment Plan was reviewed by the faculty in 2017. Minor revisions were made in the measure descriptions and the timeline of administration.

Work began in January 2017 on the Self-Study in preparation for the ALA Committee on Accreditation's (ALA-CoA) External Review Panel (ERP) site visit in Fall 2018. The Self-Study was well-received and on January 29, 2019, the ALA-CoA approved the "continued accreditation" of the MS LIS program to 2025.

In September 2019, the faculty decided to change to a two-year framework for the strategic priorities and action items. Annual strategic priority reports were the norm since inception in September 2015. The reason for the change was the evident pattern of action items often requiring a second year to be completed. Progress on the 2019 - 2021 Strategic Priorities and Action Items is described in the progress report in Appendix A.

The quality of the MS LIS program is monitored continuously using an annual cycle of data collection, analysis, reporting, faculty reviews, and the advisory board meeting. All program constituents are involved in the assessment cycle. The assessment reports and concomitant decision-making are evidence demonstrating that the program continues to meet or exceed the ALA Standards for Accreditation of Master's Programs in Library and Information Studies[1]. More importantly, students in the program are well-equipped for current and emerging positions in the evolving information professions.

Table 1. Assessment During the Academic Year

Measure/Board	Timeline (Month Administered)	Participants
Course Artifact Assessment	August, December, May	Faculty, students
E-Portfolio Reviews	August, December, May	Graduating students

---

[1]http://www.ala.org/educationcareers/accreditedprograms/standards

Measure/Board	Timeline (Month Administered)	Participants
New Student Survey	June, September, January	Students entering the program
Exit Survey	August, December, May	Graduating students
Annual Student Survey	March	Students
Advisory Board Planning Committee	March	Alumni, employers, faculty
Alumni Two-Year-Out Survey	April	Alumni, two years after graduation
Employer Survey	April, every two years	Employers
Advisory Board Meeting	May	Alumni, employers, faculty, and students

Program Goals and Outcomes

The MS LIS program goals and outcomes are based on the American Library Association's (ALA) eight core competencies of librarianship[2]. The program goals are reviewed every five years to ensure they continue to serve the MS LIS program effectively in the context of the evolving information professions. In addition, academic goals of professional organizations related to each of the MS LIS specializations supplement the MS LIS program goals.

Goal 1. Develop an Understanding of the Foundations of the Profession
 A. Demonstrate knowledge of the ethics, values, and foundational principles and the role of library and information professionals in the promotion of democratic and legal principles and intellectual freedom.
 B. Understand the history of human communication and its impact on libraries, and the importance of effective verbal and written advocacy for libraries, librarians, other library workers and library services.
 C. Demonstrate knowledge of historical and present-day libraries and librarianship as well as significant national and international policies and trends within the library and information profession.
 D. Demonstrate effective communication techniques (verbal and written) used to analyze complex problems and create appropriate solutions.
 E. Fulfilling certification and/or licensure requirements of specialized areas of the profession.

Goal 2. Develop an Understanding of Information Resources
 A. Understand the concepts and issues related to the lifecycle of recorded knowledge and information, from creation through various stages of use to disposition.
 B. Understand the concepts, issues, and methods related to the acquisition and disposition of resources, and the management, preservation and maintenance of collections.

Goal 3. Demonstrate Ability to Organize Recorded Knowledge and Information
 A. Understand the principles involved and the developmental, descriptive, and evaluative skills needed in the organization, representation and retrieval of recorded knowledge and information resources.
 B. Demonstrate ability to organize recorded knowledge and information using the systems of cataloging, metadata, indexing, and classification standards and methods.

---

[2] ALA Core Competencies
http://www.ala.org/educationcareers/sites/ala.org.educationcareers/files/content/careers/corecomp/corecompetences/finalcorecompstat09.pdf

Goal 4. Apply Technological Knowledge and Skills to Practice

A. Acquire, apply, analyze and assess information, communication, assistive, and other technological skills related to resources, service delivery, professionalism, efficacy, and cost-efficiency of current technologies and relevant technological improvements.

Goal 5. Apply Reference and User Services

A. Demonstrate knowledge and usage of the concepts, principles, and techniques of reference and user services, as well as retrieval techniques and evaluation methods, that provide access to relevant and accurate recorded knowledge and information from diverse sources to all patrons.

B. Understand and demonstrate ability to interact successfully with individuals of all ages and groups to provide consultation, mediation, and guidance in their use of recorded knowledge and information, including information literacy techniques and methods.

C. Understand and apply the principles of assessment towards communities, user preferences, and services and resources, as well as promoting methods of advocacy through development and services.

Goal 6. Master Research Methods

A. Understand the fundamentals of quantitative and qualitative research methods, including central research findings and research literature of the field, and the principles and methods used to assess the actual and potential value of new research.

Goal 7. Experience Continuing Education and Lifelong Learning

1) Continue professional development by maintaining and practicing the purpose and role of providing quality service for the lifelong learning of patrons and the promotion of library services.

2) Apply the learning theories, instructional methods, and achievement measures to the teaching and learning of concepts, processes and skills used in seeking, evaluating, and using recorded knowledge and information.

Goal 8. Apply Key Concepts of Administration and Management

A. Understanding the principles of planning and budgeting in libraries and other information agencies, as well as developing effective personnel practices and human resources.

B. Understanding the concepts behind, issues relating to, and methods for the following: assessment and evaluation of library services and their outcomes, developing partnerships, collaborations, networks, and other structures, and principled, transformational leadership.

Advisory Board Planning Meeting - April 5, 2019

Location: Queens Campus, LIB 305
Date: Friday April 5, 2019; 9:30am – 12:00pm
Attendance: Caroline Fuchs, Lisa Kropp, Michael Morea, Christina Orozco, Kathryn
        Shaughnessy, and Jim Vorbach

Summary

The first items on the agenda (Appendix B) was an update on the successful conclusion to the Fall 2018 ALA-accreditation review and the revision of LIS 211 Collection Development. The biennial employer survey was then discussed with the goal to revise the survey before it is administered in 2019. The following revisions were made:

1) Demographic information will include job title, town, state, and type of library (with an 'other' option).
2) The phrase "to the job title in question" in the one sentence introduction to question 2 will be removed.
3) The answer options in questions 2 (general skills) and 4 (entry level) will be alphabetized.
4) "RELEVANCE" in questions 2 and 4 will be changed to lower case.
5) The following answer options will be added to question 2: curiosity, time management, cultural sensitivity, flexibility, community engagement, and active professional engagement.
6) Changes to existing answer options in question 2:
   a. "Customer Service" will be replaced with "User Engagement",
   b. "Understanding of Profession Ethics" will be changed to "Exhibits Profession Ethics", and
   c. "Organizing information for presentation" will be replaced with "Presentation Skills".
7) Change the introductory sentence to question 4 from

   "This section concerns **specialized skills** that are not typically expected of all employees, but may be required for some. For each skill,please indicate how relevant that particular skill is to the job title in question".
   To "For the next question, please keep in mind an **entry level** position in your organization".

8) The following answer options will be added to question 4: data analysis, supervisory skills.
9) Changes to existing answer options in question 4:

a. "Grantsmanship" will be changed to "Grant-writing skills"
b. "Fluency in a language other than English" will be changed to "Fluency in a second language",
c. "Ability to set goals and manage time to achieve them" will be changed to "Ability to set goals and achieve them",
d. "Ability to translate theory into practice" will be changed to "Practical Application of LIS Theory",
e. "Negotiation (contracts, sales, alliances)" will be changed to "Negotiation skills", and
f. "Management of resources (budgets, subordinates, etc.)" will be changed to "Management of resources".

10) Conditional logic will be added to question 6 to skip question 7 if the survey participant enters a "No" response for 6.

Jim Vorbach will revise the employer survey to incorporate the above recommendations. Planning Board Members agreed to distribute the survey on the following listservs:

ACRL, LITA – Caroline Fuchs
Nassau County Library Directors – Michael Morea
SAA – Christina Orozco
Suffolk County Library Directors – Lisa Kropp
METRO, ACRL-NY, Catholic Library Association – Kathryn Shaughnessy

Mentorship was discussed next. The planning group suggested leveraging the mentorship programs in professional organizations rather than building a DLIS Mentorship program. Identifying sources for these programs to distribute to MS LIS students will be added to the agenda for the May Advisory Board Meeting. Also discussed was the possibility of complimenting the mentorship programs of professional organizations with online learning mentors assigned to each student entering the program from recent graduates of the online MS LIS. This will be discussed with the DLIS Student Organization DLISSA.

The planning group decided to devote most of the May Advisory Board meeting to a review of the results of the May 2018 Advisory Board Meeting with the goal to prioritize and operationalize the 'bullet points' from the meeting. The May 2018 meeting focused on three topics.

1. Combining Soft Skills and Preparing Students for the Job Market
2. Professional Development and Lifelong Learning
3. Alumni Engagement

From the breakout sessions and open discussion which followed, between 12 and 16 bullet points were derived for each topic. The points varied in their impact and ease of implementation. The May 2019 meeting will build on the 2018 meeting's results to identify the 'best' bullet points to operationalize.

Advisory Board Meeting - May 3, 2019

Location: Queens Campus, D'Angelo Activity Center 301
Date: Friday May 3, 2019; 9:30 - 3:00pm
Prepared by: James Vorbach, Ph. D.
Attendees: Susan Roby Berdinka, Taina Evans, Alyse Hennig, Lisa Kropp, Michelle Levy, Ralph Monaco, Michael Morea, Christina Orozco, Jamie Papandrea, Kimberly Simmons, Reba Weatherford, James Vorbach

INTRODUCTION

James Vorbach, DLIS Director, started the meeting with a summary of the events leading to the successful conclusion of the two-year accreditation process. On January 27, 2019, The ALA's Committee on Accreditation voted to grant "continued" accreditation status to the MS LIS program. Our next site visit will be in Fall 2025.

Dr. Vorbach updated the Board (Appendix C) on the increase in program enrollment (Appendix D), which was due largely to St. John's University's partnership with Wiley Education Services. There was a brief Q&A period on the Wiley Partnership. The increased enrollment has brought new challenges and DLIS has applied to the College for one new full-time faculty position and one new administrative position.

A revised mentorship program was discussed. The Board felt DLIS should leverage the existing mentorship programs of professional organizations and promote these programs to students. A further discussion ensued regarding mentoring students entering the program in the 'how-to's of online learning. Here the conversation focused on involving recent alumni and/or students more advanced in the program.

The new e-newsletter was announced. The e-newsletter combines the previous newsletter and the alumni digest into one distribution per month. Content referred to in the newsletter will be posted on the blog.

Dr. Vorbach set the stage for the main part of the meeting by introducing the three topics discussed at last year's advisory board meeting on May 4, 2018. The planning committee met April 5, 2019 and decided to revisit the responses from last year's Board meeting in order to prioritize the points into action items. The Board was divided into three groups. In contrast to the procedure stated in the agenda (Appendix E), each group focused on one of the three topics (top of next page). The Board felt that this approach would produce more significant results.

Each group had a copy of the 2018 Advisory Board Summary which listed the Board's responses. Two metrics were considered - value and cost - in prioritizing the responses. The 2018 responses were categorized as being of high/low value and high/low cost.

1. Combining Soft Skills and Preparing Students for the Job Market
2. Professional Development and Lifelong Learning
3. Alumni Engagement

The three groups analyzed their respective topics for one hour. Each group recorded notes on large flip-chart paper. After lunch, groups presented their results to the entire Board. This was followed by an open discussion.

