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Executive Summary

**Purpose.** The purpose of this document is to report on the 2014 – 2015 assessments undertaken by the Division of Library and Information Science (DLIS).

**Background.** DLIS is required by the American Library Association, the accrediting body for MS programs in Library and Information Studies, to continuously monitor the MS LIS program with respect to its program goals and outcomes. DLIS has chosen to report on an annual basis which is typical for accredited library schools. All constituencies (faculty, alumni, students, and employers) are required to participate in this process. A major accomplishment of the 2014 –2015 academic year was the development of a program assessment plan. While some measures have been in place, such as the student survey and the e-portfolio, there has not been a comprehensive review of program assessment since 2011. Through faculty meetings, informed by discussions with the directors of other library school programs at the New York Library Association (NYLA) Annual Conference and the American Library Association (ALA) Midwinter Conference, the exit survey and alumni profile surveys were added; the new student survey and the course assessment instrument were revised. The complete list of measures appears in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Date of Event/Administration (planned)</th>
<th>Constituency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Profile Survey</td>
<td>February 2015</td>
<td>alumni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Survey</td>
<td>April 2015</td>
<td>students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Board</td>
<td>May 1, 2015</td>
<td>alumni, employers, faculty, students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit Survey</td>
<td>May 2015</td>
<td>graduating students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Portfolio Reviews</td>
<td>Aug 2014, Dec 2014, May 2015</td>
<td>faculty and graduating students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Artifact Assessment</td>
<td>May 2015</td>
<td>faculty and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Librarianship Advisory Board</td>
<td>June 5, 2015</td>
<td>alumni and faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Student Survey</td>
<td>(Sept 2015)</td>
<td>students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1. 2014-2015 Assessments**

While the measures above are a major step, important revisions remain for the 2015 -2016 academic year. These are the following:

1) Administer the new student survey in September 2015.
2) Revise the E-Portfolio rubric. (Appendix E)
3) Design and administer a “second-year-out” alumni survey. This survey will be similar in purpose with the exit survey, but informed by two-years of work experience.
Program Goals and Outcomes

Since 2009, DLIS has based its program goals and outcomes on the ALA’s eight core competencies of librarianship\(^1\). The program goals are reviewed annually to ensure they continue to serve the MS LIS program effectively in light of the program’s evolution.

**Goal 1. Develop an Understanding of the Foundations of the Profession**

A. Demonstrate knowledge of the ethics, values, and foundational principles and the role of library and information professionals in the promotion of democratic and legal principles and intellectual freedom.

B. Understand the history of human communication and its impact on libraries, and the importance of effective verbal and written advocacy for libraries, librarians, other library workers and library services.

C. Demonstrate knowledge of historical and present-day libraries and librarianship as well as significant national and international policies and trends within the library and information profession.

D. Demonstrate effective communication techniques (verbal and written) used to analyze complex problems and create appropriate solutions.

E. Fulfilling certification and/or licensure requirements of specialized areas of the profession.

**Goal 2. Develop an Understanding of Information Resources**

A. Understand the concepts and issues related to the lifecycle of recorded knowledge and information, from creation through various stages of use to disposition.

B. Understand the concepts, issues, and methods related to the acquisition and disposition of resources, and the management, preservation and maintenance of collections.

**Goal 3. Demonstrate Ability to Organize Recorded Knowledge and Information**

A. Understand the principles involved and the developmental, descriptive, and evaluative skills needed in the organization, representation and retrieval of recorded knowledge and information resources.

B. Demonstrate ability to organize recorded knowledge and information using the systems of cataloging, metadata, indexing, and classification standards and methods.

**Goal 4. Apply Technological Knowledge and Skills to Practice**

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.

\(^1\) 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.
Annual Student Survey, administered April 2015

Note, questions in the survey are cited using the notation “Qn”.

Survey Review.

1. Archives, public and youth services are the three leading specializations (Q1). When asked to select a primary area, archival studies dominates (Q2) at 36%, with youth services (14%) and public librarianship (12%) a distant second and third respectively. The preference for the archival studies specialization has been increasing consistently since 2012 (Q2).

