



# Annual Assessment Report

Pratt Institute School of Information

Recommended by Faculty Council and approved by the SI Dean on September 8, 2017.

## Overview

In December 2015, the Faculty Council adopted a [new set of goals for the School](#), and in April 2017 a set of indicators and targets that could be used to measure the extent to which the goals were being met. The purpose of the Annual Assessment Report is to assess the extent to which the School's goals are being met and identify opportunities for improvement. This evaluative work informs the [Action Plan](#) for the 2017/2018 academic year which aims to drive improvement to the programs and school through ensuring that schools goals are addressed.

## Goals, Indicators, Targets with Breakdown by Program and School-wide Actuals

Key: ∅ = No graduates or alumni OR first entering cohort is yet to graduate for MSIXD and MSDAV programs that began in fall 2016.

Acronyms: CC = School Curriculum Committee, GSS = Graduating Student Survey, AS = Alumni Survey, AFS = Annual Faculty Survey

Dates: Data collected from 9/1/2016 to 8/31/2017

Note: MSLMS data is concatenated with MSLIS data.

Goals & Indicators	Target	MSLIS Actual	MSMDC Actual	MSIXD Actual	MSDAV Actual	Overall (School-wide) Actual
<i>Goal 1: To offer a current, forward-looking, and high-quality curriculum that supports academic inquiry and student learning.</i>						
The school offers a variety of new, revised, and special topics courses each academic year	Yes	n/a				Yes. See: <a href="#">Annual School Curriculum Committee Report (2016/2017)</a> .
Percent of courses have been reviewed for quality in the past five years.	100%	< 100% required courses. MSLIS core curriculum review is underway and revised curriculum scheduled to be presented to CC in Feb. 2018.	100% required courses reviewed by CC in 2014.	100% required courses reviewed by CC in 2015.	100% required courses reviewed by CC in 2015.	< 100% In progress. School Curriculum Committee is beginning implementation of " <a href="#">Plan for Reviewing Entire SI Curriculum</a> " which runs from Fall 2017 to Spring 2022 and is keeping track of <a href="#">last review date</a> for all curriculum components.
Percent of courses support academic inquiry in some form	100%	n/a				100%

The curriculum reflects current knowledge and skills identified by potential employers	Yes	In-progress. MSLIS core curriculum review currently underway includes substantial analysis of knowledge and skills sought by employers.	Curriculum approved in 2014 by school curriculum committee and needs of employers are discussed in curriculum proposal. However, additional analysis of employer needs is needed.	Received informal feedback on the curriculum from a UX industry expert in April 2017, which was mostly positive. Will create a more systematic process for soliciting industry feedback in this AY.	Received curriculum feedback from potential employers at a breakout session of NYC Tech Talent Pipeline's Academic Summit in April 2016. Additional feedback will be sought once graduating student portfolios are available.	In-progress. This is an area that all programs are working on in some respect - see details.
Percent of graduates agree/strongly agree that they "found the curriculum to be up to date"	85%	85.71% N=63 (GSS)	∅	∅	∅	85.71% N=63 (GSS)
Percent of graduates agree/strongly agree that "course offerings aligned well with my professional goals"	85%	87.50% N=63 (GSS)	∅	∅	∅	87.50% N=63 (GSS)
Percent of sections have an average rating of 3.0 or higher (on a 4.0 scale) on course evaluations for the following questions:  "The content of the course was consistent with the syllabus"	100%	n/a				97.33% N=812, 73/75 course sections (Course Eval)
"This course improved my understanding of the subject matter"	100%	n/a				94.67% N=812, 71/75 course sections (Course Eval)
"I would recommend this course to another student"	100%	n/a				89.33% N=812, 67/75 course sections (Course Eval)
Alumni report a variety of beneficial learning experiences that specifically mention curriculum	Yes	Yes See <a href="#">Appendix LIS2</a>	∅	∅	∅	Yes
Percent of sections are taught by full-time faculty	>50%	n/a				65.9%
There is a complete and up-to-date	Yes	Yes.	No	No	No	No