RESULTS

Soft Skills and Preparing for the Job Market
1. Create opportunities with credit (e.g. integrate into courses/internships)
    - Create a recorded workshop on email how-to's; include email tonality
    - Include a final, required project consisting of a public presentation such as a Skype interview, a YouTube video, and a reader's advisory or reference interview
    - Create a video walk-through for the e-portfolio end-of-program assessment
    - Assign various styles of writing (technical, descriptive, etc) in courses

2. Collaborate with the Office of Career Services to develop a series of recorded synchronous workshops/presentations for students and alumni, specific to LIS field
    - Create one day job skills boot camps for graduating students; have alumni and professional guests
    - Offer informational interviews with practitioners

3. Revise the mentorship program consistent with the discussion earlier in the meeting.

4. Teach advocacy writing
    - Include within a management course
    - Leverage a workshop from a professional organization

5. Teach humility, knowing what you don't know, being open to suggestions and not taking suggestions as criticism. (Note, the group viewed this point as encompassing everything in this section.)

Professional Development and Lifelong Learning (High Value / Low Cost)
- Embed into LIS 270
    - Encourage students to access free professional listservs and to be involved in communities of practice; emphasize the importance of engaging with the profession beyond presentations and publications
    - Encourage students to engage with a mentorship program in their respective areas
    - Assign the joining of a professional association (local, state library associations, and ALA)
    - Encourage students to have internships
    - Utilize ALA Connect

- Faculty embed in courses
  - Incorporate more community building assignments in online courses; online can be isolating
  - Include assignments on how to write conference proposals, create presentations, identify publishing opportunities, among others

- DLISSA
  - Hold a webinar about students' internship experiences
  - Hold a webinar on how to use social media for professional engagement
  - Hold a webinar on getting the most out of (building community through) your professional association (e.g. participating in webinars, listservs, poster sessions, pecha kucha's, program proposals, and mentorships)

- For alumni and other professionals
  - Offer workshops on how to write conference proposals, create presentations, identify publishing opportunities, among others.
  - Create online workshops which offer Continuing Education Units (CEUs), free for alumni, inexpensive for non-alumni
  - Strengthen the alumni network through personal invitations to meetings and through local library associations

Professional Development and Lifelong Learning (Medium Value / Higher Cost)
1. Offer alumni-based, in-person professional development courses; these may be help recruitment for the Certificate in Management for Information Professionals (CMIP) program
2. Hold a reception at NYLA
3. Host a breakfast or dinner; invite internship hosts; at conferences, Queens campus, or the LI Graduate Center in Hauppauge

Alumni Engagement
1. High Value (in order of increasing cost)
   - Improve the DLIS Facebook page to increase engagement (with links to blog)
   - Informational Interviews
   - Invite alumni to create online workshops for CEUs which may help connect current students and alumni
   - Include approaches to engage our distant alumni
   - ASL engagement
   - Meetups and reunions (networking, luncheons, events)

2. Mid Value (in order of increasing cost)
   - Distribute a survey to alumni with professional tracks (i.e. archives, youth, public, academic, etc), asking them to indicate their organization and title; offer the opportunity to join an online group based on their professional track
   - Partner with local LIS programs to expand the above survey and subsequent group for networking
   - Meetups at professional conferences
   - Invite alumni to post on the DLIS blog
   - Introduce an alumni speaker series (Podcast!)

3. Low Value (in order of increasing cost
   - Build an in-person community on campus
   - Invite faculty to post on the DLIS blog, thus providing new content each week
   - Introduce drop in events for current students and alumni (e.g. study groups at the SJU Library and drop-in office hours)
   - Introduce an annual award honoring of an alumnus
   - Department-generated fundraising appeals/mailings
   - "SJU Saturdays" at DAC or the LI Graduate Center once a semester

CONCLUSION

The results will be presented to the DLIS faculty at the September 10, 2019 meeting. This is an all-day meeting focused on reviewing the 2018 - 2019 assessment report. A report on the faculty review will be communicated to the Board in October.

Alumni Survey

Background. This survey is distributed to alumni two years after graduation for their feedback on the quality of the MS LIS program, the preparation received for their career, and suggestions for improving the program. The design of the survey closely follows that of the exit survey administered to students upon graduation. This year's survey was administered in May 2020 (Appendix F). The participants graduated in 2017 -2018 academic year (i.e. September 2017, January 2018, and May 2018).

The survey asks alumni to reflect on their respective programs of study and answer questions covering five areas: program, interactions, teaching, courses, and resources. The questions corresponding to these categories are shown in Tables 2 through 6 respectively, which show the percentage of "strongly agree" or "agree" responses. Of the 21 alumni to whom the survey was emailed, 11 responded to the survey, a 52% response rate. The responses to each question were: "strongly agree", "agree", "neutral", "disagree", and "strongly disagree". Table 6 contains the results from the 2020 and 2019 surveys only because the 2019 revision of the survey instrument split the question, distinguishing library resources (Q11) and technology (Q12).

Table 2. Program

Questions*	2020	2019	2018	2017
Q1: Satisfied with the program	100%	91%	83%	62%
Q13: Prepared to enter the workforce	91%	89%	66%	64%
Q14: Field experience (AS-L, internships, indep studies) contributed towards employment)	64%	78%	83%	27%
Q15: Recommend program to others	82%	94%	83%	64%

* percentages are the sum of the "strongly agree" and "agree" responses to the survey

Table 3. Interactions

Questions	2020	2019	2018	2017
Q2: Interactions with faculty generally positive	91%	100%	100%	92%
Q3: Interactions with fellow students generally positive	91%	95%	84%	83%
Q5: Interactions with office staff generally positive	91%	100%	92%	83%
Q7: Received useful information in advisement meetings	91%	90%	83%	58%

Table 4. Teaching

Question	2020	2019	2018	2017
Q9: Faculty were effective teachers	91%	85%	100%	92%

Table 5. Courses

Question	2020	2019	2018	2017
Q10: Satisfied with the variety of courses offered	100%	84%	58%	50%

Table 6. Resources

Question	2020	2019
Q11: Had access to appropriate library resources to support career interests	91%	95%
Q12: Had access to appropriate software and related technology to support career interests	82%	84%

Table 2 shows that students overall are satisfied with the program. Based on Q14 responses, DLIS will review the relationship between field experiences and career outcomes. Table 3 shows that students' interactions with faculty, students, and staff remain very positive. Student responses the effectiveness of faculty teaching (Table 4) and the variety of courses offered (Table 5) remained very positive. Students are satisfied with their access to resources (Table 6). Still, almost 20% of students answered "neutral" on Q12. For this reason DLIS will review the technology used in the curriculum and its relationship to career interests.

Open Questions

Q4 asked students to suggest ways to "foster, enhance, and/or reinforce interaction among students in the online environment. 55% responded. The responses included:
- It would be great to have had a casual online environment to ask/answer questions amongst students.
- events like happy hours and symposiums would help facilitate student interaction. … virtual happy hours may be a good idea. Since students are spread across the country, it would be a great way to give everyone the opportunity to socialize.
- many students, like myself, live in the metro area and could do an in-person meet-up on campus once or so a semester. It really allowed me to put faces to names and overall enhanced my experience. If that is too much to ask, then the video platforms where people can "see" one another are second choice!
- If the instructor moderated within the discussion boards and helped facilitate communication between students. While there were some classes when it was mandatory to comment on other

students post, it was the classes where you didn't have to comment on fellow students' work where the interaction between students was lacking.

Q6 asked students to suggest ways in which DLIS staff could further enhance and/or support the student experience. 36% responded. The responses included:

- Lay out a clear two-year plan for courses being offered so that students don't miss out on classes they would really enjoy or benefit from. Seek out more public libraries for academic service learning opportunities.
- I think that a lot of the faculty/ staff assumed a certain amount of base knowledge that many students didn't have, and much of the literature doesn't do a good job explaining since it is geared towards professionals.
- Mostly good - very tough program though. I had to take some additional classes through the LIU Post program and they were by far much easier.

Q8 asked respondents to suggest ways to improve the advisement process. 36% responded. Responses included:

- Reach out to alumni to have mentors other than faculty to help students decide what track they might want to pursue.
- Connecting students to internship or work opportunities.
- Seeking full-time employment within the public sector is quite different than private or academic. I think more information could be shared with students who may need to sit for Civil Service Exams or seek appointments to obtain those types of jobs. Perhaps a webinar or speaking engagement with someone from Civil Service, NYPL or Alumni working in a public capacity.

Q17 asked respondents to identify the major strengths of the program. 64% responded. Responses included:

- Flexibility in choosing internships/ASL/other real-world experiences.
- The major strength of the program was the insistence on virtual projects and interactions. This has prepared me for the current environment of virtual programming. I strongly believe that it would've taken me longer to adjust if I didn't have the experience of video recording, editing, and so forth. I'm camera shy but the program has provided the environment to step beyond my comfort zone and provide better service to my community.
- The faculty and staff. The passion for the material and the care for the students was evident, and it really made the entire experience very fulfilling.
- The variety of courses offered as well as the emphasis on digital services, projects and learning.
- I learned the most with the really great instructors that pushed to research on our own.
- Management courses

Q18 asked students for recommendations to improve the program. 36% responded. Responses included:

- The instruction of some of the technical aspects of librarianship are lacking, it would serve many students well to learn more about library software and computing systems at least in a general way.
- If they aren't being offered yet, I would highly suggest incorporating practical application of current popular online meeting softwares like Microsoft Teams, Google Hangouts, GoToMeeting, WebEx, and Zoom to name a few. Familiarity and use of social media is a must too; Facebook, Instagram, Youtube, etc. Discord is recommended for those aiming for Teen Services. Making sure students are comfortable doing online programs is needed in today's environment.
- Probably to make mature students feel more welcome.
- Keep up the good work!

Summary

The closed question responses (Tables 2 through 6) indicate a strong MS LIS program. Two areas where DLIS will continue to focus on are field experiences (Table 2, Q14) and technology (Table 6, Q12).

The open questions - Q4 (student community), Q8 (advisement), Q17 (program strengths), and Q18 (recommendations to improve the program) - have provided useful information to continue to improve the MS LIS program. More specifically, these results will guide faculty discussions at the September faculty meeting when the 2019 - 2020 Assessment Report is reviewed.

Career Outcomes Survey

The University Career Services distributes a placement survey each year to the graduates of St. John's University. The participants may have graduated at any of the three periods in the graduation cycle, i.e. Summer, Fall, and Spring. For example, the 2019 survey consists of the graduates from Summer 2018, Fall 2018, and Spring 2019. Table 7 below shows the results for the graduates of the MS LIS program since 2015.

Table 7. Placement Results*

Statistic	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015
Response Rate	50%	67%	59%	67%	52%
Placement	100%	86%	94%	100%	79%
Employed	100%	86%	94%	92%	72%
Employed / Furthering Education	0%	0%	0%	8%	7%
Furthering Education	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Seeking Employment	0%	14%	6%	0%	21%

Data provided by the University Career Center, January 2019

The category "Employed / Furthering Education" means that the alumnus is both employed and enrolled in a graduate program. "Furthering Education" means that the alumnus is pursuing further graduation only.

