

COA Survey on 2008 Standards, Part 1
Standard I Mission, Goals, and Objectives
January 19-June 4, 2010
Summary of Responses (n=116)

1. Respondents to question
 - 76.7% LIS education community (60.3% faculty, 16.4% administration)
 - 32.8% Practitioners
 - 18.1% Employers of graduates

Respondents could select more than one response.

Only 28.4% self-identified as graduates of LIS programs.

“Other” responses included “retired” and “ERP member.”

2. Respondents to question 2 answered the survey primarily from the point of view of LIS faculty (50.9%) or administration (16.4%); 23.3% answered as practitioners; 6% as employers. A few others answered as ERP members or program graduates.
3. Question 3 asked for “feedback on how well the concept of effective planning is addressed in Standard I.” Using a 5-point scale, the survey asked if the standard “makes clear the expectation that LIS programs need to engage in an ‘ongoing broad-based, systematic planning process.’”
The majority, 93.5% agreed (45.7% strongly agreed and 47.8% agreed), 6.5% were neutral. Ninety two (92) of the 116 respondents (79%) answered, but 24 did not.

Eight respondents provided additional comments. One commented that planning was a waste of time. Others commented that the Committee needs to

**make clear its expectations and explain the meaning of the phrase
“ongoing broad-based, systematic planning process.”**

One suggested that, in defining what we mean, we

**focus on the outcome we want, namely that each program show
evidence of planning as it pertains to each standard – the cumulative
result being, then, a “continuous process.”**

Another suggested that we

**give better guidelines, to ERP members especially, on what types of
evidence to seek and how to determine that the process is really
ongoing and meant to be, rather than one put together just for the
ERP visit.**

4. Question 4 asked for feedback on how well the concept of achievement of goals and objectives is addressed in Standard I. Using a 5-point scale, the survey asked if the standard makes clear “what determines achievement of goals and objectives”. Respondents agreed (45%; 20% strongly); 13.8% were neutral; 17.5% disagreed, 3.8% strongly. 80 answered; 36 did not.

Eleven respondents provided additional comments. Many wrote to the effect that they had a difficult time differentiating between goals, objectives, and student learning outcomes, measuring them, and determining when they have been reached.

It was suggested that the Committee provide more resources for programs to help them in this regard. One commented that

goals should “stretch” a program to new levels; that an emphasis by the Committee on achievement could cause programs to be more conservative, thus the emphasis should be on determining the ongoing use of a planning process to drive decisions.

5. Question 5 asked for feedback on how well the concept of student learning outcomes evaluation is addressed in Standard I. Using a 5-point scale, the survey asked if the standard makes clear “what constitutes effective evaluation of student learning outcomes”. Slightly less than half responding agreed (36%; 13.3% strongly); 24% were neutral; 20% disagreed, 6.7% strongly. 75 answered (65%); 41 did not.

Sixteen respondents provided additional comments, which fell into two broad areas. First, there was a general

lack of clarity regarding student learning outcomes, what constitutes a valid one, and how to measure them.

Second, there was

fear expressed that the Committee would move toward being very specific regarding outcomes and how to evaluate them

6. Question 6 asked for any additional suggestions on revisions to Standard I. Twenty-five commented. Many centered around the fact that

student learning outcomes are not clearly understood

that the Committee should

make things clearer, either through definitions of terms, specific examples, in particular, what constitutes a ‘ongoing broad-based, systematic planning process.’

One commented that

further clarification on what documents the ERP members can ask for, along with what recourse they have when those documents are not provided, and conversely, what records and documents programs need to keep and make available.

Several felt that

requirements for a program’s mission and vision should be strengthened because the vision and mission are so important.