mapping of courses to program learning outcomes		Last update on web: <a href="#">September 2016</a>				
Goal 2: To prepare students for a variety of careers in the information field through a range of graduate-level educational programs that challenge students creatively, critically, and ethically.						
Percent of students pass their program's graduation requirement	100%	100% N=64	∅	100% N=3	∅	100% N=64
Percent of students report that they pursued one or more areas of study in their program	100%	93.65% N=63 (GSS)	∅	∅	∅	93.65% N=63 (GSS)
Percent of alumni are employed within nine months of graduation <b>and</b> percent report being on a career path consistent with their goals	90% and 80%	86.11% N=36 (AS) and 79.31% N=29 (AS)	∅	∅	∅	86.11% N=36 (AS) and 79.31% N=29 (AS)
Recent graduates hold a range of job titles at various institutions	Yes	Yes (see <a href="#">Appendix LIS1</a> )	∅	∅	∅	Yes
Percent of graduates and alumni agree/strongly agree that Pratt School of Information offered a quality program that prepared them to work in the information professions	85% and 85%	92.05% N=63 (GSS) and 88.89% N=36 (AS)	∅	∅	∅	92.05% N=63 (GSS) and 88.89% N=36 (AS)
Percent of graduates and alumni would recommend Pratt School of Information to a friend, colleague, or family member	85% and 85%	92.19% N=64 (GSS) and 86.11% N=36 (AS)	∅	∅	∅	92.19% N=64 (GSS) and 86.11% N=36 (AS)
Percent of students graduate within three years	90%	84.3% (Average percent from 2000/2010 to 2012/2013)	∅	∅	∅	84.3%
All programs have learning outcomes that incorporate the ability to meet creative, critical, and ethical challenges	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No.
Goal 3: To sustain excellence in face-to-face teaching.						

Percent of sections are offered in person	100%	n/a				100%
Percent of sections have a class size of 6–18 students	100%	n/a				84.1% Note: Average class-size is 11.37 students. 6 sections with less than 6 students and 8 sections with more than 18.
Percent of sections have an average rating of 3.0 or higher (on a 4.0 scale) on student course evaluations for the following questions:  “The instructor presented the subject matter clearly”	100%	n/a				92% N=813, 69/75 course sections (Course Eval)
“The instructor utilized class time well”	100%	n/a				93.33% N=814, 70/75 course sections (Course Eval)
“The instructor promoted a constructive classroom climate”	100%	n/a				94.67% N=811, 71/75 course sections (Course Eval)
“I would recommend this instructor to another student”	100%	n/a				92% N=813, 69/75 course sections (Course Eval)
Percent of graduates agree/strongly agree that “the program faculty are effective teachers”	85%	98.44% N=64 (GSS)	∅	∅	∅	98.44% N=64 (GSS)
Graduating students and alumni report a variety of beneficial learning experiences that specifically mention teaching	Yes	Yes See <a href="#">Appendix LIS3</a> .	∅	∅	∅	Yes
<i>Goal 4: To enrich the student experience through experiential and project-based learning, international study, co-curricular and extracurricular activities, and one-on-one mentoring and advisement.</i>						
Minimum number of courses per semester (fall and spring) include projects with external partners	5	n/a				7 in fall, 5 in spring, and 1 in summer (see <a href="#">Appendix SI2</a> ).
Internship course options are available to students every semester	Yes	n/a				LIS 698 Practicum offered in fall and spring. LIS 9600 internship course was available to international students in the summer.

