



**ST. JOHN'S
UNIVERSITY**

**ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE OF
LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES**

Division of Library and Information Science

Annual Assessment Report

2025 - 2026

Prepared by: James Vorbach, Director & Associate Professor

Submitted: May 20, 2025

Approved: October 13, 2026

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	3
Program Goals and Outcomes	5
Strategic Priorities 2025 – 2027: Status Report.....	11
Advisory Board Meeting Agenda	13
Advisory Board Meeting Summary	14
Alumni Survey	19
Career Outcomes Survey	24
Course Artifact Assessment	25
E-Portfolio Assessment	28
Employer Survey	30
Student: Annual Survey	34
Student: Exit Survey	38
Student: New Student Survey	50
Appendix	53
A. DLIS Strategic Priorities 2025 – 2027	53
C. Enrollment Summary	55
D. Alumni Survey.....	56
E. Course Artifact Assessment Form	58
F. E-Portfolio Specification.....	60
G. Employer Survey.....	63
H. Annual Student Survey	65
I. Exit Survey.....	67
J. New Student Survey	69
K. MS LIS Program Goals and Outcomes, prior to Spring 2023	71

Executive Summary

The annual assessment report informs the Division of Library and Information Science (DLIS) community on the 2025 – 2026 assessments, the strategic priorities, and the 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 assessment process is guided by the DLIS Assessment Plan, approved in March 2015 and revised in September 2019. In addition, the annual assessment report is evidence supporting Standard 1 Systematic Planning in the 2015 ALA Accreditation Standards for Master's Programs in Library and Information Studies.

DLIS developed a comprehensive assessment plan in 2015 that called for reconstituting the Advisory Board and adding four new assessment measures. These consisted of an alumni survey, an exit survey of graduating students, an 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 2019. Minor revisions were made and the revised plan was approved by the DLIS faculty.

The MS LIS 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. The program will undergo its next comprehensive review in Spring 2027.

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 September 2015. However, action items often required more than one year to complete. Consequently, the faculty felt a two-year framework provided the necessary implementation time while still offering the flexibility to respond to changes in the field. The current Strategic Priorities are for 2025 – 2027 (Appendix A). Each year a status report is included in the annual assessment report. The status report provides an update on the implementation of the action items in the Strategic Priorities.

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 (Table 1). All program constituents are involved in the assessment cycle. The assessment reports and concomitant decision-making are evidence of the ongoing process of program improvement that meets or exceeds the ALA Standards for Accreditation of Master's Programs in Library and Information Studies¹. More importantly, students in the program are well-equipped for current and emerging positions in the evolving information professions.

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

Table 1. Annual Assessment Measures and the Advisory Board Meeting

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, if needed	March	Alumni, employers, faculty
Alumni Two-Year-Out Survey	April	Alumni, two years after graduation
Employer Biennial Survey	April	Employers
Advisory Board Meeting	May	Alumni, employers, faculty, and students

Program Goals and Outcomes

The MS LIS program goals and outcomes are based on the American Library Association's (ALA) 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. The program goals were revised (effective Spring 2023) in light of the 2021 ALA Core Competencies³. In addition, the MS LIS specializations apply the academic goals of related professional organizations to supplement the MS LIS program goals. The program goals are available on St. John's University's web site and the DLIS LibGuide. The program goals and outcomes prior to Spring 2023 are listed in Appendix K.

Preamble

The DLIS Program Goals are informed by ALA's Core Competencies for Librarianship (2021) as well as the history and theoretical ideals that underpin the profession. The MSLIS Program is also designed to hone and develop competencies in technological skills and professional development. Every effort is made to stay current on relevant technologies as well as the course delivery and assessment platforms. In this fully online graduate program, students are also provided opportunities to experiment, explore, and work with a variety of cutting-edge tools, technologies, communication/presentation software and platforms, which are relevant to the profession.

As with technology, an understanding of the value and need for professional development is also embedded throughout the program. Faculty continually challenge students to think about how they will keep up with the changes that impact the profession, especially in regard to technology, given the rate at which new ones are developed and others become obsolete. The program also facilitates the development of a broad range of professional skills, knowledge, and abilities that all information professionals need, regardless of their area of specialization.

Program Goal 1: Foundations of the Profession

Objective: development of an understanding of the foundations of the profession.

This goal is specifically concerned with the early development and evolution of information as a discipline, libraries, and librarianship as a profession – as well as the concepts and issues that still underpin why we do what we do today. Therefore, the ethics, values, and foundational principles that

² ALA Core Competencies

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

³2021 ALA Core Competencies

<https://www.ala.org/educationcareers/2021-update-ala-core-competencies-librarianship>

guide the library profession are also of concern. Library professionals, regardless of their specific title and/or role, should also have an understanding of:

- a) Information in society – i.e., what happens when the creation, distribution, and manipulation of information become the most significant economic and cultural activity
- b) The role of libraries in society
- c) The laws that relate to the profession, such as copyright, privacy, freedom of expression, equal rights (e.g., the Americans with Disabilities Act), open access, and intellectual property
- d) The social, public, information, economic, and cultural policies, and trends, that are relevant to the library and information professions at all levels (i.e., local, regional, national, and international)

Artifacts selected to demonstrate competency in this goal should not focus on the history or foundations of one area of specialization/study, such as Archives or Youth Services. The focus should more broadly be focused on the issues/theories that underpin the history and development of information as a discipline, the library as an institution, or librarianship as a profession.

Program Goal 2: Information Resources

Objective: development of an understanding of information resources.

This goal is concerned with the use, management, organization, and evaluation of print, digital, and emerging formats and genres of information resources – as well as how these may intersect with and reflect the diverse and cultural needs of information communities. This includes an understanding of the policies, technologies, sources, systems, concepts, and issues that support information access and retrieval, which are central to the provision of reference services and collection development/management. Library professionals, regardless of their specific title and/or role, should also have an understanding of:

- a) The lifecycle of recorded knowledge and information - through all stages of use
- b) Collection management from evaluation to preservation and other curative practices
- c) The issues and principles related to the acquisition, selection, purchasing, processing, storage, and de-selection of materials
- d) Emerging information resources and be able to describe and work with a variety of these resources

Artifacts selected to demonstrate competency in this area should focus on issues/skills related to information resources in any of the varying capacities discussed above and showcase the ability to describe and work with a variety of information resources, regardless of one's area of specialization.

Program Goal 3: Organization of Recorded Knowledge and Information

Objective: Development of the ability needed to evaluate, describe, analyze, and organize recorded knowledge and information.

This goal is specifically concerned with the principles, methods, tools, and goals of organizing and representing information and knowledge across cultures and identities. This includes an understanding of the ways in which culture influences the collection and description of recorded knowledge and information. Library professionals, regardless of their specific title and/or role, should be able to:

- a) Understand the principles, systems, trends, and goals involved in the organization and representation of recorded knowledge and information
- b) Implement the developmental, descriptive, analytical, and evaluative skills needed to organize recorded knowledge and information
- c) Maintain the systems of cataloging, collection, metadata, indexing, and classification standards and structures, and implement methods used to apply, create, and discover recorded knowledge and information, and the weaknesses and strengths of these systems
- d) Recognize the ways that cultural biases impact and influence the collection and description of recorded knowledge and information

Artifacts selected to demonstrate competency in this area should focus on issues/skills related to the organization of recorded knowledge and information in any of the varying capacities discussed above and showcase the ability to implement methods used to apply, create, and discover recorded knowledge and information - regardless of one's area of specialization.

Program Goal 4: Reference and User Services

Objective: development of the skills and abilities needed to provide ethical reference and user services as stipulated in the Reference and User Services Association (RUSA) Guidelines for Behavioral Performance of Reference and Information Service Providers.

This goal is concerned with the underlying techniques used to locate, retrieve, evaluate, and synthesize information from diverse sources for use by varying user populations and information environments. Skills required to satisfy this goal include the ability to apply the methods and practices necessary to provide consultation, mediation, instruction, and guidance in using recorded knowledge and information. This is particularly relevant during the reference interview process, where problem-solving skills can also be beneficial in determining informational needs. Library professionals, regardless of their specific title and/or role, should also be able to:

- a) Implement principles, concepts, and techniques for understanding and assessing the information needs of a community and understand the ways the library can assist and collaborate in meeting those needs

- b) Engage in evaluation and assessment of programs, services, and partnerships, with input from the community being served
- c) Practice cultural humility while planning, offering, and evaluating library reference and user services
- d) Apply the RUSA Behavioral Competencies in the ethical practice of reference and user services

Artifacts selected to demonstrate competency in this area should focus on issues/skills related to the reference and user services in any of the varying capacities discussed above and demonstrate the ability to evaluate and assess programs, services, and partnerships, with input from the community being served - regardless of one's area of specialization.

Program Goal 5: Research and Evidence-Based Practice

Objective: development of the ability to discover, interpret, and generate research that supports the library, the profession, and/or personal professional development.

This goal is primarily concerned with the ability to discover, engage with, and synthesize existing research from the field in order to align relevant findings with one's own professional development and/or institutional needs. The focus is on cultivating research skills demonstrating the *application of research methods*, and an understanding of methods of data analysis and application of research tools. Relevant findings should also align with one's own professional development and/or institutional needs. Library professionals, regardless of their specific title and/or role, should also:

- a) Understand how professional and cultural values may influence research at any stage as well as the barriers that impact access to research
- b) Recognize the ethical and appropriate *application of key research methods*, techniques, and designs in the field, including the generation, analysis, evaluation, and presentation of data, and the utilization of research tools
- c) Understand the tension between research and its application to professional practice
- d) Understand the importance of engaging in the research foundations and scholarly communications that will enable continued professional development, knowledge, and sharing

Artifacts selected to demonstrate competency in this area should focus on issues/skills related to the research and evidence-based practice in any of the varying capacities discussed above, while demonstrating an understanding of the ethical and appropriate application of key research methods, techniques, and designs to practice - regardless of one's area of specialization.

Program Goal 6: Management and Administration

Objective: development of the ability to apply the principles of management and administration across all aspects of the information setting to ensure that it meets the needs of the community.