2. The results in general are poorer in 2015 on Q3, Q4, and Q11, then in the three previous years. In Q3 and Q4, the four survey responses were: Excellent, Very Good, Fair, Poor.
   a) Q3 asks how the program is preparing students as leaders in society and the profession. Here the Fair rating increased by 10% from 2014 to 30% at the expense of the Excellent rating which was lower by the same percentage. The Very Good rating remained relatively constant at 48%. This was the highest Fair rating and lowest Excellent rating in four years.
   b) Q4 asks students to rate their experience in five quality measures:
      i. Faculty feedback about your work
      ii. Access to continuing opportunities for guidance and counseling
      iii. Access to continuing opportunities for placement assistance
      iv. Administrative and staff support
      v. Physical facilities for accomplishing the objectives of the MS LIS program

      With the exception of (i) where the rating average was between Very Good and Excellent, (ii) through (v) had averages between Fair and Very Good. By comparison, in 2012 and 2014, four of five measures were between Very Good and Excellent. In 2013, there were three measures between Fair and Very Good, but the rating averages were generally higher in 2013 than in 2015.
   c) Q11 asks students if they would consider St. John’s for future professional development. Here almost one-third of respondents (32%) answered No. In 2014, only 12% answered No, only 9% in 2013. The No-response in 2012 was higher at 18%, but not nearly as high as in 2015.

3. In contrast, 76% of respondents to Q9 (how well prepared are you for your career in library and information science) felt they were either very well prepared or well prepared, a 10% increase from 2014. The 2015 result is only slightly less than the highest result in the past four years, 79% in 2013.

4. Student rating of the effectiveness of the DLIS Director (Q5) was consistent with that of the past four years. 95% of respondents rated the Director as very effective or effective.
5. Q10 is an open question asking students for their suggestions for improving the program. A review of the responses yielded the following distinct categories. The categories are not sorted by frequency since the repetition was minimal.
   a) Building community
   b) Communication of career opportunities
   c) Professional/business skills
   d) Face to face courses
   e) Hands-on experience with innovative technologies; practice with XML, HTML, and AACR2 was mentioned by one respondent
   f) Professional development

6. Q6 and Q7 are open questions asking students what enhanced (Q6) / diminished (Q7) their MS LIS educational experience. These questions invite students to be specific and identify a related faculty member, if appropriate. For this reason these responses are forwarded to the respective faculty member. In some cases, comments identified categories for program improvements were included in the 5.

Summary.

Q1 and Q2 identified areas of student interest and program strengths, both of which are important factors for continued program development and resource allocation. The results of Q3, Q4, and Q11 were the lowest in four years. Looking at this more closely, this past academic year was characterized by three factors which could contribute to these lower results.

1. With the loss of one FT faculty member, Dr. Kathy Shelfer, who also accepted the University’s voluntary separation offer (VSO) in June 2014, the Division needed to fill teaching vacancies quickly. New adjunct faculty taught 23% of the courses offered in 2014-2015, some of whom were unable to take the University’s online teaching training in advance.
2. The loss of the DLIS Director, Jeffery Olson, and Assistant Director, Roseann Kelly, who also accepted the VSO in June 2014.
3. Two of three members of the administrative team are new. The current DLIS Director, James Vorbach, and administrative assistant, Michael Crossfox, have been in their positions since May 2014 and September 2014 respectively.

The new administrative team consisting of James Vorbach as DLIS Director, Michael Crossfox (Queens Administrative Assistant), and Linda Russell (Oakdale Administrative Assistant, shared with the Department of Psychology) are learning quickly their new roles. DLIS was approved to hire a replacement for Dr. Shelfer, and has hired Dr. Rajesh Singh who brings expertise in areas of future growth. Dr. Singh joined DLIS in the Fall 2015 term. While it is challenging to administer DLIS without an assistant director, these are difficult economic times. We continue to look for ways to improve efficiency in order to provide the excellent support, which our students deserve, for academic operations such as advisement, placement assistance, and registration, among others. Q9 indicates that despite current challenges, students recognize that the MS LIS program has prepared them well for careers as information professionals.
Exit Survey, administered May 2015

Survey review.

