

Division of Library and Information Science

Assessment Report

2015 – 2016

Prepared by: James Vorbach, Director DLIS

Submitted: July 19, 2016

Approved: August 30, 2016

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	3
Program Goals and Outcomes	3
Annual Student Survey, administered April 2016.....	6
Entering Student Survey	8
Exit Survey.....	10
ePortfolio Assessment 2013 - 2016	12
Alumni Survey, administered May 2016.....	14
Alumni Profile Survey.....	16
Advisory Board Meeting, May 6, 2016	17
Advisory Board Meeting Evaluation	21
Law Librarianship Advisory Board Meetings.....	23
Course Artifact Assessment	24
Appendix	26
A. Strategic Priorities of 2015 – 2016 and Implementation Efforts.....	26
B. Annual Student Survey: Spring 2016	30
C. Exit Survey - Spring 2016	33
D. Entering Student Survey - Spring 2016.....	37
E. 2016 Alumni Two-Year-Out Survey.....	41
F. Advisory Board May 2016 Meeting Evaluation.....	45
G. Advisory Board Members*	46
H. Course Artifact Assessment Form	47

Executive Summary

Purpose. The purpose of this document is to report on the 2015 – 2016 assessments undertaken by the Division of Library and Information Science (DLIS) to engage students, faculty, alumni, and employers in the process of ongoing improvement of the American Library Association (ALA)-accredited Master of Science in Library and Information Science program.

Background. DLIS is required by the ALA, 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 prepare a comprehensive assessment report at the end of each academic year. All constituencies (students, faculty, alumni, and employers) are required by ALA’s Committee on Accreditation (ALA-CoA) to participate in this process. In continuing the implementation of the DLIS assessment plan, approved in March 2015, the entering student survey and alumni two-year-out survey were introduced. One measure remains to be implemented in 2016 - 2017, the employer survey. This will complete the assessment plan. The complete list of measures and advisory boards appears in Table 1.

Measure	Date of Event/Administration (planned)	Constituency
Alumni Two-Year-Out Survey	May 2016	alumni
Annual Student Survey	April 2016	students
Advisory Board	May 6, 2016	alumni, employers, faculty, students
Entering Student Survey	September 2015; January 2016	Students just starting the program
Exit Survey	January 2016; May 2016	graduating students
E-Portfolio Reviews	Aug 2015, Dec 2015, May 2016	faculty and graduating students
Course Artifact Assessment	May 2015	faculty and students
Law Librarianship Advisory Board	June 5, 2015; Feb 8, 2016	alumni and faculty
Employer Survey	(March 2017)	employers

Table 1. Assessment Measures and Advisory Boards

Program Goals and Outcomes

Since 2009, DLIS has based its program goals and outcomes on the ALA’s eight core competencies of librarianship¹. The program goals are reviewed annually to ensure they continue to serve the MS LIS

¹ ALA Core Competencies

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

program effectively in light of the program's evolution. In addition, specializations within the MS LIS program supplement the program goals with that of related professional organizations.

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

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

Goal 2. Develop an Understanding of Information Resources

- A. Understand the concepts and issues related to the lifecycle of recorded knowledge and information, from creation through various stages of use to disposition.
- B. Understand the concepts, issues, and methods related to the acquisition and disposition of resources, and the management, preservation and maintenance of collections.

Goal 3. Demonstrate Ability to Organize Recorded Knowledge and Information

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

Goal 4. Apply Technological Knowledge and Skills to Practice

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

Goal 5. Apply Reference and User Services

- A. Demonstrate knowledge and usage of the concepts, principles, and techniques of reference and user services, as well as retrieval techniques and evaluation methods, that provide access to relevant and accurate recorded knowledge and information from diverse sources to all patrons.
- B. Understand and demonstrate ability to interact successfully with individuals of all ages and groups to provide consultation, mediation, and guidance in their use of recorded knowledge and information, including information literacy techniques and methods.

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

Goal 6. Master Research Methods

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

Goal 7. Experience Continuing Education and Lifelong Learning

- 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 2016

The 2016 survey is provided in Appendix B. The notation “Qn” in this section cites questions in the survey.

Review by Question.

1. When asked to select concentrations of interest (Q1) academic librarianship showed a significant increase from 2015, from 19% to 34%. Archival studies, academic, public, and youth services are most often selected with responses ranging from 34% (academic) to 49% (public). When students were asked to select their intended concentration (Q2), archival studies continues to be first at 29%, followed by public (20%), youth services (15%) and academic (12%).
2. Q3 asks how the program is preparing students as leaders in society and the profession. The results in 2016 showed an increase in the “very good” rating and decrease in the “fair” by 10%, when compared to 2015. In 2016, 80% of respondents selected either “excellent” or “very good”, with the balance being “fair”. The 2016 results were consistent with the results of 2012, 2013, and 2014.
3. 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

The results in all quality measures were significantly higher than in 2015, with the rating averages for all five measures in the “very good” to “excellent” range. In addition, the 2016 results outperformed the results from the 2012 – 2014 surveys on most quality measures.

4. Student rating of the effectiveness of the DLIS Director (Q5) was consistent with that of the past five years. 100% of respondents rated the Director as very effective or effective.
5. 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 with the suggestions of Q10.
6. Q8 seeks to determine how far respondents are in their programs of study. 21% reported having completed less than 6 credits. 50% reported having completed between 7 and 18 credits, and 29% reported having completed more than 18 credits. The 2014 survey had similar results, but the 2012, 2013, and 2015 surveys had higher percentages of respondents among those with more than 18 credits.

7. In Q9, students are asked to rate their preparedness for a career in the library and information science. 83% of respondents rated themselves either “well prepared” or “very well prepared”. This is the highest percentage for this category since 2012.
8. Q10 is an open question asking students for their suggestions on improving the program. A review of the responses yielded the following representative sample. The list is not sorted by frequency since the repetition was minimal.
 - a. Open forum for online students to discuss the program
 - b. Offer more services and social activities for distance students to connect with peers
 - c. Holding workshops on “hard” skills, to better prepare students for work in public libraries, e.g. a workshop on the Dewey Decimal System
 - d. Learning about cataloging programs and technology architectures, such as Millennium, an ILS.
 - e. Incorporate more hands-on experience and focus on actual practical experience, and giving students insight on the day-to-day expectations of librarians
 - f. More course options each semester
 - g. More assistance with job or internship placement.
9. Q11 asks students if they would consider St. John’s for future professional development. 86% of respondents answered “yes”, and 14% “no”. This is a significant improvement over 2015 where 32% answered “no”. The 2016 results are similar to those in previous years. In 2014, only 12% answered “no”, only 9% in 2013. The “no” response in 2012 was higher at 18%.

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. Archival studies (29%) continued to be the largest specialization though the margin has decreased as academic (12%) and public (20%) librarianship have increased. Youth services showed a small increase from 14% in 2015 to 15%.

The results of Q3, Q4, Q9, and Q11 were much improved over the 2015 results and in some cases were the best results since 2011. Several factors contributed to the 2016 results.

1. Realization of elements in the 2015 – 2016 strategic priorities (Appendix A) has improved the program.
2. Improvements in the blog and newsletter, and the introduction of the LibGuide have improved access to resources on the MS LIS program, internships, jobs, and events.
3. The new administrative team (since May 2014) - DLIS Director, James Vorbach, and administrative assistants, Michael Crossfox and Linda Russell - have steadily been improving DLIS administration with their experience.

