

Division of Library and Information Science

Annual Assessment Report

2020 - 2021

Prepared by: James Vorbach, Director & Associate Professor

Submitted: September 13, 2021

Approved: November 2, 2021

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	3
Program Goals and Outcomes	6
Advisory Board Planning Meeting - April 5, 2019	8
Advisory Board Meeting - May 3, 2019 (most recent meeting)	11
Alumni Survey	15
Career Outcomes Survey	20
Course Artifact Assessment	21
E-Portfolio Assessment	24
Employer Survey	27
Student: Annual Survey	32
Student: Exit Survey	37
Student: New Student Survey	43
Appendix	47
A. DLIS Strategic Priorities 2019 – 2021: Implementation of Action Items	47
B. Agenda - Advisory Board Planning Meeting, April 5, 2019.....	51
C. Advisory Board Members	52
D. Enrollment Summary.....	53
E. Agenda - Advisory Board Meeting -May 3, 2019	54
F. Alumni Survey – 2021.....	55
G. Course Artifact Assessment Form (revised 2/11/2017)	57
H. E-Portfolio Rubric	59
I. Employer Survey – 2021	63
J. Annual Student Survey – 2021	65
K. Exit Survey 2020 – 2021	67
L. New Student Survey 2020 – 2021	69
M. Curriculum Map.....	71

Executive Summary

Purpose. The purpose of the annual assessment report is to inform the DLIS community on the 2020 – 2021 assessments and advisory board meeting (Table 1). The assessments and advisory board meeting engage all constituents - students, faculty, alumni, and employers -in the ongoing process of improving the Master of Science in Library and Information Science (MS LIS) program. The overall process is guided by the DLIS Assessment Plan, approved in March 2015. In addition, this report is evidence of satisfying Standard 1 Systematic Planning in the 2015 ALA Accreditation Standards for Masters Programs in Library and Information Studies.

In light of the 15-month Covid-19 pandemic, the 2020 the advisory board meeting was cancelled and the 2021 Advisory Board meeting is planned for December 2021. This report contains the summary of the 2019 Advisory Board Meeting. Although two-years old, the summary of the 2019 Meeting provides the reader with insight into issues on the advisory board’s agenda and the board’s contributions.

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

The MS in Library and Information Science underwent its most recent comprehensive review in 2018. The Self-Study was well-received and on January 29, 2019, the American Library Association’s Committee on Accreditation (ALA-CoA) approved the “continued accreditation” of the MS LIS program to 2025.

In September 2019, the faculty adopted a two-year framework for the DLIS strategic priorities and action items. Annual strategic priority reports had been the norm since inception in September 2015. However, action items often required more than one year to complete. Consequently, DLIS felt a two-year framework provided the necessary implementation time while still offering the flexibility to respond to changes in the field and our accrediting body that the faculty wanted. The final implementation report on the 2019 - 2021 Strategic Priorities and Action Items part of this report (Appendix A).

The quality of the MS LIS program is monitored continuously using an annual cycle of data collection, analysis, reporting, faculty reviews, and the advisory board meeting. All program constituents are involved in the assessment cycle. The assessment reports and concomitant decision-making are evidence demonstrating that the program continues to meet or exceed the ALA Standards for Accreditation of Master’s Programs in Library and Information Studies¹. More importantly, students in

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

the program are well-equipped for current and emerging positions in the evolving information professions.

Table 1. Assessment During the Academic Year

Measure/Board	Timeline (Month Administered)	Participants
Course Artifact Assessment	August, December, May	Faculty, students
E-Portfolio Reviews	August, December, May	Faculty, graduating students
New Student Survey	June, September, January	Students entering the program
Exit Survey	August, December, May	Graduating students
Annual Student Survey	March	All students
Advisory Board Planning Committee	March	Alumni, employers, faculty
Alumni Two-Year-Out Survey	April	Alumni, two years after graduation
Employer Biennial Survey	April	Employers
Advisory Board Meeting	October 2021 (previously held in May)	Alumni, employers, faculty, and students

Program Goals and Outcomes

The MS LIS program goals and outcomes are based on the American Library Association's (ALA) eight core competencies of librarianship². The program goals are reviewed every five years to ensure they continue to serve the MS LIS program effectively in the context of the evolving information professions. In addition, academic goals of professional organizations related to each of the MS LIS specializations supplement the MS LIS program goals. The program goals are available on St. John's University's web site and the DLIS LibGuide.

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. Demonstrate an understanding of the need to meet and/or apply best practices, guidelines, standards, certification requirements, and licensing requirements in 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.

² ALA Core Competencies

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

- 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

- 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

Background. The Advisory Board Planning Meeting’s primary role is to set the agenda for the annual advisory board meeting. In addition, the planning board assists DLIS in managing measures in the assessment plan when necessary. The revision of the Employer Survey in the April 2019 meeting is a case in point.

Summary

The first items on the agenda (Appendix B) were 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 (most recent meeting)

Location: Queens Campus, D'Angelo Activity Center 301

Date: Friday May 3, 2019; 9:30 - 3:00pm

Prepared by: James Vorbach, Ph. D.

Attendees: Susan Roby Berdinka, Taina Evans, Alyse Hennig, Lisa Kropp, Michelle Levy, Ralph Monaco, Michael Morea, Christina Orozco, Jamie Papandrea, Kimberly Simmons, Reba Weatherford, James Vorbach

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

RESULTS

Soft Skills and Preparing for the Job Market

1. Create opportunities with credit (e.g. integrate into courses/internships)
 - Create a recorded workshop on email how-to's; include email tonality
 - Include a final, required project consisting of a public presentation such as a Skype interview, a YouTube video, and a reader's advisory or reference interview
 - Create a video walk-through for the e-portfolio end-of-program assessment
 - Assign various styles of writing (technical, descriptive, etc) in courses
2. Collaborate with the Office of Career Services to develop a series of recorded synchronous workshops/presentations for students and alumni, specific to LIS field
 - Create one day job skills boot camps for graduating students; have alumni and professional guests
 - Offer informational interviews with practitioners
3. Revise the mentorship program consistent with the discussion earlier in the meeting.
4. Teach advocacy writing
 - Include within a management course
 - Leverage a workshop from a professional organization
5. Teach humility, knowing what you don't know, being open to suggestions and not taking suggestions as criticism. (Note, the group viewed this point as encompassing everything in this section.)

Professional Development and Lifelong Learning (High Value / Low Cost)

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

- Faculty embed in courses
 - Incorporate more community building assignments in online courses; online can be isolating
 - Include assignments on how to write conference proposals, create presentations, identify publishing opportunities, among others
- DLISSA
 - Hold a webinar about students' internship experiences
 - Hold a webinar on how to use social media for professional engagement
 - Hold a webinar on getting the most out of (building community through) your professional association (e.g. participating in webinars, listservs, poster sessions, pecha kucha's, program proposals, and mentorships)
- For alumni and other professionals
 - Offer workshops on how to write conference proposals, create presentations, identify publishing opportunities, among others.
 - Create online workshops which offer Continuing Education Units (CEUs), free for alumni, inexpensive for non-alumni
 - Strengthen the alumni network through personal invitations to meetings and through local library associations

Professional Development and Lifelong Learning (Medium Value / Higher Cost)

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

Alumni Engagement

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

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

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

CONCLUSION

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

Alumni Survey

Background. This survey is distributed to alumni two years after graduation for their feedback on the quality of the MS LIS program, the preparation received for their career, and suggestions for improving the program. The design of the survey closely follows that of the exit survey administered to students upon graduation. This year’s survey was administered in May 2020 (Appendix F). The participants graduated in 2018 -2019 academic year (i.e. September 2018, January 2019, and May 2019).

