

Division of Library and Information Science

Assessment Report

2018 - 2019

Prepared by: James Vorbach, Director & Associate Professor

Approved: October 23, 2019

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	3
Program Goals and Outcomes	5
Advisory Board Planning Meeting - April 5, 2019	7
Advisory Board Meeting - May 3, 2019	10
Alumni Survey	14
Career Outcomes Survey	18
Course Artifact Assessment	19
E-Portfolio Assessment	22
Employer Survey	24
Student: Annual Survey	28
Student: Exit Survey	31
Student: New Student Survey.....	35
Appendix	40
A. Strategic Priorities 2017 – 2019: Implementation of Action Items	40
B. Agenda - Advisory Board Planning Meeting, April 5, 2019.....	43
C. Advisory Board Members	44
D. Enrollment Summary.....	45
E. Agenda - Advisory Board Meeting -May 3, 2019	46
F. Alumni Survey - 2019	47
G. Course Artifact Assessment Form (revised 2/11/2017)	51
H. Employer Survey - 2019.....	53
I. Annual Student Survey - 2019.....	55
J. Exit Survey 2018 – 2019.....	58
K. New Student Survey 2017 – 2018.....	63

Executive Summary

Purpose. The purpose of this document is to report on the 2018 – 2019 assessments and advisory board meetings (Table 1). The assessments and advisory board meetings 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 process is guided by the DLIS Assessment Plan, approved March 2015.

Background. DLIS developed a comprehensive assessment plan in 2015 that called for reconstituting the Advisory Board, creating a Law Librarianship Advisory Board (whose name was changed in 2017 to the Certificate in Management for Information Professionals (CMIP) Advisory Board), and three new assessment measures. The alumni survey, graduating student exit survey and employer survey were implemented in 2016 and 2017. In 2018 the CMIP Advisory Board was discontinued. Issues related to the Certificate in Management for Information Professionals are decided by the DLIS faculty with the assistance of the larger DLIS Advisory Board.

Work began in January 2017 on the Self-Study in preparation for the ALA Committee on Accreditation’s (CoA) External Review Panel (ERP) site visit in Fall 2018. The Self-Study was completed in June 2018. The ERP visited DLIS from September 30th to October 2, 2018. Dr. Vorbach met with the CoA on January 27, 2019 and on January 29th the CoA approved the “continued accreditation” of the MS LIS program to 2025.

In contrast to previous years, the 2017 - 2018 Strategic Priorities and Action Items were not revised for 2018 - 2019. This was due to the large effort expended preparing for the 2018 accreditation review. Work continued in 2018 - 2019 on the action items in the 2017 - 2018 report and the progress is reported in Appendix A Strategic Priorities 2017 - 2019: Implementation of Action Items.

The quality of the MS LIS program is monitored continuously using an annual cycle of data collection, analysis, reporting, board meetings, and faculty reviews. 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 Standards for Accreditation of Master’s Programs in Library and Information Studies¹. More importantly, students in the program are well-equipped for current and emerging positions in the evolving information professions.

Table 1. Assessment Measures and Advisory Boards (in order of timeline)

Measure/Board	Timeline (Month Administered)	Participants
Course Artifact Assessment	August, December, May	Faculty
E-Portfolio Reviews	August, December, May	Graduating students
New Student Survey	September, January	Students entering the program
Exit Survey	September, January, May	Graduating students

¹<http://www.ala.org/educationcareers/accreditedprograms/standards>

Measure/Board	Timeline (Month Administered)	Participants
Annual Student Survey	March	Students
Advisory Board Planning Committee	March	Alumni, employers, faculty
Alumni Two-Year-Out Survey	April	Alumni graduating two years prior
Employer Survey	April, every two years	Employers
Advisory Board	May	Alumni, employers, faculty, and students

Program Goals and Outcomes

Since 2009, DLIS has based its program goals and outcomes on the ALA's eight core competencies of librarianship². The program goals are reviewed annually to ensure they continue to serve the MS LIS program effectively in light of the program's evolution. In addition, specializations within the MS LIS program supplement the program goals with that of related professional organizations.

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.

Goal 4. Apply Technological Knowledge and Skills to Practice

² ALA Core Competencies

<http://www.ala.org/educationcareers/sites/ala.org.educationcareers/files/content/careers/corecomp/corecompetences/finalcorecompstat09.pdf>

- 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 June 2019 (Appendix F). The participants graduated in 2016 -2017 academic year (i.e. September 2016, January 2017, and May 2017).

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 30 alumni to whom the survey was emailed, 22 responded to the survey, a 73% response rate. The responses to each question were: “strongly agree”, “agree”, “neutral”, “disagree”, and “strongly disagree”. Table 6 contains the results from the 2019 survey only because the 2019 revision of the survey instrument split the question, distinguishing library resources (Q11) and technology (Q12).

Table 2. Program

Questions*	2019	2018	2017	2016
Q1: Satisfied with the program	91%	83%	62%	78%
Q13: Prepared to enter the workforce	89%	66%	64%	86%
Q14: Field experience (AS-L, internships, ind studies) contributed towards employment	78%	83%	27%	57%
Q15: Recommend program to others	94%	83%	64%	86%

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

Table 3. Interactions

Questions	2019	2018	2017	2016
Q2: Interactions with faculty generally positive	100%	100%	92%	100%
Q3: Interactions with fellow students generally positive	95%	84%	83%	100%
Q5: Interactions with office staff generally positive	100%	92%	83%	78%
Q7: Received useful information in advisement meetings	90%	83%	58%	88%

Table 4. Teaching

Question	2019	2018	2017	2016
Q9: Faculty were effective teachers	85%	100%	92%	100%

Table 5. Courses

Question	2019	2018	2017	2016
Q10: Satisfied with the variety of courses offered	84%	58%	50%	100%

Table 6. Resources

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

Table 2 shows that students overall are satisfied with the program. Table 3 shows that students' interactions with faculty, students, and staff remain very positive. Although the students' "agree" responses to faculty as effective teachers decreased (Table 4), no students disagreed. The other responses were "neutral". The result on the variety of courses offered (Table 5) has improved. Finally, students appear satisfied with their access to resources (Table 6).

Open Questions

Q4 asked students to suggest ways to "foster, enhance, and/or reinforce interaction among students in the online environment. 73% responded. The responses included:

- More group projects;
- Fund student travel to attend conferences;
- Use of the webcam feature by faculty for commenting and posting over typed posts;
- Schedule video chats twice a semester (Google chat mentioned also);
- Increase online discussion in courses;
- Encourage digital meet-ups and forums;
- More meetups at conferences, such as NYLA; and
- Change the forum discussion format to be more conversational and less "yes I agree with your comment and here's why".