Q10 provides input for the discussion of action items within the 2016 – 2017 strategic priorities.

Entering Student Survey

Background.

The entering student survey (Appendix D) gathers information on why students chose St. John's MS LIS program, student demographics, their professional goals, and asks students to evaluate the entering student orientation at the start of the term. In September 2015, the survey was revised from an earlier version that had not been administered in several years. The plan is to administer the survey to students entering the program in the Fall and Spring terms. Note, students cannot begin the program in the Summer term. This section reports on the results of the September 2015 and January 2016 surveys.

Review by Question.

1. Q1, Q2, and Q3 related to the students' choice of the MS LIS program at St. John's. Regarding how students found out about the program (Q1), the highest responses by far were 57% ALA web site/directory and 43% St. John's University's web site. The "nature of the program and course offerings" led reasons for choosing St. John's at 86%, when students could select more than one response (Q2). When asked to select the primary reason for choosing St. John's (Q3), the "nature of the program and course offerings" again was the clear leader at 43%. The "University's reputation", "colleague's recommendation", and "location" shared second place in Q2 (43%) and Q3 (14%).
2. Q4 through Q7 gathered demographic information on new students including gender, age, occupation/activities immediately prior to starting the program, and full-time/part-time status.
3. Below lists the top five professional goals (Q8) from the Spring 2016 survey in descending order of response percentage.
 - i. Enjoy a rewarding career (100%)
 - ii. Be a mentor to new information professionals (71%)
 - iii. Volunteer my professional services (57%)
 - iv. Be a high-level manager or executive (43%)
 - v. Be an innovator and leader in my field (43%)

These results are consistent with the results from Fall 2015 with two differences. Ranked third in 2015 was "Publish articles in professional journals", and "Be a high-level manager or executive" was ranked sixth. Respondents chose from eleven goals. The entire list can be seen in the 2016 survey (Appendix D).

4. Q9, Q10, and Q11 evaluated the entering student orientation. 100% of respondents rated the orientation as very useful or useful (Q9). When asked in Q10 for the part of the orientation that was most helpful, 80% of respondents regarded meeting students and faculty as most helpful, and 20% regarded the demonstration of the available online resources as most helpful. When asked for suggestions to improve the orientation (Q11) only three responded. Of these responses, two were complimentary and one was a suggestion, i.e. to make the orientation

earlier. Currently the orientation is on the first day of class. This suggestion will be discussed at the August 30th faculty meeting, as there are advantages to changing the date.

Summary.

This being the first year administering the revised entering student survey, the results establish a benchmark for future comparisons. There is evidence in these results of a strong commitment to service, with mentoring and volunteering ranked high as professional goals (Q8). This may be expected given the service-oriented nature of the profession and St. John's University's mission. Clearly the ALA web site and St. John's University's web site are major factors in prospective students finding out about the MS LIS program (Q1), while the nature of the MS LIS program is the primary reason students come to St. John's.

The evaluation of the entering student orientation was favorable, but more questions may be necessary to continue to improve it. This will also be discussed at the faculty meeting on August 30th.

Exit Survey

Survey review.

The exit survey was administered twice this past year, for Fall 2015 and Spring 2016 graduates immediately following the completion of all degree requirements. The survey asks students to reflect on their respective programs of study and answer questions covering five areas: program, interactions, teaching, course offerings, and resources. The survey questions corresponding to these categories are shown in Table 1. Of the 21 graduates (in Fall 2015 and Spring 2016 combined), 16 responded to the survey, a 76% response rate. The responses to each question were: “strongly agree”, “agree”, “neutral”, “disagree”, and “strongly disagree”. The complete survey with the Spring 2016 results is given in Appendix C.

Category	Questions	Results
Program	Q1: Satisfied with the program	88% strongly agree or agree
	Q10: Prepared to enter the workforce	81% strongly agree or agree 19% neutral
	Q11: Recommend program to others	81% strongly agree or agree 19% neutral
	Q12: Choose St. John’s, if decide to continue graduate study	50% strongly agree or agree 19% disagree or strongly disagree
Interactions	Q2: Interactions with faculty generally positive	100% strongly agree or agree
	Q3: Interactions with fellow students generally positive	94% strongly agree or agree
	Q4: Interactions with office staff generally positive	94% strongly agree or agree
	Q5: Received useful information from faculty advisors	75% strongly agree or agree; 13% disagree or strongly disagree
	Q6: Faculty were effective teachers	94% strongly agree or agree
Courses Offered	Q7: Satisfied with the variety of course offerings	63% strongly agree or agree 13% disagree or strongly disagree
	Q8: Satisfied with the frequency of course offerings	75% strongly agree or agree 6% disagree or strongly disagree
Resources	Q9: Had access to appropriate library resources, software and related technology to support educational needs	94% strongly agree or agree; 6% neutral

Table 1 – Results

Q13 through Q16 were open questions which asked students to identify the courses which contributed the most value (Q13), identify program strengths (Q14) and weaknesses (Q15), and recommendations to improve the program (Q16).

Summary.

In the Program section, Q1 (program satisfaction) and Q2 (preparedness to enter workforce) compare favorably with the results from May 2015. However, Q11 (recommend program to others) and Q12 (choose St. John's for continuing study) are worse.

In the Interactions section, Q2 (faculty interactions), Q3 (peer interactions), and Q4 (office staff interactions) were the same or better than in May 2015. Q5 (received useful information from faculty advisors) was worse.

Q6 (teaching effectiveness) was an improvement over May 2015, and Q9 (access to appropriate resources) was very good but slightly worse than in May 2015.

In the Course Offerings section, while Q7 (variety of courses offered) and Q8 (frequency of course offerings) were better than in May 2015, there is room for improvement. 63% (Q7) and 75% (Q8) of respondents strongly agree or agree with these questions as opposed to 56% and 67% in May 2015. In looking to the open questions, Q15 (program weaknesses) and Q16 (recommended program improvements) for guidance, comments "lack of variety of courses", "offer more electives", "difficulty completing specialization given available offerings" are clear. Improvements in communication this past year, such as posting the two-year course cycle and the new LibGuide platform for storing program resources, may have resulted in the slight improvement over last year's results, DLIS is limited by its enrollment (mid-sixties since 2012) from offering more courses than can possibly run. This underscores the importance of efforts to increase enrollment. This may also relate to the results for Q11 and Q12.

Comments from Q15 and Q16 (i.e. "Quality of part-time instructors", "more hands-on experiences" (also present in May 2015 comments), and "create guidelines for professors teaching online to improve consistency among courses") offer insight into the less-than-expected results for Q5, Q11, and Q12. These comments and efforts to increase enrollment will inform the development of DLIS' 2016 -2017 strategic priorities.

ePortfolio Assessment 2013 - 2016

Background

The ePortfolio replaced the comprehensive exam in Spring 2013 as the end-of-program assessment for the MS LIS. The main section in the ePortfolio covers the eight program goals, which are based on the eight core competencies of the American Library Association (ALA). In this section students provide evidence from their coursework in the form of assignments/projects and write reflections for each goal explaining how their learning from the evidence satisfies the respective program goal. Each ePortfolio is reviewed independently by two DLIS faculty. The minimum grade to “pass” the ePortfolio assessment is 80. If the outcomes (Pass/Fail) from the two reviewers differ, a third faculty member is assigned by the Director to review the e-portfolio and render a decision. Digication is the platform used by the students to create their ePortfolios.