This goal is concerned with the principles of effective and just supervisory practices, human resource management, training and development, fiduciary planning and oversight, as well as the assessment and evaluation of library services and their outcomes. Library professionals, regardless of their specific title and/or role, should also be able to:

- a) Develop and support diverse and equitable partnerships, collaborations, networks, and other structures with all collaborative partners, consortia, and within communities served
- b) Employ the concepts behind, issues relating to, and methods of principled, transformational, and change management leadership, in addition to other leadership philosophies
- c) Effectively plan, manage, implement, and close projects using the concepts of leadership methods
- d) Participate in strategic communication with colleagues throughout the organization and the community

Artifacts selected to demonstrate competency in this area should focus on issues/skills related to the management and administration of libraries and library services in any of the varying capacities discussed above. They should also showcase the ability to apply the concepts behind, and methods for, the management, administration, assessment, and evaluation of library services and their outcomes - regardless of one's area of specialization.

Program Goal 7: Social Justice

Definition: The ALA Core Competencies (2021) define social justice as both a process and a goal that includes the knowledge and skills necessary for library professionals to create library collections, services, programs, as well as the management of facilities and personnel, which foster equitable access to, and participation of, all people to utilize the library.

Objectives: to facilitate an understanding of past and current inequities within libraries and foster the capacity to address issues of oppression, privilege, and power within our libraries and between the library and its community.

This goal is concerned with issues regarding social justice, equity, diversity, inclusion, and anti-racism that professionals often face in libraries. Satisfying this goal requires an understanding of one's own cultural identity, including positionality related to power, privilege, and oppression, and an awareness of how that influences the ways in which they interact within the community and among decision makers. This also includes the ability to recognize, challenge, and change practices, services, and programs that have traditionally replicated dominant as well as marginalized systems. Other actionable behaviors that support competency in this area, which library professionals, regardless of their specific title/role, should aim to accomplish:

- a) Work toward an organizational climate that encourages, supports, assesses, and rewards work that promotes social justice, equity, diversity, and inclusion
- b) Incorporate social justice and inclusion through outreach and partnership with diverse groups and communities in order to expand inclusive collections, staff, programs, and services
- c) Equitably distributing library staff, collections, and facility resources among all user groups
- d) Seeking ongoing professional development opportunities to raise awareness and develop strategies that address issues of power, privilege, and oppression

Artifacts selected to demonstrate competency in this area should focus on the actionable behaviors and issues relating to social justice, equity, diversity, inclusion, and anti-racism in the field, as described above - regardless of one's area of specialization.

Strategic Priorities 2025 – 2027: Status Report

May 11, 2026

Introduction. This report summarizes the status implementing the action items in the 2025 - 2027 Strategic Priorities. The DLIS faculty approved the 2025 - 2027 Strategic Priorities on October 14, 2025. The strategic priorities were based on the implementation of the 2023 – 2025 action items, the 2024 – 2025 assessment report, monthly faculty meetings, and the annual advisory board meeting.

Strategic Priorities

1. Prepare the self-study for the continued accreditation of the MS LIS program.

Action Items

- a) Each of the five 2015 accreditation standards is represented by a chapter in the self-study. Each chapter is the responsibility of a committee lead by a DLIS faculty member, as listed below.

Standard (Chapter)	Faculty
Systematic Planning	James Vorbach
Curriculum	Rajesh Singh
Faculty	Kevin Rioux
Student	Shari Lee
Administration, Finance, and Resources	Christine Angel

Steps Taken

- a) The faculty are preparing a draft of the self-study for internal review. The deadline for the draft is June 30, 2026. The draft is to be submitted to the Office of Accreditation in October 2026. The final draft is due in January 2027.

2. Perform a review of the curriculum.

Action Items

- a) Review the core courses and syllabi: LIS 203, 204, 205, 239, and LIS 240.
- b) Review the elective courses and syllabi.
- c) Review the five specializations, including specialization descriptions and LibGuide distribution: academic, archival studies, public, records management, and youth services.
- d) Review the two certificates, including certificate web sites and LibGuide distribution: Management of Information Professionals and Social Justice in the Information Professions.

Steps Taken

- a) Items (a), (c), and (d) have been completed.
- b) Item (b) will be completed by October 31, 2026.

Advisory Board Meeting Agenda

Location: Teams Online Meeting

Date/Time: Tuesday, April 28, 2026; 10:00am – 12:00 pm

1. Overview of the Academic Year
2. Update on accreditation – Spring 2027
 - a. External Review Panel (ERP) site visit: February 28 – March 2, 2027
3. Faculty reports
4. Feedback from the Board
5. Adjournment

Advisory Board Meeting Summary

Location: Teams Online Meeting

Date/Time: Tuesday April 28, 2026; 10:00am – 12:00pm

Overview⁴

The meeting reviewed accreditation planning and recent curricular work and included faculty presentations on teaching and research. James Vorbach outlined the accreditation schedule and deliverables: a preliminary internal first draft of the self-study targeted for June 30, a "good draft" by October, and the final self-study due in January ahead of an external review panel (ERP) visit February 28 – March 2, 2027. He described the ERP visit schedule, the six-week window for the ERP report, and the Committee on Accreditation review at the ALA annual meeting in June 2027. He asked attendees to consider attending the in-person reception on February 28 or the online meeting on March 1st.

Vorbach's presentation included the strategic priorities for fall 2025 – spring 2027, a new Teens and Social Media course to be taught by Shari Lee, the University's Office of Distance Education and the Plan for the Self-Study. Staffing gaps were also noted: an upcoming faculty retirement, and an unfilled administrative assistant line.

Faculty presentations followed by Christine Angel, Shari Lee, Kevin Rioux, Rajesh Singh, and Kristin Szylyan. The presentations highlighted metadata and AI integration, youth services and social media pedagogy, and student concerns about AI ethics and libraries as community spaces.

Vorbach's Presentation

Vorbach outlined the advisory board agenda, noting this meeting is the last before the comprehensive review. The agenda covered a year-in-review, accreditation update, faculty presentations, and board feedback. The year-in-review highlighted five areas including strategic priorities, a new course, the Office of Distance Education, the self-study plan, and staffing.

Vorbach described the two 2025 – 2027 strategic priorities: 1) preparing the self-study and 2) performing a review of the curriculum. A preliminary draft of the self-study is due June 30 and a draft submission in October to the American Library Association (ALA). He explained that each accreditation standard corresponds to a chapter in the self-study and is lead by a faculty member. The standards are systematic planning, curriculum, faculty, student, and administration/finance/resources. The preliminary

⁴ This summary was prepared by James Vorbach who edited transcripts from Read AI and Teams.

draft will be distributed to review committees whose feedback will be incorporated in the draft submitted in October.

The second strategic priority is a review of the curriculum. It consists of reviews of the core, electives, specializations, and advanced certificates. The five core courses have been reviewed along with the five specializations (academic librarianship, archival studies, public librarianship, records management and youth services) and the two advanced certificates - management and social justice. The review of the electives will be completed by October. It was noted that the advanced certificate can be earned alongside the MS.

Office of Distance Education

Vorbach described the University's new Office of Distance Education. Named staff include the Chief Online Learning Officer, the newly hired success coach and communication specialist. A web site for St. John's online programs has been redesigned, and a CRM is planned to better support online student services, starting in fall 2026. He noted this university investment benefits the MS LIS program's online students and strengthens accreditation standard five - administration, finance, and resources.

Staffing changes and recruitment status

Staffing shortfalls were discussed. Since Michael Crossfox's departure in February 2025, his position is unfilled, resulting in redistributed responsibilities among faculty and the chair. In addition, Kevin Rioux is retiring after this academic year. Vorbach reported having completed the required paperwork for replacements.

Accreditation milestones

The plan for the self-study was approved in March 2026. The preliminary draft is due June 30. This will allow time to structure appendices and thus avoid overloading chapters with excessive detail prior to the October deadline. The preliminary draft will be distributed to review committees consisting of faculty, alumni, employers, and students. Their feedback will be incorporated in the draft submitted to the ALA by October 29. The draft will be discussed with the ERP Chair and the Office of Accreditation director in November. Their feedback will be incorporated in the final self-study submitted by January 18, 2027.

Vorbach described the ERP visit itinerary, including ERP arrival (February 27), a Sunday campus reception (February 28), and a Monday online meeting (March 1). The visit will conclude with a meeting on Tuesday March 2 between the ERP and senior university leadership.

The ERP will issue a formal report within six weeks of the visit, to which DLIS may respond. Vorbach and the ERP Chair will meet with the Committee on Accreditation (CoA) at the ALA Annual meeting in June. After which the CoA will render a decision.

Faculty presentations — Christine Angel

Christine Angel presented her teaching focus on information representation and retrieval, the core and elective courses she teaches (organization of information, museum informatics, archives and records management, data curation), and her role leading the Archives and Records Management Program.

Angel described embedding AI topics into courses, the international virtual exchange with a Berlin colleague, the Institute of Certified Records Managers (ICRM) partnership, ongoing technical training in Python, a forthcoming book on AI in education, and classroom examples highlighting how missing metadata hides information on marginalized communities in archives.

Shari Lee

Shari Lee specializes in youth services with a focus on teens. Lee described structuring courses around the specific foundations of each subject to create real-life connections for students. Lee summarized a pop culture course and explained how it led to a dedicated teens and social media course. She described analyzing social media's impact on teens, and integrating DEI and critical approaches into class discussions.

Lee encourages students' use of AI as a tool, asks for responsible application, and incorporates discussions about AI's impact on areas such as children's literature and publishing. She framed AI as another technology to be critically examined and incorporated into practice.

Kevin Rioux

Kevin Rioux described his teaching of core and specialization courses and highlighted how AI has shifted from being ignored to being integrated into coursework as students seek guidance on ethics and practical uses. He also noted students' interest in libraries as community spaces, and the need to address cultural trends and budget pressures in courses.

Rioux recounted involvement with Vincentian initiatives and said he keeps the university mission visible in his classes. He reflected that new students show generally positive attitudes toward adapting to rapid changes in the field.

Rajesh Singh

Rajesh Singh presented his teaching focus within the Advanced Certificate in Management for Information Professionals, including the courses he teaches: management, project management, knowledge management, and marketing and advocacy. He described using case studies and problem-based scenarios to help students analyze organizational challenges. He emphasized collaborative assignments that mirror workplace expectations, including strategic plans, marketing plans, knowledge management action plans, and project charters.