Q6 asked students to suggest ways in which DLIS staff could further enhance and/or support the student experience. 45% responded, but most responses were related to the faculty. Two exceptions:

- Monthly lunches/dinners/happy hour for nearby students to interact socially; and
- Seek out more public libraries for academic service learning opportunities.

Q8 asked respondents to suggest ways to improve the advisement process. 32% responded. Responses included:

- Have mandatory check-ins;
- Class-wise, the information was useful, but communications about beyond the degree should be a part of the discussion as well;
- Focus advisement meetings on students' post-graduation careers;
- Advise for specific types of jobs (i.e. NARA, public librarian, academic, etc.);
- To encourage more follow-up throughout the semester. The only time I spoke with my advisor was when registering for classes;
- Add an advisement meeting at the end of every semester to keep the students on pace. Staff should also monitor students to see if otherwise strong students start slumping or drastic changes in mood/class performance.

Q17 asked respondents to identify the major strengths of the program. 73% responded. Responses included:

- AS-L program, distance learning option, student conferences, opportunities to publish work;
- Academic Service Learning aspect of the program is the key to success in our field.
- The academic service learning is truly what helped me the most! I was able to gain hands on experience while giving me opportunities to turn my internships and jobs into research projects and presentations;
- Excellent staff, the program's standing in the wider library community, excellent internship opportunities;
- The support from faculty and their willingness to help guide students into the profession is stellar. Also, working with various emerging technologies was a huge strength of the program. I felt very well prepared for the current digital information landscape and this was something that employers certainly noticed;
- The fact that all of the students were truly focused on librarianship, and wanted to learn everything about it. The fact that the program is geared towards succeeding in the workplace. That we were given the freedom to ask questions;
- Online, fairly low-commitment, not difficult, Portfolio instead of comps or a thesis;
- I loved to online nature and how it could be completed anywhere at any time. As a married student, this helped me balance home life and school life;
- AS-L programs were particularly helpful. They gave me a portfolio I could use to show potential employers examples of my work;
- The genuine caring and support found both in faculty and fellow students;
- The courses were relevant to working in the field. All of Dr. Singh's assignments I have had to do while working in a public library. I feel like I have more experience than other librarians who went to other MLIS programs;
- The offering of different tracks in librarianship, the small size and flexible hours of scheduling, not being limited to only certain specialties; and
- Smaller class sizes. Easily accessible faculty.

Q18 asked students for recommendations to improve the program. 59% responded. Responses included:

- Schedule talks to be given by librarians working in different areas -- public, private/special, legal, schools;
- Add as much hands on real world experience as possible. And encourage students to shadow other professionals in the field when possible;
- I wish there were more in-depth content in each of the areas. I would have been okay with an additional term that focused in on information relevant to the specific disciplines as well as an additional theory class that worked towards actual publication;
- Offer more courses related to special collections;
- I think that additions of more hands-on experience would be great. Maybe a comprehensive exam that includes sample reference interviews, items to catalog, etc. I felt that even more hands-on experience would have been helpful for me;
- I would like to see more opportunities for alum involvement;
- More variety in electives;
- More opportunities for internships and conferences. I feel this would've provided chances to meet other students and work peers;
- Try to find ways to increase interactions both online and in person where possible. Distance learners are at such distinct disadvantages at times;
- More course offerings for public librarians and management courses;
- More opportunities for students and staff to meet in person to build cohesiveness within the program; and
- More classes related to social work and interacting with non-cooperative or difficult patrons.

Summary

The quantitative questions (Tables 2 through 6) indicate a strong MS LIS program. Two areas where DLIS has made notable improvements are in field experiences (Table 2) and the variety of courses (Table 5). Both areas will continue to be emphasized going forward.

The open questions - Q4 (student community), Q8 (advisement), Q17 (program strengths), and Q18 (recommendations to improve the program) - have given the faculty useful information to continue to improve the MS LIS program. More specifically, this information will inform the faculty discussions on September 10th to develop the Strategic Priorities and Action Items for 2019 - 2020.

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 2018 survey consists of the graduates from Summer 2017, Fall 2017, and Spring 2018. Table 7 below shows the results for the graduates of the MS LIS program since 2014.

Table 7. Placement Results*

Statistic	2018	2017	2016	2015	2014
Response Rate	67%	59%	67%	52%	55%
Placement	86%	94%	100%	79%	82%
Employed	86%	94%	92%	72%	82%
Employed / Furthering Education	0%	0%	8%	7%	0%
Furthering Education	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Seeking Employment	14%	6%	0%	21%	18%

**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 relates each course in the program to one or more program goals and is available to students on the DLIS LibGuide. This course-level assessment of student learning was instituted in 2015 with the approval of the DLIS Assessment Plan (May 1, 2015). The Summer 2019 term begins the second four-year assessment cycle.

Procedure. At the beginning of a term, courses are assigned by the Director for assessment. The assignment is made such that a faculty member has no more than one course per term to assess. For each course, the instructor selects one artifact (e.g. assignment, exam, or semester project) 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 2015	Fall 2019
LIS 204	Introduction to Library and Information Science	1A, 1B, 1C, 1E, 2A, 2B, 3A, 5A, 7A	Rioux	Fall 2015	Fall 2019
LIS 205	Introduction to Information Sources and Services	1A, 4A, 5A, 5B, 7A, 7B, 8A, 8B	Lee	Fall 2015	Fall 2019
LIS 239	Research and Evaluation Methods	1A, 1B, 1D, 3A, 6A	Singh	Fall 2015	Fall 2019
	MANAGEMENT				
LIS 240	Management of Libraries and Information Centers	1A, 1D, 4A, 5C, 7A, 7B, 8A, 8B	Singh	Spring 2016	Spring 2020
	ELECTIVES				
LIS 121	Literature & Related Resources for Children	2B, 7A	Lee	Fall 2016	Fall 2020
LIS 125	Library Materials and Services for Young Children	2B, 4A	Lee	Spring 2015	Spring 2019
LIS 126	Literature & Related Resources for Young Adults	2B, 7A	Lee	Fall 2018	Fall 2022