Summary

The results since inception are summarized in Table 1. The overall pass rate, 96.8%, is close to the target pass rate of 100%. The average difference statistic (Ave Diff) measures the consistency of the grading from the two reviewers. A high Ave Diff statistic may indicate different expectations among the faculty. This was discussed this past year at faculty meetings and the result in Spring 2016 was the best (lowest valued) of all previous terms. Several factors contribute to the continuing high pass rate.

- 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 using Digication.
- 4) The assessment rubric is made available to the students and reviewed annually.

	Spring 2016	Summer/ Fall 2015	Spring 2015	Fall 2014	Summer 2014	Spring 2014	Fall 2013	Spring 2013
Total	11	13	18	6	7	12	6	22
Total passed	10	12	18	6	7	11	6	22
Pass rate	90.9%	92.3%	100%	100%	100%	91.7%	100%	100%
Average (all portfolios)	91.4	93.7	93.3	92.7	93.6	86.5	94.3	93.1
Average (wo failures)	93.9	95.8	93.3	92.7	93.6	91.0	94.3	93.1
Ave Diff	3.7	6.7	8.2	6.6	6.4	9.7	6.0	5.5

Table 1. ePortfolio Summary

Next steps

The results, and comments from faculty and employers confirm the value of the e-portfolio as a measure of student learning and program assessment. The rubric is reviewed each year and fine-tuned as needed to improve clarity for both students and faculty.

Alumni Survey, administered May 2016

Background. The alumni survey is new annual assessment instrument that was administered for the first time this past academic year. DLIS introduced this tool for the purpose of surveying alumni two years after graduation on the quality of the MS LIS program, their preparation for their career, and their suggestions for improving the program. The design of the survey closely follows that of the exit survey administered to students upon graduation. The participants were alumni who graduated in 2013-2014 (i.e. Summer 2013, Fall 2013, and May 2014).

The survey asks students to reflect on their respective programs of study and answer questions covering five areas: program, interactions, teaching, course offerings, and resources. The survey questions corresponding to these categories are shown in Table 1. Of the 17 alumni to whom the survey was emailed, 9 responded to the survey, a 53% response rate. The responses to each question were: “strongly agree”, “agree”, “neutral”, “disagree”, and “strongly disagree”. The 2016 survey and results are provided in Appendix E.

Category	Questions	Results
Program	Q1: Satisfied with the program	78% strongly agree or agree; 11% neutral; 11% disagree
	Q9: Prepared to enter the workforce	86% strongly agree or agree 14% neutral
	Q11: Field experience (AS-L, internships, ind studies) contributed towards employment	57% strongly agree or agree 43% disagree
	Q12: Recommend program to others	86% strongly agree or agree 14% strongly disagree
	Q13: Choose St. John’s, if decide to continue graduate study	43% agree 29% neutral; 29% disagree
Interactions	Q2: Interactions with faculty generally positive	100% strongly agree or agree
	Q3: Interactions with fellow students generally positive	100% strongly agree or agree
	Q4: Interactions with office staff generally positive	78% strongly agree or agree 11% neutral; 11% disagree
	Q5: Received useful information from faculty advisors	88% strongly agree or agree; 12% neutral
Teaching	Q6: Faculty were effective teachers	100% strongly agree or agree
Courses Offered	Q7: Satisfied with the variety of course offerings	100% strongly agree or agree
Resources	Q8: Had access to appropriate library resources, software and related technology to support educational needs	100% strongly agree or agree

Table 1 – 2016 Alumni Survey Results

Q10, Q14 through Q17 were open questions which asked alumni to identify additional skills needed after graduation (Q10), identify the courses which contributed the most value (Q14), program strengths (Q15) and weaknesses (Q16), and their recommendations to improve the program (Q17).

Summary.

In the program section, Q9 (preparedness) and Q12 (recommend program) are favorable with 86% (strongly agree or agree). While 78% (strongly agree or agree) appears high for Q1 (program satisfaction), this is a sharp reduction from 88% in the most recent exit survey. Q11 (field experience) received an unexpected 43% disagree rating when compared to feedback from employers, and Q13 (choose St. John's for continuing ed.) received a low 43% agreement.

The results of questions in the interactions (faculty, peer, office staff, and advisors) were generally positive. The interactions with office staff did receive a 11% disagree result, but in light of the 0% disagree result (and 94% strongly agree or agree) in the 2016 exit survey, this most likely reflects interactions with former staff members of DLIS.

The Teaching, Courses Offered, and Resources sections were very favorable.

In looking at the open questions for insight into the results in the program section, three kinds of comments stand out: 1) more face to face meetings, 2) a disconnect between students and faculty, and 3) a stronger focus on jobs after graduation. One and two relate to more engagement with the online students, including increasing use of Webex for office hours, virtual meetings in courses, and by improving responsiveness on grading assessments and student questions. Webex is the technology platform that St. John's uses for virtual meetings. The third comment may be addressed by increasing emphasis on internships, job opportunities, and the development of an employer survey to better align the program with the job market.

Alumni Profile Survey

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. The survey was administered in February 2015 and was instrumental in reconstituting the DLIS Advisory Board. The survey also provided an initial group of alumni mentors and candidates for soliciting alumni profiles for marketing purposes. The survey has been replaced with links on the weekly alumni digest to forms on the web site for mentoring students and for alumni profiles.

Advisory Board Meeting, May 6, 2016

Summary submitted: May 27, 2016

Prepared by: James Vorbach, Ph. D.

INTRODUCTION

The meeting began with a presentation on the MS LIS program. The changes since the last advisory board meeting on May 1, 2015 were emphasized. The presentation was followed by a question and answer period. This was followed by two discussion sessions – the first with the entire Board and the second, a breakout session in which members were divided into four groups. The strategic priorities for 2015 – 2016 served as the framework for the first discussion. For the breakout session members were asked to discuss topics of interest from the first discussion. Lastly, each group reported on its discussion in a wrap-up session before closing. The members of the Advisory Board are listed in Appendix G.

SUMMARY

Q & A following the presentation

In reviewing the questions during this session, they could be categorized as those relating to 1) student demographics, i.e. a profile of St. John's DLIS students, 2) collection management, and 3) the new student organization DLISSA.

The session began with the question "where do DLIS students come from?" This was followed by rough estimates with regards to full-time/part-time status and proximity to the Queens Campus. Age was mentioned as another important variable and the potential importance for recruitment of analyzing geographic data on our current students. DLIS will follow-up with the Office of Institutional Research to develop a student 'profile' or 'fact sheet'.

LIS 211 Collection Development and Management of Knowledge Resources was changed in 2014 from a core course to an elective course. In the two-year course cycle it is scheduled to run every two years. Comments stressed the importance of collection management in libraries today in the context of reductions in space, the virtualization of services, and new processes for needs assessment. The rationale behind removing LIS 211 as a core course was its coverage in part in other core and elective courses. DLIS will monitor collection management practice in the field to inform revisions of LIS 211 and the frequency with which it is offered.

There were questions on the organization of the new DLIS student association (DLISSA). DLISSA was formed in September 2015 and is governed by an Executive Board with Michael Crossfox, DLIS Administrative Assistant, serving as DLIS liaison. DLISSA meets every two weeks and the meetings are accessible online. Meetings usually have invited speakers. Events off-campus are often coordinated with the three neighboring LIS Schools – Palmer, Pratt, and Queens. A highlight this year was the student symposium Saturday April 23rd at the Manhattan Campus.