The exit survey is a new assessment tool designed to be administered to graduates immediately following their completion of the MS LIS program. The survey asks students to reflect on their programs of study and answer questions covering five areas: program, interactions with faculty and students, teaching, course offerings, and resources. These areas serve to categorize the survey questions which are listed in Table 2. Of the eighteen May graduates, nine responded to the survey, a 50% response rate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Q1: Satisfied with the program</td>
<td>89% strongly agree or agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q10: Prepared to enter the workforce</td>
<td>78% strongly agree or agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q11: Recommend program to others</td>
<td>89% strongly agree or agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q12: Choose St. John’s, if decide to continue graduate study</td>
<td>67% strongly agree or agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions</td>
<td>Q2: Interactions with faculty generally positive</td>
<td>100% strongly agree or agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q3: Interactions with fellow students generally positive</td>
<td>89% strongly agree or agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q4: Interactions with office staff generally positive</td>
<td>89% strongly agree or agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q5: Received useful information from faculty advisors</td>
<td>89% strongly agree or agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Q6: Faculty were effective teachers</td>
<td>89% strongly agree or agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Q7: Satisfied with the variety of course offerings</td>
<td>56% strongly agree or agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offerings</td>
<td>Q8: Satisfied with the frequency of course offerings</td>
<td>67% strongly agree or agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Q9: Had access to appropriate library resources, software and related technology to support educational needs</td>
<td>100% strongly agree or agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Exit Survey Results

Q13 through Q16 were open questions which asked students to identify the courses which contributed the most value, identify program strengths and weaknesses, and recommendations to improve the program.
Summary.
The results in the program category were mixed with high ratings for program satisfaction and willingness to recommend the program, but not as high in preparedness to enter the workforce and choosing St. John’s for further study. This may be related to the low scores in the course offerings category. In contrast, the scores in the interactions, teaching, and resources categories were high. To some degree, low scores in the course offerings category should not be surprising, in light of the faculty changes last year and the concomitant course adjustments.

The open questions confirmed that improvement is needed in the planning and communication of course offerings. Another weakness identified was the lack of interactions with fellow students, though Q3 appears to indicate that in general student interactions were not problematic. The planning of courses was again brought up in the last question, recommendations to improve the program. Another recommendation was a request to include more real-world assignments. The faculty was highlighted as a major strength of the program. DLIS recognizes the need to improve the communication of course offerings and intends to: 1) post the next semester course offerings at least one month in advance of the registration period and 2) post a two-year course cycle for planning purposes.
E-Portfolio Assessment 2013-2015

Background
The e-portfolio replaced the comprehensive exam in the spring 2013 term as the end-of-program assessment for the MS LIS. The main section in the e-portfolio covers the program goals. In this section students provide evidence in the form of reflections on artifacts from their coursework of having satisfied each of the eight program goals. In contrast, the comprehensive exam did not have as direct a relationship with the program goals. Each e-portfolio is reviewed independently by two faculty. If the outcome (Pass/Fail) assigned by the two reviewers to one e-portfolio differ, a third faculty member is assigned by the Director to review the e-portfolio and break the tie.

Summary
The results, since inception, are summarized in Table 3. The target pass rate of 100% was attained in each graduation period, with only one exception, the spring 2014 term. Several factors contributed to this overall positive result.

1) Students are introduced to the e-portfolio in the very beginning of the program, at the new student orientation.
2) Workshops on the e-portfolio and the technology platform, Digication, are offered each semester.
3) Assignments in several core courses provide practice in using Digication.
4) The assessment rubric is made available to the students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spring 2015</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
<th>Summer 2014</th>
<th>Spring 2014</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Spring 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total passed (80% is the passing grade)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass rate</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>91.67%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (all portfolios)</td>
<td>93.33</td>
<td>92.68</td>
<td>93.64</td>
<td>86.50</td>
<td>94.33</td>
<td>93.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (wo failures)</td>
<td>93.33</td>
<td>92.68</td>
<td>93.64</td>
<td>90.95</td>
<td>94.33</td>
<td>93.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Difference</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. E-Portfolio Summary

Summary
The results and comments at faculty meetings confirm the value of the e-portfolio as a measure of student learning and program assessment. Discussions of ways to improve the e-portfolio have focused on revising the rubric so that e-portfolio assessment can provide clearer feedback on student
performance with respect to each program goal. A revised rubric is being prepared for the fall 2015 term.