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 thirty-one alumni to whom the survey was emailed, eighteen responded to the survey, a 58% response rate. The responses to each question were: “strongly agree”, “agree”, “neutral”, “disagree”, and “strongly disagree”. Table 6 does not contain results for 2018 because the 2019 revision of the survey instrument split the question, distinguishing library resources (Q11) and technology (Q12).

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

Table 2 shows that students overall are satisfied with the program. Q14 responses dipped significantly in 2021. These are students who graduated in 2019, the first graduating class following the partnership with Wiley Educational Services (WES) to recruit for the MS LIS. This drop in Q14 may reflect the changing demographic of the student body in which most students are now working full-time and have shown little interest in internships and independent studies. Table 3 shows that students’ interactions with faculty, students, and staff remain very positive. Student responses the effectiveness of faculty teaching (Table 4) and the variety of courses offered (Table 5) remained very positive. Student satisfaction with their access to library resources dropped by 9% and satisfaction with their access to software and related technology by 6% (Table 6).

The open questions - Q4 (student community), Q8 (advisement), Q17 (program strengths), and Q18 (recommendations to improve the program) - have provided useful information to continue to improve the MS LIS program. These results will guide faculty discussions at the September faculty meeting when the 2020 - 2021 Assessment Report is reviewed.

Table 2. Program

Questions*	2021	2020	2019	2018
Q1: Satisfied with the program	89%	100%	91%	83%
Q13: Prepared to enter the workforce	88%	91%	89%	66%

Questions*	2021	2020	2019	2018
Q14: Field experience (AS-L, internships, indep studies) contributed towards employment	24%	64%	78%	83%
Q15: Recommend program to others	82%	82%	94%	83%

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

Table 3. Interactions

Questions	2021	2020	2019	2018
Q2: Interactions with faculty generally positive	89%	91%	100%	100%
Q3: Interactions with fellow students generally positive	100%	91%	95%	84%
Q5: Interactions with office staff generally positive	88%	91%	100%	92%
Q7: Received useful information in advisement meetings	88%	91%	90%	83%

Table 4. Teaching

Question	2021	2020	2019	2018
Q9: Faculty were effective teachers	88%	91%	85%	100%

Table 5. Courses

Question	2021	2020	2019	2018
Q10: Satisfied with the variety of courses offered	88%	100%	84%	58%

Table 6. Resources

Question	2021	2020	2019
Q11: Had access to appropriate library resources to support career interests	82%	91%	95%
Q12: Had access to appropriate software and related technology to support career interests	76%	82%	84%

Open Questions

Q4 asked students to suggest ways to “foster, enhance, and/or reinforce interaction among students in the online environment. 39% of survey respondents answered this question. The responses included:

- More group projects.

- Maybe provide opportunities for students local to one another to meet up.
- I think a new student Zoom to hang out and talk outside of classwork would be great.
- Zoom socials!
- Physical and virtual social meet-ups.

Q6 asked students to suggest ways in which DLIS staff could further enhance and/or support the student experience. 33% of survey respondents answered this question. The responses included:

- I found that I had to "find" information regarding blackboard, technology, eportfolio, etc. For me, I wish there were videos, or real-time productions from faculty talking about those important vehicles, as well as the library associations, library concentrations, etc.
- Help link students with similar career pathways together within the program.
- Providing easier pathways to understand the civil service experience and requirements might be helpful.
- More prompt response from emails to staff would help, especially since there were many occasions where emails never received a response.
- I felt very much alone when getting my MLIS. I felt like once we were actually enrolled and in the program (I was online), we were largely on our own and no one cared about our progress or how things were going.

Q8 asked respondents to suggest ways to improve the advisement process. 22% of survey respondents answered this question. The one response other than "no suggestions" was:

- Eliminate paper and do it online.

Q17 asked respondents to identify the major strengths of the program. 50% of survey respondents answered this question. Responses included:

- One major strength of the program was the applicability of the courses to my current job as a children's librarian. For example, Dr. Lee had us create 1 year of programs with a fictional \$4000.00 budget. At my current job, I try to create programs 4 - 5 months in advance. Dr. Lee's course really prepared me to be thorough and meticulous in my planning. Additionally, the MSLIS program required copious amounts of writing, as a form of communication on the discussion boards, and also our assigned papers, capstones, and e-portfolio required it. Again, this prepared me for my current job, where I was given the job to be the newsletter editor.
- Willingness of staff to assist students and focusing on the modern aspects of librarianship. Most professors highlighted the future instead of focusing on antiquated practices.
- Faculty and Staff within the program.
- Staff was approachable, easily reached, and helpful. The focus on management courses was helpful.
- I think the courses were the strengths. I took courses and learned material that state-certified librarians (they do not have their MLIS, just the certification) are unaware of.
- The online component was huge for me; it is a great program, it just needs a little adjusting.

- Online and asynchronous. Great professors!
- Knowledgeable professors, advantageous dual-degree program with public history. I would recommend the dual-degree programs to every student interested, as it is one area that really gives me an advantage over other job candidates.

Q18 asked students for recommendations to improve the program. 50% of survey respondents answered this question. Responses included:

- Since the program was online, the human element of conversing with other students and faculty was naturally missing. I loved asynchronous learning because I could do my work within my own personal schedule. However, I would recommend real-time seminars scattered throughout a course so that there would be more of a connection with students and staff. Of course it could be recorded for those who couldn't attend.
- Certain professors focused on a project-based approach to their course, which I liked. Each assignment led toward a larger goal/project that was submitted at the end of the course. I learned best through this instructional method. I learned much less from professors who simply assigned an overwhelming amount of reading from an unreasonable amount of resources each week. Quality of information is more important than quantity when it comes to learning.
- A course designed to aid future public librarians in developing and running programs for the community. If I recall, there was something similar to this that focused on children's librarianship but it's necessary across the board. Maybe an offering that gives some focus on marketing and community outreach tactics.
- Streamline the advisement process so there's no paper. Increase funding for travel to conferences and presentations. Diversify faculty (Why are there no full-time, tenured Hispanic professors?). Improve relationship with career services so they actually help library school graduates, in my experience they didn't do anything for me when I asked for help.
- Be more mindful of online students. Reach out more often, and ask them if they need help with advising, classwork, with a professor. I felt very alone during my two years and like I didn't have someone on the DLIS staff I could turn to.
- Offer more variety of archival classes more often.
- The only recommendation I would have is to create a mixed learning model where some classes are online and some are in person. Some areas of librarianship require a hands-on approach that is extremely tough to teach effectively in an online learning environment.

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 2020 survey consists of the graduates from Summer 2019, Fall 2019, and Spring 2020. Table 7 below shows the results for the graduates of the MS LIS program since 2016.

Table 7. Placement Results*

Statistic	2020	2019	2018	2017	2016
Response Rate	70.4%	50%	67%	59%	67%
Placement	94.7%	100%	86%	94%	100%
Employed	94.7%	100%	86%	94%	92%
Employed / Furthering Education*	0%	0%	0%	0%	8%
Furthering Education*	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Seeking Employment	5.3%	0%	14%	6%	0%

**Data provided by the University Career Center, January 2019*

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

Course Artifact Assessment

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

Procedure. At the beginning of a term, courses are assigned by the Director for assessment. The assignment is made such that an instructor has no more than one course per term to assess. For the assigned course, the instructor selects one artifact (e.g. assignment, semester project, or exam) as a representative measure of learning the course’s related program goal/s. At the end of the course, the instructor completes a form (Appendix G) describing the class’ performance, reviewing the artifact’s role as a measure, and the resulting changes planned to improve the course. Two sample artifacts with their respective reviews are included. The following table indicates the status of the course assessment process as of Spring 2021.