Minimum number of fellowship opportunities are offered every academic year	10	n/a				13
Minimum number of study abroad courses offered every academic year	1	n/a				1 LIS 697 London Summer School: The Arts & Digital Culture offered June 26-July 7.
Minimum number of events are offered by SI office and student groups per academic year	50	n/a				~60
Percent of students are assigned a full-time faculty advisor in their first semester	100%	n/a				100%
Percent of graduates who said they sought advising from their faculty advisor	80%	89.06% N=64 (GSS)	∅	∅	∅	89.06% N=64 (GSS)
Percent of graduates who sought advising and agreed/strongly agreed that their faculty advisor provided helpful academic advisement	80%	89.47% N=64 (GSS)	∅	∅	∅	89.47% N=64 (GSS)
<b>Goal 5: To foster a culturally responsive learning environment.</b>						
Percent of graduating students agree/strongly agree that: "The School created an inclusive and welcoming environment"	85%	Insufficient data.	∅	∅	∅	Insufficient data. This question has been recently added to the course evaluation.
"My experience at Pratt School of Information helped me develop a deeper cultural awareness"	85%	Insufficient data.	∅	∅	∅	Insufficient data. This question has been recently added to the course evaluation.
Percent of sections have an average rating of 3.0 or higher (on a 4.0 scale) on student course evaluations for the following questions:  "The instructor promoted a constructive classroom climate"	100%	n/a				94.67% N=811, 71/75 course sections (Course Eval)
"This course helped me developed a deeper cultural awareness"	100%	n/a				100% N=13, 2/2 course sections (Course Eval) Note: This question has been recently added to the course evaluation and only includes

						summer 2017 results.
At least one culturally responsive event is hosted and organized by SI or student groups each semester	Yes	n/a				Yes, culturally responsive events were held this academic year (see <a href="#">Appendix SI1</a> ).
<b>Goal 6: To recruit and retain highly qualified students.</b>						
Percent of accepted students meet admissions standards determined by each program, with enrollment yield rates determined by each program	100%	100% meet admissions standards set by 2016/17 Dean; however, 2016/2017 program coordinator reports no involvement in setting admission standards, reviewing admissions files or setting enrollment yield rates.	100% met the admissions standards determined by the 2016/2017 Dean, who was also the program coordinator.	No data for 2016/17	100% met admission standards, but no involvement in setting enrollment yield rates	Additional work is needed in involving program coordinators in admissions and enrollment.
Recruitment efforts carried out by the Office of Admissions are determined with input from each program	Yes	No, 2016/2017 program coordinator reports no involvement.	Yes	No. Program coordinator had no input on recruitment strategies in 2016/17.	No. Program coordinator had no input on recruitment strategies in 2016/17.	Greater interaction between Office of Admissions and program coordinators is required.
Admissions and recruitment efforts carried are aligned with the School's two-year enrollment plan	Yes	No, 2016/2017 program coordinator reports no knowledge of a two-year enrollment plan.	Unknown.	No plan existed for 2016/17	No plan existed for 2016/17, but FC set maximum of 15 students for Fall 2017	An enrollment plan is needed.
Percent student retention rate	95%	96.5%	60.0%	88.2%	100%	86% (average)
<b>Goal 7: To cultivate qualified faculty members who engage in high-quality research, participate in scholarly activities, and/or are experts in their field of practice.</b>						
Percent of full-time faculty publish in accordance with their rank and tenure status	100%	n/a				100% N=8 (AFS)
Percent of part-time faculty have a record of recent and continued professional work	100%	n/a				100%

related to the courses they teach						
Faculty are appointed, reviewed, reappointed, and promoted through SI's peer review process in alignment with Pratt's Collective Bargaining Agreement and the Faculty Handbook	Yes	n/a				Yes
Policies and procedures for recruiting and hiring full-time and part-time faculty are established and followed	Yes	n/a				Yes
Percent of graduates agree/strongly agree that "program faculty demonstrate expertise in their teaching areas"	80%	100% N=64 (GSS)	∅	∅	∅	100% N=64 (GSS)
<i>Goal 8. To maintain faculty and student service to the School, Institute, and information field.</i>						
Percent of full-time faculty participate in scholarly service activities, such as peer review for journals, conferences, and grants	100%	n/a				100% N=8 (AFS)
Percent of full-time faculty maintain membership in at least two professional associations	100%	n/a				100% N=8 (AFS)
Percent of full-time faculty participate in at least one Institute-level service activity each year (not including first-year faculty)	80%	n/a				87.5% N=8 (AFS)
Percent of full-time faculty participate in at least one School-level service activity each year	100%	n/a				100% N=8 (AFS)
Percent of graduates report being a member of at least one professional association during their time at Pratt	50%	Insufficient data.	∅	∅	∅	Insufficient data. This question has been recently added to the graduating student survey.
Minimum number of students involved in Institute-level service	1	n/a				0 Note: Director of Student Involvement and Assistant Director for Student Engagement indicated there was no SI student directly involved in Institute service but there has been in the past.