Discussion with the entire Board

This session began with a brief overview by Jim Vorbach, DLIS Director, of the strategic priorities which guided DLIS this past academic year (Appendix A). The Director asked the Board for comments on priorities of interest. The discussion focused on topics in priorities 1 and 5.

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

The discussion was driven by questions relating to the manner in which professional and social interactions were encouraged, organized, and supported within DLIS. Webinars were initiated by DLIS in September, but the newly formed student organization DLISSA gradually assumed responsibility for webinar presentations. The biweekly webinars became part of the DLISSA meetings. DLISSA organized social interactions at restaurants and often collaborated with the respective student organizations at neighboring LIS Schools. It was suggested to invite Advisory Board members to speak at DLISSA meetings about the importance of presenting at conferences.

To encourage professional engagement, DLIS utilized the 2015 H. W. Wilson Foundation \$10,000 Scholarship Grant to support up to five annual \$500 awards for presenting a paper or poster, serving on a panel at a professional conference, or for receiving recognition for distinguished service in a professional activity (e.g. internship, committee service for a professional organization). This year's awards went to students presenting at Long Island Popular Culture and Libraries Conference (LI PopCon) and State University of New York Library Association (SUNYLA) Annual Conference.

Strategic Priority 5. DLIS will continue to encourage and develop opportunities for academic service-learning (AS-L), internships, independent study courses, applied projects, study abroad, and other high-impact practices to ensure students learn skills which best position them in an information landscape characterized by technological change.

There were questions on academic service-learning (AS-L) relating to its use in the program and its evaluation. AS-L integrates coursework and community service. The service must directly relate to course objectives and provide an immediate benefit for the community served. AS-L is required in the core course LIS 203 *Organization of Information* and the elective LIS 238 *Web Design*, and is optional in several electives in the Archival Studies specialization. Its evaluation is limited currently to the assessment criteria in the respective courses.

There were several questions on internships revolving around communication of internship opportunities, paid versus unpaid internships, and evaluation. There are three interconnected methods for communicating information on internships to students. The student digest is an email going out to all students each week. The digest has a section for current internship announcements. Each internship on the digest has a brief description and a link to the DLIS blog (<http://sjudlis.com>) post where details and any related attachments are accessed. The DLIS LibGuide contains information on internships in general and the necessary forms to be completed by the student and host supervisor. The DLIS LibGuide is accessed from the Resources drop-down menu on the DLIS blog or directly via its URL.

Internships are for credit only. This is university policy at this time. When DLIS receives announcements of paid internships, these are classified as part-time jobs on the blog to avoid any confusion with credit-only internships. Internship credits may vary from 0 through 3, as determined by the number of on-site hours required, i.e. 40 hours per credit. A 0-credit internship also requires 40 hours and is useful for students who do not need the credit. It permits them to register for an internship opportunity at no cost.

Assessment of internships is limited to the manual evaluation forms currently required of the student and the host site supervisor at the end of the internship. There are other deliverables, such as a research report and a log book, which the student submits to his/her faculty internship supervisor, but the two evaluation forms are the instruments for assessing the internship experience and host site. These forms are difficult to use because they consist of open items primarily and cannot be uploaded into an automated system for analysis, in their current format. DLIS plans to revise these evaluation forms and implement the revised forms in Survey Monkey.

Breakout Session and Wrap-Up

The Board was divided into four groups, each having five members. The session began with Jim Vorbach inviting the groups to explore more deeply comments made in the earlier discussion or other topics of interest to the group. Each group selected a recorder from one of its members who summarized the group's discussion and presented the summary during the wrap-up session that concluded the Board meeting. The comments from the wrap-up session and the notes provided by group recorders were categorized upon review as: 1) marketing and recruitment, 2) preparing students for today's jobs, and 3) LIS 211 Collection Development and Management of Knowledge Resources.

Marketing and Recruitment

DLIS should use social media to reach prospective and already invested market segments, and communicate the program strengths to these segments. For example, consider having several alumni administrators for the alumni LinkedIn group who will coordinate the posts.

With regards to outreach to undergraduates, there were several discussion points:

1. Capitalize on undergraduates' interest with targeted messages related to aspects of LIS education and careers. It was believed that the trend in libraries towards virtual collections would be more attractive towards undergraduates.
2. Get the attention of tech-savvy prospective students by highlighting the potential use of new technologies when they enter the profession.
3. Participate at career day events.
4. Promote the program in neighboring states without LIS schools. The example mentioned was how the University of Missouri gets most of the LIS students from Nebraska where there is no LIS school.

DLIS should promote the unique aspects of the program such as its small size, the social justice commitment, and online classes. Online assessment tools can be used to gather testimonials, especially from unique students such as those online who are far away. In marketing new programs such as the

Certification in Management for Information Professionals (CMIP), care must be taken to distinguish them from similar programs in the area.

Preparing Students for Today's Jobs

One group suggested that DLIS should focus on graduating “creative thinkers and nimble adaptors”. There should be increased emphasis on technology and virtual libraries. Graduates need a global perspective. Important skills needed for today’s jobs include: negotiating skills, understanding contracts, and vendor relations. Capstone projects about sustainability and planning were considered valuable. The new Certificate in Management for Information Professionals (CMIP) may serve as a framework for courses with these skills. As currently proposed, the CMIP program has a required capstone course.

Students should be required to write a professional development plan, underscoring the significance of continuous professional growth beyond graduation. Attendance and participation in meetings of professional organizations should be emphasized and such evidence included as an option in their ePortfolios. Currently, students may include work presented at professional meetings in Goal 7 *Experience Continuing Education and Lifelong Learning* of their ePortfolios. Some members felt that the ePortfolio should be restructured to emphasize the connections between courses, i.e. how the courses work together.

One group recommended that DLIS monitor local Civil Service requirements and communicate them to students, particularly as test deadlines near. The example of Suffolk County’s entry-level requirements, which were revised six years ago, was discussed.

The DLIS Student Association’s hosting of an inter-LIS school Symposium at the Manhattan campus in April was well-received. It was suggested that selecting a site for the event other than the host school, may improve participation by the other LIS schools. Some sites mentioned as possibilities were NYPL, QPL, BPL, NLS, and SCLS.

LIS 211 Collection Development & Management of Knowledge Resources

The status of LIS 211 was changed from a required core course to an elective course last year. There was concern that important topics, particularly in the context of changes in collection management in libraries today, are being adequately covered in other core and elective courses. There was a suggestion to create a ‘course map’ to evaluate coverage of those topics and to use for advisement purposes. DLIS currently maintains a course map which relates each course to its corresponding program goal/s.

Advisory Board Meeting Evaluation

Background. The Advisory Board was reconstituted in May 2015. Following the May 6, 2016 meeting, an evaluation survey (Appendix F) was distributed to members to get their feedback on the format of the meeting and recommendations for improvement. The first question refers to the effectiveness of the meeting format in general. The second question refers specifically to the breakout session which was new at this second meeting. The third question requests feedback on the format of next year's meeting and the final question gives respondents the opportunity to provide DLIS with additional comments.

Results.

With regards to the meeting format (Q1), 100% felt the meeting was "very effective" or "effective", though most (86%) felt the meeting was just "effective". Regarding the new breakout session (Q2), 86% felt the session was "very effective" or "effective", while 14% felt the session was "somewhat effective". The comments on Q2 (below) provided detailed information to consider.