Singh also highlighted his Cultural Competence course, which examines identity, race, privilege, power, intersectionality, and cultural humility in information work. He also discussed his Fake News and Misinformation course, which examines how AI systems generate and frame misleading information and addresses concerns such as AI sycophancy, validation, and overreliance.

Kristin Szylvian

Kristin Szylvian manages the dual degree program which was started in 2018. The dual degree program offers students the opportunity to earn a Master of Arts in Public History and a Master of Science in Library and Information Science.

Students in the dual degree program are prepared for doing work in public history that intersects with library and information science, mainly through archives. One of Szylvian's courses, History of Galleries, Libraries, Archives, and Museums (GLAM), offers students a rich opportunity to delve into the growing body of scholarship that examines libraries both in the ancient world, and more recently, in the 21st century.

Internships are an important part of the program. The students complete one in the library and information science department and two in the history department.

Discussion

During the faculty presentations and afterwards, there was a range of topics discussed. The points below were recognized as valuable in the curriculum.

- Management skills

- Collaborative work, creating a collaborative environment, group projects
- Knowledge sharing, commenting on others' discussion posts, icebreakers
- Integrating AI into courseware, techniques for overcoming pushback over generative AI
- Learning how technology (including AI) is applied to facilitate information literacy

Other Comments

- Taina Evans brought up that Calculators did not replace Math as analogous to AI replacing librarians.
- Elaine Egan mentioned Dr. Jared Cooney Horvath who reported on the declining cognitive ability, particularly of Gen Z; this led to a discussion of foundational knowledge.
- Shari Lee spoke on short form reading vs long form reading, and the impact on thinking critically; Robert Drzewicki mentioned the book *Slow Reading* which supports this.
- Vorbach mentioned that the Wiley relationship ended with the Fall 2025 class; a sharp decline in the entering class of MS LIS students occurred in Spring 2026; the Office of Distance Learning has only recently rolled out the online.stjohns.edu web site and implemented a marketing plan; currently Wiley receives 40% of the tuition for students up to Fall 2025; when the "Wiley" students graduate (Fall 2027), the MS LIS program can be moved into the new distance learning model with a concomitant tuition reduction of one-third.

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 April 2026 (Appendix D). The participants graduated in 2023 -2024 academic year (i.e. September 2023, January 2024, and May 2024).

Summary. 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. Each table value is the sum of the percentages for the "strongly agree" and "agree" responses. Of the 42 alumni to whom the survey was emailed, 19 responded to the survey, a 45% response rate. The responses to each question were: "strongly agree", "agree", "neutral", "disagree", and "strongly disagree".

This year saw a notable improvement in questions related to student satisfaction with the program (Q1, Q13, and Q15 in Table 2.

The open questions - Q4 (student community), Q8 (advisement), Q17 (program strengths), and Q18 (recommendations to improve the program) - provide useful information to continue to improve the MS LIS program. These results will inform faculty discussions at the September faculty meeting when the 2025 - 2026 Assessment Report is reviewed.

Table 2. Program

Questions*	2026	2025	2024	2023
Q1: Satisfied with the program	95%	75%	95%	95%
Q13: Prepared to enter the workforce	94%	67%	79%	81%
Q14: Field experience (AS-L, internships, independent studies) contributed towards employment	53%	56%	47%	29%
Q15: Recommend program to others	94%	78%	100%	88%

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

Table 3. Interactions

Questions*	2026	2025	2024	2023
Q2: Interactions with faculty generally positive	95%	95%	100%	100%
Q3: Interactions with fellow students generally positive	94%	89%	90%	89%
Q5: Interactions with office staff generally positive	88%	84%	95%	89%
Q7: Received useful information in advisement meetings	94%	83%	95%	94%

Table 4. Teaching

Question*	2026	2025	2024	2023
Q9: Faculty were effective teachers	100%	100%	100%	94%

Table 5. Courses

Question*	2026	2025	2024	2023
Q10: Satisfied with the variety of courses offered	88%	83%	100%	83%

Table 6. Resources

Question*	2026	2025	2024	2023
Q11: Had access to appropriate library resources to support career interests	94%	89%	100%	89%
Q12: Had access to appropriate software and related technology to support career interests	76%	89%	89%	89%

Open Questions

Q4 asked students to suggest ways to “foster, enhance, and/or reinforce interaction among students in the online environment. 53% of survey respondents answered this question. The responses were:

- Encourage discord channels
- Less group projects. It was difficult to find times to "meet" with group members when many of us were from different time zones.
- Perhaps students who live near each other can have meetups.

- Maybe fostering portfolio support groups? I ended up doing this myself with a couple of classmates and it was super helpful, so I'm sure others would appreciate it.
- I think this program did a good job . Maybe doing a one time in person event/seminar weekend on campus
- more help getting into archives and more opportunities for hands-on experience
- I think the faculty need to adopt some of the same strategies so that there is more uniformity across classes. I think the responding to one another works reasonably well. (Although I hear AI makes it pretty awful -- and that wasn't the case through my time in the program.) The one or two group projects were not my proudest outputs and were a detriment to my final portfolio. Ultimately, for the younger developing professionals, I think the program MUST provide more insight into networking for them. And, I think you should consider shedding some of the portfolio collection of material (maybe collect fewer items) and have short presentations of the portfolios with people attending instead.
- Allow group projects a longer amount of time to complete them because people work full time while doing this program and it's hard to find time to actually communicate when there are time differences
- The work I did during my online degree felt well inclusive when interacting with many of my colleagues either through discussion work or group assignments.
- Perhaps host online salons, meet-ups, or message boards for students to interact and network more. Another option is to put in contact students with similar concentrations to see if they wanted to form some kind of discussion group or support group for each other.

Q6 asked students to suggest ways in which DLIS staff could further enhance and/or support the student experience. 42% of survey respondents answered this question. The responses were:

- No
- Nothing comes to mind.
- Some teachers were combative when instructions were not clear - especially when it came to formatting, citations, etc. I think those things should be streamlined across the program.
- Maybe more required 1:1 meetings with advisors
- Make sure clickable links are not broken.
- More fun projects? I'm not sure
- Many staff, professors, were great in providing the material for assignments. Others however assigned specific readings which were difficult to obtain for an assignment due in a week or less.
- Not at this time, no.

Q8 asked respondents to suggest ways to improve the advisement process. 37% of survey respondents answered this question. Responses were:

- No
- None.
- Discussion of different career tracks
- Honestly no notes, Kevin was super supportive.
- More job hiring tips
- I struggled to have a device capable of scanning signed advisement papers, which I agree should be done. Perhaps a digital signoff, whether through a virtual software or other format could be acceptable?
- I think advisors could get to know their advisees a little better and provide more time for them. I sometimes felt my advisement meetings were short or rushed.

Q17 asked respondents to identify the major strengths of the program. 63% of survey respondents answered this question. Responses were:

- Professors and their professionalism and willingness to help the students
- Variety of courses offered and online learning
- Different concentrations offered
- Dr Singh's classes, service focus, social justice
- Being fully online. The amount of work was manageable. The professors were knowledgeable.
- Education rooted in service to communities and being appreciative and sensitive to differences really enhanced my transition into the public library system. I also feel prepared to move around in the future into university libraries or working abroad.
- Teachers were very nice and I loved being able to self pace my work (relatively).
- The flexibility of being online asynchronous. The professors being passionate about the topics they're teaching.
- Hands down, Dr. Singh. Dr. Singh is a treasure. Professionally, every single day, I use and recommend resources from his classes.
- The online aspect and cool classes and dr lee
- I liked that the program was online and that the courses were asynchronous. As someone working full time, this allowed me to manage my coursework while gaining experience in the field. Also, I liked the flexibility of the courses themselves -- that I could use course projects to my advantage in my professional role. I often was able to translate or apply concepts from class to my professional experience or to incorporate projects and tasks from work directly into my coursework: such as creating a project charter for Dr. Singh's project management

class that directly supported work I undertook at my job. The projects I worked on for my MLIS were clearly applicable to real-world library and library-related problems.

- Collaboration, working towards my career field. As it was online, it felt great to be able to do it on my schedule and my pace. Especially as I managed multiple part-time jobs at the same time during my coursework.

Q18 asked students for recommendations to improve the program. 26% of survey respondents answered this question. Responses were:

- Would love to get rid of the service hours and maybe offer a class that focuses on cataloging
- Less group projects.
- Maybe hire TAs? The actual dashboards on the online portals were pretty disorganized/visually unappealing, and often contained broken links. As a visual learner I would have liked more care put into the space that I was getting all of my information from!
- Have more fun classes and allow for bigger projects to take more time
- I do think more academic service-learning opportunities would be helpful. The ones available felt limiting and not always relevant.

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. The 2025 survey consists of the graduates from Summer 2024, Fall 2024, and Spring 2025. Table 7 below shows the results for the graduates of the MS LIS program since 2021.

Table 7. Placement Results*

Statistic	2025	2024	2023	2022	2021
Response Rate	34.2%	30.2%	68%	51%	69.2%
Placement	84.6%	100%	81.8%	96.2%	100%
Employed	76.9%	100%	81.8%	96.2%	96.3%
Employed / Furthering Education**	7.7%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Furthering Education	0%	0%	0%	0%	3.7%
Seeking Employment	15.4%	0%	18.2%	3.8%	0%

* Data provided by the University Career Center

** 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 education 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. This course-level assessment of student learning was instituted in 2015 as part of the DLIS Assessment Plan.

Procedure. At the end of each term, courses are assigned by the Chair 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. When the course concludes, the instructor completes a form (Appendix E) 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 2026.