Minimum number of students are involved in School-level service (outside of student groups)	3	n/a				3 3 students served on the SI Faculty Council, among other service (e.g., volunteers at #infoshow17, etc.). 1 Distinguished Teacher Award (DTA) Committee Graduate Student Member (AY 2016-17)
<i>Goal 9. To pursue internal and external funding for innovation in research, teaching, and/or learning.</i>						
Minimum number of grant applications submitted by SI faculty each year to internal sources, such as Faculty Development Fund and Academic Initiatives Fund	1	n/a				2 N=8 (AFS)
Minimum number of grant applications submitted by SI faculty each year to external sources, such as foundations, federal agencies, and corporate sponsors	1	n/a				5 N=8 (AFS)
Percent of full-time faculty request stipends to support teaching and/or research activities each year	100%	n/a				75% N=8 (AFS)
<i>Goal 10. To provide excellent facilities and resources that support our mission.</i>						
Percent of funds for facility/resource improvements are allocated in alignment with School planning	100%	n/a				99% \$32,143 was allocated for facilities fees, and \$31,665 was spent.
Percent of graduates agree/strongly agree that they "had access to information resources that supported my learning outcomes"	90%	92.19% N=64 (GSS)	∅	∅	∅	92.19% N=64 (GSS)
Percent of graduates agree/strongly agree that "the technology resources available (computer labs, technology-enhanced classrooms, computer software) met my educational needs"	90%	84.37% N=64 (GSS)	∅	∅	∅	84.37% N=64 (GSS)
Percent of graduates agree/strongly agree that "Pratt provided a physical environment conducive for my learning"	80%	87.50% N=64 (GSS)	∅	∅	∅	87.50% N=64 (GSS)
<i>Goal 11. To practice transparency and openness in our communications and planning.</i>						



Stakeholder feedback is sought and documented for all major decisions, such as new or revised programs, policies, concentrations, scholarship opportunities, faculty hires, resources, and space	Yes	<i>n/a</i>				Although stakeholder feedback was sought in some of these areas (e.g., new faculty hire), there are other areas where it was less strong.
Events are held to inform the SI community of planning and decision-making and solicit feedback	Yes	Yes. 2 events to inform community about upcoming ALA accreditation and solicit feedback were held on Sept. 26 and Oct. 18, 2016. A event was held on April 27, 2017 to inform community about plans and decisions coming out of ALA accreditation.	Yes. MSDC program held a program feedback event on April 6, 2017.	No. The program coordinator met individually with many IXD students to discuss their experience, but there were no formal events to inform the students about program decisions or solicit their feedback.	Yes. Since the program is small, the program coordinator met with students individually to coordinate their plans against program plans.	While there were some events to solicit SI community feedback on planning and decision-making, it could be more evenly applied.
All major decisions (new or revised programs, policies, concentrations, scholarship opportunities, faculty hires, resources, space) are announced publicly through the listserv, website, and/or social media, as appropriate	Yes	<i>n/a</i>				Although some major decisions were announced publically (hiring of FT faculty member), others were less clearly communicated.
The School's vision, mission, and goals are published publicly on the website	Yes	<i>n/a</i>				Yes, online through the previous academic year.
Key School and program statistics are available publicly on the website	Yes	Yes, key MSLIS program statistics are available on the web, and last updated on Aug. 10, 2017.	No.	No.	No.	While MSLIS program statistics are available, other programs need to offer statistics as well.
Faculty Council meeting dates, times, and agendas are announced to all faculty (full-time and part-time) and student representatives	Yes	<i>n/a</i>				While meetings were announced, they did not necessarily have agendas.
Percent of School-level policies and guidelines, including fiscal policies, have been reviewed by the Faculty Council in the past five years	100%	<i>n/a</i>				< 100% Guidelines have been reviewed in the past five years, but one policy has not.