Course Code	Course Name	Program Goals & Outcomes	Faculty	Reviewed/ Review Scheduled	Next Review
LIS 127	Library Programs & Services for Children and Young Adults	2B, 4A, 7A, 8A, 8B	Lee	Spring 2016	Spring 2020
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 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 2020
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	
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	Fall 2020
LIS 249	Archives and Records Management	1A, 1C, 3A, 3B, 5C, 7B	Angel	Fall 2017	Fall 2020
LIS 253	Oral History	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8	Szylvian	Spring 2018	Spring 2022
LIS 254	Legal Research	6A	Monaco	Fall 2016	Fall 2020
LIS 255	Advanced Legal Research	6A	Monaco	Spring 2017	Spring 2021

Course Code	Course Name	Program Goals & Outcomes	Faculty	Reviewed/ Review Scheduled	Next Review
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 2019	Fall 2021
LIS 262	Project Management in Information Organizations	1D, 5C, 8A, 8B	Singh	Fall 2017	Fall 2022
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	2022
LIS 269	Internship (269-3cr; 269A-school adult; 269B-1cr; 269C-school children; 269D-2cr; 269E- 0cr)	7A, 7B	all faculty	NA	NA
LIS 271	Special Topics: Graphic Novels in Libraries	1A, 1B, 2B, 5B, 8B	Fuchs	Summer 2020	
LIS 271	Special Topics: Grantsmanship – Fundraising for Librarians	1A, 1D, 8A, 8B	Zabriskie	Spring 2017	Spring 2021
LIS 271	Special Topics: Library Design		Glassman	Summer 2019	Summer 2022
LIS 271	Special Topics: Teen Space	1A, 1B, 1C, 4A	Lee	Summer 2020	Summer 2023
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	
LIS 302	Genealogical Sources & Services	3A, 4A, 5A, 5B, 5C	Earle	Summer 2019	

E-Portfolio Assessment

Background

The e-portfolio replaced the comprehensive exam in Spring 2013 as the end-of-program assessment for the MS LIS program. The main section in the e-portfolio covers the eight program goals, which are based on the eight core competencies of the American Library Association (ALA)³. 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. 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. Digication is the platform used by the students to create their e-portfolios.

To ensure student understanding of the purpose of the e-portfolio, the recommended practice of its development over the program of study, and the use of the development platform Digication, the following policy is in place:

- 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, recorded, and posted online.
- 3) Assignments in one core course provides practice in using Digication.
- 4) The e-portfolio assessment rubric is covered at the new student orientation and in each workshop, and is available online.

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

Summary

The results since inception are summarized in Table 9. 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 2018-2019 (Table 9) and overall pass rate (2013-2019, Table 10) are 96.9% and 96.7% respectively, close to the target pass rate of 100%. The Ave Diff increased in 2018-2019 to 8.3 which resulted in a corresponding overall increase to 6.7.

³<http://www.ala.org/educationcareers/sites/ala.org.educationcareers/files/content/careers/corecomp/corecompentences/finalcorecompstat09.pdf>

Table 9. E-Portfolio Summary By Academic Year

	2018-2019	2017-2018	2016-2017	2015-2016	2014-2015	2013-2014
Total	32	24	30	24	31	18
Total passed	31	22	30	22	31	17
Pass rate	96.9%	91.7%	100%	92%	100%	94%
Average (all portfolios)	91.0	89.3	93%	93%	93%	89%
Average (wo failures)	91.8	90.5	93%	95%	93%	92%
Ave Diff	8.3	6.7	5.0	5.3	7.5	8.5

Table 10. Overall Statistics

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

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 as a means to distinguish graduates to future employers.

The e-portfolio assessment rubric is reviewed annually. Since its introduction in 2013, there have been two changes: 1) clarification of the reflection for each program goal and 2) the revision of the Design requirement (15%).

The 2018-2019 results will be discussed at the first faculty meeting in September, with particular attention on the increase in the Ave Diff statistic.

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 several professional organizations by the Committee. 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. Most were from New York State (Table 13).

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 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) based on relevance to an entry level position. 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 H for the complete list of responses.

Table 14. Top Ten 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

Answer Options	2019	2017
Exhibits professional ethics	4.51	4.73
Critical thinking (evaluating information)	4.48	4.67
Cultural sensitivity	4.45	NA
Flexibility	4.42	NA
User Engagement	4.13	NA

Q6 asked employers to comment on the general skills. 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 5 specialized skills based on relevance (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 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 H for the complete list of responses.

Table 15. Top Ten 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

Q8 asked employers to comment on the general skills. 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 a St. John's graduate employed (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 4). 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 5) were not expected 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 2). A broader distribution of organizations may yield different results. One comment (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 where options appeared in both surveys.

St. John's graduates compare favorably with those from other LIS programs (Table 6).

Student: Annual Survey

Background. The annual student survey has been administered since the Spring 2012 term. The survey instrument was revised for the 2019 survey as part of the review of survey instruments following the continued accreditation of the MS LIS program by the ALA Committee on Accreditation in January 2019. The questions on the survey are organized into four categories: program, faculty, administration, and field experience. Field experience in this sense refers to both curricular (e.g. internships, academic service-learning) and related work experience. The 2019 survey results are provided for all closed questions in the appendix (Appendix I).

Review by Category.

a) Program

When asked to select specializations of interest (Q1), responses were balanced across the six specializations. Four of the six specializations (Academic, Archival, Public, and Youth Services) had response rates exceeding 30%. Public Librarianship had the highest response rate with 46%. Special Librarianship was selected by 23% of students. Although Management was rated the lowest at 17%, this was an increase of 6% from 2018.

When asked to select a primary specialization (Q2), Public Librarianship (17%) was chosen more than any other specialization. This represents an increase of 6% for Public Librarianship from 2018. This was followed by Archival Studies and Youth Services (14% for both), Academic and Special Librarianship (9% for both), and Management (6%). The Undecided category received the largest response rate (31%), a 10% increase from 2018. Table 17 shows the 2019 results for the program category questions. Due to the changes in the instrument, there are no comparisons with the results from previous years.

Table 17. Program

Question	Value	2019
Q3: How prepared do you feel to assume a position of leadership and/or make a difference in society?	Very Well-Prepared or Well-Prepared	85%
Q7: In your opinion, how well prepared are you for your career in library and information science?	Very Well-Prepared or Well-Prepared	70%
Q10. How likely are you to recommend St. John's MS LIS program to prospective information professionals?	Highly Likely or Likely	90%

b) Faculty

The 2019 results for faculty feedback (Q4i) and opportunities for guidance and counseling (Q4ii) are given in Table 18.