- i. The session was too noisy; the room was too small to have four breakout groups
- ii. Allocate more time to discuss the conclusions/suggestions of the groups after the session
- iii. Give each group a specific question to focus on
- iv. Distribute the topics for discussion before the meeting
- v. Consider a "world café" approach for the next meeting where each 'table' has a topic and the groups rotate; the comments of the previous group/s remain at each table for the next group/s
- vi. There was some confusion regarding the topic of the breakout session

Regarding the format of next year's meeting (Q3), 71% responded "keep the May 6th format" and 29% responded to "make the change suggested in the comment". Note, May 6th 2016 was the date of the board meeting. Looking at the three comments, one referred to his/her comment in Q2, the other two are listed below:

- i. Develop one or two themes/questions in advance and distribute to the Board prior to the meeting
- ii. Meet at noon, starting with lunch, from 12:00 – 4:00pm; this would permit a more efficient use of the day.

When asked for additional comments (Q4), one respondent was interested in hearing the results from the new two-year-out alumni survey. A second respondent expressed that he/she enjoyed "learning about the direction of the Division as well as the experiences of the other participants." The third and final comment called for revisiting the decision to remove Collection Development from the core (required) courses and provided several detailed reasons for doing so.

Summary.

While the overall feedback from the meeting was good, there are several clear alternatives to consider for improvement. Board members should participate in the review of these results and in the planning process as well. The above results will be presented to DLIS faculty at the first faculty meeting on August

30th with the recommendation that a planning meeting be scheduled during the January intercession to set the format and agenda for the May 2017 Advisory Board meeting. An invitation will be extended to all Board members to attend the planning meeting.

Law Librarianship Advisory Board Meetings

Date: September 21, 2015, 12:00pm-1:30pm

Summary. This meeting introduced DLIS' newest faculty member, Dr. Rajesh Singh, who will be leading the proposal preparation effort for the new Certificate in Management for Information Professionals (CMIP) program. The discussion reinforced the outcomes of the June 5, 2015 meeting regarding the need, requirements, and audience for the new CMIP program. The take-away was that Rajesh Singh and Jim Vorbach would begin preparing the CMIP proposal.

Date: February 8, 2016, 4:00pm-5:00pm

Summary. Jim Vorbach updated the members on the process of approving new programs and the status of the CMIP proposal. He estimated that the CMIP proposal would be approved by September 2016. A discussion followed on the course interests of members and the target audience for the CMIP program. Rajesh Singh noted any course-specific comments for the preparation of syllabi for the new courses.

Members

Valerie Carullo – Bloomberg/BNA- Law School Relations Manager

Elaine Egan – Shearman and Sterling LLP

Alirio Gomez – Director of Library and Information Science, Milbank Tweed

Ralph Monaco, Executive Director, New York Law Institute (retired) and Assistant Adjunct
Professor, DLIS, St John's University

Jean O'Grady – Director of Research Services – DlaPiper

Stacy Posillico

Taryn Rucinski, Branch Librarian, United States Court of Appeals, Second Circuit

Dr. Rajesh Singh – Assistant Professor, DLIS, St John's University

Dr. James Vorbach – Director and Associate Professor, DLIS, St John's University

Course Artifact Assessment

Over a four year period each course will be assessed to determine how well students are learning the program goals related to the course's content. 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 of learning the course's related program goals. At the end of the course, the faculty member completes a form (Appendix H) describing the class' performance, reviewing the artifact's role as a measure, and any course revisions as a result. Sample artifacts with their respective reviews are provided for the ALA-CoA External Review Panel (ERP) visit. Spring 2015 was the first use of this form of assessment. Table 1 indicates the status of this review including the courses in the queue for the Fall 2016 term.

Table 1. Curriculum Map & Course Artifact Assessment

Course Code	Course Name	Program Goals & Outcomes	Faculty	Review	Next review
	CORE				
LIS 203	Organization of Information	3A, 3B	Angel	Spring 2015	Spring 2017
LIS 204	Introduction to Library and Information Science	1A, 1B, 1C, 1E, 2A, 2B, 3A, 5A, 7A	Rioux	Fall 2015	Fall 2017
LIS 205	Introduction to Information Sources and Services	1A, 4A, 5A, 5B, 7A, 7B, 8A, 8B	Lee	Fall 2015	Fall 2017
LIS 239	Research and Evaluation Methods	1A, 1B, 1D, 3A, 6A	Singh	Fall 2015	Fall 2017
	MANAGEMENT				
LIS 240	Management of Libraries and Information Centers	1A, 1D, 4A, 5C, 7A, 7B, 8A, 8B	Singh/ Squillante	Spring 2016	Spring 2020
LIS 243	Law Library Administration	8A, 8B	Monaco		
	ELECTIVES				
LIS 121	Literature & Related Resources for Children	2B, 7A	Lee	Fall 2016	Fall 2020
LIS 125	Library Materials and Services for Young Children	2B, 4A	Lee	Spring 2015	Spring 2019
LIS 126	Literature & Related Resources for Young Adults	2B, 7A	Lee		
LIS 127	Library Programs & Services for Children and Young Adults	2B, 4A, 7A, 8A, 8B	Lee	Spring 2016	Spring 2020
LIS 211	Collection Development	1A, 2A, 2B, 3A, 5A, 5B, 5C, 6A, 8A, 8B	Rioux		
LIS 213	Popular Culture and Young Adults	2B, 4A, 8B	Lee		
LIS 221	Planning and Delivering Information Literacy Programs	5B, 5C, 7A, 7B	Shaughnessy		
LIS 222	Materials and Services to Diverse Populations	1A, 1B, 1C, 1D, 5B, 5C, 7A, 7B	Rioux		
LIS 230	Introduction to Digital Libraries	1B, 1D, 3A, 3B, 4A, 5B	Angel		

LIS 231	College and University Libraries	8A, 8B	Rioux	Spring 2016	Spring 2020
LIS 232	Special Libraries and Information Centers	8A, 8B	TBA		
LIS 233	Public Libraries and Community Information Centers	8A, 8B	Rioux		
LIS 237	Metadata for Information Professionals	1A, 1D, 3A, 3B	Vorbach	Fall 2015	Fall 2019
LIS 238	Web Design for Libraries and Information Centers	4A	Vorbach	Spring 2015	Spring 2019
LIS 245	Special Collections Librarianship and History of the Book: Principles and Practice	2A, 2B, 3A, 8B	Roveland-Brenton	Fall 2016	
LIS 248	Database Modeling and Design	3A, 3B, 4A	Vorbach	Fall 2016	
LIS 249	Archives and Records Management	1A, 1C, 3A, 3B, 5C, 7B	Angel	Fall 2015	Fall 2019
LIS 253	Oral History	4A, 7B	Szylvian	Spring 2016	Spring 2020
LIS 254	Legal Research	6A	Monaco	Fall 2016	
LIS 255	Advanced Legal Research	6A	Monaco		
LIS 257	Archival Representation	1C, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B, 4A, 5A, 5B, 8B	Angel	Fall 2016	
LIS 258	Museum Informatics	3A, 3B, 4A	Angel		
LIS 260	Information Use and Users	1B, 1D, 2A, 3A, 4A, 5A, 5B, 5C, 6A, 7B, 8B	Rioux		
LIS 261	Information Sources and Services for Children and Young Adults	2B, 4A, 5A, 5C, 7B	Lee		
LIS 269	Internship (269-3cr; 269A-school adult; 269B-1cr; 269C-school children; 269D-2cr; 269E- 0cr)	7A, 7B	all faculty		
LIS 271	Special Topics: Teen Space	1A, 1B, 1C, 4A	Lee		
LIS 271	Special Topics: Graphic Novels in Libraries	1A, 1B, 2B, 5B, 8B	Fuchs		
LIS 271	Special Topics: Grantsmanship – Fundraising for Librarians	1A, 1D, 8A, 8B	Zabriskie		
LIS 272	Exploring New York Libraries, Archives, and Museums	1A, 7A	Adams		
LIS 281	Competitive Intelligence	3A, 4A, 6A	TBA		
LIS 282	Knowledge Management	2A, 2B, 8A, 8B	Singh		
LIS 283	Social Justice and the Information Profession	1A, 1B, 1D, 2B, 4A, 5B, 5C	Rioux		
LIS 302	Genealogical Sources & Services	3A, 4A, 5A, 5B, 5C	Earle		