Course Artifact Assessment

Background. Each course in the MS LIS program is assessed over a four year period to determine how well students are learning the corresponding program goals. The Curriculum Map (Appendix M) relates each course in the program to one or more program goals and is available to students on the DLIS LibGuide (http://campusguides.stjohns.edu/dlis/registration). This course-level assessment of student learning was instituted in 2015 as part of the DLIS Assessment Plan (approved May 1, 2015). The Spring 2020 term began the second assessment cycle.

Procedure. At the beginning of a term, courses are assigned by the Director for assessment. The assignment is made such that an instructor has no more than one course per term to assess. For the assigned course, the instructor selects one artifact (e.g. assignment, semester project, or exam) as a representative measure of learning the course's related program goal/s. At the end of the course, the instructor completes a form (Appendix G) describing the class' performance, reviewing the artifact's role as a measure, and the resulting changes planned to improve the course. Two sample artifacts with their respective reviews are included as well. The following table indicates the status of the course assessment process.

Table 8. Course Artifact Assessment with Program Goals

Course Code	Course Name	Program Goals & Outcomes	Faculty	Reviewed/ Review Scheduled	Next Review
	CORE				
LIS 203	Organization of Information	3A, 3B	Angel	Spring 2020	Spring 2024
LIS 204	Introduction to Library and Information Science	1A, 1B, 1C, 1E, 2A, 2B, 3A, 5A, 7A	Rioux	Fall 2015	Fall 2020
LIS 205	Introduction to Information Sources and Services	5A	Lee	Spring 2020	Spring 2024
LIS 239	Research and Evaluation Methods	1A, 1B, 1D, 3A, 6A	Singh	Spring 2020	Spring 2024
	MANAGEMENT				
LIS 240	Management of Libraries and Information Centers	1A, 1D, 4A, 5C, 7A, 7B, 8A, 8B	Singh	Spring 2016	Fall 2020
	ELECTIVES				
LIS 121	Literature & Related Resources for Children	2B, 7A	Lee	Fall 2016	Fall 2020

Course Code	Course Name	Program Goals & Outcomes	Faculty	Reviewed/ Review Scheduled	Next Review
LIS 125	Library Materials and Services for Young Children	2B, 4A	Lee	Spring 2020	Spring 2024
LIS 126	Literature & Related Resources for Young Adults	2B, 7A	Lee	Fall 2018	Fall 2022
LIS 127	Library Programs & Services for Children and Young Adults	2B, 4A, 7A, 8A, 8B	Lee	Spring 2016	Spring 2021
LIS 211	Collection Development	1A, 2A, 2B, 3A, 5A, 5B, 5C, 6A, 8A, 8B	Rioux	Spring 2019	Spring 2022
LIS 213	Popular Culture and Young Adults	2B, 4A, 8B	Lee	Summer 2019	Summer 2023
LIS 214	Teen Spaces for Libraries	1A, 1B, 1C, 4A	Lee	Summer 2020	Summer 2024
LIS 221	Planning and Delivering Information Literacy Programs	5B, 5C, 7A, 7B	King	Spring 2017	Spring 2021
LIS 222	Materials and Services to Diverse Populations	1A, 1B, 1C, 1D, 5B, 5C, 7A, 7B	Rioux	Fall 2018	Fall 2022
LIS 230	Introduction to Digital Libraries	1B, 1D, 3A, 3B, 4A, 5B	Angel	Fall 2021	
LIS 231	College and University Libraries	8A, 8B	Rioux	Spring 2016	Spring 2022
LIS 233	Public Libraries and Community Information Centers	8A, 8B	Rioux	Spring 2017	Spring 2021
LIS 237	Metadata for Information Professionals	1A, 1D, 3A, 3B	Vorbach	Fall 2017	Fall 2021
LIS 238	Web Design for Libraries and Information Centers	4A	Vorbach	Spring 2019	Spring 2023
LIS 245	Special Collections Librarianship and History of the Book: Principles and Practice	2A, 2B, 3A, 8B	Roveland-Brenton	Fall 2016	Fall 2020
LIS 248	Database Modeling and Design	3A, 3B, 4A	Vorbach	Fall 2016	
LIS 249	Archives and Records Management	1A, 1C, 3A, 3B, 5C, 7B	Angel	Fall 2017	Summer 2021

Course Code	Course Name	Program Goals & Outcomes	Faculty	Reviewed/ Review Scheduled	Next Review
LIS 253	Oral History	4A, 7B	Szylvian	Spring 2020	Spring 2024
LIS 257	Archival Representation	1C, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B, 4A, 5A, 5B, 8B	Angel	Fall 2018	Fall 2022
LIS 258	Museum Informatics	3A, 3B, 4A	Angel	Spring 2017	Spring 2021
LIS 260	Information Use and Users	1B, 1D, 2A, 3A, 4A, 5A, 5B, 5C, 6A, 7B, 8B	Rioux	Fall 2017	Fall 2021
LIS 261	Information Sources and Services for Children and Young Adults	2B, 4A, 5A, 5C, 7B	Lee/ Seymour	Fall 2021	
LIS 262	Project Management in Information Organizations	1D, 5C, 8A, 8B	Singh	Fall 2017	Fall 2021
LIS 263	Marketing and Advocacy in Information Organizations	1B, 1D, 5C, 8A, 8B	Singh	Spring 2018	Spring 2022
LIS 264	Project Leadership for Information Professionals Capstone	1A, 1D, 5C, 7A, 8A, 8B	Singh	Fall 2018	Fall 2022
LIS 273	Graphic Novels and Libraries	1A, 2B, 5B	Fuchs	Summer 2020	
LIS 271	Special Topics: Grantsmanship – Fundraising for Librarians	1A, 1D, 8A, 8B	Zabriskie	Spring 2017	Spring 2021
LIS 274	Library Design		Glassman	Summer 2019	Summer 2023
LIS 275	Cultural Competence for Information Professionals	1A, 1D, 5B, 5C, 8A, 8B	Singh	Summer 2020	
LIS 282	Knowledge Management	2A, 2B, 8A, 8B	Singh	Spring 2018	Spring 2022
LIS 283	Social Justice and the Information Profession	1A, 1B, 1D, 2B, 4A, 5B, 5C	Rioux	Spring 2020	Spring 2024
LIS 302	Genealogical Sources & Services	3A, 4A, 5A, 5B, 5C	Earle	Summer 2020	

E-Portfolio Assessment

Background.
The e-portfolio has been the end-of-program assessment for the MS LIS program since the Spring 2013 term. Digication is the e-portfolio platform. The main section in the e-portfolio covers the eight MS LIS program goals. In this section students provide evidence from their coursework (i.e. assignments and projects) and write reflections for each goal explaining how their learning from the evidence satisfies the respective program goal. Each e-portfolio is reviewed independently by two DLIS faculty (includes the Director). The minimum grade to "pass" the e-portfolio assessment is 80%. If the outcomes (Pass/Fail) from the two reviewers differ, a third faculty member is assigned by the Director to review the e-portfolio and render a decision. E-Portfolio reviews coincide with the Summer, Fall, and Spring graduation cycle.

The following policy was adopted to ensure student understanding of the purpose of the e-portfolio, the recommended practice for creating the e-portfolio, and the use of Digication:

1) Students are introduced to the e-portfolio at the new student orientation.
2) Workshops on the e-portfolio and Digication, are offered each semester. The workshops are recorded and posted on online.
3) One core course, LIS 203, has an assignment requiring students to use their e-portfolios.
4) The e-portfolio assessment rubric (Appendix H) is covered in each workshop and is available on the e-portfolio page of the DLIS LibGuide (http://campusguides.stjohns.edu/dlis/eportfolio). The e-portfolio assessment rubric is reviewed biennially

A student failing the e-portfolio assessment meets with the Director to discuss a plan to improve the e-portfolio for next review. At this time, all students who have failed, passed the review in the following term.

Summary
The results since inception are summarized in Table 8. An academic year in the table consists of all reviews in that year's graduation cycle (i.e. summer, fall, and spring). The average difference statistic (Ave Diff) measures the consistency of the grading by the two reviewers. A high Ave Diff statistic may indicate different expectations among the faculty.

The pass rate for 2019 - 2020 (Table 9) and overall (2013-2019, Table 10) are 96.9% and 96.7% respectively, close to the target pass rate of 100%. Over the past two years, scores on e-portfolios have improved and the difference in faculty reviews have reduced slightly.

Feedback from students, faculty, alumni, and information professionals at meetings and conferences confirm the value of the e-portfolio as a measure of student learning and to distinguish graduates to future employers.

Table 9. E-Portfolio Summary By Academic Year

	2019-2020	2018-2019	2017-2018	2016-2017	2015-2016	2014-2015
Total	32	32	24	30	24	31
Total passed	31	31	22	30	22	31
Pass rate	96.9%	96.9%	91.7%	100%	92%	100%
Average (all portfolios)	92.9%	91.0%	89.3%	93%	93%	93%
Average (wo failures)	93.3%	91.8%	90.5%	93%	95%	93%
Ave Diff	7.1	8.3	6.7	5.0	5.3	7.5

Table 10. Overall Statistics

	2013-2020	2013-2019	2013-2018	2013-2017	2013-2016
Total	213	181	149	125	95
Total passed	206	175	144	122	92
Pass rate	96.7	96.7%	96.6%	97.6%	96.8%
Ave Diff	6.7	6.7	6.3	6.3	6.7

Employer Survey

Background. The employer survey is distributed biennially to information professionals in a wide range of institutions. The survey instrument was reviewed and revised by the Advisory Board Planning Committee ('Committee') at its meeting on April 5, 2019. After approval by the DLIS faculty, links to the survey were posted on the listservs of professional organizations by the Committee. The responses were collected over a four week period ending July 25, 2019. There were 58 respondents to the survey. As shown in Table 11, 59% of respondents identified as Library Directors or Directors. Table 12 shows the distribution of the respondents' organizations and Table 13 shows the respondents' states. The next distribution of the survey will be in April 2021.

Table 11. Job Titles

Title	Respondents	Percent
Library Director / Director	34	59%
Archivist / Records Manager	14	24%
Assistant Director	4	7%
Department Head	3	5%
Other*	3	5%
Total	58	100%

* CEO, Associate Dean, Librarian

Table 12. Organizations

Type	Respondents	Percent
Public	38	66%
Archive	7	12%
Academic	6	10%
Corporate	1	2%
Other*	6	10%
Total	58	100%

* Association Library, Healthcare, Museum, Public, Religious Organization, Special

Table 13. States

State	Respondents	Percent
New York	43	80%
Michigan	2	4%
California	1	2%
Colorado	1	2%
Georgia	1	2%
Illinois	1	2%
Indiana	1	2%
Iowa	1	2%
Ohio	1	2%
Pennsylvania	1	2%
Texas	1	2%
Total*	54	100%**

* Only 54 of 58 respondents provided state information

** Due to rounding error the values do not sum to 100%

Results. The survey focused on three areas: general skills, specialized skills, and a comparison between St. John's graduates and graduates from other LIS Schools for those employing St. John's graduates. Table 14 lists the top 10 general skills (Q5) for an entry level position, in order of relevance. The maximum rating average is 5.00 (where 1=Not at all relevant, 2=Not very, 3=Somewhat, 4=Very, and 5=Extremely relevant). The skills are listed in descending order of the 2019 rating. The response count for the 2019 survey was 55. The response count for the 2017 survey was 29. An "NA" in the 2017 column means that skill was not an option on the 2017 survey. See Appendix I for the complete list of responses.

