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Systematic planning is an ongoing, active, broad-based approach to:

a) Continuous review and revision of a program’s vision, mission, goals, objectives, and learning outcomes;
b) Assessment of attainment of goals, objectives, and learning outcomes;
c) Realignment and redesign of core activities in response to the results of assessment; and

d) Communication of planning policies and processes, assessment activities, and results of assessment to program constituents.

Effective broad-based, systematic planning requires engagement of the program’s constituents and thorough and open documentation of those activities that constitute planning. Many programs achieve their planning processes through development of formal planning documents that incorporate explicit targets or deadlines for achievement of planning processes.
Systematic Program Planning: 2015

Systematic planning is an ongoing, broad-based approach to:

I.1.1 Continuous review and revision of the program’s vision, mission, goals, objectives, and student learning outcomes;

I.1.2 Assessment of attainment of program goals, program objectives, and student learning outcomes;

I.1.3 Improvements to the program based on analysis of assessment data

I.1.4 Communication of planning policies and processes to program constituents. The program has a written mission statement and a written strategic or long-range plan that provides vision and direction for its future, identifies needs and resources for its mission and goals, and is supported by university administration.

All Standards areas:

• Evaluation involves those served (e.g. students, faculty, employers, alumni, and other constituents).

• The program has explicit, documented evidence of its ongoing decision-making processes and the data to substantiate evaluation.

• The program demonstrates how the results of the evaluation are systematically used to improve the program and to plan for the future.
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Study Design: Research Questions

1. What methods are used to engage LIS students in program planning and assessment?
2. Which of these methods are commonly used?
3. Are these commonly used methods frequently and consistently employed?
4. Do LIS programs provide specific, demonstrable examples of engaging students in programmatic developments and improvements?
Study Design: Methodology

- Qualitative content analysis of 15 *Program Presentations*
- Initial codes drawn from Lieutenant (2015)
- Codes iteratively refined
- Lead author coded entire data set
- Dual-coded subset of data for inter-rater reliability
- Resolved discrepancies through discussion
Preliminary Results: Questions 1 & 2

Student Engagement Methods

(n = 15)
(“Commonly used” = 8 programs or more)

- Course evaluations: 15
- Surveys: 15
- Program governance representatives: 15
- Meetings: 15
- Supplimentary faculty evaluations: 12
- Digital communication tools: 10
- Focus groups: 8
- Required assignments: 7
- External program reviews: 5
- Interviews: 4
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Preliminary Results: Question 4

Changes and Improvements Based on Student Engagement

(n = 15)

Curriculum: Program-level
Curriculum: Course-level
Student affairs and services
Assessment/planning processes
Physical resources & facilities
Administration & finance
Faculty affairs
Mission, goals, & objectives
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Governance Representation

Faculty Affairs:
Hiring, promotion, and tenure; Teaching assignments; Roles and responsibilities

Student Affairs and Services:
Policies and procedures; Admissions; Scholarships and awards; Marketing and web redesign; Advising

Physical/Digital Resources and Facilities:
Technology needs; Online courses and programs; Facilities and space needs

Diversity:
Curriculum; Recruitment and retention; Events and special programs
Student Advisory Boards

Feedback on program quality and input on program initiatives
Compliment student representation in other governance bodies
Monthly or regular meetings with administration; may include staff

Boards Responsibilities:
• Appoint students representative to governance bodies
• Organize town hall meetings
• Run annual topical current student survey
• Manage student organization budget

Specific Impacts:
• Informed facilities and space planning
• Revised core courses
• Streamlined financial aid application process
• Increased in-person course offerings
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Student-Run Meetings

Organized, publicized, and facilitated by students
Led by student organization representatives
Held once every quarter/semester or annually
Mixed attendance (students, faculty, administration, and staff), students-only, or both

Specific Impacts:
• Added and revised core courses
• Added new courses
• Created a career services office
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Student-Run Surveys

Designed, disseminated, and analyzed by students
Led by student organization or curriculum governance representatives
Types of surveys:
• Annual comprehensive survey
• Annual topical survey on core curriculum
• One-time topical survey on curriculum revisions
Specific Impacts:
• Added and revised core courses; Modified course schedules; Revised course titles and numbers
• Added new courses
• Created a career services office
Broad-based, Systematic Surveys

Target all students at specific progression points through specific surveys:
- New students at program entrance
- Current students at midpoint
- Select students during internship/CO-OP
- Exiting students at graduation

Specific Impacts:
- Motivated comprehensive curriculum review
- Revised specializations; Incorporated leadership throughout curriculum; Modified course schedules
- Revised assignments
Supplementary Course Evaluations

Formative Qualitative Course Evaluation:
• Required for all courses at the middle of the term
• Written comments or student discussion with anonymous report
• Designed to solicit student perspectives before the course ends

Summative Qualitative Course Evaluation:
• Required for all courses at the end of the term
• Instrument created by student organization leaders
• Evaluates multiple aspects of the course
• Designed to provide actionable feedback to faculty

Weekly Course Evaluations
• Used once during the first offering of a redesigned core course
• Evaluated course content and organization
• Syllabus revised to provide more experience with web technologies
Required Assignments

*Program Presentation I* revised its Mission, Goals, and Objectives (MGO) statements

- Draft MGOs distributed to students enrolled in a marketing course
- Students reviewed draft MGOs and MGOs from other LIS organizations
- Students provided constructive comments and feedback on draft MGOs.

Complimentary students engagement methods used:

- Focus group: Reviewed final draft MGOs
- Student representation in program governance: Voting rights on final MGO statements.
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Interviews

Types of interviews:
• Exit interviews: Summative assessment of program quality
• Strategic planning: Input to inform Working Plan

Specific Impacts:
• Reviewing advising processes
• Created specializations; Revised curriculum structure; Incorporating service learning and opportunities for practical experience
• Hired career services staff
Summary of Findings

Engagement Methods
• Most common: Surveys, course evaluations, governance representation
• Less common: Focus groups, interviews, student-run engagement

Changes and Impacts
• Most common: Curriculum, student affairs and services
• Rare: Faculty affairs, administration and finances, & mission, goals, & objectives
• Impact of specific changes: Mixed results
Recommendations

• Align methods with their purpose
• Be creative
• Adopt mixed methods
• Triangulate results
• Avoid analysis paralysis
• Improve student leadership opportunities
Questions for Conversation

• What is missing?
• Who are we responsive to?
• Are we changing?
• Are we prepared?
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“Thank you for listening to students’ perspectives!”

- Student feedback from 2012 Student Curriculum Survey
  Survey run by Student organization leaders
  Program Presentation L (Spring 2014)

Elizabeth Lieutenant: e.lieutenant@me.com & http://elizabethlieutenant.com/

Bill Kules: kules@cua.edu & http://questionablepedagogy.com/
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“What are we going to do?” Applying content analysis methodology to solve your research problems. Poster. Bridging the Spectrum Symposium. Washington, DC. February 12.