Table 8. Course Artifact Assessment with Program Goals

Course Code	Course Name	Program Goals & Outcomes	Faculty	Reviewed	Next Review
	CORE				
LIS 203	Organization of Information	3A, 3B	Angel	Spring 2020	Spring 2024
LIS 204	Introduction to Library and Information Science	1A, 1B, 1C, 1E, 2A, 2B, 3A, 5A, 7A	Rioux	Fall 2015	Fall 2020
LIS 205	Introduction to Information Sources and Services	5A	Lee	Spring 2021	Spring 2025
LIS 239	Research and Evaluation Methods	1A, 1B, 1D, 3A, 6A	Singh	Spring 2020	Spring 2024
	MANAGEMENT				
LIS 240	Management of Libraries and Information Centers	1A, 1D, 4A, 5C, 7A, 7B, 8A, 8B	Singh	Fall 2020	Fall 2024
	ELECTIVES				
LIS 121	Literature & Related Resources for Children	2B, 7A	Lee	Fall 2020	Fall 2024

Course Code	Course Name	Program Goals & Outcomes	Faculty	Reviewed	Next Review
LIS 125	Library Materials and Services for Young Children	2B, 4A	Kropp	Spring 2020	Spring 2024
LIS 126	Literature & Related Resources for Young Adults	2B, 7A	Lee	Fall 2018	Fall 2022
LIS 127	Library Programs & Services for Children and Young Adults	2B, 4A, 7A, 8A, 8B	Lee	Spring 2016	Spring 2021
LIS 211	Collection Development	2A, 2B, 8A, 8B	Rioux	Spring 2021	Spring 2025
LIS 213	Popular Culture and Young Adults	2B, 4A, 8B	Lee	Summer 2019	Summer 2023
LIS 214	Teen Spaces for Libraries	1A, 1B, 1C, 4A	Lee	Summer 2020	Summer 2024
LIS 221	Planning and Delivering Information Literacy Programs	5B, 5C, 7A, 7B	King	Spring 2017	Spring 2021
LIS 222	Materials and Services to Diverse Populations	1A, 1B, 1C, 1D, 5B, 5C, 7A, 7B	Rioux	Fall 2020	Fall 2024
LIS 231	College and University Libraries	8A, 8B	Rioux	Spring 2016	Spring 2022
LIS 233	Public Libraries and Community Information Centers	8A, 8B	Rioux	Spring 2021	Spring 2025
LIS 238	Web Design for Libraries and Information Centers	4A	Vorbach	Spring 2019	Spring 2023
LIS 249	Archives and Records Management	1A, 1C, 3A, 3B, 5C, 7B	Angel	Fall 2017	Summer 2021
LIS 253	Oral History	4A, 7B	Szylvian	Spring 2020	Spring 2024
LIS 257	Archival Representation	1C, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B, 4A, 5A, 5B, 8B	Angel	Fall 2020	Fall 2024
LIS 258	Museum Informatics	3A, 3B, 4A	Angel	Spring 2021	Spring 2025
LIS 260	Information Use and Users	1B, 1D, 2A, 3A, 4A, 5A, 5B, 5C, 6A, 7B, 8B	Rioux	Fall 2017	Fall 2021

Course Code	Course Name	Program Goals & Outcomes	Faculty	Reviewed	Next Review
LIS 261	Information Sources and Services for Children and Young Adults	2B, 4A, 5A, 5C, 7B	Lee/ Seymour	Fall 2021	
LIS 262	Project Management in Information Organizations	1D, 5C, 8A, 8B	Singh	Fall 2017	Fall 2021
LIS 263	Marketing and Advocacy in Information Organizations	1B, 1D, 5C, 8A, 8B	Singh	Spring 2018	Spring 2022
LIS 264	Project Leadership for Information Professionals Capstone	1A, 1D, 5C, 7A, 8A, 8B	Singh	Fall 2018	Fall 2022
LIS 273	Graphic Novels and Libraries	1A, 2B, 5B	Fuchs	Summer 2020	Summer 2024
LIS 275	Cultural Competence for Information Professionals	1A, 1D, 5B, 5C, 8A, 8B	Singh	Summer 2020	
LIS 282	Knowledge Management	2A, 2B, 8A, 8B	Singh	Spring 2018	Spring 2022
LIS 283	Social Justice and the Information Profession	1A, 1B, 1D, 2B, 4A, 5B, 5C	Rioux	Spring 2020	Spring 2024
LIS 302	Genealogical Sources & Services	3A, 4A, 5A, 5B, 5C	Earle	Summer 2020	Summer 2024

E-Portfolio Assessment

Background

The e-portfolio has been the end-of-program assessment for the MS LIS program since the Spring 2013 term. Digication is the e-portfolio platform. The main section in the e-portfolio covers the eight MS LIS program goals. In this section students provide evidence from their coursework (i.e. assignments and projects) and write 500-600 word reflections for each goal explaining the relationship between the evidence and the goal and their learning from the evidence. Each e-portfolio is reviewed independently by two DLIS faculty. The Director also participates as a reviewer. The minimum grade to “pass” the e-portfolio assessment is 80%. If the outcomes from the two reviewers differ, a third faculty member is assigned by the Director to review the e-portfolio and render a decision. E-Portfolio reviews coincide with the Summer, Fall, and Spring graduation cycle.

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

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

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

Summary

The results since 2015 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 2019 - 2020 (Table 9) was 96.2%. This rate is consistent with the two previous academic years and close to the target pass rate of 100%. The e-portfolio results are reviewed at the annual faculty assessment meeting in September.

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. The e-portfolio also helps to distinguish graduates to future employers. Students keep their Digication accounts after graduation.

Table 9. E-Portfolio Summary By Academic Year

	2020-2021	2019-2020	2018-2019	2017-2018	2016-2017	2015-2016
Total	53	32	32	24	30	24
Total passed	51	31	31	22	30	22
Pass rate	96.2	96.9%	96.9%	91.7%	100%	92%
Average (all portfolios)	89.8	92.9%	91.0%	89.3%	93%	93%
Average (wo failures)	90.4	93.3%	91.8%	90.5%	93%	95%
Ave Diff	7.0	7.1	8.3	6.7	5.0	5.3

Employer Survey

Summary. The employer survey is distributed biennially to information professionals in a wide range of institutions. The survey focuses on rating the relevance general skills and specialized skills for entry-level information professionals. The survey instrument was last revised by the Advisory Board Planning Committee ('Committee') at its meeting on April 5, 2019. The employer survey is provided in Appendix I. The next distribution of the survey will be in May 2023.

The responses for the 2021 survey were collected over a four-week period ending June 1, 2021. There were 83 respondents to the survey. Table 11 shows the distribution of the respondents by Job Title. Table 12 shows the distribution by respondents' organizations and Table 13 shows the distribution by respondents' states. Table 14 lists the top 10 general skills (Q5) for an entry level position, in order of relevance. The maximum rating average is 5.00 (where 1=Not at all relevant, 2=Not very relevant, 3=Somewhat relevant, 4=Very relevant, and 5=Extremely relevant). The skills are listed in descending order of the 2021 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 the skill was not an option on the 2017 survey.