Table 14. Top 10 General Skills

Answer Options	2019	2017
Basic Computer (e.g. word-processing,spreadsheets	4.80	4.63
Oral/written communication	4.71	4.83
Teamwork (interpersonal relationship)	4.69	4.80
Curiosity	4.58	NA
Listening to others	4.58	4.83
Exhibits professional ethics	4.51	4.73

Answer Options	2019	2017
Critical thinking (evaluating information)	4.48	4.67
Cultural sensitivity	4.45	NA
Flexibility	4.42	NA
User Engagement	4.13	NA

Participants were able to comment on the general skills in Q6. The following list highlights these comments:
1. Active participation in a professional organization distinguishes graduates;
2. Skills such as decision-making, leadership, and professional engagement are learned on the job;
3. "Confidence in taking action with support of supervisor or peers" is a necessary skill;
4. 'Soft' skills are more important than hard skills which can be learned on the job; and
5. Curiosity, engagement, and interpersonal skills indicate a candidate who can learn and grow.

Table 15 lists the top 10 specialized skills in descending order of relevance on the 2019 survey (Q7). The maximum rating average is 5.00 (where 1=Not at all relevant, 2=Not very, 3=Somewhat, 4=Very, and 5=Extremely relevant). The response count for Q7 on the 2019 survey was 55. The response count on the 2017 survey was 29. An "NA" in the 2017 column means that the skill was not an option on the 2017 survey. See Appendix I for the complete list of responses.

Table 15. Top 10 Specialized Skills

Answer Options	2019	2017
Ability to Set Goals and Achieve Them	4.19	4.41
Practical Application of LIS Theory	3.49	4.04
Project Management	3.44	3.79
Marketing and Advocacy	3.36	3.59
Management of Resources	3.15	3.34
Data Analysis	2.93	NA
Negotiation Skills	2.64	2.59
Supervisory Skills	2.58	NA
Mentoring or Coaching Colleagues	2.51	NA
Grant-writing Skills	2.36	2.55

Participants were able to comment on the specialized skills in Q8. The following list highlights these comments:

1. Mentoring and supervisory skills would be developed as part of the job;
2. While most of these skills may not be relevant for an entry level position, employees must possess these skills in order to advance.
3. These are all skills I would hope an entry level employee would be reaching toward, but I wouldn't necessarily expect someone to have them right away.
4. Many of the skills presented here are only relevant for supervisory positions ("Department Head", etc.) and may not be as significant for a part-time or entry level full time Librarian title.
5. The relevance of some of the skills depended on the position.

When asked whether the respondent was aware of the organization having employed a St. John's graduate (Q9), 43% answered "yes" and 57% "no" or "not sure". The twenty-three respondents who answered "yes" were asked to compare St. John's graduates with employees graduating from other LIS programs. Table 16 lists the results.

Table 16. Comparison with other LIS Programs

Answer Options	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
St. John's grads are NOT AS prepared as those from other LIS programs.	55%	45%	0
St. John's grads compare FAVORABLY to those from other LIS programs.	0	48%	52%
St. John's grads are BETTER prepared than those from other LIS programs.	9%	77%	14%

Summary. There appears to be broad agreement among respondents on the general skills (Table 14). Each of the top ten general skills exceeds the "very relevant" rating of 4.0. In contrast, graduates were not expected to have many of the specialized skills (Table 15) on entering the field, with the exception of the highest-rated skill "Ability to Set Goals and Achieve Them". It should be noted that 66% of respondents were employed at Public Libraries (Table 12). A broader distribution of organizations may yield different results. One comment in Q8 mentioned that the relevance of some specialized skills depended on the position.

The results of the 2019 survey were consistent with that of the 2017 survey in case where options appeared in both surveys.

St. John's graduates compare favorably with those from other LIS programs (Table 16).

Student: Annual Survey

Background. The annual student survey is administered in April and has been administered each year since the Spring 2012 term. The survey instrument was revised in 2019 following the 2018 comprehensive review of the MS LIS program by the ALA Committee on Accreditation (ALA-CoA). The ALA-CoA's decision was for the continued accreditation of the MS LIS program through 2025.

The questions on the survey are organized into five categories: program, faculty, administration, field experience and professional development. Field experience in this sense refers to both curricular (e.g. internships, academic service-learning) and related work experience. The 2020 survey results are given in Appendix J for all closed questions.

Review by Category.

a) Program

Table 17 and 18 list the responses for questions Q1and Q2 respectively on the specializations supported in the program. While public librarianship consistently leads as a specialization of interest (Table 17), archival studies and youth services lead as primary specializations (Table 18).

Table 17. Specializations of Interest

Specialization	2020	2019
Public Librarianship	56%	46%
Archival Studies	47%	37%
Youth Services	35%	31%
Academic Librarianship	26%	34%
Special Librarianship	21%	23%
Management	7%	17%
Undecided	2%	11%

Table 18. Primary Specialization

Specialization	2020	2019
Archival Studies	28%	14%
Youth Services	28%	14%
Public Librarianship	21%	17
Academic Librarianship	9%	9%
Management	5%	6%
Special Librarianship	2%	9%
Undecided	7%	31%

Table 19 shows the results for questions related to career preparedness and students' overall perception of the program. Results are shown from 2019 when the survey instrument was revised

Table 19. Career Preparedness

Question	Value	2020	2019
Q10: In your opinion, how well prepared are you for your career as an information professional?	Very Well-Prepared or Well-Prepared	76%	70%
Q12: How prepared do you feel to assume a position of leadership and/or make a difference in society?	Very Well-Prepared or Well-Prepared	79%	85%
Q14. How likely are you to recommend St. John's MS LIS program to prospective information professionals?	Highly Likely or Likely	83%	90%

b) Faculty

The results for faculty-related questions are provided in Table 20.

Table 20. Faculty

Question	2020	2019
Q3. Faculty provide feedback on student work in a reasonable time.	88%	82%
Q4. Students have access to continuing opportunities for advisement.	86%	65%

c) Administration and Resources

Results for questions related to placement assistance, DLIS administrative response time, and library resources are provided in Table 21. Q7 was added to the survey in 2020.

Table 21. Administration and Resources

Question	2020	2019
Q5. Students have access to continuing opportunities for placement assistance.	53%	59%
Q6. DLIS Administration responds to student questions in a reasonable time.	77%	77%
Q7. Online databases through University Libraries are an efficient research tool.	91%	NA

d) Field Experience

Q9 asked students to select field experiences in which they were engaged, including outside work (Table 22). This question was unchanged in the 2019 survey revision, so the 2017 and 2018 results are shown as well.

Table 22. Field Experience

Field Experience	2020	2019	2018	2017
Academic service-learning project	92%	90%	75%	90%
Internship	36%	20%	25%	17%
Graduate assistantship	20%	20%	37%	30%
Part-time employment related to the MS LIS program	52%	10%	38%	53%
Full-time employment related to the MS LIS program	16%	10%	25%	20%
Volunteer work related to the MS LIS program	20%	40%	38%	17%

e) Professional Development at St. John's

Q11 asked students what St. John's educational opportunities they would consider after graduation (Table23).

Table 23. Professional Development

Type	2020	2019
Advanced Certificate	50%	50%
Second Graduate Degree	25%	50%
Webinar /Workshop	63%	60%
None	8%	20%

Students were asked (Q13) for their recommendations to improve the MS LIS program. Only 17% responded to this question. A sample of their responses are below.

1) There should be a focus on social justice issues that exist with the information profession. Taking LIS 283 with Dr. Rioux has been incredibly eye-opening for me. In order for students to receive a truly well-rounded LIS education, I believe a class such as LIS 283 should be added to the core curriculum.
2) I think some faculty need to approach lessons differently. A powerpoint is not always sufficient as they are often used in conjunction with a lecture which we do not receive. Therefore,

sometimes you have a powerpoint with no background information from a class discussion to tie it to.

3) Better understanding of the needs of online students who are taking these classes from far away.

4) I think the dual degree students need to feel more included in DLIS, and that there should not be two required LIS internships unless DLIS starts placing students in internships, especially as there are no required internships for the regular MSLIS students.

5) More experience working with more of the digital tools of the profession.

6) It bears repeating start your portfolio NOW. It would be great to have access to the sample portfolios and webinar on the Digication platform as part of the introductory colloquia.

7) More contact with both students and faculty. Faculty advisors should check in with students at minimum once a semester beyond registration.

8) A process made known for difficulties with a teacher and how to appeal unfair decisions/grading.

Summary.

Q1 and Q2 identified areas of student interest (Q1) and their primary specialization (Q2). The results from Q1 and Q2 are important factors for continued program development and resource allocation. Tables 19 through 23 show important feedback from students on the program, the faculty, administration, field experiences, and library resources. These results and the student recommendations for program improvement (Q13) will be discussed at the September faculty meeting.

Student: Exit Survey

Background. The exit survey was administered to the Summer 2019, Fall 2019, and Spring 2020 graduates following their completion of the degree requirements. The survey asks students to reflect on their programs of study and answer questions covering five areas: program, interactions, teaching, courses, and resources. The survey questions corresponding to these categories are shown in Tables 24 - 30. The percentage values in the tables are the sum of the "Strongly Agree" and "Agree" responses. Of the 31 graduates (Summer 2019, Fall 2019 and Spring 2020 combined), 23 responded to the survey, a 74% response rate. The responses to each question were: "strongly agree", "agree", "neutral", "disagree", and "strongly disagree". The 2019 – 2020 survey results are provided in Appendix K.

Table 24. Program

Questions*	2019-2020	2018-2019	2017–2018	2016–2017
Q1: Satisfied with the program	87%	88%	71%	100%
Q12: Prepared to enter the workforce	96%	88%	86%	100%
Q13: Recommend program to others	87%	83%	71%	100%

*percentage values are the sum of the "strongly agree" and "agree" responses

Table 25. Interactions

Questions	2019-2020	2018-2019	2017–2018	2016 –2017
Q2: Interactions with faculty generally positive	100%	88%	71%	100%
Q3: Interactions with fellow students generally positive	100%	100%	86%	91%
Q4: Interactions with office staff generally positive	83%	94%	57%	100%
Q5: Received useful information from faculty advisors	91%	82%	86%	100%

Table 26. Teaching

Question	2019-2020	2018-2019	2017–2018	2016–2017
Q6: Faculty were effective teachers	100%	88%	71%	100%
Q7: Faculty are knowledgeable in their areas of expertise	100%	100%		

Table 27. Courses

Questions	2019-2020	2018-2019	2017–2018	2016–2017
Q8: Satisfied with the variety of course offerings	83%	82%	29%	100%
Q9: Satisfied with the frequency of course offerings	96%	88%	29%	100%

Table 28. Resources

Question	2019-2020	2018–2019
Q10: Had access to appropriate library resources to support my educational needs.	83%	94%
Q11: Had access to appropriate software and related technology to support my educational needs	96%	94%

Open questions

Q15 and Q16 were open questions which asked students to identify program strengths (Q15) and recommend improvements in the program (Q16). Table 29 contains a representative sample of Q15 responses and Table 30 contains a representation sample of Q16 responses.

Table 29. Q15 Program Strengths

Though some dislike discussion boards, I have found them to be a great way to learn from other student perspectives.
I like the asynchronous classes; it was helpful for my schedule
The online environment was easy to use. At first it was daunting knowing that everything was online, but professors made the online environment manageable. This is a major strength because students in different circumstances can find a routine that works for them. For example, as someone who works full-time, I was able to do the majority of my work on weeknights and weekends and still feel connected to my peers and the work that I was doing.
Most of the courses were well-paced. Assignments weren't due on top of each other and we were given ample windows of time to submit work. I think one of the assets was the usage of blackboard discussion board modules, with different readings/questions each week. It made the material more digestible and gave us the ability to interact with classmates in a meaningful instead of superficial way.
I think the ePortoflio is an excellent final assessment to tie all your coursework up into a narrative for the student. Almost every professor I had was an incredible asset and I am thankful for their expertise and support in the program.