Student representatives participate in all Faculty Council meetings	Yes	n/a				Yes, student representatives attended all Faculty Council meetings.
Bylaws for standing and ad-hoc committees are available for all members	Yes	n/a				No, Faculty Council has no bylaws.
Percent of graduates agree/strongly agree that SI practices transparency and openness in its communications and planning	90%	Insufficient data.	∅	∅	∅	Insufficient data. This question has been recently added to graduating student survey.
Percent of graduates agree/strongly agree that SI's communication platforms are effective in providing information about events and activities that can enrich their experience	90%	Insufficient data.	∅	∅	∅	Insufficient data. This question has been recently added to graduating student survey.
A two-year course planning schedule is available to current students	Yes	n/a				No.
Course evaluations are available to current students	Yes	n/a				Yes, current evaluations available in the PMC 4th floor library.
An archive of past syllabi is available publicly	Yes	n/a				Yes, <a href="#">available online</a> .

### Appendix SI1: Culturally responsive events held during the academic year

10/4	SAA	Hispanic Society Tour
10/12	PALA (SILSSA)	Librarians as Labor: Lessons from the LIU Lockout
11/11	ASIS&T	Tour of Center for Jewish History
12/1	Debbie Rabina	Grey Literature End of Term Harvest
12/1	Mia Bruner	BPL Correctional Dept. Talk
4/8	UXPA	Planned Parenthood UXathon
4/18	SAA	Herstory Lesbian Archive Tour
4/22	SAA	Diversity, Inclusion and Accessibility Speaker Series
n.d.	ASIS&T	Rikers prison library book drive and book rebinding

### Appendix SI2: Courses with external partner during the academic year

Semester	Course	# sections	Partner
----------	--------	------------	---------

Fall 2016	LIS 652 Information Services and Sources	2	New York Public Library - Correctional Services Dept.
Fall 2016	LIS 625 Management of Archives and Special Collections	1	Green-Wood Cemetery
Fall 2016	LIS 673 Literacy and Instruction	1	Metropolitan College
Fall 2016	LIS 697 Content Strategy	1	Brooklyn Museum
Fall 2016	LIS 644 Usability Theory & Practice	1	PEN America, Fordham University
Fall 2016	LIS 640 Research Design & Methods	1	Brooklyn Public Library
Spring 2017	LIS 634 Conservation Lab	1	Brooklyn College
Spring 2017	LIS 652 Information Services and Sources	2	New York Public Library - Correctional Services Dept.
Spring 2017	LIS 665 Projects in Digital Archives	1	Brooklyn Public Library
Spring 2017	LIS 644 Usability Theory & Practice	1	St. Francis Library, National Cued Speech Association, New York Academy of Medicine Library, The Jewish Museum
Summer 2017	LIS 697 Audience Research and Evaluation	1	Brooklyn Museum

## MSLIS Program Data and Appendices

Indicators	Target	Actual	Notes
<i>e-Portfolio Data</i>			
First-time e-Portfolio pass rate		91.18%	62 out of 68 students passed on their first attempt
Percent of graduates who agree/strongly agree that “The e-Portfolio workshop I attended helped me in preparing and submitting my e-Portfolio”		100% N=54 (GSS)	Note that 12 students stated they did not attend a workshop.
Percent of graduates who agree/strongly agree that “Meeting with my advisor prior to submitting my e-Portfolio was useful”		98.21% N=56 (GSS)	Note that 10 students stated they did not meet with their advisor before submitting.
Percent of graduates who agree/strongly agree that “It was easy for me to find course projects to put into my e-Portfolio”		96.97% N=66 (GSS)	
Percent of graduates who agree/strongly agree that “The comments/feedback provided by my advisor were helpful in making improvements to my e-Portfolio”		94.55% N=66 (GSS)	Note that 11 students did not request or receive comments from advisor.
Percent of graduates who agree/strongly agree that “I believe that my e-Portfolio was assessed fairly”		100% N=64 (GSS)	2 students stated “I don’t know”
Percent of graduates who agree/strongly agree that “My e-Portfolio demonstrates the depth and breadth of knowledge I have gained at Pratt School of Information”		95.24% N=63 (GSS)	3 students stated “I don’t know”
<i>Program Curriculum</i>			
Percent of graduates who agree/strongly agree that <b>LIS-651</b> provided foundational knowledge		82.54% N=63 (GSS)	
Percent of graduates who agree/strongly agree that <b>LIS-652</b> provided foundational knowledge		89.23% N=65 (GSS)	
Percent of graduates who agree/strongly agree that <b>LIS-653</b> provided foundational knowledge		57.81% N=64 (GSS)	
Percent of graduates who agree/strongly agree that <b>LIS-654</b> provided foundational knowledge		96.88% N=64 (GSS)	
<i>Overall Perceptions</i>			
Percent of graduates who agree/strongly agree that “I feel that the program-level learning objectives (Research, Communication, User-Centered focus, Technology, Reflective Practice [LIS Practice]) served my learning goals.”		96.83% N=63 (GSS)	2 students reported “I don’t know”