Participants were asked to comment on the general skills in Q6. The following list highlights these comments:

1. A candidate coming from an MLIS program should have a level of education and professionalism by the time they graduate the program. I give my librarians the reins on projects they spearhead because I feel they are educated, enthusiastic and are ready to do the job expected from a public service employee.
2. Ability to problem solve and not seek constant reinforcement/repeat of directions and expectations is also important.
3. It is VERY important to have good social skills and a lot of patience and understanding.
4. Overall awareness of the work environment; Interest in trying new things; humility; willingness to learn about the organization (before suggesting sweeping changes, for example); customer-centered mindset; questions the status quo (in a constructive way); understands that tradition sometimes creates barriers to service and tactfully identifies those barriers and suggests ways around them. (We have been hiring recently, so these are fresh in my mind!).
5. Advanced computer is difficult - coding and web design aren't really necessary BUT database and general use of multiple platforms is.
6. Interpersonal skills are a must. Depending on the position, they may train new staff or manage patrons who regularly attend programs.
7. Since I don't have high expectations out of the gate for skills that improve with time and experience - leadership skills, decision making, local history, organizational history, I do have high expectations in other areas - customer service, flexibility, organizational loyalty, positive attitude and general helpfulness.
8. Enthusiasm, approachability highly valued.

9. Knowledge of website design especially using WordPress seem to be in high demand.

Table 15 lists the top 10 specialized skills expected of entry-level information professionals in descending order of relevance on the 2021 survey (Q7). The maximum rating average is 5.00 (where 1=Not at all relevant, 2=Not very relevant, 3=Somewhat relevant, 4=Very relevant, and 5=Extremely relevant). The response count for Q7 on the 2021 survey was 83. The response count on the 2019 survey was 55. The response count on the 2017 survey was 29. An “NA” in the 2017 column means that the skill was not an option on the 2017 survey.

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

1. Not everyone comes out of school ready to supervise, that is a skill that comes with time.
2. As long as a new employee is willing to ask for help, do their best, be honest when there’s an issue and try again, they will improve over time.
3. A disposition that I'm looking for under the project management and goal setting skills is accountability. Is this a person who will hold themselves appropriately accountable when they commit to something? Or will they either blame others for errors, or be so cruel to themselves they are paralyzed from moving on from the error?
4. This is assuming an entry-level professional position; some of these skills become very important once you move up in responsibility level.
5. Most of these are not skills that it would be fair to expect of an entry level candidate, other than connecting theory to practice.
6. We prefer to hire Certified Archivists.
7. I feel like most of these specialized skills can be developed on the job but it's important for any new librarian to have a sense of these. The most important is a public service orientation and an understanding of what public libraries currently are and are becoming.
8. A general comfort level with technology is a must, as well as the initiative to spend time poking around "under the hood" (this ties to curiosity).

There appears to be broad agreement among respondents on the general skills (Table 14). Each of the top ten general skills exceeds the “very relevant” rating of 4.0. In contrast, graduates were not expected to have many of the specialized skills (Table 15) on entering the field, with the exception of the highest-rated skill “Ability to Set Goals and Achieve Them”. It should be noted that 64% of respondents were employed at Public Libraries (Table 12). A broader distribution of organizations may yield different results.

Table 11. Job Titles

Title	Respondents	Percent
Director/ Executive Director/ Library Director	49	59%
Archivist / Digital Archivist / Curator	12	14%
Librarian	8	10%
Department Head	6	7%
Assistant Director	3	4%
Other*	5	6%
Total	83	100%

* Assistant Professor, Coordinator of Library Services, Digital Initiatives Coordinator, Librarian Trainee, and Reference Clerk

Table 12. Organizations

Type	Respondents	Percent
Public	53	64%
Archive	5	6%
Academic	9	11%
Corporate	2	2%
School	2	2%
Youth Services in a Public Library	1	1%
Other*	11	13%
Total	83	100%

* BOCES, Consortia, Government, Medical, Museum, Private non-profit, and Religious

Table 13. States

State	Respondents	Percent
New York	65	78.3%
Illinois	2	2.4%
Indiana	2	2.4%
New Mexico	2	2.4%
Virginia	2	2.4%
California	1	1.2%
Colorado	1	1.2%
Georgia	1	1.2%
Iowa	1	1.2%
Kentucky	1	1.2%
Massachusetts	1	1.2%
Michigan	1	1.2%
Minnesota	1	1.2%
Ohio	1	1.2%
Washington	1	1.2%
Total*	83	100%*

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

Table 14. Top 10 General Skills

Answer Options	2021	2019	2017
Basic Computer (e.g. word-processing,spreadsheets)	4.68	4.80	4.63
Listening to others	4.59	4.58	4.83
Exhibits professional ethics	4.56	4.51	4.73
Teamwork (interpersonal relationship)	4.52	4.69	4.80
Critical thinking (evaluating information)	4.49	4.48	4.67
Oral/written communication	4.48	4.71	4.83
Flexibility	4.44	4.42	NA
Cultural sensitivity	4.39	4.45	NA
Curiosity	4.3	4.58	NA
Decision-Making	4.2	4.09	4.33

Table 15. Top 10 Specialized Skills

Answer Options	2021	2019	2017
Ability to Set Goals and Achieve Them	4.07	4.19	4.41
Project Management	3.44	3.44	3.79
Practical Application of LIS Theory	3.41	3.49	4.04
Marketing and Advocacy	3.34	3.36	3.59
Management of Resources	3.21	3.15	3.34
Data Analysis	3.12	2.93	NA
Supervisory Skills	2.75	2.58	NA
Negotiation Skills	2.53	2.64	2.59
Mentoring or Coaching Colleagues	2.46	2.51	3.21
Fluency in a Second Language	2.37	2.35	2.34

Student: Annual Survey

Summary. The annual student survey is administered in April. The survey instrument was revised in 2019 following the 2018 comprehensive review of the MS LIS program and the continued accreditation decision by the ALA Committee on Accreditation (ALA-CoA).

The questions on the survey are organized into five categories: program, faculty, administration and resources, field experience, and professional development. Field experience in this sense refers to both curricular (e.g. internships, academic service-learning) and related work experience. The section concludes with student recommendations for program improvement (Q13). The 2021 survey is given in Appendix J.

Program. Table 17 and 18 list the responses for questions Q1 and Q2 respectively on the specializations supported in the program. The results from Q1 and Q2 are important factors for continued program development and resource allocation. Table 19 shows the results for questions related to career preparedness and students' overall perception of the program.

Table 17. Specializations of Interest

Specialization	2021	2020	2019
Public Librarianship	54%	56%	46%
Youth Services	43%	35%	31%
Archival Studies	34%	47%	37%
Special Librarianship	29%	21%	23%
Management	29%	7%	17%
Academic Librarianship	26%	26%	34%
Undecided	6%	2%	11%

Table 18. Primary Specialization

Specialization	2021	2020	2019
Youth Services	37%	28%	14%
Archival Studies	23%	28%	14%
Management	11%	5%	6%
Public Librarianship	9%	21%	17
Academic Librarianship	6%	9%	9%
Special Librarianship	6%	2%	9%

Undecided	9%	7%	31%
-----------	----	----	-----

Table 19. Career Preparedness

Question	Value	2021	2020	2019
Q10: In your opinion, how well prepared are you for your career as an information professional?	Very Well-Prepared or Well-Prepared	77%	76%	70%
Q12: How prepared do you feel to assume a position of leadership and/or make a difference in society?	Very Well-Prepared or Well-Prepared	82%	79%	85%
Q14. How likely are you to recommend St. John's MS LIS program to prospective information professionals?	Highly Likely or Likely	95%	83%	90%

Faculty.

Table 20. Faculty

Question	Value	2021	2020	2019
Q3. Faculty provide feedback on student work in a reasonable time.	Strongly Agree or Agree	88%	88%	82%
Q4. Students have access to continuing opportunities for advisement.	Strongly Agree or Agree	79%	86%	65%

Administration and Resources.