Table 29 Q15 Program Strengths (cont.)

I think the professors are naturally a major strength of the program. It can be difficult to complete an online degree, but the course material made it worth any struggles that arose. I think the courses are well designed, and I always felt that what I was learning would be valuable to me in the future. The professors are excellent experts.
The management course, the service project, the e portfolio, intro courses
Quality instruction by knowledgeable professionals who care about the profession and those they are teaching, especially in an online environment.

Table 30. Q16 Recommendations to Improve the Program

I would absolutely recommend that weekly video instruction (even just 1/2 hour) be required for all classes.
One of the most important aspects of online learning is feeling connected to classmates and the program. I had some classes that required no interaction between students and this took away from the experience. Faculty feedback on assignments was lacking in 5 of my courses.
Even in my final semester, I found myself really struggling with making sure my APA citations were accurate. [ ] one of the things I found stressful was that I had no way of knowing what a professor's teaching style or course requirements/workload were going to be like before I registered for a class. My suggestion here would be to provide the syllabus or at least a brief overview of the course structure/assignments--not just the description--during enrollment time so that students can get a better sense of what they can expect.
For regular LIS students I do think there needs to be a greater awareness of the St. John's university calendar, and holidays. I do appreciate how hard the professors work to create a schedule for courses that works, but if you are a GA on campus, the lack of awareness of holidays and other days makes it difficult at times, as it leaves little room for schedule changes that affect a student's ability to complete their coursework.
Some courses had too much group work. I prefer working independently but understand the significance of group work. Also more assistance with the e-portfolio throughout the course - maybe once a year, would be good.
The program also should have more of a required focus on social justice issues in librarianship. A social justice component should be explicitly added to the program goals either as its own goal or as part of an existing goal.

Table 30. Q16 Recommendations to Improve the Program (cont.)

More tech courses
Some professors could be more timely in responding to student emails. When working in an online setting, this, as a student, is a very important thing to me. I took note and greatly appreciated the professors who were quick to respond to my emails and questions. [ ] Overall, though, I was impressed with the program, and had positive experiences in every class I took.

Summary

The survey instrument was revised for the 2019 survey as part of the review of all survey instruments following the comprehensive review and continued accreditation of the MS LIS program. Some questions (Q7, Q10, and Q11) do not appear in previous years. For these questions, only results since 2019 are shown. Overall, the quantitative part of the survey yielded very good results and the open questions provided useful information for discussion at the September faculty meeting.

Student: New Student Survey

Background

The new student survey is administered at the start of the Summer, Fall and Spring terms. The survey was revised in 2019. The survey gathers information on students' choice of St. John's (Q1 and Q2), student information (Q3, Q4, and Q5), and the students' evaluation of the online orientation course LIS 270 (Q6 and Q7). The 2019 - 2020 column in the following tables combines the results of the Summer 2019, Fall 2019, and Spring 2020 surveys. Responses from prior years are included where the same questions appear on the previous survey instrument. The survey was not administered in the 2018 - 2019 academic year. The 2019 – 2020 survey results are provided in Appendix L.

a) Choice of St. John's

In Q1, participants were asked to check all responses that apply (Table 31).

Table 31. Q1 How did you find out about the St. John's MS-LIS program?

Response	2019-2020	2017-2018	2016-2017	2015-2016
St. John's University website	54%	33%	57%	47%
American Library Association website/directory	41%	39%	48%	58%
Recommendation from Alumni of the program and/or librarian	15%	33%	14%	16%
St. John's Online Graduate Programs Portal	5%	NA	NA	NA
Career counselors in the college where I earned my previous degree	3%	0%	0%	5%
Direct Mail (paper) campaign	3%	NA	NA	NA
Other (please explain)	23%	11%	19%	16%

Table 32. Q1 Other (open comments)

Research, google
online browsing for an online MS-LIS program
Familiar with school due to growing up nearby
I Googled MLIS programs.
Internet search

Table 32. Q1 Other (cont.)

Google search for this area of studies online
Facebook advertisement

Q2 asked students to rank the reasons provided in the responses in order of relevance where 1 = "most relevant" and 5 = "least relevant". The results in Table 33 show the sum of the 1 and 2 rankings in descending order. Clearly, the online modality and the flexibility of the program and course offerings are the reasons most relevant to the students' choice of St. John's.

Table 33. Q2 Reasons for Choosing St. John's, in Ranked Order

	2019 - 2020
Online program	32%
Flexibility of the program and course offerings	28%
Availability of funding/scholarship	16%
Reputation of the school, department, and/or faculty	13%
Recommendation of colleague or family member	10%

b) Student Information
Questions Q3 through Q5 gather information on age group, full- and part-time status, and work/activities immediately prior to starting the program. Tables 34 through 36 report on these results. Gender and ethnicity data are collected on graduate applications. This information is provided to DLIS by the Office of Institutional Research for reporting to the DLIS Advisory Board.

Table 34. Age Group

Value	2019-2020	2017-2018	2016-2017	2015-2016
25 years or younger	34%	35%	60%	58%
26-40 years	53%	47%	20%	32%
41-55 years	11%	6%	20%	11%
55 or older	3%	12%	0%	0%

Table 35. Current Status

Value	2019-2020	2017-2018	2016-2017	2015-2016
Full-time (9-12 credits/semester)	13%	6%	55%	42%
Part-time (3-6 credits/semester)	87%	94%	45%	58%

Table 36. Immediately Prior to Entering the Program (Select all that apply)

Value	2019-2020	2017-2018	2016-2017	2015-2016
Employed in a field related to information studies	49%	47%	55%	26%
Undergraduate student	38%	35%	35%	26%
Volunteer/community service	19%	18%	10%	32%
Graduate student	30%	6%	5%	37%
Other (please describe)	14%	6%	5%	0%

The "Other" response in Table 36 invited comments. These consisted primarily of employment in fields unrelated to information studies.

St. John's University signed a contract with Wiley Education Services in 2017 for recruitment and student support services. The changes observed in Tables 34 and 35 since 2017 may be due in part to Wiley's recruitment strategy. It is notable that enrollment has increased since the beginning of the Wiley partnership from 67 in Fall 2017 to 143 in Spring 2020.

c) Online Orientation

Questions Q6 and Q7 requested feedback from students on the online orientation course LIS 270. The results are shown in Tables 37 and 38 respectively. Q7 asked for suggestions to improve the online orientation. The number of responses to Q7 were 11 of 39 or 28% (Table 38).

Table 37. Q6 LIS 270, the online orientation, was helpful at the start of the program?

Value	2019-2020
Strongly Agree	27%
Agree	46%
Neutral	24%
Disagree	0%
Strongly Disagree	3%

Table 38. Q7. What suggestions do you have for improving LIS 270, the online orientation?

1	None, everything was great.
2	I found that the orientation did not set a true example for the amount of work expected for the graduate level workload. However, I would think that included should be more information on maneuvering through BlackBoard.
3	i like being able to introduce myself to others who may be taking the same course as me throughout the semester.
4	add a quick group project/partner project to learn how to collaborate online-and or to help
5	I wasn't able to complete it only because I did not start it prior to the beginning of my first semester. If it would be broadcast (more so) the importance of completing this course prior to commencing, that would be helpful.
6	I think there could have been a little more information on how to get a StormCard or at least your StormCard number so we can use the library as soon as possible. Also just some more general information on our to navigate Blackboard like how to get to the my grades from my classes.
7	It was difficult to navigate and the assignments weren't clear.
8	Clearer steps to accessing SJU website prior to starting classes (I wasn't sure how to log in and was panicking a bit on day one). Also clearer access to online library databases. In order to get to the library, I had to call and get my stormcard code because I'm not a campus resident with a physical card.
9	Showing various samples of course maps.
10	I felt that the instructions were a bit unclear at times, and I did not know if I was done with the course even though I had completed the assignment.
11	I have none. I found it to be both helpful and informative.

Summary

Several observations can be drawn from the 2019-2020 surveys.

1) The St. John's University's web site and the ALA web site/directory are the most important means of finding out about St. John's MS LIS program.
2) The online modality and the flexibility of the program are the highest ranked reasons for choosing St. John's MS LIS program.
3) Since 2017, students are older. Students in the 26 – 40 age group comprise 53% of those entering the program in 2019-2020. The 25 years or younger age group is the second largest at

34%. These results are similar to the results from the 2017-2018 surveys and are most likely related to Wiley's recruitment strategy.

4) The overwhelming majority of students entering the program since 2017 are part-time, compared to a more even split in previous years. Advisement meetings with new students confirm that a majority of students are working full-time.

5) When asked if the online orientation course was helpful 73% responded "strongly agree" or "agree"; 24% responded "neutral, while 3% responded "strongly disagree". The fact that 27% of respondents did not agree that the online orientation was helpful is reason to investigate. Q7 provided several suggestions which the faculty will consider in revising the course.

Appendix

A. DLIS Strategic Priorities 2019 – 2021: A Progress Report

Date: June 10, 2020

Introduction. The DLIS faculty approved the 2019 - 2021 Strategic Priorities in September 2019. The development of the strategic priorities was informed by the implementation of the 2017 – 2019 action items, the 2018 – 2019 assessment measures, the faculty meetings, and the May 2019 advisory board meeting. This progress report is a midpoint review. The faculty decided at the September 2019 meeting to move to a two-year strategic priority framework, based on a pattern in which strategic priorities often required several years for their respective action items to be completed.

Strategic Priorities

1. Develop and promote activities that help students understand the application of professional ethics and how library and information science promotes social and economic class justice.

   Action Items

   a) Develop the new Brother Corry Social Justice Fellowship as a means for engaging students in research related to social justice.

   b) Emphasize issues relating to professional ethics and social justice in new and existing LIS coursework such as LIS 239 Research Methods and LIS 283 Social Justice in the Information Professions.

   c) Explore ways the University's institutional repository http://scholar.stjohns.edu may serve as a publication platform for student and faculty research.

   Steps Taken

   a) The Brother Corry Social Justice Fellowship has been revised to integrate better with research-related coursework and to require deliverables more appropriate for a Master's level research fellowship. As evidence of the revision's success, DLIS received the first two proposals for the fellowship in May 2020.

   b) LIS 283 has been revised per action item (b) above.

   c) Action item (c) is an open item at this time.

2. Strengthen the relationship between alumni and the students and faculty by increasing opportunities for alumni participation in the MS LIS program.

   Action Items

   a) Implement a revised mentorship program as discussed at the 2019 Advisory Board Meeting which leverages the mentorship programs of related professional associations and invites recent alumni to serve as online learning mentors.

   b) Plan to hold the Gillard Alumni Lecture at the ALA Annual Conference in collaboration with the Catholic Library Association. Preliminary discussions of this approach took place at the Advisory Board Planning Meeting in April 2019.

   Steps Taken

   a) DLIS is in the process of constructing a list of mentorship programs offered by professional associations related to each of the six MS LIS specializations. Once completed, this list will be emailed to the Advisory Board for feedback. A protocol for inviting recent alumni to serve as online learning mentors is an open item at this time.

   b) Due to the Covid-19 pandemic, the 2020 ALA Annual Conference became a virtual conference. The decision was made to postpone the Gillard Alumni Lecture until the 2021 ALA Annual Conference. The lecture may become an important networking and social opportunity for alumni at the conference.