Table 18. Faculty

Question	Ratings	2019
Q4i: Faculty feedback about your work	Excellent or Good	82%
Q4ii: Access to continuing opportunities for guidance and counseling	Excellent or Good	65%

c) Administration

The 2019 results for placement assistance (Q4iii) and administrative and staff support (Q4iv) are provide in Table 19.

Table 19. Administration

Question	Ratings	2019
Q4iii: Access to continuing opportunities for placement assistance	Excellent or Good	59%
Q4iv: Administrative and staff support	Excellent or Good	77%

d) Field Experience

Q6 asked students to select field experiences in which they were engaged, including outside work (Table 20).

Table 20. Field Experience

Field Experience	2019
Academic service-learning project	90%
Internship	20%
Graduate assistantship	20%
Part-time employment related to the MS LIS program	10%
Full-time employment related to the MS LIS program	10%
Volunteer work related to the MS LIS program	40%

Students were asked (Q9) for their recommendations to improve the MS LIS program. Only 17% responded to this question. Their responses are as follows”

- 1) There need to be improvements for the dual degree students and their required internships and courses as it can be confusing to figure out;
- 2) Necessary internship, more library technology;
- 3) More interactive and engaging opportunities to bridge the online program to the real world;
- 4) Faculty need to be trained in facilitating online courses and how to communicate in an online environment. I've had more classes with professors who are unclear in their written communication in this program than is acceptable. The program as a whole needs to understand that an online program is completely different than an on campus program with some online classes. I never felt like I had a real opportunity to take part in student organizations, because I would often only hear about events and meetings on the day they were scheduled or after they've passed. I also think the focus on specializations does more harm than good - there should be a better focus on creating a solid foundation rather than sectioning students off into specific interests;
- 5) Better screening of adjunct faculty who are not affiliated with St. John's University Libraries. Let go of Blackboard and embrace better online learning platforms;
- 6) There is a bit of a disconnect between professors and students. From my time here, I have been sure to try to take all courses possible from a few of the professors, such as Dr. Singh. This is because he is able to best show what is expected. There is simply not enough communication and examples given on what is expected, and when.

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 14 through 17 provide a baseline for moving forward with the revised survey instrument. The results for Q4ii Access to Continuing Opportunities for Guidance and Counseling and Q4iii Access to Continuing Opportunities for Placement Assistance are lower than expected. These results will be discussed at the September faculty meeting, along with the student recommendations for program improvement.

Student: Exit Survey

Background. The exit survey was administered to the Fall 2018 and Spring 2019 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 21 - 25. The percentage values in the tables are the sum of the “Strongly Agree” and “Agree” responses. Of the 24 graduates (Fall 2018 and Spring 2019 combined), 18 responded to the survey, a 75% response rate. The responses to each question were: “strongly agree”, “agree”, “neutral”, “disagree”, and “strongly disagree”. The 2018 – 2019 survey results are listed in Appendix J.

Table 21. Program

Questions*	2018-2019	2017 – 2018	2016 – 2017	2015-2016
Q1: Satisfied with the program	88%	71%	100%	88%
Q12: Prepared to enter the workforce	88%	86%	100%	81%
Q13: Recommend program to others	83%	71%	100%	81%

*percentage values are the sum of the “strongly agree” and “agree” responses

Table 22. Interactions

Questions	2018-2019	2017–2018	2016 –2017	2015–2016
Q2: Interactions with faculty generally positive	88%	71%	100%	100%
Q3: Interactions with fellow students generally positive	100%	86%	91%	94%
Q4: Interactions with office staff generally positive	94%	57%	100%	94%
Q5: Received useful information from faculty advisors	82%	86%	100%	75%

Table 23. Teaching

Question	2018=2019	2017–2018	2016–2017	2015–2016
Q6: Faculty were effective teachers	88%	71%	100%	94%
Q7: Faculty are knowledgeable in their areas of expertise	100%			

Table 24. Courses

Questions	2018-2019	2017-2018	2016-2017	2015-2016
Q8: Satisfied with the variety of course offerings	82%	29%	100%	63%
Q9: Satisfied with the frequency of course offerings	88%	29%	100%	75%

Table 25. Resources

Question	2018 – 2019
Q10: Had access to appropriate library resources to support my educational needs.	94%
Q11: Had access to appropriate software and related technology to support my educational needs	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 26 contains a representative sample of responses to both questions.

Table 26. Open Questions

Question	Responses
Q15: Program Strengths	<p>The varied expertise of the professors.</p> <p>Field trips and site visits to museums and archives</p> <p>Diverse student body.</p> <p>Travel grants to attend conferences (but the amount should be increased)</p> <p>The full-time professor were always very helpful and willing to answer questions when I asked them (which was often)</p> <p>Course variety and instructor feedback</p> <p>Online students received the same guidance and attention that in-person students received.</p> <p>The faculty were very knowledgeable and effective.</p> <p>I would say the willing (sic) Professors to help in whatever situations arise that prevented one from succeeding in class.</p>

Question	Responses
Q15: Program Strengths (cont.)	<p>Online - it can be done on my own time - helpful while I'm working full time.</p> <p>Great, communicative faculty and Academic Service-Learning Projects!</p> <p>As a student who was off campus, I appreciated the timeliness in which my professors would respond to my inquiries via email. I also thought the recommended readings within each course were very informative and aligned with the course goals.</p> <p>Great professors, asynchronous class schedule</p>
Q16: Recommendations to improve the program	<p>Move away from Blackboard</p> <p>Streamline IT help and the Help Desk</p> <p>100% online academic advisement</p> <p>Increase amount of travel grants</p> <p>Designate one office that is a quiet space for GA's to work in when the lounge gets too loud</p> <p>Base all future courses on Rioux's model of online classes with weekly modules, a transparent grading system, and clear instructions</p> <p>Consider offering a "Spanish-Language Services" special topics course in the future</p> <p>To foster more interaction between online students.</p> <p>To emphasize working on the e-portfolio throughout course.</p> <p>To make mention of how Blackboard can save artifacts - I stumbled upon it. Also professors save work on Blackboard too which I learned about from another student</p> <p>More variety in the course choices. Especially for online students. It's not always possible to come to campus to take an interesting sounding course</p> <p>STOP GIVING GROUP WORK. it's counterintuitive to online courses. People are taking online courses because they don't have time to go to class because they have full time jobs or children. Why would anyone online class make them meet on other people's time. It doesn't even reflect actual work. Yes we'll have to work with others but not in the capacity that group work requires</p>

Question	Responses
Q16: Recommendations to improve the program (cont.)	<p>Each course should be catered to the type of institution you will be working at. I shouldn't be learning about how to catalog at a museum if I'll be working in a library. It's a waste of time. I should learn something each week that I can apply the next day at work. Maybe you think it'll give future librarians an all-around education but it's an all-around waste of time. If you think about it, you're hurting future librarians and their institutions by giving them information that doesn't apply to them.</p> <p>More course variety.</p> <p>To improve this program, I would suggest giving job statistics to those who are first entering the program. I.e. let them know not only graduation rates but also what percentage of students are actually obtaining careers and what specific fields these students followed to obtain careers.</p> <p>More cataloging courses.</p>

Summary

The survey instrument was revised for the 2019 survey as part of the review of all survey instruments following the granting of continued accreditation of the MS LIS program by the ALA Committee on Accreditation in January 2019. As a result some questions (Q7, Q10, and Q11) do not appear in previous years. In these cases only 2018-2019 results are shown. The quantitative part of the survey yielded satisfactory results and the open questions provide useful information for discussion at the September faculty meeting.