The Average Difference statistic averages the difference between the scores of the two faculty reviewers of each e-portfolio. This statistic ranges from 5.5 to 9.7. A high Average Difference statistic may indicate different expectations among the faculty. This will be investigated further during the fall 2015 term.
Alumni Profile Survey, administered February 2015.
The goal of this survey was to establish relationships with alumni who may strengthen the MS LIS program by mentoring students, being profiled on the web site, and/or serving on the advisory board. Since it had been four years since the last alumni survey, we believed that a profile survey with the goal of relationship building was the appropriate step at this time. As Table 4 indicates, recent alumni (graduating after 2010) were the majority of respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduation</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After 2010</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2009</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2004</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-1999</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-1994</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 1990</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 41
skipped question 0

Table 4. Response Rate by Graduation Date
The results provided valuable information in all three areas – mentoring, web profiles, and advisory board candidates. In fact 50% (10 of 20) of the advisors attending the May 1, 2015 Board Meeting were drawn from the results of this survey. Table 5 summarizes the results.

Q1: Mentoring: Would you be interested in mentoring current students?
Q2: Advisory Board: Would you be interested in serving on the DLIS Advisory Board?
Q3: Profile Consent: DLIS is assembling profiles of Alumni to be featured on our website. May we reach out to you at a later date for more information about what you have been doing since graduation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Q1 (Percent)</th>
<th>Q1 (Count)</th>
<th>Q2 (Percent)</th>
<th>Q2 (Count)</th>
<th>Q3 (Percent)</th>
<th>Q3 (Count)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 39
skipped question 2

Table 5. Summary of Alumni Profile Survey
Next steps.
DLIS plans to introduce a mentoring program in Fall 2015. In this regard, we will be contacting alumni in the survey who expressed an interest. DLIS intends to move forward with alumni profiles as well. Preliminary work will be done in Fall 2015 on the design of the alumni blog page, with the goal of having alumni profiles on the web site and blog by March 2016.
Advisory Board Meeting Summary
Board Meeting: May 1, 2015
Summary submitted: May 28, 2015
Prepared by: James Vorbach, Ph. D.

Introduction. The meeting began with a presentation on the MS LIS program and updates since May 2011, the date of the last advisory board meeting. Following the presentation was question period. This evolved into a discussion of student engagement in an online context and professional development. The second part of the discussion was guided by the questions in the agenda. The notes from this part of the meeting were categorized into essential skills, professional development, and recruitment. These four categories - student engagement, professional development, essential skills, and recruitment - serve as the organizational framework for the summary. Topics which fit in more than one category were repeated.

Summary.
1. Student Engagement
The board discussed the importance of student engagement, particularly in the context of the online learning forum. Collaborative work was seen as essential for keeping students engaged in an online course. While most online courses in the program emphasize collaborative work, consideration of additional measures was recommended to assist new students transitioning to online learning. A specific suggestion was suggested with regards to coordinating assignment due dates so assignments across courses are not due on the same day.

Extra-curricular activities were discussed as important also for building community. Several additional activities were discussed to augment the existing student orientations and the symposia series:
   o Webinars, biweekly or monthly;
   o Meet-ups at professional meetings or conferences;
   o Mentorship – by students and/or alumni; the alumni survey provided data in this regard.
   ACRL and SLA were identified as organizations with mentorship programs.

DLIS has a meet-up web site but the effectiveness of this site needs to be evaluated.

2. Professional development
The importance of professional networking at meetings and conferences was discussed. Several approaches were considered for encouraging student involvement in professional organizations.

Setting up a conference/meeting schedule at the beginning of the semester was considered an important factor for increasing participation. Other factors include: knowing others attending the meeting and having incentives for meeting attendance. One incentive considered was to recommend (or require) students to include artifacts in their e-portfolios that were created as a result of participation in
conferences/meetings, as evidence of satisfying program goal 7 “Lifelong learning”. Note, the e-portfolio is the end-of-program assessment.

Volunteering at events of professional organizations is another important networking opportunity that was discussed.

Internships were discussed in this context. This led to a discussion of how to ensure students are prepared professionally for internships, and the converse, ensuring that internship sites are appropriate hosts. Outreach to alumni was suggested as an important step towards improving both the availability of quality internships and the process of matching students with internships.

Badging was discussed as a new form of online professional development.