Percent of alumni who agree/strongly agree that “Through my courses in the Pratt MSLIS program, I acquired knowledge that prepared me for my current employment.”		95.16% N=62 (GSS)	2 students reported “I don’t know”
Areas of study from Graduating Student Survey and/or Alumni Survey?		See <a href="#">Appendix LIS4</a>	
Types of organizations where alumni are employed (from alumni survey)?		See <a href="#">Appendix LIS5</a>	
Percent of alumni who agree/strongly agree that “my practicum experience helped prepare me for work in the information professions.”		81.25% N=16 (AS)	20 students reported “I did not take LIS 698 Practicum.”

### **Appendix LIS1: MSLIS Job Titles 9-months after program completion**

Art Digitization Project Manager, Assistant Digital and Metadata Librarian, Institutional Repository Assistant, Library Media Specialist , Research Data Support Specialist, Upper School Librarian, doctoral student and TA, Project Manager, METRO Fellow, Children's Sr. Librarian I, Program Officer, Assistant Archivist, Reference Librarian, Digital Archives Assistant, Fellow, Freelance social media assistant, Freelance writer, Assistant Archivist (part-time, temp.), Digital Initiatives Librarian, Curator of the OWU Historical Collection, Information Specialist , Sr. Publisher Support Specialist, Part-Time Adjunct Reference Librarian, Research Analyst, College Lecturer II, Library, Archives Technician, Collections Assistant, Metadata Operations Assistant, Manager of Research, Librarian, Access Services Assistant, Electronic Resources Librarian , Reference and Collections Librarian, Interim Evening & Weekend Library Manager, Library Media Specialist, UX Design Lead, Senior Children's Librarian, National digital stewardship resident, UX researcher and strategist

### **Appendix LIS2: MSLIS alumni report a variety of beneficial learning experiences that specifically mention curriculum**

*What learning experiences or aspects of the Pratt MSLIS program have been most beneficial to you post-graduation?*

- UX and collections (archival and special) classes. I learned a lot that applies to my job and where my career is headed....
- This is hard to answer. I feel much of my coursework has been beneficial to me post-graduation. My archives courses, my UX courses- especially usability core class and the summer IxD class, Info Viz, Programming for cultural heritage... Much of my core reference class is relevant to my work too.
- I work with students from kindergarten to 8th grade and all the pedagogical courses are an important part of my work post-graduation. The tween and YA literacy courses were beneficial with talking to students and creating collections aimed at this age range. But I also feel there are parts of many of my courses that play into how I organize the classes I teach.
- The technology and data related courses. Having great internship and practicum experiences in New York.
- Learning about pedagogy, opportunities for instruction, student teaching experience, getting to know the public school system... reference services course, opportunities to present research
- The amount of internship opportunities that were forwarded to students, the archives management class doing an actual archival project from start to finish was very beneficial because I could definitively say what aspects of archives I had experience in