Table 8. Course Artifact Assessment with Program Goals

Course Code	Course Name	Program Goals	Faculty	Reviewed	Next Review
	CORE				
LIS 203	Organization of Information	3	Angel	Spring 2024	Spring 2028
LIS 204	Introduction to Library and Information Science	1, 2, 3, 4	Rioux	Fall 2022	Fall 2026
LIS 205	Introduction to Information Sources and Services	4	Lee	Spring 2025	Spring 2029
LIS 239	Research and Evaluation Methods	5	Singh/ Polger	Spring 2024	Spring 2028
LIS 240	Management of Libraries and Information Centers	6	Singh	Fall 2024	Fall 2028
	ELECTIVES				
LIS 121	Literature & Related Resources for Children	1, 4	Lee	Fall 2024	Fall 2028
LIS 125	Library Materials and Services for Young Children	2	Lee	Spring 2024	Spring 2028
LIS 126	Literature & Related Resources for Young Adults	2	Lee	Fall 2024	Fall 2028

Course Code	Course Name	Program Goals & Outcomes	Faculty	Reviewed	Next Review
LIS 127	Library Programs & Services for Children and Young Adults	2, 6	Lee	Spring 2026	Spring 2030
LIS 211	Collection Development	2, 6	Evans	Spring 2025	Spring 2029
LIS 213	Popular Culture and Young Adults	4	Lee	Summer 2023	Summer 2027
LIS 214	Teen Spaces for Libraries	1	Lee	Summer 2022	Summer 2026
LIS 221	Planning and Delivering Information Literacy Programs	4	Rioux	Spring 2023	Spring 2027
LIS 222	Materials and Services to Diverse Populations	1, 4, 7	Rioux	Fall 2024	Fall 2028
LIS 231	College and University Libraries	6	Rioux, Polger	Spring 2026	Spring 2030
LIS 233	Public Libraries and Community Information Centers	6	Rioux	Spring 2025	Spring 2029
LIS 238	Web Design for Libraries and Information Centers	3	Vorbach	Spring 2023	Spring 2027
LIS 249	Archives and Records Management	1, 3, 4	Angel	Fall 2025	Fall 2029
LIS 253	Oral History	3, 4, 5, 7	Szylvian	Fall 2024	Fall 2028
LIS 257	Archival Representation	1, 2, 3, 4, 6	Angel	Fall 2020	Fall 2024
LIS 258	Museum Informatics	3	Angel	Spring 2025	Spring 2029
LIS 260	Information Use and Users	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6	Rioux	Fall 2023	Fall 2027
LIS 261	Information Sources and Services for Children and Young Adults	2, 4	Stewart	Fall 2023	Fall 2027
LIS 262	Project Management in Information Organizations	6	Singh	Fall 2025	Fall 2029

Course Code	Course Name	Program Goals & Outcomes	Faculty	Reviewed	Next Review
LIS 263	Marketing and Advocacy in Information Organizations	6	Singh	Spring 2026	Spring 2030
LIS 275	Cultural Competence for Information Professionals	7	Singh	Summer 2022	Summer 2026
LIS 282	Knowledge Management	6	Singh	Summer 2023	Summer 2027
LIS 283	Social Justice and the Information Profession	1, 2, 4, 7	Rioux	Spring 2024	Spring 2028
LIS 302	Genealogical Sources & Services	3, 4	Earle	Summer 2024	Summer 2028
LIS 310	Data Curation	2, 3	Angel	Summer 2022	Summer 2026
LIS 311	Records & Information Mgmt	1, 2, 3	Haliday	Spring 2023	Spring 2027
LIS 314	Archival Appraisal & Management	1, 2, 4	Angel	Summer 2024	Summer 2028
LIS 315	Data Preservation & Access	2, 3	Angel	Fall 2023	Fall 2027
LIS 316	Developing an Information Governance Strategy	1, 3	Angel	Summer 2023	Summer 2027
LIS 320	Fake News & Misinformation	4	Singh	Summer 2023	Summer 2027
LIS 322	Library Services for the Unhoused	7	Stewart	Summer 2025	Summer 2029

E-Portfolio Assessment

Background

An e-portfolio is the end-of-program assessment for the MS LIS program. The software platform used to create e-portfolios is called Springshare. Students demonstrate in the main section of the e-portfolio that they have satisfied the MS LIS program goals. Students accomplish this by uploading a course artifact (i.e. assignments and projects) and writing a 600-700 word essay for each goal. Each essay explains the relationship between the artifact and the goal and describes their learning from the artifact. Each e-portfolio is reviewed by a DLIS faculty member. If a reviewer fails an e-portfolio, the Chair provides a second review. The Chair's decision is final. The minimum grade to "pass" an e-portfolio review is 80%. E-Portfolio reviews coincide with the Summer, Fall, and Spring graduation cycle.

The following policy was adopted to ensure students understand the purpose of the e-portfolio, the recommended practice for creating the e-portfolio, and the use of Springshare:

- 1) Students are introduced to the e-portfolio at the new student orientation.
- 2) Students receive an account in Springshare in their core course LIS 205.
- 3) DLIS created and posted a video on the creation of an e-portfolio. Additional resources are in the online student manual (<http://campusguides.stjohns.edu/dlis/eportfolio>).
- 4) An e-portfolio specification (Appendix F) is available on the e-portfolio page of the online student manual.

A student failing the e-portfolio assessment meets with the Chair to discuss the reviewers' comments and outline a plan to improve and submit the e-portfolio for the next review.

Summary

The results are summarized in Table 9. An academic year in the table consists of the three reviews in that year's graduation cycle (i.e. summer, fall, and spring). The pass rate for 2025 - 2026 was 98.3%, which is higher than previous pass rates. The target pass rate is 100%.

Feedback from students, faculty, alumni, and information professionals at meetings and conferences confirms the value of the e-portfolio as a measure of student learning. Students keep their Springshare accounts after graduation and often customize their e-portfolios for job applications. The e-portfolio helps to distinguish graduates applying for jobs.

Table 9. E-Portfolio Summary By Academic Year

	2025- 2026	2024- 2025	2023- 2024	2022- 2023	2021- 2022	2020- 2021	2019- 2020
Total	59	46	44	41	56	53	32
Total passed	58	44	43	38	52	51	31
Pass rate	98.3%	95.7%	97.7%	92.7%	92.9%	96.2%	96.9%
Average Grade (all e-portfolios)	92.1%	89.9%	88.6%	88.1%	90.1%	89.8%	92.9%

Employer Survey

Summary. The employer survey is distributed biennially to information professionals in a wide range of institutions. The survey focuses on rating the relevant general skills and specialized skills for entry-level information professionals. This report shows the results from 2025. The survey will be administered next in Spring 2027.

The Advisory Board Planning Committee last revised the survey instrument on April 5, 2019. The employer survey is provided in Appendix G. The responses for the 2025 survey were received in April 2025. Table 10 shows the distribution of the respondents by Job Title. Table 11 shows the distribution by respondents' organizations and Table 12 shows the distribution of respondents by states. The response count for the 2025 survey was 25. The response count for the 2023 survey was 26. The response count for the 2021 survey was 83. The response count for the 2019 survey was 55.

General Skills. Table 13 lists the results for the top 10 general skills 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 2025 rating.

The general skills that did not make the top ten in 2025 are: Decision Making, Presentation Skills, Community Engagement, Active Professional Engagement, Leadership, Statistics, and Advanced computer (e.g., databases, coding, web design).

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

1. Soft skills such as critical thinking and interpersonal skills are very important.
2. Being open to learning.
3. Customer Services Skills / comfort in working with the public.
4. Need to be able to work as scheduled on a regular basis!
5. Professional Librarians need to have skills that exceed those of other library staffers. They are often expected to be "in charge". For the role of librarian to be valued as a licensed professional, we need to support developing skills that set librarians apart from the other library staffers.
6. Very good selection of skills.

Specialized Skills. Table 14 lists the top 10 specialized skills expected of entry-level information professionals in descending order of relevance on the 2025 survey. 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 specialized skill that did not make it to the top ten was Negotiation Skills.

Participants were able to comment on the specialized skills. There were three comments.

1. Not enough knowledge of basic library organization and principles
2. Not to be critical, but some of these items are together but not related. Example - marketing and advocacy. Advocacy is a basic librarian skill and might work better as it's own line. Another is "setting and achieving goals". Setting goals is a basic skill. Achieving them is higher level and not always possible - and not a reflection of the librarian.
3. What does "practical application of LIS theory" mean? Also, these "specialized" skills are heavily weighted toward archives and/or collection management. They do not address any of the specialized skills for dealing with the public or for "teaching" in the broadest sense of the work, including reference interactions, readers advisory, workshop facilitation, etc. This section is very limited unless these areas are addressed later in the survey.

There appears to be broad agreement among respondents on the general skills (Table 13). All the top ten general skills exceed the "very relevant" rating of 4.0. In contrast, graduates were not expected to have many of the specialized skills (Table 14) on entering the field, with nine of ten skills being rated *somewhat relevant* or *not very relevant*.

Table 10. Job Titles 2025 Survey

Title	Respondents	Percent
Dean of Library, Associate Dean	3	12%
Library Director, Assistant Director	18	72%
Chief Librarian	4	16%
Total	25	100%

Table 11. Organizations 2025 Survey

Type	Respondents	Percent
Public Library	17	68%
Archive	0	0%
Academic Library	7	28%
Corporate	0	0%
School Library	0	0%
Youth Services in a Public Library	0	0%
Other*	1	4%
Total	25	100%

* Association

Table 12. States 2023 Survey

State	Respondents	Percent
New York	25	100%
Total	25	100%

Table 13. Top 10 General Skills

Answer Options	2025	2023	2021	2019
Teamwork (interpersonal relationships)	4.73	3.9	4.52	4.69
Oral/written communication	4.55	4.14	4.48	4.71
Basic Computer (e.g. word-processing, spreadsheets, presentations)	4.5	4.71	4.68	4.80
Listening to others	4.5	4.29	4.59	4.58
Cultural sensitivity	4.41	4.00	4.39	4.45
Curiosity	4.36	4.24	4.3	4.58
Critical thinking (evaluating information)	4.32	4.24	4.49	4.48
Flexibility	4.32	4.14	4.44	4.42
Exhibits professional ethics	4.27	4.38	4.56	4.51
User Engagement	4.14	3.95	4.18	4.13

Table 14. Top 10 Specialized Skills

Answer Options	2025	2023	2021	2019
Ability to Set Goals and Achieve Them	4.09	3.75	4.07	4.19
Marketing and Advocacy	3.45	3.15	3.34	3.36
Practical Application of LIS Theory	3.36	3.35	3.41	3.49
Management of Resources	3.27	3.05	3.21	3.15
Project Management	3.05	3.1	3.44	3.44
Data Analysis	2.91	2.9	3.12	2.93
Fluency in a Second Language	2.5	1.8	2.37	2.35
Mentoring or Coaching Colleagues	2.45	2.25	2.46	2.51
Supervisory Skills	2.36	2.4	2.75	2.58
Grant-writing Skills	2.27	1.55	2.22	2.36

Student: Annual Survey

Summary. The annual student survey is administered each Spring. The questions on the survey are organized into six categories: areas of interest (Tables 15 and 16), career preparedness (Table 17), faculty (Table 18), administration and resources (Table 19), field experience (Table 20), and professional development (Table 21). The section concludes with student recommendations for program improvement (Q13). Of the 139 students, 28 responded to the survey, a 20% response rate. The survey is given in Appendix H.

