Division of Library and Information Science

Strategic Plan 2015 – 2016

and

Assessment Report 2014 - 2015

Prepared by: James Vorbach, Director DLIS
Submitted: July 2, 2015
Approved: September 1, 2015

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

Purpose. The purpose of this document is to report on the Strategic Plan of the Division of Library and Information Science (DLIS) for 2015 – 2016 based on the results of the 2014 – 2015 assessments and the strategic directions of St. John's University. The document begins with the institutional context, followed by the Strategic Plan, then summaries of each of the assessments.

Background. A major accomplishment of the 2014 –2015 academic year was the development of a program assessment plan. While various measures have been in place for some time, 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 LIS programs at the New York Library Association (NYLA) Annual Conference and the American Library Association (ALA) Midwinter Conference, the exit and alumni profile surveys were added, and the new student survey and course assessment with respect to program were revised. The complete list of measures appears in Table 1.

Measure	Date of Event/Administration (planned)	Comment
Alumni Profile Survey	February 2015	New measure
Student Survey	April 2015	
Advisory Board	May 1, 2015	New board
Exit Survey	May 2015	New measure
E-Portfolio Reviews	Aug 2014, Dec 2014, May 2015	Rubric being revised for Fall 2015
Course Artifact Assessment	May 2015	Revised
Law Librarianship Advisory Board	June 5, 2015	New board
New Student Survey	(Sept 2015)	Revised

Table 1.

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

1) Administer the new student survey in September 2015.
2) Revise the E-Portfolio rubric. (Appendix E)
3) Review the self-studies of Library Schools recently accredited for comparison purposes. The self-studies are available from the ALA's web site.
4) 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.
5) Review the program goals and outcomes. Any required changes will be in place for to the May 2016 advisory board meeting.

Institutional Context

In October 2014, St. John's University President Dr. Conrado "Bobby" Gempesaw formed the Strategic Priorities Working Group (SPWG). The SPWG consisted of faculty and administrators from a wide range of disciplines or business areas. The SPWG was empowered to develop a set of goals and corresponding action items for each of the four strategic priorities below.

1. Ensure student success
2. Recruit, recognize, and retain the best faculty, staff, and administers
3. Enhance the teaching and learning environment
4. Expand global and community partnerships

The resulting framework of priorities, goals and actions was completed in draft form in June 2014 (DRAFT Strategic Plan, Appendix B). This framework provides strategic direction for the University going forward and informs the strategic decisions of each unit (college and department) in the University. DLIS' strategic plan 2015 – 2016 is strongly connected to this framework and thus contributes towards its realization.

Strategic Plan 2015 – 2016

Informed by the various assessments over the past year, the Division of Library and Information Science (DLIS) has developed a plan consisting of six objectives to guide our efforts toward improving the MS LIS program and increasing enrollment of strong MS candidates. Following each objective is a list of one or more sources on which the objective is based. The citation key below identifies the acronym and the appendix where the corresponding report is located. For conciseness, faculty meeting minutes are not identified individually.

Citation Key (Appendix)

AB: Advisory Board (G)	FM: Faculty Meeting minutes
AP: Alumni Profile Survey (F)	LAB: Law Librarianship Advisory Board (H)
EP: E-Portfolio Assessment (E)	SP1.1: SJU Strategic Plan (Draft) priority 1, action item 1 (B)
ES: Exit Survey (D)	StS: Student Survey (C)

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. [AB, FM, StS]
   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.
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. [AB, AP, FM, SP1.2]
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 Libraries and Popular Culture Conference (LI PopCon, April 2015), 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. [AB, FM, SP4.2]

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. [ES, FM, LAB]
    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.
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 develop new relationships subject to available resources. Existing initiatives will be evaluated in light of current resources, and guide future budget requests. (ES, SP1.4, SP4.2)
6. Lastly, DLIS will complete the steps in the 2014-2015 assessment plan, detailed at the end of the Executive Summary.

Appendices

A. **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. Fulfulling 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

---

[1] ALA Core Competencies
http://www.ala.org/educationcareers/sites/ala.org.educationcareers/files/content/careers/corecomp/corecompetences/finalcorecompstat09.pdf

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

Goal 5. Apply Reference and User Services

A. Demonstrate knowledge and usage of the concepts, principles, and techniques of reference and user services, as well as retrieval techniques and evaluation methods, that provide access to relevant and accurate recorded knowledge and information from diverse sources to all patrons.