Student: New Student Survey

Background

The new student survey was under revision in the 2018 - 2019 academic year. The revised survey was administered to students entering the program in the Summer 2019 term. This will be reported in the 2019 - 2020 Assessment Report.

This section reports on the results of the September 2017 and January 2018 surveys, which were reported earlier in the 2017 - 2018 Assessment Report. The survey gathers information on why students chose St. John's, student information, and asks students to evaluate the New Student Orientation.

There are eleven questions on the survey. The questions are categorized as: 1) Choice of St. John's, 2) Student Information, and 3) Student Orientation.

Review by Category

a) Choice of St. John's

Questions Q1, Q2, and Q3 relate to why students chose the MS LIS program at St. John's. Table 23 presents the results and compares with those from previous years.

Table 23. Choice of St. John's MS LIS Program

Question	Value	2017-2018	2016-2017	2015-2016
Q1: How did you find out about the St. John's MS-LIS program?				
	St. John's University website	33%	57%	47%
	American Library Association website/directory	39%	48%	58%
	Recommendation from an Alumni of the program and/or librarian	33%	14%	16%
	Career counselors in the college where I earned my previous degree	0%	0%	5%
	Other (please explain)	11%	19%	16%
Q2: What were your reasons for choosing to pursue your graduate education at this institution? Check all that apply.				
	Nature of the program and course offerings	72%	86%	86%
	Reputation of the school, department, and/or faculty	61%	62%	43%
	Availability of funding/scholarship	17%	48%	43%

Q2: What were your reasons for choosing to pursue your graduate education at this institution? Check all that apply. (cont.)		2017-2018	2016-2017	2015-2016
	Location	11%	43%	43%
	Recommendation of colleague or family member	39%	14%	43%
	Other (please describe)	28%	14%	14%
Q3: What was your primary reason for choosing to pursue your graduate education at this institution? Select only one.				
	Nature of the program and course offerings	47%	40%	32%
	Reputation of the school, department, and/or faculty	12%	35%	16%
	Availability of funding/scholarship	6%	20%	21%
	Location	0%	5%	11%
	Recommendation of colleague or family member	18%	0%	5%
	Other (please describe)	18%	0%	16%

Looking at the trends over three years, the “availability of funding/scholarship” and “location” are less important in the decision to attend St. John’s. The “recommendation of colleague or family member is more important as the primary deciding factor. The “nature of the program and course offering” is consistently the most important deciding factor. With regards to finding out about St. John’s MS LIS program, “St. John’s University’s web site” and “ALA’s web site” have decreased in importance and “recommendation from an alumnus or librarian” has increased. An open comment, corresponding to the “other” response, shows students doing their own searches for information on online MS LIS programs.

b) Student Information

Questions Q5 through Q8 gather information on new students including age group, work/activities immediately prior to starting the program, full-time/part-time status, and professional goals. Gender and ethnicity data are collected on graduate applications. This information is provided to DLIS by the Office of Institutional Research. Table 2 presents the results for Q5, Q6, and Q7. For clarity, Q8’s results are listed separately in Table 3.

St. John’s University signed a contract with Wiley Education Services for recruitment and student support services. Some of the changes observed in Table 24 may be the result of the change in Wiley’s broader recruitment strategy. 2017-2018 shows a growth in the “26 – 40 years” group (Q5). The increase in “caring for family” as an activity engaged in immediately prior to entering the program (Q6) appears consistent with the increased age of students entering the program. The number of part-time students increased significantly in 2017-2018 (Q7). This is an indicator of the increase in students employed full-time.

Table 24. Student Information

Question	Value	2017-2018	2016-2017	2015-2016
Q5: To which age group do you belong?				
	25 years or younger	35%	60%	58%
	26-40 years	47%	20%	32%
	41-55 years	6%	20%	11%
	55 or older	12%	0%	0%
Q6: In which of these activities were you engaged immediately prior to entering this program? Please select ALL that apply.				
	Employed in a field related to information studies	47%	55%	26%
	Employed in a field unrelated to information studies	41%	40%	47%
	Undergraduate student	35%	35%	26%
	Volunteer/community service	18%	10%	32%
	Graduate student	6%	5%	37%
	Caring for family	24%	5%	26%
	Other (please describe)	6%	5%	0%
Q7: What is your current status?				
	Full-time (9-12 credits/semester)	6%	55%	42%
	Part-time (3-6 credits/semester)	94%	45%	58%

Table 25 lists the top five professional goals (Q8). A complete list of Q8's responses is in Appendix K.

Table 25. Professional Goals

Question	Value	2017-2018	2016-2017	2015-2016
Q8: Which of the following professional goals do you see yourself accomplishing in the future? Please select ALL options that apply. In the future I believe I will:				
	Enjoy a rewarding career	94%	100%	100%
	Be a mentor to new information professionals	65%	80%	68%
	Volunteer my professional services	59%	40%	47%

Q8 (cont)	Value	2017-2018	2016-2017	2015-2016
	Be a high-level manager or executive	-	40%	37%
	Be an innovator and leader in my field	35%	35%	42%
	Publish articles in professional journals	29%	-	-
	Pursue another Master's degree or Ph.D.	29%	-	-

Two new responses appeared in the top five (Q8) in 2017-2018 – “publish articles in professional journals” and “pursue another master’s degree or Ph.D. It will be interesting to track these two responses going forward.

c) Student Orientation

Questions Q4, Q9, Q10, and Q11 requested feedback from new students on the student orientation. Q4 and Q9 results are in Table 26. Q4 was a new question in 2016 – 2017, and Q9 was added in Spring 2016. Q10 and Q11 were open questions.