Table 21. Administration and Resources

Question	Value	2021	2020	2019
Q5. Students have access to continuing opportunities for placement assistance.	Strongly Agree or Agree	48%	53%	59%
Q6. DLIS Administration responds to student questions in a reasonable time.	Strongly Agree or Agree	76%	77%	77%
Q7. Online databases through University Libraries are an efficient research tool.	Strongly Agree or Agree	88%	91%	NA

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

Table 22. Field Experience

Field Experience	2021	2020	2019	2018	2017
Academic service-learning project	81%	92%	90%	75%	90%
Part-time employment related to the MS LIS program	24%	52%	10%	38%	53%
Volunteer work related to the MS LIS program	24%	20%	40%	38%	17%
Full-time employment related to the MS LIS program	19%	16%	10%	25%	20%
Internship	10%	36%	20%	25%	17%
Graduate assistantship	10%	20%	20%	37%	30%

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

Table 23. Professional Development

Type	2021	2020	2019
Advanced Certificate	41%	50%	50%
Second Graduate Degree	41%	25%	50%
Webinar /Workshop	59%	63%	60%
None	18%	8%	20%

Recommendations. Students were asked for their recommendations to improve the MS LIS program (Q13). 26% responded to this question. A representative sample of their responses are below.

- 1) Maybe more management classes.
- 2) Adjustments for time zone. I have to turn work in when it is due in the time zone that the university is located and not in the timezone I live in. This means I get less time to complete work than other classmates.
- 3) I feel the program is very well organized and at this time I cannot think of a way to improve it from where it is currently.
- 4) More connection to alumni in a mentorship capacity might be helpful.
- 5) Better communication/explanation throughout the AS-L [Academic Service-Learning] process.

- 6) I like the idea of this mentor program. It would have been nice to have someone to talk to occasionally that was not my advisor or a teacher during my coursework.
- 7) More classes offered for individuals who want to pursue academic librarianship.

Student: Exit Survey

Summary. The exit survey was administered to the Summer 2020, Fall 2020, and Spring 2021 graduates following their completion of the degree requirements. The survey asks students to reflect on their programs of study and answer questions covering five areas: program, interactions, teaching, courses, and resources. The survey questions corresponding to these categories are shown in Tables 24 - 28. The percentage values in the tables are the sum of the “Strongly Agree” and “Agree” responses. Of the 51 total graduates, combining the Summer 2020, Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 graduates, 51 responded to the survey, a 100% response rate. The responses to each question were: “strongly agree”, “agree”, “neutral”, “disagree”, and “strongly disagree”.

The survey instrument was revised for the 2019 survey as part of the review of all survey instruments following the comprehensive program review and continued accreditation of the MS LIS program. Some questions (Q7, Q10, and Q11) do not appear in previous years. For these questions, only results since 2019 are shown. Overall, the quantitative part of the survey yielded very good results and the open questions provided useful information for discussion at the September faculty meeting. The 2020 – 2021 survey is provided in Appendix K.

Table 24. Program

Questions*	2020-2021	2019-2020	2018-2019	2017–2018
Q1: Satisfied with the program	94%	87%	88%	71%
Q12: Prepared to enter the workforce	92%	96%	88%	86%
Q13: Recommend program to others	92%	87%	83%	71%

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

Table 25. Interactions

Questions	2020-2021	2019-2020	2018-2019	2017–2018
Q2: Interactions with faculty generally positive	98%	100%	88%	71%
Q3: Interactions with fellow students generally positive	98%	100%	100%	86%
Q4: Interactions with office staff generally positive	82%	83%	94%	57%
Q5: Received useful information from faculty advisors	94%	91%	82%	86%

Table 26. Teaching

Question	2020-2021	2019-2020	2018-2019	2017-2018
Q6: Faculty were effective teachers	94%	100%	88%	71%
Q7: Faculty are knowledgeable in their areas of expertise	100%	100%	100%	

Table 27. Courses

Questions	2020-2021	2019-2020	2018-2019	2017-2018
Q8: Satisfied with course selection offered during my program of study	96%	83%	82%	29%
Q9: Satisfied with the frequency of course offerings	90%	96%	88%	29%

Table 28. Resources

Question	2020-2021	2019-2020	2018-2019
Q10: Had access to appropriate library resources to support my educational needs.	94%	83%	94%
Q11: Had access to appropriate software and related technology to support my educational needs	94%	96%	94%

Program Strengths.

Q15 asked students to identify program strength. The list below is a representative sample of the responses.

1. Communication with staff and professors.
2. The Academic Service-Learning classes were very educational and helpful.
3. The professors all have varying experiences and differing backgrounds within the field which I think helps cater to a more diverse group of students.
4. I think the major strengths was faculty and student engagement. I applied to this program because I work full-time, and needed asynchronous classes that I could get through at my own pace. I was worried though, as an online program, that I wouldn't have substantiate interactions with faculty or my peers. However, the use of group projects, discussion board posts, and dedicated faculty made it so that I don' feel like I missed out on any interpersonal experiences.
5. The course selection and the professors who taught them were major strengths of the MSLIS program.
6. Flexibility, required learning activities.

7. I appreciated the rigor of the coursework, and learning from practicing professionals. I believe the expertise of the faculty is a major strength.
8. I liked the interaction between faculty and students when it came to scheduling courses each semester. I also enjoyed the ability to specialize my degree with the courses I wanted.
9. Building every course such that it satisfies one or more of the ALA core competencies was extremely helpful, as was the fact that an early course helped me set up the ePortfolio I would fill out for the following two years.
10. The professors were great and very accessible through email and phone. The classes were high quality and I feel like I learned a lot.
11. The effectiveness of being an online program that still felt personal and connected really shone through for this program. Especially when Covid-19 arrived and everything else in our lives became virtual.
12. The Management Certificate Program.
13. The knowledgeable faculty, the clear program goals and outcomes, Blackboard interface and off campus access to library resources.
14. The professors were so understanding and helpful, whether it came to needing clarification on assignments to even job help.
15. The courses themselves were well designed with the awareness of what the student will need moving into the workforce, and the professors were extremely helpful in all areas of study.
16. I believe the internships and projects that involved working with libraries and archives were the best aspects of the program. It is vital to get as much practical experience in the field, and these types of assignment taught me the most about the field and what it entails.
17. Major strengths of the program was the experience that professor had behind them. Several used this knowledge in their instructions to provide real-life scenarios that allowed us to think critically about what we may expect in our careers.
18. It allow me to have a various interactions with different LIS fields such as archives, museums, and many more.
19. The professors were outstanding and empathetic.
20. The faculty. The information was well organized. The variety of classes offered.
21. The smaller size of this program made a big difference in access to instructors and the development of more genuine camaraderie with fellow students. I had considered other larger schools, but am glad I chose St. John's. The speedy responses from instructors and ability to team up repeatedly with classmates made this a much more enjoyable experience.
22. The staff who were helpful, the courses which were informative, and the student body made the program wonderful!
23. Networking, the personal interactions with the faculty, the ASL.
24. I liked that the program focused on real-life applications in many examples of the coursework.
25. Classes had project based elements that I felt taught better than simply writing papers
26. Even though it was online I feel like I really got to know some of my peers.
27. Flexibility, diversity.

28. Professors are very responsive via email and very knowledgeable and passionate about the subject matter.
29. The courses in this program teach applicable career skills and knowledge. Students enrolled in the program are all committed which makes collaboration, communication, and group projects pleasant experiences.

Recommendations to Improve the Program.

Q16 asked students to recommend improvements in the program. The list below is a representative sample of the responses.