B. Understand and demonstrate ability to interact successfully with individuals of all ages and groups to provide consultation, mediation, and guidance in their use of recorded knowledge and information, including information literacy techniques and methods.

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

Goal 6. Master Research Methods

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

Goal 7. Experience Continuing Education and Lifelong Learning

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.

B. St. John's University - Draft Strategic Plan (June 4)

Preamble

Since its founding in 1870, St. John's University has provided a diverse student body with access to a high quality education grounded in the Catholic intellectual tradition and Vincentian ethos.

As we approach our 150th anniversary, there is much to celebrate, but, as Dr. Conrado "Bobby" Gempesaw said at his installation in October 2014, "a great university is never content with the way things are; it seeks to be better." The Strategic Priorities Working Group, a diverse group of faculty and administrators, was charged by Dr. Gempesaw with developing a shared framework for addressing the university's strategic priorities and converting those priorities into action.

This plan, which is designed to further our mission as a Catholic, Vincentian, Metropolitan, and Global University, directs our actions to four priorities. The first, and most important, is ensuring student success, with a particular focus on retention, persistence, graduation, career success, and life-long engagement. The other three priorities are the pillars that support student success. We will recruit, retain, and recognize the best faculty, staff, and administrators. We will enhance our teaching and learning environment. And we will expand our global and community partnerships.

We best ensure our students' success through a culture of shared ownership and a structure of shared responsibility. In short, student success is the primary responsibility of every member of the St. John's community. This plan is designed to convert that goal into action by empowering academic and administrative leaders, ensuring rigorous review and assessment of outcomes, ensuring academic excellence across all colleges and programs, and promoting a culture of accountability.

This plan and our actions under it are designed to enhance our commitment to St. John's University's core values. We will continue to promote an educational environment steeped in the Catholic intellectual tradition, as well as respect, compassion, truthfulness, opportunity, and the Vincentian commitment to serving those in need. We will also work to fully integrate our mission in our academic programs through a reinvigorated Core Curriculum, the implementation of high impact educational practices, and an expansion of our global and community partnerships.

Four action steps have been identified for each strategic priority. These action steps resulted from an intensive six-month process of input and feedback involving hundreds of members of the university community. The completed university-wide plan reflects the broad-based and inclusive process through which it was developed. At its heart is a commitment to shared ownership and shared responsibility that will promote academic excellence, advance our mission, ensure student success and ensure that, in the words of Dr. Gempesaw, "when we reach our 150th anniversary in 2020, St. John's will be an even stronger and better university than it is today."

-- The Strategic Priorities Working Group

Priority 1: Ensure student success

1. Enrollment Management: Pursue a dynamic enrollment strategy sensitive to nuances of the primary and secondary markets, our mission, and other key variables consistent with efforts to increase the retention, persistence, graduation rates, and overall academic achievement of our students, as well as the strategic goals of each college. Expand partnerships with local schools, especially Catholic elementary and high schools. Optimize articulation agreements with local community colleges to facilitate transfer student enrollment. Leverage existing relationships with guidance counselors, administrators, and students at these schools, and actively cultivate new ones, through robust recruitment, on-campus events, and faculty participation. Expand partnerships with universities and organizations world-wide to increase the number of international students enrolled in undergraduate and graduate programs. Develop college-specific graduate enrollment strategies designed to increase enrollment, quality, and program brand recognition.

2. Advisement, Mentoring, and Career Development: Reorganize undergraduate advisement, including associated technologies and data management, with more functions located in individual colleges/schools, significant faculty involvement, and integration with career development. Identify a senior administrator responsible for coordinating university-wide student success initiatives and for ensuring accountability for college-specific initiatives. Enhance graduate student academic and career advisement and placement.

3. Core Curriculum: Present to the Board of Trustees in Fall 2015 a revitalized undergraduate core curriculum that is flexible, cohesive, integrated with our mission, and consistent with University learning goals and outcomes. The new core should reflect best practices for integrative general education, including exposure to high-impact practices and assessment of learning outcomes. The core should include a first-year seminar that develops students' intellectual and practical competencies and introduces them to the St. John's mission. The new core should be structured so that students can readily double major, double degree, minor, take courses from any college, or transfer into St. John's without negative impact on retention and graduation.