Appendix

A. Strategic Priorities of 2015 – 2016 and Implementation Efforts

1. Develop and promote activities which engage students both professionally and socially. DLIS students work primarily in an online environment with little face to face contact with peers. Activities will be developed which will engage students on a regular basis with particular consideration for the online student.
 - a) A series of biweekly webinars will be developed as a forum for student organization meetings, talks by faculty and outside professionals.
 - b) Students will be encouraged to participate in professional conferences by presenting papers, posters, and through volunteering. Funds are available from the H.W. Wilson Foundation and the Graduate Division of Arts & Science to support such activities. A website will be developed to facilitate attendance at professional meetings by indicating who else will be attending. Students will be encouraged to include their presentations as evidence of program goal 7, Lifelong Learning, in their e-portfolios. Communications related to upcoming professional meetings will be improved using a revised calendar tool and longer lead times.

Steps Taken

- a) A biweekly webinar series was initiated in September 2015. Concurrently the DLIS Student Association (DLISSA) was formed which soon assumed responsibility for the webinar series. DLISSA met biweekly; the meetings were accessible to online students. DLISSA invited presenters from career services and the information professional community. DLISSA organized a student symposium on April 23, 2016 at St. John's Manhattan Campus.
 - b) Four students were awarded the H. W. Wilson Professional Development Scholarship. Three students in the Youth Services specialization presented on a panel at LI PopCon on April 14th and the fourth student will be presenting a poster at SUNYLA's Annual Conference in June.
 - c) Two students will be attending the 2016 ALA Annual Conference and one will be attending the 2016 SLA Annual Conference, both in June. The students' transportation expenses will be paid in part by DLIS.
 - d) The calendar tool on the DLIS LibGuide has been revised to include the dates of professional meetings in the New York Metro area.
2. Launch an alumni mentorship program in Fall 2015 which will connect interested students with alumni in their area of interest. The alumni profile survey has identified over 30 alumni willing to participate. The new two-year-out survey will grow this initial group by inviting recent alumni to participate. Such relationships will help students refine career goals and strengthen the bond between DLIS and program alumni.

Steps Taken

The alumni mentoring program was formed in January 2016. To date, students have shown little interest in the program. DLIS needs to consider new approaches to better promote this relationship between students and alumni.

3. Develop a marketing and recruitment strategy. This consists of correcting problems in the web site and graduate bulletin, outreach to local libraries, joint conference sponsorships such as LI Popular Culture and Libraries Conference (LI PopCon), promotions at the major regional and national conferences, diversifying outreach to number and types of professional organizations (including libraries, archives, records management facilities, and genealogical organizations), advertising in select journals such as American Librarians and ALA Cognotes, delivering our message to regional as well as our own undergraduates, and investigating ways to bring our message to secondary schools. One such effort which is currently underway is the DLIS – St. John the Baptist H.S. partnership through academic service-learning.

Steps Taken

Although DLIS did not develop a formal marketing and recruitment strategic plan, steps were taken to implement some of the above initiatives.

- a) The DLIS web pages on St. John's University's web site (<http://www.stjohns.edu>) were improved, and the graduate bulletin was updated.
 - b) DLIS continued to co-sponsor LI PopCon 2016 with NCLA and SCLA, and was a Bronze-level sponsor at the 2016 Association for Library and Information Science Education (ALISE) Conference. St. John's Office of Graduate Admissions funded the Bronze-level sponsorship.
 - c) DLIS continued to have a table in the exhibit area at the Annual Long Island Libraries Conference (LILC). For the first time, the table was funded by St. John's Office of Graduate Admissions. At the 2016 American Library Association (ALA) Conference, DLIS will participate in the ALISE LIS Schools area in the Exhibits Hall and in the Alumni Cooperative Reunion. In addition, DLIS plans to have a table in the exhibit area at the 2016 New York Library Association (NYLA) Conference in November.
 - d) DLIS was represented at regional conferences and meetings in the New York City area including ACRL-NY, SLA-NY, Metro's Annual, LILRC's Annual, and LILRC's 50th Gala.
 - e) DLIS students mentored students in St. John the Baptist Diocesan High School as part of an academic service-learning project in LIS 238 Web Design in the Spring term.
 - f) Both the DLIS Blog and Newsletter were redesigned to improve their organization, navigation, and visual appeal.
4. Planned curricular refinements consist of 1) revising the two-year course cycle and improving the communication of course offering plan to students and 2) developing dual degree and certificate programs which will strengthen career outcomes, attract new students, leverage faculty strengths, and distinguish our program from the competition. Preliminary work has identified three new programs and one program to be revised.

- a. Dual degree in Public History and LIS has a draft proposal in place. With modest revisions, this can be submitted September.
- b. Two new certificate programs are currently being evaluated. The law librarianship advisory board felt strongly that a certificate in leadership and project management will attract mid-level professionals who need the skills to advance. In preliminary discussions between DLIS and the Art and Design department, a certificate program in Digital Curation and Stewardship was seen as a valuable path for both current students and professionals wishing to enter this growing field.

Steps Taken

- a) The Dual degree MA in Public History/MS LIS program proposal was completed and was presented to the Academic Affairs Committee of the University's Board of Trustees on May 12th. The Board approved the proposal and it is currently being reviewed by New York State Education Department (NYSED), which is the final step in the approval process.
 - b) On the recommendation of the Law Librarianship committee of the DLIS Advisory Board, the Certificate in Management for Information Professionals proposal was developed. The proposal was approved by the Liberal Arts Faculty Council in February. The New York State HET forms were completed and are currently being reviewed in the Provost's Office prior to submission to NYSED. NYSED approval is expected by September 1, 2016.
 - c) Preliminary discussions among faculty in DLIS, Department of History, and the Department of Art and Design identified a need and a market for a certificate program in Digital Curation and Stewardship. Work on this certificate program is scheduled to begin in September.
 - d) The DLIS LibGuide was created to improve communication of program content previously stored on the LIS 270 Colloquia web site in Blackboard. The LibGuide houses the revised two-year course cycle and the course-offerings by term reports.
5. DLIS will continue to encourage and develop opportunities for academic service-learning (AS-L), internships, independent study courses, applied projects, study abroad, and other high-impact practices to ensure students learn skills which best position them in an information landscape characterized by technological change. Additionally, these activities will help students build their professional network. We are strengthening current relationships with AS-L partners such as the Center for Migration Studies, the Paulist Fathers Archives, and St. John the Baptist Diocesan High School and will develop new relationships subject to available resources. Existing initiatives will be evaluated in light of current resources, and guide future budget requests.