3. Create new programs and refine existing programs informed by the information needs in the evolving marketplace.

   Action Items

   a) Implement a marketing plan for the Certificate in Management for Information Professionals.

   b) Explore potential improvements in the archival studies specialization based on 1) recent trends in the field, as reported by the Society for American Archivists, and 2) broadening its scope to include records management.

   Steps Taken

   a) A marketing plan for the Certificate in Management for Information Professionals is under development.

   b) A new course, Records and Information Management, was developed and offered in Spring 2020, as part of the larger initiative to revise the Archival Studies specialization. The revised specialization will cover content areas included in certification examinations administered by the Academy of Certified Archivists (ACA) and the Institute of Certified Records Management (ICRM). The revision is ongoing.

4. Prepare students to enter the profession and engage in lifelong learning.

Action Items

a) Explore additional opportunities for academic service-learning (AS-L) in the MS LIS program by performing an analysis of AS-L in graduate programs with emphasis on LIS curricula.

b) Revise the DLIS LibGuide to more clearly communicate to students the opportunities in the program related to career development, encourage involvement in professional associations, and professional networking in general.

c) Develop a framework for planning webinars for the academic year. Construct a database of presenters from professionals in field.

<u>Steps Taken</u>

a) Work is underway analyzing AS-L in LIS graduate programs. The analysis should be completed in the 2020 - 2021 academic year.

b) The DLIS LibGuide has been revised with emphasis on the areas identified in the above item (b).

c) Social media has been used quite effectively in identifying presenters for the DLISSA webinar series. A database of presenters should be completed in the 2020 - 2021 academic year.

5. Offer students a program characterized by excellent online pedagogy.

Action Items

a) Support faculty interested in completing the Online Learning Consortium's Certificate Program.

b) Plan for the transition to Blackboard Ultra in Fall 2020 as the Learning Management System.

c) Hold an annual meeting for part-time faculty to discuss online learning pedagogy and share experiences.

<u>Steps Taken</u>

a) Dr. Kevin Rioux has completed the Online Learning Consortium's (OLC) Certificate Program. Funds to support a second faculty member are uncertain at this time due to the financial impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on the University.

b) The University decided in May 2020 to change its Learning Management System from Blackboard to Canvas. Training modules are being prepared at this time. The DLIS faculty will decide later in the summer whether to switch to Canvas in the Fall 2020 or Spring 2021 term.

c) A meeting with the part-time faculty is planned for September 2020.

B. Agenda - Advisory Board Planning Meeting, April 5, 2019

    Queens Campus, LIB 305
    9:30am – 12:00pm

AGENDA

9:30 – 9:45   Program Updates

- Next accreditation 2025
- LIS 211 Collection Management - back in the curriculum

9:45 – 10:30   2019 Employer Survey

10:30 – 10:45   Break

10:45 – 12:00   May Advisory Board Meeting, discussion includes

- 2018 Advisory Board Meeting Summary
- 2017 – 2018 DLIS Strategic Priorities and Action Items
- Alumni mentorship program
- Revised e-newsletter

12:00   Lunch – Faculty Club

C. Advisory Board Members

First Name	Last Name*	Title	Organization
Michael	Crossfox	Academic Support Assistant	DLIS
Taina	Evans	Elderly Services Librarian	Brooklyn Public Library
Caroline	Fuchs	Associate Dean	St. John's University Libraries
Alirio	Gomez	Knowledge Manager	Jackson Lewis P.C.
Alyse	Hennig	Assistant Archivist	St. John's University Libraries
Tara	King	Instructional Designer	St. John's University
Lisa	Kropp	Director	Lindenhurst Memorial Library
Michelle	Levy	Archivist	Paulist Fathers
Ralph	Monaco	Director (retired)	New York Law Institute
Michael	Morea	Director	Gold Coast Public Library
Jean	O'Grady	Director, Research Services	DLA Piper LLP
Christina	Orozco	Archivist	Paulist Fathers
Jamie	Papandrea	Director	Brookhaven Public Library
Elizabeth	Pollicino Murphy	Director	St. Joseph College Libraries
Susan	Roby Berdinka	Information Services	Self-Employed
Taryn	Rucinski	Branch Librarian	US Court of Appeals, 2nd Circuit
Kathryn	Shaughnessy	Associate Prof/Librarian	St. John's University Libraries
Kimberly	Simmons	Student	DLIS
Tim	Spindler	Executive Director	LI Library Resources Council
Kristin	Szylvian	Associate Professor	Department of History
Anthony	Todman	Associate Prof/Librarian	St. John's University Libraries
James	Vorbach	Associate Prof. & Director	DLIS
Reba	Weatherford	Student	DLIS

D. Enrollment Summary presented at for May 2019 Advisory Board Meeting

Program		Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017	Fall 2018	Spring 2019
MS	Library & Information Science	64	65	68	63	102	113
MA/MS	Public History/Lib & Info Science				4	10	10
ADVCRT	Management for Info Professionals				1	2	1
Grand Total		**64**	**65**	**68**	**68**	**114**	**124**

2019 - 2020 Enrollment Summary

Program		Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017	Fall 2018	Fall 2019	Spring 2020
MS	Library & Information Science	65	68	63	102	124	131
MA/MS	Public History/Lib & Info Science			4	10	13	12
ADVCRT	Management for Info Prof			1	2	1	0
Grand Total		**65**	**68**	**68**	**114**	**138**	**143**

E. Agenda - Advisory Board Meeting -May 3, 2019

Location: Queens Campus, D'Angelo Activity Center (DAC) Rm 301
Date: Friday May 3, 2019; 9:30am – 3:00pm

9:30 – 10:00   Reception

10:00 – 11:00   Discussion Briefs

     a) Challenges of increased enrollment

     b) Program specializations

     c) Mentorship programs within professional organizations

     d) E-Newsletter prototype

11:00 – 12:15   Breakout Session

Goal: Ranking the bullet points from the 2018 advisory board meeting based on high/low "value" with respect to the topic and high/low "cost" (cost in this sense includes both ease of implementation and monetary cost)

Procedure: Discuss the ranking system and clarify as needed. Divide board members into three groups. Each group reviews and ranks the bullet points from one of the following topics:

1. Combining Soft Skills and Preparing Students for the Job Market
2. Professional Development and Lifelong Learning
3. Alumni Engagement

After 20 minutes, each group moves to the next topic. Each group sees the results from previous groups' reviews.

12:15 – 1:00   Lunch

1:00 – 1:30   Recorders wrap-up from the Breakout Session

1:30 – 2:30   Discussion

2:30 – 3:00   Evaluation Survey and Closing

F. Alumni Survey - 2020

Q1. I was satisfied with the quality of the program.			
Answer Choices	Responses		
Strongly Agree	63.64%	7	
Agree	36.36%	4	
Neutral	0.00%	0	
Disagree	0.00%	0	
Strongly Disagree	0.00%	0	
Comment		0	
	Answered	**11**	
	Skipped	**0**	

Q2. My interactions with faculty members were generally positive.			
Answer Choices	Responses		
Strongly Agree	63.64%	7	
Agree	27.27%	3	
Neutral	9.09%	1	
Disagree	0.00%	0	
Strongly Disagree	0.00%	0	
Comment		1	
	Answered	**11**	
	Skipped	**0**	

Q3. My interactions with my fellow students were generally positive.			
Answer Choices	Responses		
Strongly Agree	54.55%	6	
Agree	36.36%	4	
Neutral	9.09%	1	
Disagree	0.00%	0	
Strongly Disagree	0.00%	0	
Comment		0	
	Answered	**11**	
	Skipped	**0**	

Q5. My interactions with DLIS office staff were generally positive.

Answer Choices	Responses		
Strongly Agree	63.64%	7	
Agree	27.27%	3	
Neutral	9.09%	1	
Disagree	0.00%	0	
Strongly Disagree	0.00%	0	
Comment		2	
	Answered	**11**	
	Skipped	**0**	

Q7. I received useful information in my advisement meetings.

Answer Choices	Responses		
Strongly Agree	27.27%	3	
Agree	63.64%	7	
Neutral	9.09%	1	
Disagree	0.00%	0	
Strongly Disagree	0.00%	0	
Comment		1	
	Answered	**11**	
	Skipped	**0**	

Q9. The faculty were effective teachers.

Answer Choices	Responses		
Strongly Agree	45.45%	5	
Agree	45.45%	5	
Neutral	9.09%	1	
Disagree	0.00%	0	
Strongly Disagree	0.00%	0	
Comment		3	
	Answered	**11**	
	Skipped	**0**	

Q10. I was satisfied with the variety of courses offered to me.			
Answer Choices	Responses		
Strongly Agree	54.55%	6	
Agree	45.45%	5	
Neutral	0.00%	0	
Disagree	0.00%	0	
Strongly Disagree	0.00%	0	
Comment		0	
	Answered	**11**	
	Skipped	**0**	

Q11. I had access to appropriate library resources to support my career interests.			
Answer Choices	Responses		
Strongly Agree	54.55%	6	
Agree	36.36%	4	
Neutral	9.09%	1	
Disagree	0.00%	0	
Strongly Disagree	0.00%	0	
Comment		1	
	Answered	**11**	
	Skipped	**0**	

Q12. I had access to appropriate software and related technology to support my career interests.			
Answer Choices	Responses		
Strongly Agree	45.45%	5	
Agree	36.36%	4	
Neutral	18.18%	2	
Disagree	0.00%	0	
Strongly Disagree	0.00%	0	
Comment		0	
	Answered	**11**	
	Skipped	**0**	

Q13. I was prepared to enter the workforce.			
Answer Choices	Responses		
Strongly Agree	72.73%	8	
Agree	18.18%	2	
Neutral	9.09%	1	
Disagree	0.00%	0	
Strongly Disagree	0.00%	0	
Comment		0	
	Answered	**11**	
	Skipped	**0**	

Q14. Field experience in the form of Academic Service-Learning projects, internships and independent studies contributed toward my finding employment.			
Answer Choices	Responses		
Strongly Agree	36.36%	4	
Agree	27.27%	3	
Neutral	36.36%	4	
Disagree	0.00%	0	
Strongly Disagree	0.00%	0	
Comment		1	
	Answered	**11**	
	Skipped	**0**	

Q15. I would recommend this program to others.			
Answer Choices	Responses		
Strongly Agree	54.55%	6	
Agree	27.27%	3	
Neutral	18.18%	2	
Disagree	0.00%	0	
Strongly Disagree	0.00%	0	
Other (please specify)		0	
	Answered	**11**	
	Skipped	**0**	

G. Course Artifact Assessment Form (revised 2/11/2017)

Course Number and Title: *LIS 999 course name*
Artifact: *assignment name*
Term: {*format: Fall 2016*}
Instructor:
Date: [*format: month-name (d)d, yyyy*}

Course Description.

Program Goals[3]
The course contributes towards satisfying the following program goals of the MS LIS:

 Program goals listed

Description of Artifact: *assignment name, same as above*
description

Students' overall performance

Did students' performance on the artifact meet your expectations with regards to satisfying the program goals and outcomes?

What changes do you recommend to improve the course?