Table 26. Student Orientation

Question	Value	2017-2018	2016-2017	Spring 2016
Q4: How did you attend New Student Orientation?				
	Online (synchronously)	47%	20%	
	In person	29%	55%	
	I didn't attend, watched recording	24%	25%	
Q9: How useful was the New Student Orientation?				
	Very Useful	40%	30%	57%
	Useful	60%	70%	43%
	Not Useful	0%	0%	0%

Q10 asked for the elements of the orientation that were most helpful. The response rate for Q10 was 56% (44% skipped the question) and the areas identified were:

- Meeting the faculty and other students
- Hearing the experiences of current students
- Reviewing instructor expectation in the core courses

- Information available from the DLIS blog and LibGuide
- Seeing the work of professors and how it aligns with student interest
- Overview of the program

Q11 asked for suggestions to improve the orientation. The response rate for Q11 was 39% (61% skipped the question). The suggestions for improving the orientation are represented by:

- Improve the testing of the online meeting prior to the start of the orientation
- Email agenda topics in advance to solicit other topics or Q&A readiness
- Some presenters should slow down their delivery
- Have the camera on the speaker; it's too far away from everyone attending in person
- More time for professor's presentations and less on the topics which began the orientation

Summary

Several observations can be drawn when the 2017-2018 surveys are compared with previous years.

- 1) The recommendation of an alumnus and/or librarian is more important as a means of finding out about St. John's MS LIS program. The St. John's University's web site and the ALA web site/directory are less important.
- 2) The availability of funding and/or scholarships is not as significant as in previous years as a reason for attending St. John's program.
- 3) The location of St. John's is not as important as in previous years as a reason for attending St. John's program.
- 4) Students are older. The 26 – 40 age group is the largest in 2017-2018 as compared to the 25 or younger group in previous years.
- 5) The overwhelming majority of students entering the program in 2017-2018 are part-time compared to a more even split in previous years.
- 6) Interestingly "volunteer my professional services", "publishing articles in professional journals", and "pursue another Master's degree or Ph.D." increased significantly as professional goals. The latter two responses did not appear in the top five (Q8) in previous years.

This past year was the first recruitment cycle since the partnership with Wiley Education Services was signed. Some of the above observations may follow from a new student profile. This remains to be seen in future surveys.

Appendix

A. Strategic Priorities 2017 – 2019: Implementation of Action Items

Date: July 7, 2019

1. Develop and promote activities which engage students both professionally and socially.

Action Items

- a) Develop evaluations for all lectures, symposia, and workshops to identify areas of improvement. Create an annual report which compiles the assessment of such events for review at the all-day faculty meeting.
- b) Improve communications to students on the importance of participation in professional conferences by presenting papers, posters, and by serving on committees. This includes the availability of travel reimbursement for attending conferences to make a presentation. DLIS will also emphasize having papers or book chapters accepted for publication.

Steps Taken

- a) Following the decision by the ALA Committee on Accreditation (CoA) in January 2019 for the “continued accreditation” of the MS LIS program, the DLIS faculty decided to review all symposia, workshops, and lectures in the context of the online nature of the program. That review is scheduled to be complete by May 2020. One related decision was the change of the Brother Corry Social Justice Lecture to a \$1,000 fellowship where students propose a research plan, carry out the research, and receive a \$1,000 scholarship on submission of a research paper concluding the plan.
 - b) Professional conference presentations are promoted at the new student orientations, email digest, and blog.
2. Increase participation of alumni in DLIS programs and events to strengthen the relationship between alumni and DLIS students and faculty.

Action Items

- a) Expand the mentorship program to increase the participation of students and alumni, and which considers the online nature of the program.
- b) Organize at least two social events for alumni, e.g. Oktoberfest and a St. John’s basketball game at Carnesecca Arena.

Steps Taken

- a) Mentorship programs of professional associations will be promoted to students. In addition, DLIS we explore reaching out to recent alumni to mentor new students on online pedagogy.
- b) DLIS plans to promote two alumni social events, the Oktoberfest and a St. John’s basketball game at Carnesecca Arena, during the 2019 - 2020 academic year.

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

Action Items

- a) Develop a recruitment plan for the newly approved Advanced Certificate in Management for Information Professionals.
- b) Complete the development for a new Advanced Certificate in Digital Curation and Stewardship program in collaboration with the Department of History and the Department of Art and Design.
- c) Redesign LIS 211 Collection Development based on the feedback from the May 2017 Advisory Board Meeting.

Steps Taken

- a) A recruitment plan for the Advanced Certificate in Management for Information Professionals has been completed.
- b) Further development work on an Advanced Certificate in Digital Curation and Stewardship has been suspended. A market analysis failed to identify sufficient career opportunities for the Advanced Certificate to warrant its implementation.
- c) LIS 211 Collection Development has been redesigned by Taina Evans, a member of the Advisory Board. Ms. Evans taught the course in the Spring 2019 term.

4. Prepare students to be competitive in today's job market.

Action Items

- a) Provide innovative field experiences and high-impact practices in the curriculum, such as academic service-learning (AS-L), internships, independent study courses, applied projects, study abroad, and capstone courses.
- b) Offer webinars which inform students on careers as information professionals and on the job search, utilizing St. John's Career Services, DLIS' alumni network, and other information professionals in the field.
- c) Emphasize opportunities for students to learn 'soft' skills such as collaborative work, presentations, resume and cover letter writing, and advocacy.

Steps Taken

- a) The student association, DLISSA, and DLIS have instituted a process for planning biweekly webinars and inviting speakers. Presenters include professionals in the field (both alumni and non-alumni) and St. John's Career Services. Topics cover a range of valuable 'soft' skills related to the information professions and the job search.
- b) AS-L continues to be a part of the core (LIS 203), electives in the archival studies specialization, and the elective LIS 238.
- c) Internships are encouraged by faculty advisors and opportunities are posted to the email digest and blog. Study abroad opportunities with other ALA-accredited LIS programs are posted as well.

- d) Students have the opportunity to engage in independent research with faculty mentorship via LIS 901 Independent Study.
5. Engage faculty in a departmental initiative to improve online teaching.

Action Items

- a) Complete the development of guidelines for instructors teaching online, in collaboration with the Office of Online Learning and Services, to improve consistency among courses.
- b) Engage both full-time and part-time faculty in an ongoing dialog on improving online teaching.