Areas of Interest. Tables 15 and 16 list the responses for questions Q1 and Q2 respectively on the specializations students are interested in. Q1 asks students to select all areas of interest and Q2 asks students to identify the one area of primary interest.

Table 15. Specializations of Interest

Specialization	2026	2025	2024	2023	2022
Public Librarianship	43%	68%	46%	37%	44%
Archival Studies	43%	61%	46%	44%	37%
Youth Services	43%	32%	33%	37%	42%
Academic Librarianship	39%	48%	38%	48%	44%
Management	18%	13%	4%	22%	14%
Records & Information Management	4%	29%	17%	19%	16%
Undecided	4%	3%	8%	7%	7%

Table 16. Primary Specialization

Specialization	2026	2025	2024	2023	2022
Youth Services	32%	16%	17%	15%	35%
Archival Studies	21%	42%	33%	19%	23%
Public Librarianship	21%	26%	25%	22%	12%
Management	14%	3%	4%	11%	5%
Academic Librarianship	7%	10%	17%	22%	16%
Undecided	4%	3%	4%	7%	7%
Records & Information Management	0%	0%	0%	4%	2%

Table 17. Career Preparedness*

Question	2026	2025	2024	2023	2022
Q10: In your opinion, how well prepared are you for your career as an information professional?	67%	57%	77%	56%	73%
Q12: How prepared do you feel to assume a position of leadership and/or make a difference in society?	71%	50%	92%	44%	77%
Q14. How likely are you to recommend St. John's MS LIS program to prospective information professionals?	95%	93%	75%	75%	82%

* values are the sum of the Very Well Prepared and Well-Prepared percentages in Q10 & Q12; the sum of the Highly Likely & Likely responses in Q14

Table 18. Faculty*

Question	2026	2025	2024	2023	2022
Q3. Faculty provide feedback on student work in a reasonable time.	100%	90%	100%	89%	88%
Q4. Students have access to continuing opportunities for advisement.	86%	90%	88%	85%	91%

*values are the sum of the Strongly Agree and Agree percentages

Table 19. Administration and Resources*

Question	2026	2025	2024	2023	2022
Q5. Students have access to continuing opportunities for placement assistance.	64%	48%	75%	64%	67%
Q6. DLIS Administration responds to student questions in a reasonable time.	71%	77%	79%	76%	83%
Q7. Online databases through University Libraries are an efficient research tool.	93%	87%	83%	88%	93%

*values are the sum of the Strongly Agree and Agree percentages

Field Experience. Q9 asked students to select field experiences in which they were engaged, including curricular (Academic Service-Learning, internships, and graduate assistantships) and outside work (Table 20).

Table 20. Field Experience

Field Experience	2026	2025	2024	2023	2022
Full-time employment related to the MS LIS program	30%	64%	58%	33%	24%
Part-time employment related to the MS LIS program	30%	27%	0%	33%	43%
Internship	15%	27%	0%	0%	24%
Graduate assistantship	0%	18%	8%	33%	14%
Academic service-learning project	10%	0%	42%	44%	81%
Volunteer work related to the MS LIS program	25%	0%	17%	33%	33%

Professional Development. Q11 asked students, after graduation, what educational opportunities at St. John's University would they consider for future professional development (Table 21).

Table 21. Professional Development

Type	2026	2025	2024	2023	2022
Advanced Certificate	47%	77%	50%	44%	50%
Webinar/workshop	37%	46%	58%	44%	59%
Second graduate degree	32%	23%	25%	33%	14%
None	26%	8%	25%	33%	23%

Recommendations. Students were asked for their recommendations to improve the MS LIS program (Q13). 13 responded to the question, a 46% response rate.

- A dedicated school librarian track — the program would benefit from a more defined path for students interested in school librarianship, with coursework tailored specifically to that role.
 - More electives in children's and YA literature.
 - A course in library instruction - librarians are constantly leading and teaching classes. With greater focus on instructional strategies, students might be better prepared for that role in

their future jobs. I was lucky to have a background in education, so it wasn't an issue for me personally. But for students with no teaching experience, stepping into that role without any grounding in pedagogy or lesson planning is a heavy lift.

- Reduce the price of tuition
- This program is well-equipped!
- Make sure Canvas or whatever software is used is compatible with all devices. I have had multiple issues while using an iPad.
- I have been very happy with my coursework. Not sure where improvements should be made.
- Nothing, this program has been the best program of all my graduate degree programs. It makes me want to continue school to the Doctorate level. The professors are outstanding! I would not change a thing, other than group assignments. They always seem to be a problem with everything going wrong and a fight to get others to work together due to schedules.
- I do not know.
- An easier way of registering for classes, I almost couldn't for my second semester as I did not have an advisor. If I were not in a chat with other students, I would not have known that I could have registered.
- It would be helpful to have some in-person classes available. It would be even better to have an in-person option so students and professors can have face-to-face interaction and communicate better. I understand if that is not feasible though.
- None.
- I think the MS LIS program should offer tutoring services for students who are struggling with the assignments and provide clear examples of what the given assignments are asking for.
- A better (more accurate) online library. Oftentimes, unexpected results come up as compared to Google Scholar.
- A class that better prepares students for the reality of work within a public library, as most of what I have learned about this reality has been at work rather than through pursuing my degree.

Student: Exit Survey

Summary. The exit survey was administered to the Summer 2025, Fall 2025, and Spring 2026 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 22 - 26. Of the 59 total graduates, combining the Summer 2025, Fall 2025 and Spring 2026 graduates, 58 responded to the survey, a 98% response rate. The responses to each question were: “strongly agree”, “agree”, “neutral”, “disagree”, and “strongly disagree”.

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 survey is provided in Appendix I.

Table 22. Program*

Questions*	2025-2026	2024-2025	2023-2024	2022-2023
Q1: Satisfied with the program	95%	95%	98%	86%
Q12: Prepared to enter the workforce	91%	89%	90%	94%
Q13: Recommend program to others	93%	87%	90%	83%

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

Table 23. Interactions

Questions	2025-2026	2024-2025	2023-2024	2022-2023
Q2: Interactions with faculty generally positive	93%	98%	93%	89%
Q3: Interactions with fellow students generally positive	100%	96%	95%	92%
Q4: Interactions with office staff generally positive	81%	93%	93%	75%
Q5: Received useful information from faculty advisors	93%	93%	93%	89%

Table 24. Teaching

Question	2025-2026	2024-2025	2023-2024	2022-2023
Q6: Faculty were effective teachers	93%	93%	98%	94%
Q7: Faculty are knowledgeable in their areas of expertise	98%	98%	98%	97%

Table 25. Courses

Questions	2025-2026	2024-2025	2023-2024	2022-2023
Q8: Satisfied with course selection offered during my program of study	91%	93%	93%	86%
Q9: Satisfied with the frequency of course offerings	83%	89%	85%	78%

Table 26. Resources

Question	2025-2026	2024-2025	2023-2024	2022-2023
Q10: Had access to appropriate library resources to support my educational needs.	95%	98%	98%	92%
Q11: Had access to appropriate software and related technology to support my educational needs	97%	96%	87%	97%

Program Strengths.

Q15 asked students to identify program strengths. 88% of the students responded to this question.

1. For me, the major strengths were the faculty members. I had very pleasant experiences with all of them, especially Dr. Angel and Dr. Lee.
2. The focus on social justice in LIS. I work in a public library, so I also appreciated that there was a public librarianship specialization with courses relevant to my everyday work and intended career path.
3. The faculty.
4. I appreciated going at my own pace, but the clear communication with professors and course expectations really made it great. Also, I had some great advisors.
5. Diversity of course topics/electives

6. The online degree offers flexibility to balance work and other responsibilities. The professors are knowledgeable. Most classes provided valuable historical contexts and taught skills that can be transferred to the real world.
7. The teachers were extremely knowledgeable and well prepared. I felt that they were not just giving me assignments but preparing me for the real world of library and information science.
8. Professor expertise, elective course offerings
9. Expert professors, the college library, and resources for remote students were great.
10. The intentional efforts to teach social justice in librarianship in our courses were a major strength. Another major strength was the professors, specifically Dr. Singh and Dr. Rioux, whose courses I took several times throughout the program.
11. I would argue it had the most strength in the interpersonal skills of the instructors, administrative staff, and additional employees in the program. I never once felt ashamed or afraid to speak, and my questions were always answered with effort. People make this program; the same way they make libraries.

The course competencies and structuring were also extremely helpful. I feel that I encountered relevant discourse from the field, and was given realistic problems to solve.