4. High-Impact Educational Practices: In addition to the first-year seminar, ensure that high-impact practices – including undergraduate research, academic service-learning, internships, capstone courses, field experiences, honors program, university academic scholars, and other signature experiences – are integrated into each student's education.   Redesign curricular pathways to be rich in problem-based learning and culminate in applied projects for all undergraduate students.

Priority 2: Recruit, recognize, and retain the best faculty, staff, and administrators

1. Responsibility-Centered Leadership: Prepare individual plans for each academic and administrative unit, including for each satellite campus, indicating how each unit will contribute to the University-wide strategic plan. Assess the unit plans on an annual basis to ensure that targets are met. Train and develop academic and administrative leadership to advance an ownership culture. Recognizing the high cost of education and importance of student success, develop a revenue sharing system, based on appropriate targets, that creates incentives for individual

academic and administrative units to increase net tuition revenue; to strategically manage expenses; and to increase retention, persistence to graduation, career placement, fundraising, and faculty productivity and engagement.

2. Recruitment: Fill faculty positions through national and international searches to recruit the best candidates consistent with unit and institutional strategic priorities in alignment with disciplinary hiring season. Develop a faculty mentoring and development process for junior faculty. Fill key administrator positions through a combination of national and international searches and by promoting the best personnel from within. Develop processes for identifying and cultivating internal talent for administrative positions. Emphasize mission in hiring and develop more robust mission orientation and development program

3. Employee Performance, Evaluation, and Compensation: Measure and manage the quality of individual staff, administrator, and faculty performance to promote a culture of shared ownership and accountability. Reexamine the Partnership for Performance (PFP) process and instrument to ensure close alignment of compensation with performance and facilitate individual growth and advancement. Reexamine the faculty evaluation, compensation, and support structure, including that provided for in the collective bargaining agreement, to more closely align compensation and scholarly support with performance and provide additional opportunities for individual growth and advancement.

4. Scholarly Productivity and Faculty Engagement: Enhance faculty scholarly and creative activity and engagement to advance excellence in teaching, research, and service. Through fundraising initiatives, create more endowed chairs and professorships to recruit, recognize, and retain the best faculty.

Priority 3: Enhance the teaching and learning environment

Action items:

1. Integrated Technology Solutions for Teaching, Learning, and Student Success Pipeline: Develop and employ integrated technology solutions that support and enhance recruitment, advisement, retention, persistence, graduation, career placement, and alumni engagement. Train faculty and staff to make effective use of technology solutions to ensure student success.

2. Faculty Development: Develop and employ a comprehensive approach to faculty development and training to encourage pedagogy that engages students, enhances student learning, incorporates high-impact practices, and makes effective use of technology in curriculum delivery as appropriate.

3. Facilities Planning: Form a new university-wide group to identify the critical priorities of facilities needs and report its findings to the Provost and Vice President for Business Affairs. The group will develop a long-term, comprehensive master space plan in alignment with the University's strategic priority to ensure student success. The group will also develop appropriate standards of condition, accessibility, and appearance for all classrooms and learning spaces. [

4. <u>Technology Planning and Infrastructure</u>: Form a new university-wide group to identify critical technology priorities and needs and to report its findings to the Provost and the Vice President for Business Affairs. The group will meet formally to make recommendations of how technology will be utilized to enhance the teaching and learning environment and to promote student success.

Priority 4: Expand global and community partnerships

1. <u>Institutional Advancement</u>: Launch a major capital campaign, with the goal of creating new funding sources for the University's strategic priorities, to celebrate the University's 150th year anniversary. Increase coordination between Institutional Advancement and the academic units, including by co-locating major gift officers and alumni relations personnel in each college and involving deans and academic leaders directly in fundraising efforts and the setting of fundraising strategy. Increase coordination between Alumni Relations, Career Services, Office of University Mission, and the academic units to strengthen ties to the alumni network and grow student opportunities for mentoring, experiential learning, and career placement.

2. <u>Academic and Community Partnerships</u>: Foster relationships with global and domestic academic and community institutions to create partnerships that capitalize on St. John's strongest programs and supplement areas of strategic need. Expand academic partnerships with global institutions to increase the number of visiting scholars at St. John's and to increase the number of St. John's faculty members teaching and studying abroad. Develop new study-abroad programs in other regions such as in Asia and South America to augment existing St. John's facility locations in Europe.