Sample Reviews (if submitted as separate files, list filenames here)

 Student 1

 {Student's artifact may be either pasted here, submitted as separate document, or persistent URL to the artifact may be pasted here.}

 Review of Student 1's artifact.

---

[3] https://www.stjohns.edu/resources/places/library-and-information-science (Scroll down to the program goals section)

Student 1's artifact.

Student 2

{Student's artifact may be either pasted here, submitted as separate document, or a persistent URL to the artifact may be pasted here.}

Review of Student 2's artifact

Student 2's artifact

Appendix (optional)

H. E-Portfolio Rubric

Program Goal Criteria	Excellent	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Selection of Artifacts	(1) All artifacts selected for inclusion within the ePortfolio relate to each of the eight DLIS program goals. (2) A minimum of eight different arifacts are used witin the Program Goals section of the ePortfolio. (3) A wide variety of media types are included.	(1) All artifacts selected for inclusion within the ePortfolio relate to each of the eight DLIS program goals. (2) A minimum of eight different artifacts are used within the Program Goals section of the ePortfolio. (3) A wide variety of media types are not included	(1) Not all of the artifacts selected for inclusion within the ePortfolio relate to each of the eight DLIS program goals. (2) A minimum of eight different artifacts are not used within the Program Goals section of the ePortfolio. (3) A wide variety of media types are not included.
Description	(1) All descriptions include an explanation of how the artifact(s) relates to the particular program goal it addresses and why it was chosen forinclusion. (2) All descriptions clearly explain the purpose, and tells what, when and who. It answers the question "what I did and why?" (3) All artifacts are cited. (4) Links are included for all artifacts.	(1) All descriptions include an explanation of how the artifact(s) relates to the particular program goal it addresses and why it was chosen for inclusion. (2) The description does not clearly explain the purpose, and tells what, when and who and/or the description does not clearly answer the question "What I did and why?" (3) All artifacts are cited. (4) Links are included for all artifacts.	If you are missiong criteria 1, 3, or 4 described in the "excellent" cell then you earn an automatic failure.

	The analysis clearly evaluates the following components: (1) significance of the project, (2) successes; (3) failures (if any occurred), and; (4) what was learned.	The analysis is missing an evaluation for one of the following components: (1) significance of the project; (2) successes; (3) failures (if any occurred), and; (4) what was learned	The analysis is missing an evalution for more than one of the following components: (1) significance of the project; (2) successes; (3) failures (if any occurred), and; (4) what was learned.
Reflection	A clear analysis of individual professional growth is present and includes the following components: (1) A contemplation of how to plan and do things differently with regards to the specific program goal the artifact(s) addressed(s); (2) An answer to the question "What is next?" and; (3) An answer to the question "What will I do to improve my future practice?"	A clear analysis of individual professional growth is present but is missing one of the following components: (1) A contemplation of how to plan and do things differently with regards to the specific program goal the artifact(s) addressed(s); (2) An answer to the question "What is next?" and; (3) An answer to the question "what will I do o improve my future practice?"	An analysis of individual professional growth is present but is missing more than one of the following components: (1) A contemplation of how to plan and do things differently with regards to the specific program goal the artifact(s) addressed(s); (2) An answer to the question "What is next?" and; (3) An answer to the question "What will I do to improve my future practice?"

Professional Philosophy	The professional philosophy clearly articulates the following components: (1) an understanding of the professional role of the information specialist; (2) best practices; (3) the knowledge and/or understanding you have acquired throughout the program, which demonstrate professional growth; (4) considerations for how your learning experiences will impact your professional practice, and; (5) reflection on how you intend to grow as an information professional over the next few years.	The professional philosophy is missing one of the following components: (1) an understanding of the professional role of the information specialist; (2) best practices; (3) the knowledge and/or understanding you have acquired throughout the program, which demonstrate professional growth; (4) considerations for how your learning experiences will impact your professional practice, and; (5) reflection on how you intend to grow as an information professional over the next few years.	The professional philosophy is missing more than one of the following components: (1) an understanding of the professional role of the information specialist; (2) best practices; (3) the knowledge and/or understanding you have acquired throughout the program, which demonstrate professional growth; (4) considerations for how your learning experiences will impact your professional practice, and; (5) reflection on how you intend to grow as an information professional over the next few years.
Resume	The résumé includes the following components: (1) educational background; (2) professional work experience; (3) memberships in professional organizations; (4) professional presentation and/or publications (if any), and; (5) honors/awards (if any).	The résumé is missing one of the following components: (1) educational background; (2) professional work experience; (3) memberships in professional organizations; (4) professional presentation and/or publications (if any), and; (5) honors/awards (if any).	The résumé is missing more than one of the following components: (1) educational background; (2) professional work experience; (3) memberships in professional organizations; (4) professional presentation and/or publications (if any), and; (5) honors/awards (if any).

Bio	The bio includes the following componetnts: (1) a professional photograph; (2) cover letter	The bio includes a cover letter, however the photo is missing or is not professional.	The bio is missing a cover letter
Design	The ePortfolio is easy to read. Navigation is intuitive.	The ePortfolio is generally easy to read.	The ePortfolio is often difficult to read due to inappropriate use of fonts and type size for headings, sub-headings and text or inconsistent use of font styles (italic, bold, underline). Some formatting tools are under or over-utilized and decrease the readers' accessibility to the content.
	Color, background, font styles (italic, bold, underline) and type size for headings, sub-headings and text are used consistently and enhance the readability throughout the ePortfolio.	Color, background, font styles, and type size for headings, sub-headings and text are generally used consistently throughout the ePortfolio.	Color of background, fonts, and links decreases the readability of the text, is distracting and used inconsistently in some places throughout the ePortfolio.
	Horizontal and vertical white space alignment is used appropriately to organize content.	Horizontal and vertical white space alignment is generally used appropriately to organize content.	Horizontal and vertical white space alignment is sometimes used inappropriately to organize content.

I. Employer Survey - 2019

Q5. Rate the relevance for successful performance of the job (General Skills)

	Not at all	Not very	Somewhat	Very	Extremely	Weighted Average
Basic computer (e.g., word-processing, spreadsheets)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	80.0%	4.8
Oral/written communication	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	21.8%	74.6%	4.71
Teamwork (interpersonal relationships)	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	27.3%	70.9%	4.69
Curiosity	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	34.6%	61.8%	4.58
Listening to others	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	34.6%	61.8%	4.58
Exhibits Professional Ethics	0.0%	0.0%	7.3%	34.6%	58.2%	4.51
Critical thinking (evaluating information)	0.0%	0.0%	5.6%	40.7%	53.7%	4.48
Cultural Sensitivity	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%	36.4%	54.6%	4.45
Flexibility	0.0%	0.0%	10.9%	36.4%	52.7%	4.42
User Engagement	1.8%	3.6%	16.4%	36.4%	41.8%	4.13
Decision-Making	0.0%	0.0%	22.2%	46.3%	31.5%	4.09
Community Engagement	0.0%	7.3%	30.9%	38.2%	23.6%	3.78
Presentation Skills	3.6%	0.0%	29.1%	52.7%	14.6%	3.75
Active Professional Engagement	0.0%	13.0%	33.3%	40.7%	13.0%	3.54
Leadership	0.0%	16.7%	37.0%	33.3%	13.0%	3.43
Advanced computer (e.g., databases, coding, web design)	1.9%	9.3%	51.9%	27.8%	9.3%	3.33
Statistics	13.0%	18.5%	44.4%	24.1%	0.0%	2.8
Other (please specify)						

Answered 55

Skipped 3

Respondents		Other (please specify)
	1	customer service skills, willingness to learn
	2	pubic speaking
	3	specific skills to age category i.e. youth services
	4	Basic customer service skills
	5	Innovative thinking

Q7. Rate the relevance for successful performance of the job (Specialized Skills)

	Not at all	Not very	Somewhat	Very	Extremely	Weighted Average
Ability to Set Goals and Achieve Them	0.0%	0.0%	13.2%	54.7%	32.1%	4.19
Practical Application of LIS Theory	1.9%	7.6%	39.6%	39.6%	11.3%	3.49
Project Management	3.6%	5.5%	38.2%	45.5%	7.3%	3.44
Marketing and Advocacy	1.8%	18.2%	29.1%	41.8%	9.1%	3.36
Management of Resources	3.6%	16.4%	38.2%	41.8%	0.0%	3.15
Data Analysis	5.5%	20.0%	47.3%	25.5%	1.8%	2.93
Negotiation Skills	9.4%	26.4%	45.3%	18.9%	0.0%	2.64
Supervisory Skills	16.4%	18.2%	41.8%	21.8%	1.8%	2.58
Mentoring or Coaching Colleagues	14.6%	30.9%	29.1%	25.5%	0.0%	2.51
Grant-writing skills	14.6%	29.1%	47.3%	9.1%	0.0%	2.36
Fluency in a Second Language	16.7%	24.1%	50.0%	9.3%	0.0%	2.35
Other (please specify)						

Answered	**55**	
Skipped	**3**	

Respondents	Other (please specify)
1	Time management skills

J. Annual Student Survey - 2020

Q1. In which of the following specializations do you have an interest? You may select more than one specialization.		
Answer Choices	Responses	
Academic Librarianship	25.58%	11
Archival Studies	46.51%	20
Management	6.98%	3
Public Librarianship	55.81%	24
School (no longer supported)	0.00%	0
Special Librarianship	20.93%	9
Youth Services	34.88%	15
I am undecided	2.33%	1
	Answered	**43**
	Skipped	**0**

Q2. Of the specializations you selected above, what is your primary interest at the present time ? (Select one)		
Answer Choices	Responses	
Academic Librarianship	9.30%	4
Archival Studies	27.91%	12
Management	4.65%	2
Public Librarianship	20.93%	9
School Media	0.00%	0
Special Librarianship	2.33%	1
Youth Services	27.91%	12
I am undecided	6.98%	3
	Answered	**43**
	Skipped	**0**

Q3. Faculty provide feedback on student work in a reasonable time.		
Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly agree	30.23%	13
Agree	58.14%	25
Neither agree nor disagree	9.30%	4
Disagree	2.33%	1
Strongly disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		3
	Answered	**43**
	Skipped	**0**

Q4. Students have access to continuing opportunities for advisement.		
Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly agree	41.86%	18
Agree	44.19%	19
Neither agree nor disagree	9.30%	4
Disagree	2.33%	1
Strongly disagree	2.33%	1
Comment		2
	Answered	**43**
	Skipped	**0**

Q5. Students have access to continuing opportunities for placement assistance.		
Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly agree	13.95%	6
Agree	39.53%	17
Neither agree nor disagree	39.53%	17
Disagree	2.33%	1
Strongly disagree	4.65%	2
Comment		3
	Answered	**43**
	Skipped	**0**

Q6. DLIS Administration responds to student questions in a reasonable time.		
Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly agree	39.53%	17
Agree	37.21%	16
Neither agree nor disagree	16.28%	7
Disagree	6.98%	3
Strongly disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		3
	Answered	**43**
	Skipped	**0**

Q7. Online databases through University Libraries are an efficient research tool.		
Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly agree	48.84%	21
Agree	41.86%	18
Neither agree nor disagree	9.30%	4

Q7. Online databases through University Libraries are an efficient research tool. (cont.)		
Disagree	0.00%	0
Strongly disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		2
	Answered	**43**
	Skipped	**0**

Q8. How many credits will you have completed at the end of the current term?		
Answer Choices	Responses	
Less than 18 credits	39.53%	17
18 or more credits	60.47%	26
	Answered	**43**
	Skipped	**0**

Only students having more than 18 credits answered Q9 through Q14.