12. I find that the major strengths of the program relied upon the flexibility that many of the professors presented when curating assignments. I found that my professors often highlighted the different ways that we can use this degree and allowed us to form finals and other assignments based on ways that align with our career goals.
13. The program has a broad course load so that students get to understand multiple parts of librarianship before honing in on one specific focus.
14. The professors are generally very understanding and supportive
15. The major strength of this program is its ability to balance the autonomy of an asynchronous program with the collaborative nature of our future professions.
16. The program offer relevant areas of the field to specialize in and those classes were effective in making me understand those areas better and their connection to librarianship and the program goals.
17. The Master of Science in Library and Information Science (MSLIS) program at St. John's University stands as a unique pillar in the field, distinguished not just by its academic rigor, but by its profound commitment to the human element of information science. Throughout my journey in this program, I have realized that its strengths lie in a rare fusion of social justice advocacy, technological ethics, and a faculty-student connection that is truly transformative. The Heart of the Program: Social Justice and Informational Equity One of the most significant strengths of the St. John's MSLIS program is its unwavering focus on Goal 7: Social Justice. In an era where libraries are increasingly caught in political crosswinds, the program prepares students to navigate the "chilling effect" of censorship and legislative shifts. Unlike programs that treat neutrality as a form of silence, St. John's teaches that true neutrality is an active commitment to ensuring the library remains a sanctuary—a "third

space" where equity is a lived reality. Social Justice Pedagogy: The curriculum facilitates a deep understanding of power, privilege, and oppression within libraries. Cultural Safety: There is a heavy emphasis on "cultural safety," ensuring that the management of collections and personnel fosters equitable participation for all, particularly marginalized communities. Active Advocacy: Students learn that advocacy is not just a loud protest but a strategic use of institutional systems to protect the agency of patrons, especially youth. A Transformative Faculty-Student Connection Perhaps the most unique and human strength of this program is the depth of the relationships between students and faculty. Despite being an online program, St. John's fosters a sense of belonging that is often absent in traditional graduate studies. Unparalleled Mentorship: The faculty members, including Dr. Shari Lee, Dr. Kevin Rioux, Dr. Christine Angel, Dr. Rajesh Singh, and Dr. James Vorbach, are the true definition of transformative educators. Personal Support: The faculty does not just provide academic guidance; they provide a lifeline. In moments of personal crisis, these professors demonstrate a level of empathy that moves beyond the classroom, believing in their students' potential even when the students themselves might struggle to see it. Rigor and Inspiration: This connection creates a unique motivational cycle where students feel a genuine desire to "WOW" their professors with each assignment, pushing themselves to achieve a higher level of professional excellence. Technological Ethics in the Age of AI St. John's excels at bridging the gap between technical infrastructure and ethical responsibility. The program addresses the modern challenges of Artificial Intelligence and digitization without losing sight of the human "in the loop." Confronting Algorithmic Bias: The program tackles the reality that AI systems can reinforce societal biases, particularly in archival tagging and search terms. Ethical Metadata: Through the guidance of experts like Dr. Angel, students learn that metadata is a tool for social justice, ensuring that Black and Indigenous historical documents are described with the same detail and respect as Eurocentric collections. Future-Focused Leadership: Under the direction of scholars like Dr. Vorbach, the program ensures students are equipped to lead digital transitions while maintaining a "human-centered" approach to technology. Addressing "Moral Injury" and Professional Well-being

A groundbreaking strength of the St. John's program is its focus on the psychological and emotional health of information professionals. It moves beyond the common "vocational awe" narrative: which suggests librarians must sacrifice their well-being for the mission, and focuses on sustainable practice. Trauma-Informed Management: The program advocates for management styles that prioritize safety, transparency, and peer support. Validating the Human Experience: By acknowledging "moral injury", the emotional toll of dismantling a collection due to censorship, St. John's prepares students for the high-stress, politically charged reality of modern librarianship. Sustainable Organizing: Students are taught "strategic advocacy" (Carpenter, 2025) and "sustainable organizing," giving them the tools to fight helplessness and build institutional fortresses around their values. Versatility and Peer Solidarity

The program's online environment is remarkably versatile, bringing together a diverse cohort

of professionals who manage to build life-long relationships despite the digital distance.

Collaborative Excellence: Group projects, such as the Seminar Week 9 case studies, allow students to dive into the ethical heart of the profession together. The "Silent Majority" and Community Support: The curriculum emphasizes that librarians shouldn't have to stand alone; it teaches how to engage "community coalitions" and "Friends of the Library" groups to shift the burden of advocacy onto a collective responsibility. Professional Networking: The solidarity forged in the digital classroom creates a network of colleagues who know each other's work ethic and style, forming a foundation for future career collaboration. Bridging Practice and Scholarship

Finally, St. John's is a perfect springboard for those looking toward advanced scholarship and doctoral studies. The program encourages students to move from being practitioners to being scholar-advocates. Research Integration: By applying theoretical frameworks to real-world scenarios, like using trauma-informed care to inform librarianship (Grimes, 2025); students develop a researcher's mindset. Strategic Thinking: The focus on policy analysis and legislative impact prepares graduates to contribute to high-level conversations about the future of the field. In conclusion, the MSLIS program at St. John's University is defined by its heart. It treats Library and Information Science not as a static set of technical skills, but as a living, breathing profession that requires courage, empathy, and a fierce commitment to human rights. It is a program where the faculty believes in you, where your peers support you, and where the "wild rumpus" of modern information challenges is met with a sophisticated blend of social justice and strategic leadership.

18. Diversity of staff, social justice course, availability of faculty/advisors, timely feedback received to improve assignments
19. It's very flexible and accommodating to work schedules, and I appreciated the number of course offerings for various specializations. The professors were all passionate about the subjects they taught, which bolstered my own engagement with the material in turn.
20. The professors are knowledgeable in their respective fields. The courses generally include up-to-date information.
21. I appreciated that this is a remote asynchronous program, which is very helpful for working students. Overall, I had very positive experiences with the faculty members and feel like I learned a tremendous amount from this program. I will miss the interesting discussions I had in my classes. I appreciate the diversity of knowledge I learned, and feel like I have a good base for continuing my work in libraries.
22. I felt overall that the program is well structured with positive instructors and access to materials needed for the courses.
23. The asynchronous aspect of the course gives students the opportunity to get their work done on their schedule

24. The major strengths of the program were the utilization of a completely online program and learning the various software programs.
25. Easy access to all of the material, including the textbook. Even with other asynchronous courses I've taken in the past, there was often an exorbitant 'entry fee' of sorts in the form of purchasing all the necessary material or getting a subscription to the sites where crucial material was published. Not so here!
26. As a working professional, it was very helpful to be able to complete the program through asynchronous online classes. Some of the professors were incredibly organized which made it easy to follow the course content.
27. DLIS professors are proficient at delivering effective courses on an asynchronous platform.
28. The communication between professors and students.
29. The Staff. All of my professors were very knowledgeable and helpful. They took the time to reach out to me if I needed anything.
30. I love the asynchronous online environment. Being able to complete this degree that is based in NY from WA was a lifesaver. I really think the specialization routes and the certificates are major strengths too, as well as how passionate the professors are about their subjects.
31. I appreciate that this course was truly asynchronous because it gave me the ability to work while also giving appropriate attention to the program. The biggest strength is in the professors, though. I cannot stress enough that all of my professors were so present and helpful over my two years in the program. I never felt like they posted a class and just went through the motions. Questions were answered in a timely fashion and my professors always wanted to make sure I found the answer I was looking for. They are a truly supportive bunch who are clearly passionate about educating!
32. Asynchronous. Dr. Singh was so helpful in assisting me in every one of his classes and as my advisor.
33. The opportunity to study asynchronously allowed me to earn my masters while working and living my adult life. Workload generally felt reasonable--the program was challenging but didn't completely consume my life. A few courses really stood out as managing to overcome some of the impersonal limitations of online study. A strong example is Professor April, whose genealogy course resembled in-person study due to her very high engagement and responsiveness to each student.
34. One of the major strengths of the MLIS program was the balance between theoretical and practical. Courses connected core LIS history, values, research, and ethics to hands-on assignments. It helped me prepare for real-life work, including cataloging, reference, research design, program planning, and strategic management. Another strength was the faculty. They were knowledgeable and supportive through this endeavor, and you can see they really wanted us to succeed. The flexibility of online learning, along with collaboration through group projects and discussion boards, allowed me to build strong academic and professional skills as well as friends.

35. The weekly discussion format was beneficial as it provided the opportunity to talk to classmates about material and assist each other when needed. And asynchronous style program was also important, and the reason I chose it, due to the flexibility it offered.
36. The major strengths of the program are the course offerings and certain faculty.
37. The faculty were amazing.
38. The program's significant strengths were its flexibility and diverse course offerings, which included courses that reflected the various career paths for librarianship and archival work. I also appreciated some of the professors' commitment to acknowledging the prevalent issues affecting librarianship (i.e., systemic whiteness and racism) and developing potential strategies.
39. The faculty.
40. Some of the faculty with lots of experience in their field and recent, relevant texts. Interactive group projects. Access to LibApps. St. John's library, especially ebook collection.
41. The knowledge the professors and faculty have is reflected thought the coursework. The asynchronous learning model works well with working professionals perusing a new path.
42. Well-rounded education, focus on Social Justice, practical and theoretical aspects of the work
43. Strong curriculum and teaching.
44. The accessibility of professors, and staff to assist with questions, or concerns regarding the program or specific coursework. Also the ease in which I, with no professional work experience, was able to transition into the program and learn about the field. While the program requires effort and time for coursework completion and studying, it is not unfairly difficult. It feels like it is designed with intention, and desire for students to thrive.
45. Knowledgeable and friendly staff, clear goals, variety of courses especially electives, solid skill set to take into the field, encouraged connection to professional organizations.
46. I felt that the internship requirement is a great strength of the program
47. The flexibility of the online format was absolutely vital to me, and the ability to focus on archival skills also made SJU a top choice for me.
48. The courses offered, the practical application of what we learned to assignments
49. I liked the fully remote and asynchronous nature of the program because it allowed me to work and complete my degree at the same time.
50. The major strengths of the program are the course offerings (especially in youth services), the knowledgeable faculty, the ease of use of Canvas, the communication, and the advisor support.
51. Most of the professors were fantastic! My two faculty advisors (Singh and Angel) made me feel welcomed and supported throughout my studies.

Recommendations to Improve the Program.

Q16 asked students to recommend improvements in the program. 84% of students responded to this question.

1. I would recommend offering the Social Justice class more frequently, if possible.
2. None. It is terrific as is.
3. I'd love more genealogy classes, Professor Earle was exceptional!
4. Offering some electives more frequently/every semester to accommodate both full- and part-time students
5. There wasn't an opportunity to take a preferred elective because of the new social justice requirement. The use of Canvas and other technologies could be more straightforward. Canvas was used differently for each class which took time to adjust.
6. I don't have any feedback of that nature. I felt that my time with St. John's was extremely well spent and have recommended this program to at least two people.
7. More opportunities for student interaction
8. More one on one guidance from a mentor
9. A recommendation I have to improve the program is to provide more examples of exemplary work to give students models to ensure we are meeting the learning goals. One of my professors, Dr. Singh, does this in all the courses I have taken, and it has been very helpful in my studies.
10. I would improve the registration process. It was somewhat of a nightmare each time the semesters rolled over, with millions of students dogpiling on classes, deleted courses left on student accounts (which is not fun negotiating with Financial Services), and other issues.