3. Essential Skills for Librarians and Information Professionals
There was a discussion of professional and business skills that are necessary in today’s libraries. The skills were considered not as ends in themselves but as steps in a learning process of adapting to change. Versatility was a keyword in this discussion. The skills are summarized as follows:
- Working collaboratively
- Familiarity with new technologies; evaluating best of breed for a given application
- Writing for results - including abstracts, grant-writing, preparing budgets and their justifications, research proposals, paper/poster presentations, basic marketing skills
- Teaching/explaining skills, both group and one-on-one modes; advocacy
- Facilitating meetings
- Vendor negotiations
- Creation of ADA compliant materials.

4. Recruitment
Current approaches were briefly discussed including graduate admissions participation at regional recruitment events, social media marketing, marketing via web site and blog, and inviting prospective students to DLIS events. The following were considered for supplementing these approaches.
- Introduce five-year bachelors-MS LIS programs; five are at the final stage in the approval process (NYSED) and should be approved by Sept 2015
- Explore ways to recruit at the high school level
- Email flyers to students and alumni
- Distribute flyers via email and hard copy to library directors.
- Explore a collaboration with St. John’s Law School
- Post alumni profiles on web site
Law Librarianship Advisory Board Meeting

Meeting: June 5, 2015, 12:00pm-1:30pm
Summary submitted: June 15, 2015
Prepared by: Ralph Monaco, MLS, and James Vorbach, Ph. D.

Attendees:
Valerie Carullo – Bloomberg/BNA- Law School Relations Manager
Alirio Gomez – Director of Library and Information Science, Milbank Tweed
Shabeer Khan, former Director of Library Services, Kaye Scholer,
Ralph Monaco, Executive Director, New York Law Institute and Assistant Professor, Adjunct,
Division of Library and Information Science, St John’s University
Jean O’Grady – Director of Research Services – DlaPiper
Stacy Posillico – Reference Librarian, Touro School of Law
Taryn Rucinski, Branch Librarian, United States Court of Appeals, Second Circuit
Dr. James Vorbach – Director and Associate Professor, Division of Library and Information Science, St John’s University
Elaine Egan (Invited to join Committee after initial meeting)

Introduction.
Ralph Monaco introduced all present and invited Dr. Vorbach to make an opening statement. Ralph Monaco began by making a few observations. Many top positions in law firm libraries were going to “Knowledge Managers” who were not recruited from the ranks of the law library profession. He was concerned that traditional law librarians were not viewed as progressive, but were viewed as unwilling to respond to an ever-changing landscape. He also indicated that the rise of COO or CIO positions in firms created another layer between the library and upper management that has led to a trend towards hiring Knowledge Managers as library directors. He thought that these COO or CIO individuals were gathering at different conferences such as ILTA (International Law and Technology Association) or ARMA (American Records Management Association) where networking conversations about their respective libraries possibly focus upon the use of Knowledge Managers from outside the traditional law library field.

Discussion.
• Jean O’Grady indicated that some law librarians had made it to the ranks of Knowledge Managers close to the C—Level. As examples she mentioned Greg Lambert, Chief Knowledge Services Officer, Jackson Walker, LLP and Deborah Panella Director of Library and Knowledge Services at Cravath Swaine & Moore.
• Some observed that the marginalizing of law librarians may be attributable to their attitude to technology and its integration into the everyday workflow of the library and their attorneys. As an example someone mentioned a librarian who indicated that learning about and integrating such aggregator tools like as Manzamo and Osmosis, etc. wasn’t part of his/her job description or responsibility. Library School programs should address this attitude towards technology and
the future of libraries as resources not places. Adaptability, flexibility and openness to change should be firmly embedded in any library school curricula.