1. Offer more specialized classes in legal or medical research.
2. More management classes.
3. Student surveys about the courses were consistently administered before the courses were complete. It would be better to wait until the course is finished to get a complete response to how the course was conducted.
4. I think it would be helpful for new students to be provided with more information about the varying aspects of the program over a longer period of time so that they have more time to acclimate to the expectations, various technology and program goals / required courses. This also pertains to the eportfolio, making one of the eportfolio webinars a requirement to watch within the first semester may help students to understand the technical aspects of the eportfolio and importance of starting the eportfolio early.
5. I think providing webinars, resources, or alumni mentorships on the tangible "what next?" of it all after graduation. I feel prepared to go into the workforce because of outside mentorships that I found on my own, who have helped me to understand the job-seeking process. I feel ready to do the actual job once I get it because of this program, but there's a knowledge gap between finishing the program and starting the career. I also think that a class that focuses on social justice / critical pedagogy should be mandatory for all students to take, as it's important not only for professional but personal growth.
6. St. John's LIS department bureaucracy could use some work; I had numerous issues with different accounts, my student email, my original advisor, my student loans, and ignorance as to steps I needed to take at certain points in the program in order to attend courses.
7. More use of professors' knowledge. In some classes it felt like the only thing the professor did was pick readings and assign and grade work. Lectures or more input from professors in discussion boards would be good. Some professors engaged with the class more than others.
8. It would be nice to have more information on program requirements towards the end, like email reminders on the portfolio, and notes on end of program things.
9. The core classes offered were really informative, but I expected a bit more in the core classes, specifically much more about cataloging.
10. The first semester should have a required ePortfolio webinar. The instructors mention ePortfolio and how to archive your work but the reasoning behind it is lost in all the extensive class material.

11. Improve communication with the tech services. Trying to get a technology issue resolved with IT department was a nightmare. I was on hold for over 2 hours and no one answered the phone and no one called me despite setting up an appointment to get a call.
12. Having more involvement on behalf of the instructors, either through videos or during weekly instructions. Having advisors help with suggestions for finding a job after graduating would also be helpful.
13. More focus on e-portfolio in the beginning before we start classes as well as professors giving a moment at the end of class or in the syllabus how these assignments work toward the DLIS Goals. Sometimes I struggled applying my future LIS career with the assignments.
14. I would highly suggest making either LIS 222 (Diverse Populations in LIS) or LIS 283 (Social Justice in LIS) part of the core curriculum for the DLIS program. Taking both of these courses completely changed my mindset about the reality of the LIS field. I believe that it should be required of all students in the program to take one or both of these courses, as they provided me with valuable information and experience on modern, real-world issues affecting our field and how we can work to promote diversity and inclusion with the LIS profession.
15. I think that it would be beneficial if the courses offered more incentive for students to communicate with one another even while they are not working on group projects together or answering discussion points.
16. I wish we had had access to different types of library software such as cataloging or archival software that we could mess around and become more familiar with them.
17. I think the class registration process should be made easier. Perhaps instead of meeting with your advisor in order to register, people will automatically be sent a code to register and have the choice of meeting with their advisor prior to registering.

Student: New Student Survey

Summary

The new student survey is administered at the start of the Summer, Fall and Spring terms. The survey gathers information on students' choice of St. John's (Q1 and Q2), student information (Q3, Q4, and Q5), and the students' evaluation of the online orientation course LIS 270 (Q6 and Q7). Each academic year column combines the results of the Summer, Fall, and Spring entering class surveys.

The survey was revised in 2019 after the comprehensive program review and continued accreditation decision by the ALA Committee on Accreditation in 2018. Responses from prior years are included where the same questions appear on the previous survey instrument. The survey was not administered in the 2018 - 2019 academic year when it was being revised.

The 2020-2021 survey was distributed to 45 students. 30 responded to the survey, a 67% response rate. The 2020 – 2021 survey is provided in Appendix L.

Several observations can be drawn from the 2020-2021 surveys.

- 1) The St. John's University's web site and the ALA web site/directory are the most important means of finding out about St. John's MS LIS program.
- 2) The online modality and the flexibility of the program are the highest ranked reasons for choosing St. John's MS LIS program.
- 3) For the past three years students in the 26 – 40 age group represent the largest number of students entering the program. In 2020-2021, the 26 – 40 age group comprised 50% of new students.
- 4) While part-time students comprise 70% of new students in 2020-2021, this is a decrease from the two previous academic years. The number of full-time students has increased to 30% as compared to 13% in 2019-2020.
- 5) When asked if the online orientation course was helpful 76% responded "strongly agree" or "agree", a slight increase from 2019-2020 (73%). Students provided several suggestions for improving the online orientation which the faculty will consider in revising the course.

Choice of St. John's

Table 31. Q1 How did you find out about the St. John's MS-LIS program? (Check all that apply)

Response	2020-2021	2019-2020	2017-2018	2016-2017
St. John's University website	72%	54%	33%	57%
American Library Association website/directory	28%	41%	39%	48%
Recommendation from Alumni of the program and/or librarian	16%	15%	33%	14%

Response	2020-2021	2019-2020	2017-2018	2016-2017
St. John's Online Graduate Programs Portal	16%	5%	NA	NA
Career counselors in the college where I earned my previous degree	0%	3%	0%	0%
Direct Mail (paper) campaign	0%	3%	NA	NA
Other (please explain)*	20%	23%	11%	19%

* faculty recommendation, facebook ad, lack of GRE requirement

Table 32. Q2 Reasons for Choosing St. John's, in Ranked Order

	2020-2021	2019 - 2020
Online program	32%	32%
Flexibility of the program and course offerings	30%	28%
Availability of funding/scholarship	18%	16%
Reputation of the school, department, and/or faculty	14%	13%
Recommendation of colleague or family member	5%	10%

Student Information

Questions Q3 through Q5 gather information on age group, full- and part-time status, and work/activities immediately prior to starting the program. Tables 33 through 35 report on these results. Gender and ethnicity data are collected on graduate applications. This information is provided to DLIS by the Office of Institutional Research.

Table 33. Age Group

Value	2020-2021	2019-2020	2017-2018	2016-2017
25 years or younger	33%	34%	35%	60%
26-40 years	50%	53%	47%	20%
41-54 years	13%	11%	6%	20%
55 or older	3%	3%	12%	0%

Table 34. Current Status

Value	2020-2021	2019-2020	2017-2018	2016-2017
Full-time (9-12 credits/semester)	30%	13%	6%	55%
Part-time (3-6 credits/semester)	70%	87%	94%	45%

Table 35. Immediately Prior to Entering the Program (Select all that apply)

Value	2020-2021	2019-2020	2017-2018	2016-2017
Undergraduate student	38%	38%	35%	35%
Employed in a field related to information studies	31%	49%	47%	55%
Graduate student	24%	30%	6%	5%
Volunteer/community service	17%	19%	18%	10%
Other (please describe)*	38%	14%	6%	5%

* Employed in an unrelated field, homemaker, unemployed

Online Orientation

Questions Q6 and Q7 requested feedback from students on the online orientation course, LIS 270. Q6 asks if the LIS 270 Online Orientation was helpful at the start of the program. Q7 asked for suggestions to improve the online orientation. Eleven of 30 survey respondents responded to Q7, a 37% response rate.

Table 36. Q6: LIS 270, the online orientation, was helpful at the start of the program?

Academic Year	Strongly Agree or Agree
2020-2021	76%
2019-2020	73%

Q7: What suggestions do you have for improving LIS 270, the online orientation?

The following list is a representative sample of the responses.

1. Once I obtained access, it was very helpful. The access issue was detrimental.
2. It's takes up time. Power slides and a brief presentation videos would work in my opinion.

3. I am new to online asynchronous learning. An explanation of how that process generally works would have been very helpful. Coming into it I didn't understand that there would be no "class" and almost all interactions would take place on the blackboard discussion forums.
4. Maybe include some more interactive activities in order to give students some hands on experience using the different programs explained in the orientation.
5. Have a more organized layout.
6. I think more time should be spent on getting a storm card and accessing the libraries. I am still unable to do both because I was confused.
7. I think instead of focusing on Blackboard; help us understand all the things SJU offers and getting us started in those things. Like accessing the Library online.