I also would like to suggest more instances for financial aid, be it in the form of grants, scholarships, endowments, etc. The LIS field is growing evermore diverse with each second, and in our coursework, we discuss how librarians come from a variety of backgrounds (geographically, economically, social, etc.). Potential information professionals should not be deterred from pursuing their ambitions because of fiscal inequity. This is less of a pointed critique towards St. John's, and more a lamentation of higher education's failings today. But I feel St. John's can set an example going forward.

11. I would recommend that advisors just communicate more often throughout the semester for support and to answer questions.
12. I would offer more courses under the social justice certification. I was not able to complete that certification while I was here because one of the required courses was only offered my first semester and I did not have enough time to adequately plan out my schedule to take all of the required courses.
13. I feel that there should be more field experience offered. Most of what prepared me for my career happened because I'm a trainee and have experience. MLIS students who have never worked in a library would not be prepared to work in a library simply from this program.

There should be more focus on teaching what happens in libraries, especially public libraries and the tendency to have to interact with dangerous people

14. To improve the program, I would recommend uniformity of scheduling across all courses. Having some courses being Monday–Sunday and others Wednesday–Thursday, as well as some deadlines being 11:59pm ET vs. 11:59pm local time vs. other random times added an unnecessary layer of complexity. Students in asynchronous programs like this one are, in my experience, typically working full-time jobs. Streamlining the work-weeks and deadline requirements would make things much easier to manage—and eliminate confusion from course-to-course.
15. More resolutions for team and group projects that may leave someone doing all the work so they don't lose group participation points if they have uncooperative team/group members. I had that very experience myself and also heard about other classmates who did as well. It seemed to be a normal thing.
16. Not a single thing, this is the most awesome program
17. Course with an AI focus
18. I appreciate when courses offer various avenues for learning, such as video lectures and other supplemental material that isn't just readings. Having multiple ways to consume information helps me connect with the material more. I also wish there was an established way to interact with classmates more. At the start of my time in the program, one of my classmates made a Discord server for other LIS students, which ended up being invaluable to many of us for both peer review/assignment clarification and social reasons.
19. More video lectures could be created if professors are comfortable recording them or voicing over PowerPoint presentations. The children's literature course, LIS 121, could include reading children's literature and identifying traits in books, rather than reading about them.
20. I feel as though some assignments could be explained better, as this is an entirely remote program, all the communication happens through email or Canvas. I have had additional issues with some administrative parts of the degree, though of course that is not the fault of the program.
21. I wish that the program offered the School Media degree
22. N/A
23. I would recommend to keep the records of all the courses available indefinitely or at least a five year retention period after students graduate and provide ample warning of its removal.
24. Branching out to a wider range of institutions, to make it easier for graduates to establish themselves in different fields.
25. I was disappointed by the extent to which generative AI was promoted in some courses. There was very little discussion of the harms to the environment, to marginalized human workers, or to intellectualism in general.
26. More initiatives from DLIS to support students' networking and engaging with each other outside of courses.

27. I would emphasize the E-Portfolio more. I was not aware that this was a requirement until my last semester, and I wish I had had a better head start.
28. In an ideal world, expectations would be consistent across the whole program. It is difficult going from professor to professor, having no idea what one expects compared to another. Also, it is so helpful to have the entire course available and laid out from the beginning. Life happens, and it is nice to be able to work ahead when you know you have something coming up that can get in the way of schoolwork. I also really appreciated when professors gave timely, specific, and individual feedback. It helped with learning and engagement, and I would love it if every professor could do so. I know it would be a time commitment, but its impact would be great. I am a bit concerned about the push for AI usage. While I understand that AI is a growing technology that the library wants to be aware of, I do not feel that it is ethical or environmentally friendly. Relying on AI feels like cheating and plagiarism, and I feel like the ethical and environmental impacts should be addressed more if it must continue to be part of the curriculum.
29. I do not have recommendations for improvement at this time. I loved this program and although I am looking forward to no longer being a student, I will miss this.
30. Remove AI as a positive aspect. AI involves a lot of pollution and plagiarism, so it's baffling to me that we're taught to use it as a higher level education institution. It's also wild to me that one of the first classes we take infers a lot about elitism for a job we're not supposed to look down on others in.
31. I think that some of the more "technical" aspects of the field, such as cataloging, can be especially difficult to translate into the online asynchronous format. In my experience (and that of many of my peers as far as I've noticed), the primarily lecture-based format of LIS 203 made it really difficult to absorb the information in a meaningful way. As a mandatory course, I think it could benefit from more discussion-based learning and more time to explore core concepts in depth rather than what often felt like a very broad crash course.
- I also felt concerned by several incidents in which I was encouraged by faculty to use AI in an assignment. While I understand the mentality of staying abreast of new technologies, I think that the immense environmental and ethical harms of this system directly violate proclaimed ALA values, especially that of social justice, which this program has (rightfully) incorporated more deeply into its curriculum. I think the field overall could stand to take a more courageous stance on this pressing issue.
32. Because the program is entirely online, I would recommend increasing informal community-building opportunities, such as virtual meetups, small discussion groups, or student interest clubs.
33. Some of the slides and information used by professors were sometimes outdated or didn't work, and I think it would be better for them to know the items being utilized worked before classes began.

34. The classes could have been more interactive. The work could have felt more applicable to the profession. Some professors were not engaged in the class at all with outdated syllabi and little to no interaction with students.
35. More video instructions from professors.
36. Offering more of the courses regularly, rather than having such a varied schedule, so that you couldn't take them when you wanted, or missing out on the opportunity to take classes you really wanted to take. Additionally, it would be nice to offer core classes during the summer semesters.
37. More videos from the teachers.
38. Competent administrative staff; course material that reflects the current landscape of the profession.
39. If there is a way to develop a student communication class or module in Canvas, it may be nice for some students to develop working relationships with their peers.
40. I would make sure all students know from the beginning of their courses what the e-portfolio entails, and are instructed to keep track of and organize their past assignments. I would advise the staff to be patient when having to explain aspects of it to students, and especially things like course registration and financial aid.
41. Offer more feedback to encourage students to take more varied classes.
42. Only until you take courses do you start to understand where your interest may guide you into choosing a profession. It would be helpful early on for there to be more tools to help decide or perhaps career oriented seminars. I also think those in the same specialization or advanced certificate program should have a place to connect or discuss the program.
43. Required internships, and the possibility of more remote work to help students network better.
44. I recommend offer elective classes more frequently, I was frequently disappointed by electives availability
45. Please please please make more online lectures. It is extremely difficult to feel like a teacher cares about the class or is putting in effort when they only post a soundless slideshow or a list of other people's writing to read.
46. I feel that exams/testing could have been more demanding
47. Maybe make it easier for students who are still exploring and realize they want a concentration to pivot to that. I only regret that I didn't get to get a concentration in youth services.
48. The only recommendation I have to improve the program would be for casual communication between students in the program to be encouraged more.
49. I've realized that the syllabus tends to get copied over each semester without a thorough review. It's important to ensure that the content, such as dates, chapters, and expectations, accurately reflects the current course structure. The grading rubric also needs to clearly outline expectations.

Last semester, we had a professor switch partway through, and the replacement seemed to prioritize APA formatting over the actual course content. While I understand the importance of proper citation, it shouldn't be the main focus in a management class.

Feedback should also reflect the actual content of the work. For example, receiving a mark of 9/10 with only a comment like "this is good work" doesn't provide a meaningful opportunity for growth.

On that note, I really appreciated the feedback from Professor Haliday and Dr. Angel. If I get marked down, they clearly explained what was missing in my work and how I could improve, which was much more helpful.

Student: New Student Survey

Summary

The new student survey is administered at the beginning of the Summer, Fall and Spring terms. The New Student Survey gathers information on students' choice of St. John's (Tables 27 and 28), student information (Tables 29, 30, and 31), and the students' evaluation of the Orientation to Online Learning, LIS 270. (Table 32 and question 7). In the tables, each column combines the results of the Summer, Fall, and Spring surveys.

The 2025-2026 survey was distributed to 43 students. 22 responded to the survey, a 51% response rate. The survey is provided in Appendix J.

Table 27. Q1 How did you find out about the St. John's MS-LIS program? (Check all that apply)

Response	2025-2026	2024-2025	2023-2024	2022-2023
St. John's University website	56%	53%	51%	48%
American Library Association website/directory	50%	33%	36%	27%
St. John's University's Online Programs web site	22%	32%	29%	23%
Recommendation from Alumni of the program and/or librarian	17%	14%	19%	21%
Career counselors in the college where I earned my previous degree	0%	0%	0%	4%
Other (please explain)*	33%	16%	27%	17.3%

* web searches, job supervisor, self-guided research, colleagues, recommended by current student in the program, employee of St. John's, US News and World Report, conference

Table 28. Q2 Reasons for Choosing St. John's, in Ranked Order

Students were asked to rank their reasons choosing St. John's where 1 = "most relevant" and 5 = "least relevant"). The values in the table represent the sum of responses 1 and 2.

Reasons	2025-2026	2024-2025	2023-2024	2022-2023
Online program	59%	70%	64%	56%
Flexibility of the program and course offerings	58%	58%	67%	64%
Recommendation of colleague or family member	36%	17%	18%	19%
Availability of funding/scholarship	27%	27%	20%	36%
Reputation of the school, department, and/or faculty	25%	25%	24%	27%

Table 29. Age Group

Age	2025-2026	2024-2025	2023-2024	2022-2023
25 years or younger	41%	36%	39%	45%
26-40 years	45%	40%	41%	30%
41-54 years	9%	20%	19%	25%
55 or older	5%	5%	1%	0%

Table 30. Full-time/Part-time

	2025-2026	2024-2025	2023-2024	2022-2023
Part-time (3-6 credits/semester)	59%	65%	69%	82%
Full-time (9-12 credits/semester)	41%	35%	31%	18%

Table 31. Immediately Prior to Entering the Program (Select all that apply)

Activity/ies	2025-2026	2024-2025	2023-2024	2022-2023
Employed in a field not related to information studies	41%	48%	33%	38%
Employed in a field related to information studies	32%	25%	26%	29%
Undergraduate student	32%	22%	42%	31%
Graduate student	23%	22%	12%	13%
Volunteer/community service	18%	10%	16%	11%

Table 32. Q6: LIS 270, the online orientation, was helpful at the start of the program?