- I benefited from taking UX courses, and found interacting with real clients on projects very valuable. I also learned a lot from the info policy, data visualization, and info services & reference classes. I found lessons about digital archiving interesting and practical.
- Three of the four introductory classes were very useful in giving a broad overview of the information professions (excluding the Information Technologies class).
- The archival management, digital archives and conservation/preservation courses.
- As I am more of a traditional librarian, learning things such as research and cataloging at Pratt have been helpful.
- For job-specific knowledge, my archiving classes helped prepare me for this job. I think the level of use of technology in the program has been helpful. At some point I think the experiences of giving presentations might be beneficial.
- ... UX classes, programming for cultural heritage class, knowledge organization, metadata
- UX stuff, IT stuff, scholarly communications, internship
- Projects in Digital Archives course; Management of Archives and Special Collections course; Archives Appraisal Course; Preservation and Conservation course; Internships completed while enrolled (found through Pratt Listserv)
- Learning about computer coding languages, like HTML, CSS, XML, etc, and content management systems; development of public speaking and presentation skills; learning about cataloging and classification, and knowledge organization in general.
- Classes in Archive Management, Digital Archives,
- ... classes that worked with partners), user-centered thinking/philosophy in classes, classes which touched upon civic/ moral issues inherent in information jobs
- The course in academic librarianship was most useful to me in terms of looking for an academic position and preparing for the interview process.
- Student teaching
- Some of my coursework in archives has been helpful.
- The usability/IA and other IxD courses, info visualization, programming for cultural heritage.

**Appendix LIS3: MSLIS graduating students and alumni report a variety of beneficial learning experiences that specifically mention teaching**

*Graduating Students -*

*Alumni - What learning experiences or aspects of the Pratt MSLIS program have been **most** beneficial to you post-graduation?*

- ... strong support from professor during student teaching, adjunct professors providing alternate perspectives,
- I'd recommend people to take the courses I took with those professors, especially Craig MacDonald.
- Learning how to do Readers Advisory in YA with Jennifer Swan opened my eyes to teen books and how to do an effective RA.
- (e.g. anything taught by Dr. Rabina)
- The networking with other new professionals, adjunct professors, and guest speakers
- I also got a lot out of Ken Soehner's class which has helped me in the work I do at the Frick.

**Appendix LIS4: MSLIS Areas of Study** (note that "None" and "Other" have been manually coded from free-form response)

Area of Study	GSS Percent	GSS N	AS Percent	AS N
---------------	-------------	-------	------------	------

Archives (with or without the advanced certificate)	54.0%	34	52.8%	19
Art History (dual degree)	7.9%	5	11.1%	4
Conservation and Digital Curation (with or without the advanced certificate)	1.6%	1	16.7%	6
Digital Art & Information (dual degree)	1.6%	1	2.8%	1
Digital Humanities (with or without the advanced certificate)	15.9%	10	19.4%	7
Libraries and Academic/Research Contexts (LARC)	7.9%	5	16.7%	6
Law Librarianship (dual degree)	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
Literacy, Education and Outreach (LEO)	15.9%	10	2.8%	1
Museum Libraries (with or without the advanced certificate)	22.2%	14	2.8%	1
Rare Books and Special Collections	34.9%	22	13.9%	5
Data Analytics, Research and Assessment (DARA)	6.3%	4	38.9%	14
School Libraries (Library Media Specialist)	14.3%	9	11.1%	4
User Experience (with or without the advanced certificate)	17.5%	11	11.1%	4
None	0.0%	0	1.6%	1
Other (please explain)	12.7%	8	17.5%	11
<b>answered question</b>		<b>63</b>		<b>36</b>
<b>skipped question</b>		<b>3</b>		<b>5</b>

#### Appendix LIS5: MSLIS Alumni - Types of Organizations that Employ Them

Type of Organization	AS %	AS N
----------------------	------	------

Academic library	22.9%	8
Archive or special collection	22.9%	8
Corporate, law or business library	5.7%	2
Gallery	0.0%	0
Government (local, state, or federal)	0.0%	0
Higher Education (non-library)	2.9%	1
Museum & Museum Library	5.7%	2
Non-profit	17.1%	6
Public library	11.4%	4
Publishing/media	11.4%	4
School library	8.6%	3
Self-employed	2.9%	1
Other (please specify): Doctoral Student, Consultant, Social Media/Freelance Writer, Digital Academic Archive, International Cultural Institute, Advertising (pharmaceuticals), UX research and strategy company	20.0%	7
<b>answered question</b>		<b>35</b>
<b>skipped question</b>		<b>6</b>