Steps Taken

- a) The Office of Online Learning and Services provided DLIS with online learning guidelines which will be discussed at faculty meetings in the 2019 - 2020 academic year.
 - b) Dr. Kevin Rioux is completing a certificate program by the Online Learning Consortium (OLC) in 2019 and will share highlights with the faculty at the monthly faculty meetings.
 - c) Adjunct faculty meetings are now regularly scheduled at the start of the Fall and Spring terms. The meetings provide a new forum for engaging the adjunct faculty.
6. Prepare for ALA reaccreditation of the MS LIS in 2018.

Action Items

- a) Prepare the plan for the self-study, due October 2, 2017.
- b) Conference call with ERP Chair and OA Director to review plan, est. October 16, 2017.
- c) Prepare draft of self-study for internal review, due January 15, 2018
- d) Send draft of self-study to ERP Chair, each panelist, and OA Director, due June 4, 2018.
- e) Conference call with ERP Chair and OA Director to self-study draft, est. June 25, 2018.

Steps Taken

- a) All action items have been completed.
- b) Dr. Vorbach met with the CoA on January 27, 2019. On January 29th the CoA decided to grant the MS LIS program "continued accreditation".

B. Agenda - Advisory Board Planning Meeting, April 5, 2019
Queens Campus, LIB 305
9:30am – 12:00pm

AGENDA

- | | |
|---------------|---|
| 9:30 – 9:45 | Program Updates <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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
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

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

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 - 2019

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

Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly Agree	63.64%	14
Agree	27.27%	6
Neutral	9.09%	2
Disagree	0.00%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		4
	Answered	22
	Skipped	0

Q2. My interactions with faculty members were generally positive.

Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly Agree	63.64%	14
Agree	36.36%	8
Neutral	0.00%	0
Disagree	0.00%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		2
	Answered	22
	Skipped	0

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

Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly Agree	50.00%	10
Agree	45.00%	9
Neutral	5.00%	1
Disagree	0.00%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		1
	Answered	20
	Skipped	2

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

Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly Agree	75.00%	15
Agree	25.00%	5
Neutral	0.00%	0
Disagree	0.00%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		6

Answered 20
Skipped 2

Q7. I received useful information in my advisement meetings.

Answer Choices	Responses
Strongly Agree	45.00% 9
Agree	45.00% 9
Neutral	5.00% 1
Disagree	5.00% 1
Strongly Disagree	0.00% 0
Comment	2
Answered 20	
Skipped 2	

Q9. The faculty were effective teachers.

Answer Choices	Responses
Strongly Agree	55.00% 11
Agree	30.00% 6
Neutral	15.00% 3
Disagree	0.00% 0
Strongly Disagree	0.00% 0
Comment	2
Answered 20	
Skipped 2	

Q10. I was satisfied with the variety of courses offered to me.

Answer Choices	Responses
Strongly Agree	31.58% 6
Agree	52.63% 10
Neutral	10.53% 2
Disagree	5.26% 1
Strongly Disagree	0.00% 0
Comment	2
Answered 19	
Skipped 3	

Q11. I had access to appropriate library resources to support my career interests.

Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly Agree	57.89%	11
Agree	36.84%	7
Neutral	5.26%	1
Disagree	0.00%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		1
	Answered	19
	Skipped	3

Q12. I had access to appropriate software and related technology to support my career interests.

Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly Agree	47.37%	9
Agree	36.84%	7
Neutral	10.53%	2
Disagree	5.26%	1
Strongly Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		0
	Answered	19
	Skipped	3

Q13. I was prepared to enter the workforce.

Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly Agree	42.11%	8
Agree	47.37%	9
Neutral	10.53%	2
Disagree	0.00%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		3
	Answered	19
	Skipped	3

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	61.11%	11
Agree	16.67%	3
Neutral	11.11%	2
Disagree	5.56%	1
Strongly Disagree	5.56%	1
Comment		2
	Answered	18
	Skipped	4

Q15. I would recommend this program to others.

Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly Agree	77.78%	14
Agree	16.67%	3
Neutral	5.56%	1
Disagree	0.00%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.00%	0
Other (please specify)		2
	Answered	18
	Skipped	4

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 Goals⁴

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.

⁴ <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. 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				

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				

I. Annual Student Survey - 2019

Q1. In which of the following specializations do you have an interest? You may select more than one specialization.

Answer Choices	Responses	
Academic Librarianship	34.29%	12
Archival Studies	37.14%	13
Management	17.14%	6
Public Librarianship	45.71%	16
School (no longer supported)	0.00%	0
Special Librarianship	22.86%	8
Youth Services	31.43%	11
I am undecided	11.43%	4
	Answered	35
	Skipped	0

Q2. Of the specializations you selected above, at the present time what is your primary specialization ? (Select one)

Answer Choices	Responses	
Academic Librarianship	8.57%	3
Archival Studies	14.29%	5
Management	5.71%	2
Public Librarianship	17.14%	6
School Media	0.00%	0
Special Librarianship	8.57%	3
Youth Services	14.29%	5
I am undecided	31.43%	11
	Answered	35
	Skipped	0

Q3. How prepared do you feel to assume a position of leadership and/or make a difference in society?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Very well prepared	29.41%	10
Well prepared	55.88%	19
Somewhat prepared	14.71%	5
Not at all prepared	0.00%	0
Poor	0.00%	0
	Answered	34
	Skipped	1

Q4. Rate your experience with each of the following:

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Faculty feedback about your work	38.24%	44.12%	11.76%	5.88%
Access to continuing opportunities for guidance and counseling	23.53%	41.18%	26.47%	8.82%
Access to continuing opportunities for placement assistance	26.47%	32.35%	29.41%	11.76%
Administrative and staff support	40.00%	37.14%	14.29%	8.57%

Q5. How many credits will you have completed at the end of the current term?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Less than 6 credits	0.00%	0
6-18 credits	70.59%	24
More than 18 credits	29.41%	10
	Answered	34
	Skipped	1

Only students having more than 18 credits answered Q6 through Q10

Q6. 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	90.00%	9
Internship	20.00%	2
Graduate assistantship	20.00%	2
Part-time employment in a library, or in a position related to the MS LIS program	10.00%	1
Full-time employment in a library, or in a position related to the MS LIS program	10.00%	1
Volunteer in a library, or in a position related to the MS LIS program	40.00%	4
Other (please specify)	20.00%	2
	Answered	10
	Skipped	25

Q7. In your opinion, how well prepared are you for your career in library and information science ?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Very well prepared	20.00%	2
Well prepared	50.00%	5
Somewhat prepared	30.00%	3
Not at all prepared	0.00%	0
	Answered	10
	Skipped	25

Q8. After you graduate, what St. John's educational opportunities would you consider for future professional development?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Advanced certificate	50.00%	5
Second graduate degree	50.00%	5
Webinar / workshop	60.00%	6
None	20.00%	2
Comment		0
	Answered	10
	Skipped	25

Q10. How likely are you to recommend St. John's MS LIS program to prospective information professionals?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Highly likely	40.00%	4
Likely	50.00%	5
Somewhat likely	0.00%	0
Not at all likely	10.00%	1
Comment		1
	Answered	10
	Skipped	25

J. Exit Survey 2018 – 2019

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

Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly Agree	58.82%	10
Agree	29.41%	5
Neutral	5.88%	1
Disagree	0.00%	0
Strongly Disagree	5.88%	1
Comment		2
	Answered	17
	Skipped	1

Q2. My interactions with faculty members were generally positive.

Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly Agree	35.29%	6
Agree	52.94%	9
Neutral	11.76%	2
Disagree	0.00%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		3
	Answered	17
	Skipped	1

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

Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly Agree	52.94%	9
Agree	47.06%	8
Neutral	0.00%	0
Disagree	0.00%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		2
	Answered	17
	Skipped	1

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

Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly Agree	47.06%	8
Agree	47.06%	8
Neutral	5.88%	1
Disagree	0.00%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		2
	Answered	17
	Skipped	1

Q5. I received useful information from my faculty advisor.

Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly Agree	52.94%	9
Agree	29.41%	5
Neutral	17.65%	3
Disagree	0.00%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		3
	Answered	17
	Skipped	1

Q6. The faculty were effective teachers.

Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly Agree	41.18%	7
Agree	47.06%	8
Neutral	11.76%	2
Disagree	0.00%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		2
	Answered	17
	Skipped	1

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

Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly agree	70.59%	12
Agree	29.41%	5
Neutral	0.00%	0
Disagree	0.00%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.00%	0
Other (please specify)		1
	Answered	17
	Skipped	1

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

Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly Agree	41.18%	7
Agree	41.18%	7
Neutral	5.88%	1
Disagree	5.88%	1
Strongly Disagree	5.88%	1
Comment		5
	Answered	17
	Skipped	1

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

Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly Agree	47.06%	8
Agree	41.18%	7
Neutral	11.76%	2
Disagree	0.00%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		0
	Answered	17
	Skipped	1

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

Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly Agree	58.82%	10
Agree	35.29%	6
Neutral	0.00%	0
Disagree	5.88%	1
Strongly Disagree	0.00%	0
Comment		2
	Answered	17
	Skipped	1

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

Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly Agree	64.71%	11
Agree	29.41%	5
Neutral	0.00%	0
Disagree	0.00%	0
Strongly Disagree	5.88%	1
Comment		2
	Answered	17
	Skipped	1

Q12. I feel prepared to enter the workforce.

Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly Agree	58.82%	10
Agree	29.41%	5
Neutral	5.88%	1
Disagree	0.00%	0
Strongly Disagree	5.88%	1
Comment		2
	Answered	17
	Skipped	1

Q13. I would recommend this program to others.

Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly Agree	55.56%	10
Agree	27.78%	5
Neutral	11.11%	2
Disagree	0.00%	0
Strongly Disagree	5.56%	1
Other (please specify)		0
	Answered	18
	Skipped	0

K. New Student Survey 2017 – 2018

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

Answer Choices	Responses	
Recommendation from an Alumni of the program and/or librarian	33.33%	6
Career counselors in the college where I earned my previous degree	0.00%	0
American Library Association website/directory	38.89%	7
St. John's University website	33.33%	6
Other (please explain)	11.11%	2
	Answered	18
	Skipped	0

Q2. What were your reasons for choosing to pursue your graduate education at this institution? Please check all that apply.

Answer Choices	Responses	
Nature of the program and course offerings	72.22%	13
Reputation of the school, department, and/or faculty	61.11%	11
Recommendation of colleague or family member	38.89%	7
Availability of funding/scholarship	16.67%	3
Location	11.11%	2
Other (please describe)	27.78%	5
	Answered	18
	Skipped	0

Q3. What was your primary reason for choosing to pursue your graduate education at this institution? Please select only ONE option.

Answer Choices	Responses	
Nature of the program and course offerings	47.06%	8
Reputation of the school, department, and/or faculty	11.76%	2
Recommendation of colleague or family member	17.65%	3
Availability of funding/scholarship	5.88%	1
Location	0.00%	0
Other (please describe)	17.65%	3
	Answered	17
	Skipped	1

Q4. How did you attend New Student Orientation?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Online (synchronously)	47.06%	8
In person	29.41%	5
I didn't attend, watched recording	23.53%	4
	Answered	17
	Skipped	1

Q5. To which age group do you belong?

Answer Choices	Responses	
25 years or younger	35.29%	6
26-40 years	47.06%	8
41-55 years	5.88%	1
55 or older	11.76%	2
	Answered	17
	Skipped	1

Q6. In which of these activities were you engaged immediately prior to entering this program?
Please select ALL that apply.

Answer Choices	Responses	
Undergraduate student	35.29%	6
Graduate student	5.88%	1
Volunteer/community service	17.65%	3
Caring for family	23.53%	4
Employed in a field related to information studies	47.06%	8
Employed in a field unrelated to information studies	41.18%	7
Other (please describe)	5.88%	1
	Answered	17
	Skipped	1

Q7. What is your current status?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Full-time (9-12 credits/semester)	5.88%	1
Part-time (3-6 credits/semester)	94.12%	16
	Answered	17
	Skipped	1

Q8. Which of the following professional goals do you see yourself accomplishing in the future?
Please select ALL options that apply. In the future I believe I will:

Answer Choices	Responses	
Enjoy a rewarding career	94.12%	16
Be a mentor to new information professionals	64.71%	11
Volunteer my professional services	58.82%	10
Be an innovator and leader in my field	35.29%	6
Publish articles in professional journals	29.41%	5
Pursue another Master's degree or PhD	29.41%	5
Publish articles in academic journals	23.53%	4
Be a high-level manager or executive	11.76%	2
Be an independent consultant	11.76%	2
Other (please specify)	11.76%	2
Start my own business	5.88%	1
	Answered	17
	Skipped	1

Q9. How useful was the New Student Orientation?

	Responses	
Not Useful	0.00%	0
Useful	60.00%	9
Very Useful	40.00%	6
	Answered	15
	Skipped	3