Academic Year*	2025-2026	2024-2025	2023-2024	2022-2023
Online Orientation was helpful	86%	91%	90%	95%

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

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

23% of the students responded to this question.

- I thought it was very helpful in getting a sense of how to use Canvas! I really appreciated the availability of instructional videos and the recording of the Zoom meeting, as I couldn't make it. I would definitely suggest continuing to make recordings available.
- Opportunities to meet other students in the program
- There were some discrepancies in the instructions for use on a Mac. I had to figure them out with other resources than what were shown. But that experience was helpful to me! I still have to get help with figuring out the assignment for Outlook as it wasn't resolved when I submitted the result I had with the instructions.
- n/a
- Determine students understanding of canvas before assigning the course. I used canvas for 5 years at my undergraduate school and am thus very familiar with its functions

Appendix

A. DLIS Strategic Priorities 2025 – 2027

Approved: October 14, 2025

Introduction. The strategic priorities guide the efforts toward improving the MS LIS program and ensuring student success in the workplace. The priorities are based on the implementation of the 2023 – 2025 action items, the 2024 – 2025 assessments, monthly faculty meetings, and annual advisory board meetings. Progress on the Strategic Priorities is reported in the annual assessment report.

Strategic Priorities

1. Prepare the self-study for the continued accreditation of the MS LIS program.

Action Item

- a) Each of the five 2015 accreditation standards is represented by a chapter in the self-study. Each chapter is the responsibility of a committee lead by a DLIS faculty member, as listed below.

Standard (Chapter)	Faculty
Systematic Planning	James Vorbach
Curriculum	Rajesh Singh
Faculty	Kevin Rioux
Student	Shari Lee
Administration, Finance, and Resources	Christine Angel

2. Perform a review of the curriculum.

Action Items

- a) Review the core courses and syllabi: LIS 203, 204, 205, 239, and LIS 240.
- b) Review the elective courses and syllabi.
- c) Review the five specializations, including specialization descriptions and LibGuide distribution: academic, archival studies, public, records management, and youth services.
- d) Review the two certificates, including certificate web sites and LibGuide distribution: Management of Information Professionals and Social Justice in the Information Professions.

B. Advisory Board Members

First Name	Last Name	Title	Organization
Robert	Drzewicki	Metadata Analyst	
Elaine	Egan	Knowledge Manager	
Taina	Evans	Coordinator, Older Adult Services	Brooklyn Public Library
Caroline	Fuchs	University Librarian and Dean of Libraries	St. John's University
Alyse	Hennig	Archivist	
Lisa	Kropp	Director	Lindenhurst Memorial Library
Michelle	Levy	Archivist	Paulist Fathers
Ralph	Monaco	Executive Director (retired)	New York Law Institute
Jaclyn	Morales	Medical Librarian	Northwell Health
Michael	Morea	Director	Gold Coast Public Library
Christina	Orozco	Archivist	Paulist Fathers
Jamie	Papandrea	Director	West Islip Public Library
Stacy	Posillico	Medical Librarian	Northwell Health
Susan	Roby Berdinka	Trustee	Riverhead Free Library
Kathryn	Shaughnessy	Associate Prof/Open Educational Resources Librarian	St. John's University Libraries
Tim	Spindler	Executive Director	LI Library Resources Council
Division of Library and Information Science (DLIS) Faculty and Staff			
Christine	Angel	Associate Professor	DLIS
Shari	Lee	Associate Professor	DLIS
Kevin	Rioux	Associate Professor	DLIS
Rajesh	Singh	Professor	DLIS
Kristin	Szylvian	Associate Professor	Department of History, joint appointment
James	Vorbach	Chair and Associate Prof.	DLIS

C. Enrollment Summary

Degree	Major			Fall 2020	Fall 2021	Fall 2022	Fall 2023	Fall 2024
MS	LIS2	LIS		123	110	110	113	150
MA/MS	HISL	Public History/LIS		9	7	7	9	9
				132	117	117	122	159

Enrollment by Gender

Degree	Major		Gender	Fall 2020	Fall 2021	Fall 2022	Fall 2023	Fall 2024
MS	LIS2	LIS	F	101	85	93	93	125
MS	LIS2	LIS	M	22	25	17	20	25
MA/MS	HISL	Public History/LIS	F	4	4	5	7	8
MA/MS	HISL	Public History/LIS	M	5	3	2	2	1
Grand Total				132	117	117	122	159

Enrollment by Ethnicity/Race

Degree	Major		Ethnicity/ Race	Fall 2020	Fall 2021	Fall 2022	Fall 2023	Fall 2024
MS	LIS2	LIS	2 or more races	6	6	6	6	3
MS	LIS2	LIS	American Indian				1	1
MS	LIS2	LIS	Asian	5	4	1	1	8
MS	LIS2	LIS	Black or African American	8	7	11	11	15
MS	LIS2	LIS	Hispanic	11	8	7	9	16
MS	LIS2	LIS	Non Resident					
MS	LIS2	LIS	Unknown	4	6	2	2	2
MS	LIS2	LIS	White	89	79	83	83	105
MA/MS	HISL	Public History/LIS	Asian					
MA/MS	HISL	Public History/LIS	Black or African American				1	2
MA/MS	HISL	Public History/LIS	Hispanic	1	1	1	1	1
MA/MS	HISL	Public History/LIS	Non Resident					
MA/MS	HISL	Public History/LIS	White	8	6	6	7	6
Grand Total				132	117	117	122	159

D. Alumni Survey

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?

E. Course Artifact Assessment Form

Course Number and Title: *LIS 999 course name*

Artifact: *assignment name*

Term: *{format: Fall 2016}*

Instructor:

Date: *{format: month-name (d)d, yyyy}*

Course Description.

Program Goals

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

Program goals listed (see pg 5 of this document)

Description of Artifact: *assignment name*

description

Artifact High-Impact Practice (HIP):

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 to improve the course?

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

Student 1

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

Review of Student 1's artifact.

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)

F. E-Portfolio Specification

Program Goals

Selection of Artifacts

- (1) Each selected artifact for inclusion within the ePortfolio relates to one of the seven DLIS program goals.
- (2) A minimum of seven different artifacts are required.

Essay

A 600-700 word essay is written for each program goal. The essay consists of a description and a reflection.

Description

- (1) Each description includes an explanation of how the artifact(s) relates to the corresponding program goal. The description also explains why it was chosen for inclusion.
- (2) Each description clearly explains the purpose, and tells what, when and who. It answers the question "what I did and why?"
- (3) All artifacts are cited.
- (4) Artifacts are accessible. For example broken links result in an unsatisfactory grade for this program goal.

Reflection

The reflection clearly evaluates the following components:

- (1) significance of the project,
- (2) successes;
- (3) failures (if any occurred), and;
- (4) what was learned.

A clear statement 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) and;
- (2) An answer to the question "What will I do to improve my future practice?"

Professional Philosophy

The professional philosophy clearly articulates the following components:

- (1) an understanding of the professional role of the information specialist;

- (2) best practices;
- (3) the knowledge and/or understanding you have acquired throughout the program, which demonstrate professional growth;
- (4) considerations for how your learning experiences will impact your professional practice, and;
- (5) reflection on how you intend to grow as an information professional over the next few years.

The **Statement of Professional Philosophy** should not primarily be about what the student learned to **do** or **has come to believe**; it should be more about **what** s/he will do, would like to do, or plans to do with what s/he has learned – and **why**. This would be their professional philosophy - the big ideas/concepts that shaped their approach to their work. Here students should be able to differentiate between the practical aspects of what they learned and the more theoretical ideas that guide their understanding of the profession, and thus, their approach as a practitioner. Students need to connect the theories and foundational norms that underpin the profession to the big ideas/thinking that drive them in practice.

Design

- Bio – the Bio page welcomes visitors to your e-portfolio. A professional photograph is also a desirable part of the introduction and should be a head shot taken in a professional setting. Please ensure you include additional information about yourself such as an informal “cover letter” for anyone who views your e-portfolio
- Resume - a brief overview of educational background and professional work experience. It should include memberships in professional organizations, any professional presentations or publications and any honors or awards. Contact information is optional.
- Use of Multimedia – the use of artifacts that cover a range of formats such as documents, presentations, digital tools (e.g. LibGuides)
- Citations – APA citations are required on sources and artifacts
- Navigation/Layout – menu structure, color scheme, background image, etc.

Grading

An minimum grade of 80% is required to successfully complete the review.

An grade less than 80% will require the e-portfolio to be revised and resubmitted. An INC will be entered as the grade for LIS 105. The student has a meeting with the Chair to discuss

the reviewers' comments and the Chair's recommendations for revising the e-portfolio for resubmission. There is no need to re-register for LIS 105. The INC grade will be changed to a P grade upon receiving a successful review of a resubmitted e-portfolio.

G. Employer Survey

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

Basic computer (e.g., word-processing, spreadsheets)

Oral/written communication

Teamwork (interpersonal relationships)

Curiosity

Listening to others

Exhibits Professional Ethics

Critical thinking (evaluating information)

Cultural Sensitivity

Flexibility

User Engagement

Decision-Making

Community Engagement

Presentation Skills

Active Professional Engagement

Leadership

Advanced computer (e.g., databases, coding, web design)

Statistics

Other (please specify)

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

H. Annual Student Survey

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
Records Management
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
Records Management
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

I. Exit Survey

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)

J. New Student Survey

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 website
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)

K. MS LIS Program Goals and Outcomes, prior to Spring 2023⁵

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.
- 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.

⁵ Last reviewed October 2020; based on the 2009 ALA Core Competencies:

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

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

- A. 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.
- B. 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.