- Libraries as resources underscores the necessity for library school curricula to focus heavily on portal technology, virtual reference desks, metrics, big data analytics and the pace of change which will only quicken in the years ahead.
- Need to be conversant with collaborative technologies but not necessarily invested in anyone particular software, such as SharePoint, but in-depth knowledge or exposure to the concepts of collaboration, workflow, globalization, mobility and integration are vital.
- Library schools need to train individuals or at least develop greater awareness of the skills that along the way will allow them to speak with people on the C-Level of organizations. This calls for strategic thinking on issues such as globalization, big data, alternative fee arrangements and the delivery of information to individuals anywhere and anytime. – mobility.
- Legal Process Management has gained ground in law firms and librarians do not presently have a seat at the legal process management table. LPM needs to be incorporated into management courses.
- Suggestions were made to align St John’s DLIS with such organizations as ILTA\(^2\) and AALL\(^3\) and possibly ARMA\(^4\). Closer partnerships with these organizations will allow our students to gain practical knowledge and make contacts with leaders in this arena.
- Students need very practical experience and need to hit the ground running upon graduation. Internships and closer alignments with organizations such as ILTA are possible ways of doing this. Outreach to individuals such as LTN editor Monica Bay is another example. DLIS should explore cooperation with Legal Tech\(^5\) as well as Suffolk University Institute on Law Practice technology and innovation\(^6\).

**Summary.**

The discussion identified several problems in the field including 1) attitude of some law librarians towards technology, i.e. resistance to learning, 2) perception of traditional law librarians as being unwilling to adapt to change, 3) library schools training librarians who fail to perceive themselves as leaders in the information professions, due in large part to current curricula.

The discussion covered many concrete recommendations to improve curricula. These are roughly categorized as 1) curricula-wide recommendations and 2) course skills increasingly important to information professionals today, and 3) a certificate program targeting mid-level professionals.

---

\(^2\) International Legal and Technology Association (ILTA) [http://lawdept.iltanet.org/](http://lawdept.iltanet.org/)
\(^3\) American Association of Law Libraries (AALL)
\(^4\) American Records Management Association (ARMA). ARMA International is a not-for-profit professional association and the authority on governing information as a strategic asset. ARMA International publishes *Information Management* magazine.
\(^5\) LegalTech is the most important legal technology event of the year. Legal Technology is ever changing and LegalTech offers law firms and legal departments the ability to stay on top of this evolving industry to improve their law practice management.
\(^6\) Suffolk University Institute on Law Practice Technology & Innovation oversees projects and programs designed to leverage technology and other innovations to improve the practice of law and the delivery of legal services.
1. Curricula-wide
   - Understanding the underlying concepts in acquiring and distributing content;
   - Understanding the work, the business context, and how to apply technology to improve outcomes;
   - Understanding the library as resource, not as place;
   - Provide opportunities for student creativity working on real-world, collaborative projects; strategic thinking;
   - Provide opportunities for experiential learning, e.g. internships, hack-a-thons;
   - Emphasize adaptability, flexibility, and openness to change
   - Understanding the implications of globalization

2. Course Skills
   - Knowledge management (KM) (Library Schools need to define KM)
   - Project management - includes planning, content management workflow, budgeting, and integration
   - Technology – collaborative work, big data, web services, virtual reference desk, portal technology, mobility; the Board emphasized understanding the concepts of what technology to apply, not expertise in a particular technology

3. New Certificate Program
   - A new certificate program was envisioned as an approach to address the above needs
   - The certificate would target mid-career law librarians that need to update their skills to step into new management roles.
   - The courses in the certificate program would also be available to current students as electives in the MS LIS program, providing them also with valuable project management and technological skills

In addition, professional engagement was emphasized. Relationships with organizations such as ARMA and ILTA were viewed as important vehicles for getting into the conversation with information managers. It was felt that students should also be encouraged to participate in events sponsored by Legal Tech and Suffolk University Institute on Law Practice Technology and Innovation.

Next steps.
The group agreed to meet in September to frame the courses in the new certificate program. The group will be joined at this meeting by Dr. Rajesh Singh, the newest member of the DLIS faculty, who has teaching and research experience in leadership, knowledge management, and project management.
Course Artifact Assessment: A Measure of Program Goal Learning.

Over a four year period each course in the program will be assessed to determine how well students are learning the program goals for which the course is designed to satisfy. The core courses will be assessed twice during this period. For each course, faculty will select one artifact (e.g. assignment, exam, or semester project) as a representative measure for the course’s related program goals. At the end of the course, the faculty member completes a form describing the class’ performance, reviewing the artifact’s role as a measure, and stating any action needed. Sample artifacts are provided for External Review Panel (ERP) visit. Spring 2015 was the first use of this form of assessment. Three courses were analyzed: LIS 125, LIS 203, and LIS 238, listed below. Dr. Lee’s and Dr. Vorbach’s reports follow. Dr. Angel’s report is available as a separate attachment.