Appendix

A. DLIS Strategic Priorities 2019 – 2021: Implementation of Action Items

September 6, 2021; revised November 1, 2021

Summary. The DLIS faculty approved the 2019 - 2021 Strategic Priorities in September 2019. The development of the strategic priorities was informed by the implementation of the 2017 – 2019 action items, the 2018 – 2019 assessment measures, the faculty meetings, and the May 2019 advisory board meeting. This implementation report concludes this two-year cycle and informs the 2021 – 2023 Strategic Priorities.

Strategic Priorities

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

Action Items

- a) Develop the new Brother Corry Social Justice Fellowship as a means for engaging students in research related to social justice.
- b) Emphasize issues relating to professional ethics and social justice in new and existing LIS coursework such as LIS 239 Research Methods and LIS 283 Social Justice in the Information Professions.
- c) Explore ways the University's institutional repository <http://scholar.stjohns.edu> may serve as a publication platform for student and faculty research.

Steps Taken

- a) The Brother Corry Social Justice Fellowship has been revised to integrate better with research-related coursework and to require deliverables more appropriate for a Master's level research fellowship. As evidence of the revision's success, two fellowships were awarded in 2020.
- b) LIS 239 and LIS 283 have been revised per action item (b) above.
- c) Faculty will consider uploading their work to the University's institutional repository <http://scholar.stjohns.edu>, when they believe it will benefit the broader academic community.

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

Action Items

- a) Implement a revised mentorship program as discussed at the 2019 Advisory Board Meeting which leverages the mentorship programs of related professional associations and invites recent alumni to serve as online learning mentors.
- b) Plan to hold the Gillard Alumni Lecture at the ALA Annual Conference in collaboration with the Catholic Library Association. Preliminary discussions of this approach took place at the Advisory Board Planning Meeting in April 2019.

Steps Taken

- a) On the Career Development page of the DLIS LibGuide (the online student manual), a link to the ALA's mentoring page is provided. This ALA page offers links to mentoring programs offered by ALA Professional Associations and Affiliates (such as ACRL, ALSC, LLAMA, Black Caucus of ALA, etc.) as well as Round Tables for New Members and GLBT+ Members.

A Mentoring Survey is distributed to student graduating from the program. This survey seeks volunteers for mentoring current students in online pedagogy and in job search guidance. DLIS is working to improve the communication of this new program to current students to increase participation.

- b) DLIS plans to hold the Gillard Lecture at the 2022 ALA Annual Conference. The Lecture will be co-sponsored by the Catholic Library Association. The lecture is seen as an important networking opportunity for alumni at the conference.
- c) The biweekly webinar series sponsored by DLIS and the DLIS Student Association has increase the participation of alumni over the past two years. This was especially helpful during the early stages of the Covid-19 pandemic as alumni panels shared their experiences with students.
- d) Alumni have participated in promoting the MS LIS program by serving at the DLIS exhibit at the ALA and NYLA Annual Conferences.

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

Action Items

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

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

Steps Taken

- a) The Certificate in Management for Information Professionals (CMIP) was revised in 2020-2021 to reduce the number of required credits from 15 to 12. DLIS believed that this reduction would not detract from the quality of the program while making it more accessible. Plans are to market the Certificate online and at regional conferences.
 - b) DLIS has developed a partnership with the Institute of Certified Records Management (ICRM) to develop courses which will substitute for requirements in the ICRM's records manager certification process. A marketing strategy for this initiative is under development.
 - c) A proposal for new Certificate in Social Justice for Information Professionals was developed in Fall 2020. This Certificate is in its final stages of the approval process.
4. Prepare students to enter the profession and engage in lifelong learning.

Action Items

- a) Explore additional opportunities for academic service-learning (AS-L) in the MS LIS program by performing an analysis of AS-L in graduate programs with emphasis on LIS curricula.
- b) Revise the DLIS LibGuide to more clearly communicate the opportunities in the program related to career development, and to encourage involvement in professional associations and professional networking in general.
- c) Develop a framework for planning webinars for the academic year. Construct a database of presenters from professionals in field.

Steps Taken

- a) DLIS' response to the Covid-19 pandemic has resulted in opportunities for new relationships and new forms of service to organization in the community.
- b) The DLIS LibGuide has been revised with emphasis on the areas identified in the action item 4b.
- c) Social media has been used effectively in identifying information professionals to present at the biweekly DLISSA webinar series. The presenters' contact information is stored for future reference.

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

Action Items

- a) Support faculty interested in completing the Online Learning Consortium's Certificate Program.
- b) Plan for the transition to Blackboard Ultra in Fall 2020 as the Learning Management System.
- c) Hold an annual meeting for part-time faculty to discuss online learning pedagogy and share experiences.

Steps Taken

- a) Dr. Kevin Rioux has completed the Online Learning Consortium's (OLC) Certificate Program. Dr. Shari Lee will begin the OLC Certificate program in the 2021 – 2022 academic year..
- b) The University decided in May 2020 to change its Learning Management System from Blackboard to Canvas. DLIS switched to Canvas for the Spring 2021 term. All DLIS faculty have completed training in Canvas as appropriate.
- c) A meeting with the part-time faculty is planned for January 2022.

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 |

Note, there was no Advisory Board Planning Meeting in 2020 due to the Covid-19 pandemic. The 2021 Advisory Board Planning Meeting is planned for October 2021.

C. Advisory Board Members

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

D. Enrollment Summary

Program		Fall 2016	Fall 2017	Fall 2018	Fall 2019	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
MS	Library & Information Science	68	63	102	124	123	111
MA/MS	Public History/Lib & Info Science		4	10	13	9	7
ADVCRT	Management for Info Prof		1	2	1	0	0
Total		68	68	114	138	132	118

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

Note, there was no Advisory Board Meeting in 2020. The next Advisory Board Meeting is planned for November 2021.

F. Alumni Survey – 2021

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

Responses: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Strongly Disagree, Disagree

2. My interactions with faculty members were generally positive.

Responses: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Strongly Disagree, Disagree

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

Responses: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Strongly Disagree, Disagree

4. Can you suggest ways that DLIS can foster, enhance, and/or reinforce interaction among students in the online environment?

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

Responses: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Strongly Disagree, Disagree

6. Can you suggest ways in which DLIS staff could further enhance and/or support the student experience?

7. I received useful information in my advisement meetings.

Responses: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Strongly Disagree, Disagree

8. Can you suggest ways in which DLIS could improve the advisement process?

9. The faculty were effective teachers.

Responses: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Strongly Disagree, Disagree

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

Responses: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Strongly Disagree, Disagree

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

Responses: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Strongly Disagree, Disagree

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

Responses: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Strongly Disagree, Disagree

13. I was prepared to enter the workforce.

Responses: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Strongly Disagree, Disagree

14. Field experience in the form of Academic Service-Learning projects, internships and independent studies contributed toward my finding employment.

Responses: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Strongly Disagree, Disagree

15. I would recommend this program to others.

Responses: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Strongly Disagree, Disagree

16. Please tell us why you would possibly not recommend the program. (This is question is conditional. It is presented to the participant if the participant answers Neutral, Strongly Disagree, or Disagree to question 15.)

17. What were the major strengths of the program?

18. What recommendations do you have to improve the program?

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 Goals³

The course contributes towards satisfying the following program goals of the MS LIS:

Program goals listed

Description of Artifact: *assignment name*
description

Students' overall performance
description

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

What changes do you recommend in order 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.}

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

Review of Student 1's artifact.

Student 1's artifact.

