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1. Respondents to question 1 could select more than one response.
   60.9% faculty, 15.6% administration
   35.9% practitioners
   17.2% employers of graduates

   Only 34.4% self-identified as graduates of LIS programs.
   “Other” respondents included: retired MLIS faculty (1), ex-adjunct MLIS faculty, and “a leader in ALA/ACRL.”

2. Respondents to question 2 answered the survey primarily from the point of view of LIS faculty (51.6%) or administration (14.1%).
   Practitioners 17.2%
   Employers 6.3%
   A few others answered as ERP members or program graduates.

3. Question 3 asked for “feedback on how well the concept of planning is addressed in Standard II.” Using a 5-point scale, the survey asked if the standard “is clear that LIS curricula should be planned and coherent as a result of an ‘ongoing broad-based, systematic planning process.’”
   58 answered; 7 did not.
   43.1% strongly agreed, an equal number agreed (43.1%); or were neutral (8.6%).

   Ten respondents provided additional comments. Four of the ten commented that
   the Committee needed to make clear its definition of “broad-based” and /or the phrase: ‘ongoing broad-based, systematic planning process.’

   One suggested that the standard
   is process oriented and that processes do not guarantee good results;
another suggested the addition of some minor prescriptive elements; while another suggested the addition of the phrase, “and the planning process includes making data-driven decisions for improving practice.”

4. Question 4 asked for feedback on how well the concept of use of competency statements is addressed in Standard II. Using a 5-point scale, the survey asked if the standard makes clear “that competency statements of relevant professional organizations should be addressed by the curriculum.” 55 respondents answered; 10 did not; 49.1% agreed; 25.5% strongly; 7.3% were neutral; 14.5% disagreed, 3.6% strongly.

Ten respondents provided additional comments. One commented that

Standard II only requires competencies for specializations - that there is no call for competencies that could apply to a generalist;

another that

it should be clearer that Standard II does not refer only to the ALA competency statement;

another was unclear what was meant by specializations (an area of concentration or a full program?).

Three others wrote that

the phrase “should be addressed by the curriculum” was far too broad, one suggesting that the phrase in Standard II should read: “…should be explicitly aligned in the curriculum.”

5. Question 5 asked for feedback on how well the concept of distance delivery is addressed in Standard II.6, which states that the curriculum, regardless of forms or locations of delivery selected, conforms to the requirements of the Standards. Using a 5-point scale, the survey asked if the standard makes clear “that curriculum delivered online or via distance education is to
conform to the standards as required for any other form of delivery.”
54 answered; 11 did not.
50% strongly agreed
31% agreed
5.6% were neutral
11.1% disagreed, 1.9% strongly.

Ten respondents provided additional comments; one felt that our focus has been on face-to-face delivery;
several felt that accreditation is not able to deal with distance delivery;
others felt the standards should be clearer
one suggesting delivery standards in addition to content standards.

6. Question 6 asks if Standard II is clear that the evaluation of the curriculum "is used for ongoing appraisal, to make improvements, and to plan for the future."
53 answered; 12 did not.
39.6% strongly agreed
41.5% agreed
9.4% were neutral
9.5% disagreed, none strongly.

Six respondents provided additional comments. One commented that Standards I and II are often confounded due to similarities in wording and little distinction between program and curriculum goals;
one repeated a comment about data-driven decisions and two requested that the Committee should require proof of such.

7. Question 7 asks if Standard II is clear that the curriculum should be continually evaluated with input from all relevant constituents.
53 answered; 12 did not.
34% strongly agreed
45.3% agreed
9.4% were neutral
7.5% disagreed 3.8% strongly.

Ten respondents provided additional comments, centering around two themes:
- “relevant” constituencies should be named
- The Standard could be clearer in requiring that input should be planned for.

8. Question 8 asked for any additional suggestions on revisions to Standard II.
16 commented.
One suggested that results from these surveys be shared with Deans in a Delphi survey format
One was concerned that ALA holds meetings at annual and midwinter for deans that exclude faculty, who are the most involved.
One suggested that COA require programs to complete a form similar to one which NCATE requires presumably outlining, by course, assessment types and how they align with course and program goals.