Course: LIS 125: Library Materials and Services for Young Children
Instructor: Shari Lee
Date: May 19 2015

Course: LIS 203: Organization of Information (not included)
Instructor: Dr. Christine M. Angel
Date: May 19, 2015

Course: LIS 238 Web Design for Libraries and Information Centers
Instructor: James Vorbach, Ph. D.
Date: 5/29/2015
Course Artifact Assessment

Course: LIS 125: Library Materials and Services for Young Children
Term: Spring 2015
Instructor: Shari Lee
Date: May 19 2015

Description of Artifact

Research Paper: 30% of Final Grade

Students provide a 4,500-5000 word research paper on a topic of their choosing – as long as it relates to emergent literacy in some way. Students also present a brief overview/synopsis of their research using presentation software of choice. Final product is graded based on the extent of the research, the introduction, description, and critical analysis of the topic, (i.e., the review of the literature and the evidence provided in support of their argument and conclusions drawn), the clarity and quality of writing, as well as how well the paper conforms to APA.

Program Goals

Goal 2. Develop an Understanding of Information Resources

2B. Understand the concepts, issues, and methods related to the acquisition and disposition of resources, and the management, preservation and maintenance of collections.

Goal 4. Apply Technological Knowledge and Skills to Practice

4A. 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.

1. Describe the students’ overall performance.

Students in this class were highly engaged. They showed interest in the course content and contributed to discussions thoughtfully and in a timely manner. Assignments were creative and not only demonstrated that students had gained a solid understanding of the value of emergent literacy to young children and society, but also of the issues surrounding this topic. Overall, these students performed very well in this course.

2. Did students’ performance on the artifact meet your expectations with regards to satisfying the corresponding program goals and outcomes?

Yes! The artifact in question is the final research paper. These papers were overwhelmingly well researched, organized, and written. They met my expectations, the requirements for the assignments and, by extension, the program goals the course supports. These students demonstrated excellent research skills, graduate level writing, as well as thoughtful presentation of complex topics.

3. If expectations were not met, what actions do you recommend to reach the target expectations?

N/A
Course Artifact Assessment

Course: LIS 238 Web Design for Libraries and Information Centers
Term: Spring 2015
Instructor: James Vorbach, Ph. D.
Date: 5/29/2015

Program Goals/Outcomes.

Goal 4. Apply Technological Knowledge and Skills to Practice.
   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.

Description of Artifact. The artifact is the semester project which integrates all course learning in the design of a web site. There were two types of projects this term: 1) design of a web site for an archival collection, and 2) teaching and mentoring secondary students in their design of web sites for selected student activity groups. The project outcomes are a paper which describes the client, the requirements, and design strategy, and web site developed in WordPress. Students working in groups are assigned either an archival collection or a group of secondary students at the client secondary school. Through the various stages of the project, students experience all aspects of goal 4, i.e. acquire, apply, analyze, and assess a wide range of technological skills. Samples of each project type are provided, along with the instructor’s assessment.

1. Describe the students’ overall performance.
The overall performance on the project was very good. 96% was the class average. The assessment consisted of four parts: presentation, paper, web site, and peer review. Peer review was a new component in the assessment. Given the group work and participation of real clients in utilizing academic service-learning pedagogy, peer review provided a way for students to enforce group participation. It represented 20% of the overall grade. There was only one case where a student was identified as under-performing by a group, and this student received her colleagues reduced assessment for this 20%.

2. Did students’ performance on the artifact meet your expectations with regards to satisfying the corresponding program goals and outcomes?
85% of the class (17 students) met or exceeded the target grade on the project of 93%. 25% of the class (five students) received a 100%. In general my expectations were satisfied by these results.
Communications with the two clients – the Marymount Manhattan College Library and St. John the
Baptist High School – after the projects were submitted, confirmed the positive results qualitatively and overall value of this teaching model.

3. If expectations were not met, what actions do you recommend to reach the target expectations?
Looking more closely at the 15% (three students) who did not meet the target grade, two of the three did poorly on the presentation and the third student’s grade was most affected by a low peer review. Reviewing the project specification, the description of the requirements for the presentation could be improved. This is a takeaway for the next iteration of this course.