Student 2

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

Review of Student 2's artifact

Student 2's artifact

Appendix (optional)

H. E-Portfolio Rubric

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

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

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

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

I. Employer Survey – 2021

1. Job Title

2. Town / City

3. State

4. Type of Library / Information Organization

Responses: Archive, Academic, Corporate, Public, School, Youth Services in Public Library, Other (please specify)

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

Responses: Not at all, Not very relevant, Somewhat , Very relevant, Extremely relevant

<p>Basic computer (e.g., word-processing, spreadsheets) Oral/written communication</p> <p>Teamwork (interpersonal relationships) Curiosity Listening to others Exhibits Professional Ethics</p> <p>Critical thinking (evaluating information) Cultural Sensitivity Flexibility User Engagement Decision-Making Community Engagement Presentation Skills Active Professional Engagement Leadership</p> <p>Advanced computer (e.g., databases, coding, web design) Statistics Other (please specify)</p>
--

6. Comments on general skills

--

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

Responses: Not at all, Not very relevant, Somewhat , Very relevant, Extremely relevant

Ability to Set Goals and Achieve Them
Practical Application of LIS Theory
Project Management
Marketing and Advocacy
Management of Resources
Data Analysis
Negotiation Skills
Supervisory Skills
Mentoring or Coaching Colleagues
Grant-writing skills
Fluency in a Second Language
Other (please specify)

8. Comment on specialized skills.

--

9. To your knowledge, does anyone currently working at your organization hold an MLS or MS LIS from St. John's University?

Responses: Yes, No

10. Please indicate your agreement to the following comparative statements about Graduates of St. John's University's LIS program.

Responses: Disagree, Neutral, Agree

- St. John's grads are NOT AS prepared as those from other LIS programs
- St. John's grads compare FAVORABLY to those from other LIS programs
- St. John's grads are BETTER prepared than those from other LIS programs

J. Annual Student Survey – 2021

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

Responses:

Academic Librarianship
Archival Studies
Management
Public Librarianship
Special Librarianship
Youth Services
I am undecided

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

Responses:

Academic Librarianship
Archival Studies
Management
Public Librarianship
Special Librarianship
Youth Services
I am undecided

3. Faculty provide feedback on student work in a reasonable time.

Responses: Strongly agree, Agree, Neither Agree or disagree, Disagree, Strongly disagree

4. Students have access to continuing opportunities for advisement.

Responses: Strongly agree, Agree, Neither Agree or disagree, Disagree, Strongly disagree

5. Students have access to continuing opportunities for placement assistance.

Responses: Strongly agree, Agree, Neither Agree or disagree, Disagree, Strongly disagree

6. DLIS Administration responds to student questions in a reasonable time.

Responses: Strongly agree, Agree, Neither Agree or disagree, Disagree, Strongly disagree

7. Online databases through University Libraries are an efficient research tool.

Responses: Strongly agree, Agree, Neither Agree or disagree, Disagree, Strongly disagree

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

Responses: Less than 18 credits, 18 or more credits

Using conditional logic, only students having more than 18 credits answered Q9 through Q14.

9. Field Experience: check all the following forms of experience that you have at this point in your program of study.

Academic service-learning project
Internship
Graduate assistantship
Part-time employment in a library, or in a position related to the MS LIS program
Full-time employment in a library, or in a position related to the MS LIS program
Volunteer in a library, or in a position related to the MS LIS program
Other (please specify)

10. In your opinion, how well prepared are you for your career as an information professional?

Responses: Very well prepared, Well prepared, Somewhat prepared, Not at all prepared

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

Advanced certificate
Second graduate degree
Webinar / workshop
None

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

Responses: Very well prepared, Well prepared, Somewhat prepared, Not at all prepared

13. What do you think would improve the MS LIS program for future students? (open question)

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

Responses: Highly likely, Likely, Somewhat likely, Not at all likely

K. Exit Survey 2020 – 2021

1. I was satisfied with the quality of the program.
Responses: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagree
2. My interactions with faculty members were generally positive.
Responses: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagree
3. My interactions with my fellow students were generally positive.
Responses: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagree
4. My interactions with DLIS office staff were generally positive.
Responses: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagree
5. I received useful information from my faculty advisor.
Responses: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagree
6. The faculty were effective teachers.
Responses: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagree
7. The faculty are knowledgeable in their areas of expertise.
Responses: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagree
8. I was satisfied with the course selection offered during my program of study.
Responses: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagree
9. Courses were offered frequently enough for timely completion of degree requirements.
Responses: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagree
10. I had access to appropriate library resources to support my educational needs.
Responses: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagree
11. I had access to appropriate software and related technology to support my educational needs.
Responses: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagree
12. I feel prepared to enter the workforce.
Responses: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagree

13. I would recommend this program to others.

Responses: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagree

Students answering “Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree” in question 13 were shown the following question for 14.

14. Please tell why you would possibly not recommend the program. (open question)

15. What were the major strengths of the program? (open question)

16. What recommendations do you have to improve the program? (open question)

L. New Student Survey 2020 – 2021

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

Responses:

- Recommendation from an alumna/alumnus of the program and/or librarian
- Career counselors in the college where I earned my previous degree
- American Library Association website/directory
- St. John's University website
- St. John's University Online Programs Portal
- Direct Mail (paper) campaign
- Other (please explain)

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

Responses:

- Flexibility of the program and course offerings
- Reputation of the school, department, and/or faculty
- Recommendation of colleague or family member
- Availability of funding/scholarship
- Online program

3. To which age group do you belong?

Responses:

- 25 years or younger
- 26-40 years
- 41-54 years
- 55 or older

4. What is your current status?

Responses: Full-time (9-12 credits/semester, Part-time (3-6 credits/semester

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

Responses:

Undergraduate student

Graduate student

Volunteer/community service

Employed in a field related to information studies

Other (please describe)

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

Responses: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagree

7. What suggestions do you have for improving LIS 270, the online orientation? (open question)

M. Curriculum Map

Course Code	Course Name	Program Goals & Outcomes	Faculty
CORE (4 courses)			
LIS 203	Organization of Information	3A, 3B	Angel
LIS 204	Introduction to Library and Information Science	1A, 1B, 1C, 1E, 2A, 2B, 3A, 5A, 7A	Rioux
LIS 205	Introduction to Information Sources and Services	5A	Lee
LIS 239	Research and Evaluation Methods	1D, 3A, 6A	Singh
MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENT (2 courses)			
LIS 240	Management of Libraries and Information Centers	1D, 8A, 8B	Singh
ELECTIVES (40 courses)			
LIS 121	Literature & Related Resources for Children	1A, 5A, 5C	Lee
LIS 125	Library Materials and Services for Young Children	2B, 4A	Lee
LIS 126	Literature & Related Resources for Young Adults	2B, 7A	Lee
LIS 127	Library Programs & Services for Children and Young Adults	2B, 4A, 7A, 8A, 8B	Lee
LIS 211	Collection Development	2A, 2B, 8A, 8B	Evans
LIS 213	Popular Culture and Young Adults	4A	Lee
LIS 214	Teen Spaces For Libraries	1A, 1B, 1C, 4A	Lee
LIS 221	Planning and Delivering Information Literacy Programs	5B, 5C, 7A, 7B	King
LIS 222	Materials and Services to Diverse Populations	1A, 1B, 1C, 1D, 5B, 5C, 7A, 7B	Rioux
LIS 230	Introduction to Digital Libraries	1B, 1D, 3A, 3B, 4A, 5B	Angel
LIS 231	College and University Libraries	8A, 8B	Rioux
LIS 233	Public Libraries and Community Information Centers	8A, 8B	Rioux
LIS 237	Metadata for Information Professionals	1A, 1D, 3A, 3B	Vorbach
LIS 238	Web Design for Libraries and Information Centers	4A	Vorbach

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