3. <u>Student Support Services</u>: Develop robust support services for all students, recognizing the diverse needs of our domestic and international students, consistent with our mission as a Metropolitan and Global University. Ensure that our academic programs appropriately reflect the academic diversity of our students and foster success at all levels.

4. <u>Public Relations</u>: Enhance the St. John's identity through a public relations strategy that engages the University community with a sense of pride and ownership, showcasing student-faculty-employee achievements, athletics, and mission; and with a strong external component regionally.

C. **Annual Student Survey, administered April 2015**

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

Review by Question.

1. Archives, public and youth services are the three leading concentrations (Q1). When asked to select a primary area, archives dominates (Q2) at 36%, with youth services (14%) and public (12%) a distant second and third respectively. The preference for the archival concentration 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.

D. Exit Survey, administered May 2015

Note, Questions in the survey are cited using the notation "Qn", where n denotes the number of the question.

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 program of study and answer questions covering five areas: program, interactions, teaching, course offerings, and resources. These areas serve to categorize the survey's questions in Table 1. Of the eighteen May graduates, nine responded to the survey, a 50% response rate.

Category	Questions	Responses
Program	Q1: Satisfied with the program	89% strongly agree or agree
	Q10: Prepared to enter the workforce	78% strongly agree or agree 22% neutral
	Q11: Recommend program to others	89% strongly agree or agree
	Q12: Choose St. John's, if decide to continue graduate study	67% strongly agree or agree 22% disagree or strongly disagree
Interactions	Q2: Interactions with faculty generally positive	100% strongly agree or agree
	Q3: Interactions with fellow students generally positive	89% strongly agree or agree
	Q4: Interactions with office staff generally positive	78% strongly agree or agree
	Q5: Received useful information from faculty advisors	89% strongly agree or agree
Teaching	Q6: Faculty were effective teachers	89% strongly agree or agree
Course Offerings	Q7: Satisfied with the variety of course offerings	56% strongly agree or agree 33% disagree or strongly disagree
	Q8: Satisfied with the frequency of course offerings	67% strongly agree or agree 33% neutral or disagree
Resources	Q9: Had access to appropriate library resources, software and related technology to support educational needs	100% strongly agree or agree

Table 1 – 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. E-Portfolio Assessment 2013-2015

Background

The e-portfolio replaced the comprehensive exam in Spring 2013 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 outcomes (Pass/Fail) assigned by the two reviewers 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 1. The target pass rate of 100% was attained in each graduation period, with only one exception, Spring 2014. 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.

	Spring 2015	Fall 2014	Summer 2014	Spring 2014	Fall 2013	Spring 2013
Total	18	6	7	12	6	22
Total passed	18	6	7	11	6	22
Pass rate	100%	100%	100.00%	91.67%	100.00%	100.00%
Average (all portfolios)	93.33	92.68	93.64	86.50	94.33	93.14
Average (wo failures)	93.33	92.68	93.64	90.95	94.33	93.14
Ave Diff	8.22	6.64	6.43	9.67	6.00	5.54

Table 1. E-Portfolio Summary

Next steps

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.

F. 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.

Table 1.

Alumni Profile - Date of Graduation		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
After 2010	75.6%	31
2005-2009	14.6%	6
2000-2004	4.9%	2
1995-1999	4.9%	2
1990-1994	0.0%	0
Before 1990	0.0%	0
	answered question	41
	skipped question	0

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 2 summarizes the results.

Table 2.

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?

Answer Options	Q1 (Percent)	Q1 (Count)	Q2 (Percent)	Q2 (Count)	Q3 (Percent)	Q3 (Count)
Yes	69.2%	27	47.5%	19	82.5%	33
No	30.8%	12	52.5%	21	17.5%	7
answered question		39		40		40
skipped question		2		1		1

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.

G. **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, replacing the comprehensive exam in 2013.

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

H. 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 staple of 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]. Not sure if there is a student's division at ILTA. 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. Internship or close alignments with organizations such as ILTA were a possible way of doing this. Outreach to individuals such as LTN editor Monica Bay. Explore cooperation with Legal Tech[5] as well as Suffolk University Institute on Law Practice technology & innovation[6].

Summary.

The discussion identified several problems in the field including 1) attitude of some law librarians towards technology, i.e. resistance to learn, 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/
[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 support, big data, web services, virtual reference desk, portal technology, mobility; the emphasis was on 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.

I. 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. Two of the three instructors' reports follow.

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, professinalism, 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.