Steps Taken

- a) AS-L continues to be used in the core course LIS 203 Organization of Information, in several elective courses in the archival studies specialization, and in LIS 238 Web Design. Relationships have been expanded to include additional libraries and cultural heritage institutions.

- b) A two-week study abroad program was developed for Summer 2016, consisting of two courses taken concurrently at St. John's campus in Paris. The program was developed in collaboration with Dr. Gerry Benoit and Dr. Jim Matarazzo of Simmons College who were to be the respective courses' instructors. Unfortunately, an insufficient number of students signed up and the program failed to run. Plans are to offer this program again in Summer 2018. In Summer 2017, the Cultural Immersion Program in Jamaica is planned.
 - c) The proposed Certificate in Management for Information Professionals program includes a new capstone course, LIS 264 Project Leadership for Information Professionals Capstone.
 - d) DLIS posts internship opportunities on the weekly digest and blog.
6. Lastly, DLIS will complete the steps in the 2014-2015 assessment plan. These steps consist of:
- a. Administer the new student survey in September 2015.
 - b. Revise the E-Portfolio rubric.
 - c. Review the self-studies of Library Schools recently accredited for comparison purposes. The self-studies are available from the ALA's web site.
 - d. 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.
 - e. Review the program goals and outcomes. Any required changes will be in place for to the May 2016 advisory board meeting.

Steps Taken

This year a, b, d, and e were completed. Item c, review the self-studies of recently accredited programs, was postponed to the 2016-2017 academic year.

B. Annual Student Survey: Spring 2016

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

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Academic Librarianship	34.1%	14
Archival Studies	39.0%	16
Law Librarianship	19.5%	8
Public Librarianship	48.8%	20
School Media	12.2%	5
Special Librarianship	12.2%	5
Youth Services	39.0%	16
I am undecided	2.4%	1
<i>answered question</i>		41
<i>skipped question</i>		0

2. Of the concentrations you selected above, at the present time, which of these is your primary intended concentration? (Select one)

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Academic Librarianship	12.2%	5
Archival Studies	29.3%	12
Law Librarianship	12.2%	5
Public Librarianship	19.5%	8
School Media	7.3%	3
Special Librarianship	0.0%	0
Youth Services	14.6%	6
I am undecided	4.9%	2
<i>answered question</i>		41
<i>skipped question</i>		0

3. During the new student orientation, we explained that the goal of our program was to not only prepare you to become a library or information professional, but to also prepare you to become a leader who would make a difference in society as well as the profession. In your opinion, how well are we doing?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent	20.0%	8
Very Good	60.0%	24
Fair	20.0%	8
Poor	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		40
<i>skipped question</i>		1

4. Rate your experience with each of the following:

Answer Options	Excellent	Very Good	Fair	Poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Faculty feedback about your work.	16	20	3	0	1.67	39
Access to continuing opportunities for guidance and counseling.	17	17	6	0	1.73	40
Access to continuing opportunities for placement assistance	12	19	7	2	1.98	40
Administrative and staff support	17	13	8	2	1.88	40
Physical facilities for accomplishing the objectives of the MS LIS program	12	18	7	1	1.92	38
<i>answered question</i>						40
<i>skipped question</i>						1

5. Please rate the effectiveness of the DLIS Director as a leader of the Division:

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Very Effective	62.5%	25
Effective	37.5%	15
Somewhat effective	0.0%	0
Not at all effective	0.0%	0
Please comment on your response:		12
answered question		40
skipped question		1

8. Please indicate the number of credits you have completed as of the beginning of the Spring 2016 Semester. Do not include credits for incomplete classes.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Less than 6 credits	21.1%	8
7-18 credits	50.0%	19
More than 18 credits	28.9%	11
answered question		38
skipped question		3

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

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Very well prepared	36.7%	11
Well prepared	46.7%	14
Somewhat prepared	16.7%	5
Not at all prepared	0.0%	0
answered question		30
skipped question		11

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

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	86.2%	25
No	13.8%	4
Please explain:		12
answered question		29
skipped question		12

C. Exit Survey - Spring 2016

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

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	42.9%	3
Agree	28.6%	2
Neutral	28.6%	2
Disagree	0.0%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0
Comment		1
<i>answered question</i>		7
<i>skipped question</i>		0

2. My interactions with faculty members were generally positive.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	57.1%	4
Agree	42.9%	3
Neutral	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0
Comment		1
<i>answered question</i>		7
<i>skipped question</i>		0

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

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	42.9%	3
Agree	57.1%	4
Neutral	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0
Comment		0
<i>answered question</i>		7
<i>skipped question</i>		0

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

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	71.4%	5
Agree	28.6%	2
Neutral	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0
Comment		0
	<i>answered question</i>	7
	<i>skipped question</i>	0

5. I received useful information from my faculty advisor.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	42.9%	3
Agree	28.6%	2
Neutral	28.6%	2
Disagree	0.0%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0
Comment		1
	<i>answered question</i>	7
	<i>skipped question</i>	0

6. The faculty were effective teachers.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	28.6%	2
Agree	57.1%	4
Neutral	14.3%	1
Disagree	0.0%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0
Comment		1
	<i>answered question</i>	7
	<i>skipped question</i>	0

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

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	14.3%	1
Agree	57.1%	4
Neutral	14.3%	1
Disagree	14.3%	1
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0
Comment		2
<i>answered question</i>		7
<i>skipped question</i>		0

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

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	42.9%	3
Agree	14.3%	1
Neutral	28.6%	2
Disagree	14.3%	1
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0
Comment		2
<i>answered question</i>		7
<i>skipped question</i>		0

9. I had access to appropriate library resources, software and related technology to support my educational needs.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	71.4%	5
Agree	28.6%	2
Neutral	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0
Comment		0
<i>answered question</i>		7
<i>skipped question</i>		0

10. I am prepared to enter the workforce in my chosen area.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	42.9%	3
Agree	57.1%	4
Neutral	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0
Comment		0
<i>answered question</i>		7
<i>skipped question</i>		0

11. I would recommend this program to others.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	28.6%	2
Agree	57.1%	4
Neutral	14.3%	1
Disagree	0.0%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0
Other (please specify)		1
<i>answered question</i>		7
<i>skipped question</i>		0

12. If I decide to continue graduate study, I would choose St. John's.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	14.3%	1
Agree	42.9%	3
Neutral	28.6%	2
Disagree	14.3%	1
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0
Comment		1
<i>answered question</i>		7
<i>skipped question</i>		0

D. Entering Student Survey - Spring 2016

1. How did you find out about the St. John's MS-LIS program?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Recommendation from an Alumni of the program and/or librarian	28.6%	2
Career counselors in the college where I earned my previous degree	14.3%	1
American Library Association website/directory	57.1%	4
St. John's University website	42.9%	3
Other (please explain)		2
answered question		7
skipped question		0

2. What were your reasons for choosing to pursue your graduate education at this institution? Please check all that apply.		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Nature of the program and course offerings	85.7%	6
Reputation of the school, department, and/or faculty	42.9%	3
Recommendation of colleague or family member	42.9%	3
Availability of funding/scholarship	42.9%	3
Location	42.9%	3
Other (please describe)	14.3%	1
answered question		7
skipped question		0