Q9. Field Experience: check all the following forms of experience that you have at this point in your program of study.		
Answer Choices	Responses	
Academic service-learning project	92.00%	23
Internship	36.00%	9
Graduate assistantship	20.00%	5
Part-time employment in a library, or in a position related to the MS LIS program	52.00%	13
Full-time employment in a library, or in a position related to the MS LIS program	16.00%	4
Volunteer in a library, or in a position related to the MS LIS program	20.00%	5
Other (please specify)	12.00%	3
	Answered	**25**
	Skipped	**18**

Q10. In your opinion, how well prepared are you for your career as an information professional ?		
Answer Choices	Responses	
Very well prepared	40.00%	10
Well prepared	36.00%	9
Somewhat prepared	24.00%	6
Not at all prepared	0.00%	0
	Answered	**25**
	Skipped	**18**

Q11. After you graduate, what St. John's educational opportunities would you consider for future professional development?		
Answer Choices	Responses	
Advanced certificate	50.00%	12
Second graduate degree	25.00%	6
Webinar / workshop	62.50%	15
None	8.33%	2
Comment		2
	Answered	**24**
	Skipped	**19**
Q12. How prepared do you feel to assume a position of leadership and/or make a difference in society?		
Answer Choices	Responses	
Very well prepared	29.17%	7
Well prepared	50.00%	12
Somewhat prepared	20.83%	5
Not at all prepared	0.00%	0
Poor	0.00%	0
	Answered	**24**
	Skipped	**19**
Q14. How likely are you to recommend St. John's MS LIS program to prospective information professionals?		
Answer Choices	Responses	
Highly likely	45.83%	11
Likely	37.50%	9
Somewhat likely	16.67%	4
Not at all likely	0.00%	0
Comment		2
	Answered	**24**
	Skipped	**19**

K. Exit Survey 2019 - 2020

Q1. I was satisfied with the quality of the program.

Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly Agree	52.17%	12
Agree	34.78%	8
Neutral	8.70%	2
Disagree	0.00%	0
Strongly Disagree	4.35%	1
Comment		3
Answered		**23**
Skipped		**0**

Q2. My interactions with faculty members were generally positive.

Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly Agree	65.22%	15
Agree	34.78%	8
Neutral	0.00%	0
Disagree	0.00%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		2
Answered		**23**
Skipped		**0**

Q3. My interactions with my fellow students were generally positive.

Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly Agree	43.48%	10
Agree	56.52%	13
Neutral	0.00%	0
Disagree	0.00%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		1
Answered		**23**
Skipped		**0**

Q4. My interactions with DLIS office staff were generally positive.

Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly Agree	47.83%	11
Agree	34.78%	8
Neutral	13.04%	3
Disagree	0.00%	0
Strongly Disagree	4.35%	1
Comment		3

Q4. (Cont.)

Answered		**23**
Skipped		**0**

Q5. I received useful information from my faculty advisor.

Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly Agree	56.52%	13
Agree	34.78%	8
Neutral	8.70%	2
Disagree	0.00%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		3
Answered		**23**
Skipped		**0**

Q6. The faculty were effective teachers.

Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly Agree	60.87%	14
Agree	39.13%	9
Neutral	0.00%	0
Disagree	0.00%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		4
Answered		**23**
Skipped		**0**

Q7. The faculty are knowledgeable in their areas of expertise.

Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly agree	78.26%	18
Agree	21.74%	5
Neutral	0.00%	0
Disagree	0.00%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.00%	0
Other (please specify)		0
Answered		**23**
Skipped		**0**

Q8. I was satisfied with the course selection offered during my program of study.

Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly Agree	39.13%	9
Agree	43.48%	10
Neutral	17.39%	4
Disagree	0.00%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		6
Answered		**23**
Skipped		**0**

Q9. Courses were offered frequently enough for timely completion of degree requirements.

Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly Agree	52.17%	12
Agree	43.48%	10
Neutral	4.35%	1
Disagree	0.00%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		2
Answered		**23**
Skipped		**0**

Q10. I had access to appropriate library resources to support my educational needs.

Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly Agree	52.17%	12
Agree	30.43%	7
Neutral	13.04%	3
Disagree	0.00%	0
Strongly Disagree	4.35%	1
Comment		5
Answered		**23**
Skipped		**0**

Q11. I had access to appropriate software and related technology to support my educational needs.

Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly Agree	60.87%	14
Agree	34.78%	8
Neutral	4.35%	1
Disagree	0.00%	0

Q11. (Cont.)

Strongly Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		2
Answered		**23**
Skipped		**0**

Q12. I feel prepared to enter the workforce.

Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly Agree	47.83%	11
Agree	47.83%	11
Neutral	4.35%	1
Disagree	0.00%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		3
Answered		**23**
Skipped		**0**

Q13. I would recommend this program to others.

Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly Agree	56.52%	13
Agree	30.43%	7
Neutral	8.70%	2
Disagree	4.35%	1
Strongly Disagree	0.00%	0
Other (please specify)		0
Answered		**23**
Skipped		**0**

L. New Student Survey 2019 - 2020

Q1. How did you find out about the St. John's MS-LIS program? (Check all that apply)

Answer Choices	Responses	
Recommendation from an alumna/alumnus of the program and/or librarian	15.38%	6
Career counselors in the college where I earned my previous degree	2.56%	1
American Library Association website/directory	41.03%	16
St. John's University website	53.85%	21
St. John's University Online Programs Portal	5.13%	2
Direct Mail (paper) campaign	2.56%	1
Other (please explain)		9
Answered		**39**
Skipped		**0**

Q2. Please rank your reasons for choosing to pursue your graduate education at St. John's. (where 1 = "most relevant" and 5 = "least relevant")

	1	2	3	4	5
Flexibility of the program and course offerings	8.82%	47.06%	20.59%	20.59%	2.94%
Reputation of the school, department, and/or faculty	13.89%	11.11%	33.33%	38.89%	2.78%
Recommendation of colleague or family member	17.14%	2.86%	11.43%	11.43%	57.14%
Availability of funding/scholarship	11.11%	19.44%	27.78%	22.22%	19.44%
Online program	45.95%	13.51%	10.81%	8.11%	21.62%

Q3. To which age group do you belong?

Answer Choices	Responses	
25 years or younger	34.21%	13
26-40 years	52.63%	20
41-54 years	10.53%	4
55 or older	2.63%	1
Answered		**38**
Skipped		**1**

Q4. What is your current status?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Full-time (9-12 credits/semester)	13.16%	5
Part-time (3-6 credits/semester)	86.84%	33
Answered		**38**
Skipped		**1**

Q5. In which of these activities were you engaged immediately prior to entering this program? Please select ALL that apply.

Answer Choices	Responses	
Undergraduate student	37.84%	14
Graduate student	29.73%	11
Volunteer/community service	18.92%	7
Employed in a field related to information studies	48.65%	18
Other (please describe)	13.51%	5
Answered		**37**
Skipped		**2**

Q6. Do you agree that LIS 270, the online orientation, was helpful at the start of the program?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly Agree	27.03%	10
Agree	45.95%	17
Neutral	24.32%	9
Disagree	0.00%	0
Strongly Disagree	2.70%	1
Answered		**37**
Skipped		**2**

M. Curriculum Map

Course Code	Course Name	Program Goals & Outcomes	Faculty
	CORE (4 courses)		
LIS 203	Organization of Information	3A, 3B	Angel
LIS 204	Introduction to Library and Information Science	1A, 1B, 1C, 1E, 2A, 2B, 3A, 5A, 7A	Rioux
LIS 205	Introduction to Information Sources and Services	5A	Lee
LIS 239	Research and Evaluation Methods	1A, 1B, 1D, 3A, 6A	Singh
	MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENT		
LIS 240	Management of Libraries and Information Centers	1D, 8A, 8B	Singh
	ELECTIVES (35 courses)		
LIS 121	Literature & Related Resources for Children	2B, 7A	Lee
LIS 125	Library Materials and Services for Young Children	2B, 4A	Lee
LIS 126	Literature & Related Resources for Young Adults	2B, 7A	Lee
LIS 127	Library Programs & Services for Children and Young Adults	2B, 4A, 7A, 8A, 8B	Lee
LIS 211	Collection Development	1A, 2A, 2B, 3A, 5A, 5B, 5C, 6A, 8A, 8B	Rioux
LIS 213	Popular Culture and Young Adults	2B, 4A, 8B	Lee
LIS 214	Teen Spaces For Libraries	1A, 1B, 1C, 4A	Lee
LIS 221	Planning and Delivering Information Literacy Programs	5B, 5C, 7A, 7B	King
LIS 222	Materials and Services to Diverse Populations	1A, 1B, 1C, 1D, 5B, 5C, 7A, 7B	Shaughnessy
LIS 230	Introduction to Digital Libraries	1B, 1D, 3A, 3B, 4A, 5B	Angel
LIS 231	College and University Libraries	8A, 8B	Rioux
LIS 233	Public Libraries and Community Information Centers	8A, 8B	Rioux
LIS 237	Metadata for Information Professionals	1A, 1D, 3A, 3B	Vorbach
LIS 238	Web Design for Libraries and Information Centers	4A	Vorbach

Course Code	Course Name	Program Goals & Outcomes	Faculty
LIS 245	Special Collections Librarianship and History of the Book: Principles and Practice	2A, 2B, 3A, 8B	Sheehan
LIS 248	Database Modeling and Design	3A, 3B, 4A	Vorbach
LIS 249	Introduction to Archival Principles & Practices	1A, 1C, 3A, 3B, 5C, 7B	Angel
LIS 253	Oral History	4A, 7B	Szylvian
LIS 257	Archival Representation	1C, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B, 4A, 5A, 5B, 8B	Angel
LIS 258	Museum Informatics	3A, 3B, 4A	Angel
LIS 260	Information Use and Users	1B, 1D, 2A, 3A, 4A, 5A, 5B, 5C, 6A, 7B, 8B	Rioux
LIS 261	Information Sources and Services for Children and Young Adults	2B, 4A, 5A, 5C, 7B	Lee
LIS 262	Project Management in Information Organizations	1D, 5C, 8A, 8B	Singh
LIS 263	Marketing & Advocacy in Information Organizations	1B, 1D, 5C, 8A, 8B	Singh
LIS 264	Project Leadership for Information Professionals Capstone	1A, 1D, 5C, 7A, 8A, 8B	Singh
LIS 269	Internship (269-3cr; 269A-school adult; 269B-1cr; 269C-school children; 269D-2cr; 269E-0cr)	7A, 7B	all faculty
LIS 273	Graphic Novels and Libraries	1A, 2B, 5B	Fuchs
LIS 274	Library Design	4A, 5C, 8A, 8B	Glassman
LIS 275	Cultural Competence for Information Professionals	1A, 1D, 5B, 5C, 8A, 8B	Singh
LIS 271	Special Topics: Grantsmanship – Fundraising for Librarians	1A, 1D, 8A, 8B	Zabriskie
LIS 271	Records and Information Management	1B, 1E, 2A, 3A	Angel
LIS 282	Knowledge Management	2A, 2B, 8A, 8B	Singh
LIS 283	Social Justice and the Information Profession	1A, 1B, 1D, 2B, 4A, 5B, 5C	Rioux
LIS 302	Genealogical Sources & Services	3A, 4A, 5A, 5B, 5C (check)	Earle