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

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Nature of the program and course offerings	42.9%	3
Reputation of the school, department, and/or faculty	14.3%	1
Recommendation of colleague or family member	14.3%	1
Availability of funding/scholarship	0.0%	0
Location	14.3%	1
Other (please describe)	14.3%	1
answered question		7
skipped question		0

4. Are you?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Female	85.7%	6
Male	14.3%	1
answered question		7
skipped question		0

5. To which age group do you belong?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
25 years or younger	42.9%	3
26-40 years	57.1%	4
41-55 years	0.0%	0
55 or older	0.0%	0
answered question		7
skipped question		0

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

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Undergraduate student	14.3%	1
Graduate student	42.9%	3
Volunteer/community service	14.3%	1
Caring for family	28.6%	2
Employed in a field related to information studies	14.3%	1
Employed in a field unrelated to information studies	57.1%	4
Other (please describe)	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		7
<i>skipped question</i>		0

7. What is your current status?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Full-time (9-12 credits/semester)	14.3%	1
Part-time (3-6 credits/semester)	85.7%	6
<i>answered question</i>		7
<i>skipped question</i>		0

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

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Enjoy a rewarding career	100.0%	7
Be a mentor to new information professionals	71.4%	5
Publish articles in professional journals	28.6%	2
Publish articles in academic journals	28.6%	2
Volunteer my professional services	57.1%	4
Be a high-level manager or executive	42.9%	3
Be an independent consultant	14.3%	1
Start my own business	28.6%	2
Be an innovator and leader in my field	42.9%	3
Pursue another Master's degree or PhD	28.6%	2
Other (please specify)	0.0%	0
answered question		7
skipped question		0

9. How useful was the New Student Orientation?			
Answer Options	Not Useful	Useful	Very Useful
	0	3	4
answered question			7
skipped question			0

E. 2016 Alumni Two-Year-Out Survey

1. I was satisfied with the quality of the program.		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	33.3%	3
Agree	44.4%	4
Neutral	11.1%	1
Disagree	11.1%	1
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0
Comment		1
<i>answered question</i>		9
<i>skipped question</i>		0

2. My interactions with faculty members were generally positive.		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	44.4%	4
Agree	55.6%	5
Neutral	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0
Comment		1
<i>answered question</i>		9
<i>skipped question</i>		0

3. My interactions with my fellow students were generally positive.		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	66.7%	6
Agree	33.3%	3
Neutral	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0
Comment		1
<i>answered question</i>		9
<i>skipped question</i>		0

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

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	66.7%	6
Agree	11.1%	1
Neutral	11.1%	1
Disagree	11.1%	1
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0
Comment		1
<i>answered question</i>		9
<i>skipped question</i>		0

5. I received useful information from my faculty advisor.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	50.0%	4
Agree	37.5%	3
Neutral	12.5%	1
Disagree	0.0%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0
Comment		1
<i>answered question</i>		8
<i>skipped question</i>		1

6. The faculty were effective teachers.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	37.5%	3
Agree	62.5%	5
Neutral	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0
Comment		1
<i>answered question</i>		8
<i>skipped question</i>		1

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

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	25.0%	2
Agree	75.0%	6
Neutral	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0
Comment		1
answered question		8
skipped question		1

8. I had access to appropriate library resources, software and related technology to support my career interests.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	37.5%	3
Agree	62.5%	5
Neutral	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0
Comment		1
answered question		8
skipped question		1

9. I was prepared to enter the workforce in my chosen area.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	28.6%	2
Agree	57.1%	4
Neutral	14.3%	1
Disagree	0.0%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0
Comment		1
answered question		7
skipped question		2

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

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	28.6%	2
Agree	28.6%	2
Neutral	0.0%	0
Disagree	42.9%	3
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0
Comment		1
<i>answered question</i>		7
<i>skipped question</i>		2

12. I would recommend this program to others.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	14.3%	1
Agree	71.4%	5
Neutral	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Strongly Disagree	14.3%	1
Other (please specify)		1
<i>answered question</i>		7
<i>skipped question</i>		2

13. If I decide to continue graduate study, I would choose St. John's.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	0.0%	0
Agree	42.9%	3
Neutral	28.6%	2
Disagree	28.6%	2
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0
Comment		1
<i>answered question</i>		7
<i>skipped question</i>		2

F. Advisory Board May 2016 Meeting Evaluation

1. How effective was the format of the meeting?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Not Effective	0	0
Somewhat Effective	0	0
Effective	85.7%	6
Very Effective	14.3%	1
Comments		
		<i>answered question: 7</i>
		<i>skipped question: 0</i>

2. At the May 6th meeting, there was a breakout session after lunch where attendees discussed one or more strategic directions in small groups. How effective was this session?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Not Effective	0.0%	0
Somewhat Effective	14.3%	1
Effective	71.4%	5
Very Effective	14.3%	1
Comment		6
		<i>answered question 7</i>
		<i>skipped question 0</i>

3. How could the advisory board meeting be made more effective next year?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Keep the May 6th format	71.4%	5
Make the change suggested in the comment below	28.6%	2
Comment		3
		<i>answered question 7</i>
		<i>skipped question 0</i>

G. Advisory Board Members*

First Name	Last Name	Title	Organization
Kathryn	Baumgartner	Student	DLIS
Valerie	Carullo	Law School Relationship Manager	Bloomberg BNA
Margaux	DelGuidice	Teacher Librarian	Garden City H.S.
Taina	Evans	Youth Services Librarian	Brooklyn Public Library
Caroline	Fuchs	Associate Prof/Librarian	St. John's University Libraries
Alirio	Gomez	Information Services Consultant	Agomez Consulting, Inc.
Alyse	Hennig	Assistant Archivist	St. John's University Libraries
Shabeer	Khan	Director, Information Services	Kaye Scholer LLP
Lisa	Kropp	Assistant Director	Lindenhurst Memorial Library
Michelle	Levy	Archivist	Paulist Fathers
Ralph	Monaco	retired	New York Law Institute
Michael	Morea	Director	Gold Coast Public Library
Dan	Murphy	Knowledge Manager	
Tom	Nielsen	Director, Membership Services	Metropolitan NY Library Council
Jean	O'Grady	Director, Research Services	DLA Piper LLP
Christina	Orozco	Archivist	Paulist Fathers
Jamie	Papandrea	Director	Brookhaven Public Library
Elizabeth	Pollicino Murphy	Director	St. Joseph College Libraries
Stacy	Posillico	Law Librarian	
Susan	Roby Berdinka	Information Services	Self-Employed
Blythe	Roveland- Brenton	University Archivist	St. John's University Libraries
Taryn	Rucinski	Branch Librarian	US Court of Appeals, 2nd Circuit
Kathryn	Shaughnessy	Associate Prof/Librarian	St. John's University Libraries
Anthony	Todman	Associate Prof/Librarian	St. John's University Libraries
Satasha	Williams	Student	DLIS
Christian	Zabriskie	Reference Librarian	Queens Public Library

*not including DLIS faculty (C. Angel, S. Lee, K. Rioux, R. Singh, K. Szylvian, and J. Vorbach) and staff (M. Crossfox)

H. Course Artifact Assessment Form

Course:

Term:

Instructor:

Date:

Complete each of the following sections.

1. Program Goals/Outcomes Related to the Course
2. Description of Artifact/s
3. Describe the students' overall performance.
4. Did students' performance on the artifact meet your expectations with regards to satisfying the program goals and outcomes?
5. If expectations were not met, what actions do you recommend to improve the course?

revised 12/14/2015